



Monitoring  
Analytics

# ORDC Simulation Results

The Independent Market Monitor for PJM

April 26, 2019

This page intentionally left blank.

## Introduction

PJM's March 29<sup>th</sup> Price Formation Filing includes simulation results estimating the impact of PJM's proposal. The Market Monitor replicated PJM's simulations using identical software and the same input data as PJM. Replication allows the Market Monitor to verify the results, understand the modelling assumptions, analyze the results in greater detail, and perform alternative simulation scenarios.

The Market Monitor also performed simulations using alternative specifications of the Operating Reserve Demand Curve (ORDC) to demonstrate how market results may change under different proposals.

PJM used PowerGEM's PROBE Perfect Dispatch Model (PROBE Ver 2.85\_1-M) to run its simulations. PROBE Ver 2.85\_1-M contained an error that caused the synchronized reserve shadow price (used to determine the price of synchronized reserves) to be greater than the prices indicated by the ORDC curves. The result of the error is that the simulation results overstate the prices and the overall costs of reserves. This issue was identified and corrected in PROBE Ver 2.85\_1-P and later versions. The Market Monitor used PROBE Ver 2.85\_1-R, which incorporated the fix, to produce its own simulation results. PROBE Ver 2.85\_1-R produces synchronized reserve shadow prices that are consistent with the ORDC curves.

The PowerGEM PROBE Perfect Dispatch software is designed to optimize resource commitment and dispatch to find the lowest production cost solution for energy and reserve requirements, subject to resource and network constraints in a given 24 hours period. One of the inputs to this optimization is the set of resource types that can have their commitment and dispatch changed relative to an initial assumed start state. In the typical perfect dispatch case only diesel and combustion turbine resources can have commitment changes, while other resource types are limited to redispatch, unless otherwise specified. The larger the set of resource types that can have their commitment and dispatch optimized, the more optimal the solution in terms of minimizing production cost given energy and reserve requirements. The PROBE software will change the commitment and dispatch of a given resource set to minimize the cost of any significant changes in market conditions within the 24 hour period. This same flexibility in system dispatch and commitment is generally not available in actual operations. This means that the simulations will tend to have fewer periods of high prices and that the high prices will tend to be lower than in an actual real time market day with the same load conditions. The simulated market results will underestimate the real world costs of meeting the energy and reserve requirements in the simulation cases.

## PJM Simulations

PJM performed three simulations: Cases A, B, and C.

Case A includes no changes in the dispatch and pricing process from PJM's standard Perfect Dispatch simulation software.<sup>1</sup> PJM currently uses the Perfect Dispatch software to benchmark its actual real-time market performance against a simulated outcome that economically optimizes resource dispatch and fast start resource commitment.<sup>2</sup> Case A represents this optimal dispatch and commitment and does not represent the actual status quo. Thus, comparisons using Case A as the benchmark will underestimate the real world costs of meeting the energy and reserve requirements in the simulation cases. PJM also modifies the Case A results by incorporating the payment of a single clearing price to all synchronized reserves.

Case B uses a change in the Perfect Dispatch software settings to extend the economic evaluation of resource commitments to steam units, typically committed prior to the operating day by the Day-Ahead Market, the Day-Ahead Reliability Assessment, or manually by reliability processes. Case B presents a significant departure from reality by allowing the software to decommit resources required by PJM for reliability. Day-ahead reliability commitments accounted for an average of 1,100 MW of generation per hour in 2018.

Case C introduces PJM's proposed ORDC to Case B. PJM argues that the relevant comparison to assess the impact of the ORDC proposal is the comparison of Case B to Case C. Because Case B modifies actual PJM operating conditions, it is not an accurate base case. The Market Monitor also compares Case A to Case C and creates a Case A ORDC that implements the ORDC in the Case A model. If it is the case, and PJM implies that it is, that the ORDC would replace manual operator commitments with market commitments, the relevant comparison is Case A to Case C, because Case A contains the steam unit commitments made by operators.<sup>3</sup> Case B removes all uneconomic operator commitments.

The Market Monitor disagrees with PJM's conclusion that a 30 minute time horizon is appropriate for the 10 minute reserve products. Case C 15 minute presents a case where the ORDC is shifted inward using a 15 minute forecast time horizon for the synchronized and primary reserve demand curves.

Table 1 shows the summary results for the five simulation cases.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Perfect Dispatch software is PowerGEM's PROBE Perfect Dispatch Model.

<sup>2</sup> See PJM Perfect Dispatch Fact Sheet, <<https://www.pjm.com/-/media/about-pjm/newsroom/fact-sheets/perfect-dispatch-fact-sheet.ashx?la=en>>, last accessed April 19, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> See March 29<sup>th</sup> Filing, Pulong Testimony.

**Table 1 Comparison of simulation cases**

	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case A ORDC	Case C 15
Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)	\$35.80	\$37.30	\$37.76	\$36.91	\$37.61
Generator Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)	\$33.29	\$34.72	\$35.18	\$34.39	\$35.03
Generator Energy Revenue (\$ millions)	\$26,796.6	\$27,943.2	\$28,312.6	\$27,679.3	\$28,191.9
Weighted Synchronized Reserve MCP (\$/MWh)	\$1.99	\$2.58	\$6.33	\$6.05	\$4.66
Weighted Non-Synchronized Reserve MCP (\$/MWh)	\$1.03	\$1.25	\$3.21	\$3.08	\$2.34
Weighted Secondary Reserve MCP (\$/MWh)	NA	NA	\$0.0004	\$0.0004	\$0.0015
Hourly Average Cleared Synchronized Reserve (MW/hour)	1,817.8	1,818.2	3,167.3	3,189.6	2,866.6
Hourly Average Cleared Non-Synchronized Reserve (MW/hour)	634.6	634.2	677.6	678.1	677.3
Hourly Average Cleared Secondary Reserve (MW/hour)	NA	NA	1,944.0	1,928.2	2,195.2
Hourly Average Cleared Total Reserve (MW/hour)	2,452.4	2,452.4	5,789.0	5,795.9	5,739.0
Total Cleared Synchronized Reserve (millions MWh)	15.5	15.5	27.0	27.2	24.4
Total Cleared Non-Synchronized Reserve (millions MWh)	5.4	5.4	5.8	5.8	5.8
Total Cleared Secondary Reserve (millions MWh)	NA	NA	16.6	16.4	18.7
Reserve Revenue (\$ millions)	\$36.4	\$46.7	\$189.3	\$182.1	\$127.3
Uplift (\$ millions)	\$109.9	\$30.4	\$27.5	\$93.0	\$28.0
Bid Production Cost (\$ millions)	\$13,229.6	\$13,121.2	\$13,152.0	\$13,256.8	\$13,135.8
Total Energy and Reserve Market Revenues (\$ millions)	\$26,833.0	\$27,989.9	\$28,501.9	\$27,861.5	\$28,319.2

### **Case B to Case C**

PJM argues that the relevant comparison to assess the impact of the ORDC proposal is the comparison of Case B to Case C. Because Case B modifies actual PJM operating conditions, it is not an accurate base case. The comparison of Case B to Case C understates the impact of PJM’s proposed changes on the actual market outcomes. The Market Monitor includes this comparison in order to highlight some of the detailed impacts of the comparison that PJM did not include in their filing. PJM presents the changes from Case B to Case C for the calendar year 2018 as the impact of implementing its proposed ORDC. In addition to the summary metrics provide in PJM’s filing, the Market Monitor provides additional detailed metrics for each case.

Table 2 provides monthly load weighted average energy prices. The increase in LMP due to the ORDC is much greater in January, primarily resulting from higher base prices during the first week of January.

**Table 2 PJM load-weighted average LMP: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case B	Case C	Difference
Jan	\$73.87	\$75.01	\$1.14
Feb	\$27.58	\$28.00	\$0.42
Mar	\$30.64	\$30.97	\$0.34
Apr	\$34.10	\$34.73	\$0.63
May	\$31.96	\$32.33	\$0.37
Jun	\$30.13	\$30.48	\$0.35
Jul	\$34.53	\$34.85	\$0.31
Aug	\$36.02	\$36.22	\$0.20
Sep	\$35.59	\$35.72	\$0.13
Oct	\$33.90	\$34.52	\$0.63
Nov	\$37.45	\$38.05	\$0.60
Dec	\$33.23	\$33.66	\$0.43
Total	\$37.30	\$37.76	\$0.46

The LMP increases vary geographically. Table 3 shows the differences in annual average hub LMPs and Table 4 shows zonal load-weighted average LMP increases.

**Table 3 Average hub LMP: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Average LMP (\$/Mwh)		
	Case B	Case C	Difference
AEP GEN HUB	\$32.20	\$32.68	\$0.48
AEP-DAYTON HUB	\$33.52	\$34.02	\$0.49
ATSI GEN HUB	\$34.40	\$34.87	\$0.47
CHICAGO GEN HUB	\$28.68	\$29.07	\$0.39
CHICAGO HUB	\$29.29	\$29.68	\$0.38
DOMINION HUB	\$37.25	\$37.73	\$0.48
EASTERN HUB	\$37.34	\$37.64	\$0.30
N ILLINOIS HUB	\$29.09	\$29.47	\$0.38
NEW JERSEY HUB	\$35.14	\$35.55	\$0.40
OHIO HUB	\$33.28	\$33.78	\$0.50
WEST INT HUB	\$35.30	\$35.75	\$0.46
WESTERN HUB	\$35.51	\$36.01	\$0.50

**Table 4 PJM load-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/Mwh)		
	Case B	Case C	Difference
AECO	\$37.81	\$38.30	\$0.49
AEP	\$36.65	\$37.17	\$0.51
AP	\$38.12	\$38.62	\$0.50
ATSI	\$37.24	\$37.71	\$0.48
BGE	\$42.13	\$42.63	\$0.50
COMED	\$30.74	\$31.15	\$0.41
CPP	\$35.67	\$36.21	\$0.55
DAY	\$36.44	\$36.97	\$0.53
DEOK	\$36.12	\$36.61	\$0.49
DOM	\$41.06	\$41.56	\$0.50
DPL	\$41.46	\$41.72	\$0.26
DUQ	\$36.95	\$37.42	\$0.47
EKPC	\$35.75	\$36.28	\$0.53
JCPL	\$37.81	\$38.22	\$0.41
METED	\$38.14	\$38.55	\$0.42
PECO	\$37.55	\$37.98	\$0.43
PENELEC	\$36.94	\$37.46	\$0.52
PEPCO	\$40.86	\$41.35	\$0.50
PPL	\$37.40	\$37.77	\$0.38
PSEG	\$37.34	\$37.72	\$0.38

Average generator weighted average LMP increases differ from load-weighted average LMP increases. Table 5 shows the generation-weighted average LMP at generation pricing nodes by zone. Typically, load LMP exceeds generator LMP due to congestion and losses, which is the case for most zones in both Cases B and C. However, generator LMPs increase more than load LMPs from Case B to Case C for nine of 19 zones.

**Table 5 PJM generation-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Generation Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case B	Case C	Difference
AECO	\$37.18	\$37.55	\$0.38
AEP	\$33.41	\$33.91	\$0.50
AP	\$35.26	\$35.75	\$0.49
ATSI	\$35.95	\$36.45	\$0.49
BGE	\$41.81	\$42.30	\$0.49
COMED	\$28.99	\$29.36	\$0.37
DAY	\$38.76	\$39.46	\$0.70
DEOK	\$33.44	\$33.94	\$0.50
DOM	\$40.34	\$40.85	\$0.50
DPL	\$44.92	\$45.12	\$0.20
DUQ	\$35.68	\$36.14	\$0.45
EKPC	\$36.29	\$36.87	\$0.58
JCPL	\$33.85	\$34.24	\$0.39
METED	\$34.06	\$34.45	\$0.39
OVEC	\$31.31	\$31.80	\$0.49
PECO	\$34.78	\$35.18	\$0.40
PENELEC	\$34.75	\$35.37	\$0.62
PEPCO	\$43.84	\$44.50	\$0.66
PPL	\$35.42	\$35.81	\$0.39
PSEG	\$34.80	\$35.21	\$0.42

Table 6 shows the increases in monthly MW weighted average reserve clearing prices for synchronized and primary reserves. Average prices for secondary reserves are zero. Reserve prices more than double annually, increasing in all months and by the largest amounts in the winter months.



**Table 6 Monthly PJM reserve market prices: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Reserve Weighted Average Market Clearing Prices (\$/MW)					
	Case B		Case C		Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	\$6.03	\$1.43	\$15.80	\$6.66	\$9.77	\$5.23
Feb	\$2.36	\$0.31	\$6.65	\$2.57	\$4.30	\$2.26
Mar	\$3.85	\$1.94	\$6.71	\$3.04	\$2.85	\$1.10
Apr	\$4.96	\$2.47	\$7.90	\$3.87	\$2.94	\$1.40
May	\$3.20	\$1.09	\$5.82	\$2.82	\$2.62	\$1.72
Jun	\$1.29	\$1.06	\$3.74	\$2.30	\$2.45	\$1.24
Jul	\$1.45	\$1.08	\$4.11	\$2.25	\$2.65	\$1.17
Aug	\$0.81	\$0.45	\$3.59	\$1.89	\$2.78	\$1.44
Sep	\$1.74	\$1.47	\$4.23	\$2.82	\$2.49	\$1.35
Oct	\$2.38	\$1.94	\$6.04	\$3.83	\$3.66	\$1.89
Nov	\$1.93	\$1.29	\$5.92	\$3.13	\$3.99	\$1.84
Dec	\$0.95	\$0.59	\$5.46	\$2.89	\$4.50	\$2.30
Annual	\$2.58	\$1.25	\$6.33	\$3.21	\$3.75	\$1.95

Table 7 shows the monthly increases in the quantity of reserves. The increase in synchronized reserves ranges from 51.0 percent in April to 92.9 percent in February. The increases in primary reserves range from 0.7 percent in October to 19.5 percent in February.

**Table 7 Monthly PJM reserve market clearing: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Cleared Reserve MWh							
	Case B		Case C		Difference		Percent Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	1,333,092.8	460,168.2	2,418,397.5	546,578.3	1,085,304.7	86,410.1	81.4%	18.8%
Feb	1,104,579.4	424,887.5	2,130,543.1	507,781.1	1,025,963.7	82,893.6	92.9%	19.5%
Mar	1,320,246.7	480,453.2	2,040,335.0	508,224.3	720,088.4	27,771.1	54.5%	5.8%
Apr	1,242,142.7	444,263.6	1,875,125.5	478,559.4	632,982.8	34,295.9	51.0%	7.7%
May	1,224,596.4	450,672.8	1,926,473.6	487,224.9	701,877.2	36,552.1	57.3%	8.1%
Jun	1,260,166.9	415,391.3	2,259,288.5	423,859.6	999,121.6	8,468.4	79.3%	2.0%
Jul	1,311,952.1	484,208.9	2,367,598.0	507,157.2	1,055,645.9	22,948.3	80.5%	4.7%
Aug	1,298,609.1	481,900.0	2,377,283.8	512,919.8	1,078,674.7	31,019.7	83.1%	6.4%
Sep	1,307,381.3	372,220.2	2,329,466.3	378,763.9	1,022,085.0	6,543.7	78.2%	1.8%
Oct	1,462,476.9	435,479.7	2,450,038.5	438,649.3	987,561.6	3,169.7	67.5%	0.7%
Nov	1,310,593.5	471,232.5	2,278,685.6	489,567.6	968,092.0	18,335.2	73.9%	3.9%
Dec	1,315,281.3	482,772.0	2,532,455.1	494,226.7	1,217,173.9	11,454.7	92.5%	2.4%
Total	15,491,118.8	5,403,649.7	26,985,690.1	5,773,512.0	11,494,571.3	369,862.3	74.2%	6.8%

Increases in energy prices, reserve prices, and reserve clearing MW create higher revenues for suppliers. Table 8 provides the monthly generator revenue comparison for Case B to Case C. The total generator revenue increase from Case B to Case C is \$511.9 million. Energy revenues increase by \$369.4 million, accounting for 72.1 percent of the increase. Synchronized reserve revenues increase by \$130.8 million, accounting for 25.6 percent of increased revenues.

**Table 8 Monthly PJM generator revenue: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Case B				Revenue (\$)				Case C				Difference			
	Generation				Case C				Generation				Difference			
	SR	PR	OR	SR	PR	OR	SR	PR	OR	SR	PR	OR	SR	PR	OR	
Jan	\$5,081,623,092.5	\$8,041,039.6	\$657,447.2	\$0.0	\$5,179,435,042.5	\$38,219,472.1	\$3,640,986.1	\$6,807.5	\$97,811,950.0	\$30,178,432.6	\$2,983,538.9	\$6,807.5	\$24,251,912.0	\$11,571,891.5	\$1,174,639.1	\$0.0
Feb	\$1,519,472,468.7	\$2,603,153.7	\$132,698.2	\$0.0	\$1,543,724,380.7	\$14,175,045.2	\$1,307,337.2	\$0.0	\$24,251,912.0	\$11,571,891.5	\$1,174,639.1	\$0.0	\$20,989,475.3	\$8,598,219.1	\$613,316.8	\$0.0
Mar	\$1,859,115,556.6	\$5,089,052.2	\$933,042.7	\$0.0	\$1,880,105,031.9	\$13,687,271.3	\$1,546,359.5	\$0.0	\$20,989,475.3	\$8,598,219.1	\$613,316.8	\$0.0	\$33,121,170.5	\$8,650,052.6	\$755,155.2	\$0.0
Apr	\$1,826,358,822.0	\$6,159,167.4	\$1,098,624.4	\$0.0	\$1,859,479,992.5	\$14,809,220.0	\$1,853,779.5	\$0.0	\$33,121,170.5	\$8,650,052.6	\$755,155.2	\$0.0	\$20,751,109.2	\$7,287,174.1	\$879,999.9	\$0.0
May	\$1,775,298,936.7	\$3,915,318.4	\$492,517.1	\$0.0	\$1,796,050,045.9	\$11,202,492.5	\$1,372,517.0	\$0.0	\$20,751,109.2	\$7,287,174.1	\$879,999.9	\$0.0	\$23,322,986.0	\$6,823,761.5	\$536,496.9	\$0.0
Jun	\$1,935,187,664.6	\$1,628,149.4	\$439,857.2	\$0.0	\$1,958,510,650.6	\$8,451,910.9	\$976,354.2	\$0.0	\$23,322,986.0	\$6,823,761.5	\$536,496.9	\$0.0	\$24,392,351.7	\$7,820,992.2	\$619,288.7	\$0.0
Jul	\$2,580,228,898.0	\$1,907,918.9	\$521,565.1	\$0.0	\$2,604,621,249.7	\$9,728,911.1	\$1,140,853.8	\$0.0	\$24,392,351.7	\$7,820,992.2	\$619,288.7	\$0.0	\$18,206,133.6	\$7,480,720.9	\$752,717.3	\$0.0
Aug	\$2,750,194,638.6	\$1,050,710.0	\$214,835.1	\$0.0	\$2,768,400,772.2	\$8,531,431.0	\$967,552.5	\$0.0	\$18,206,133.6	\$7,480,720.9	\$752,717.3	\$0.0	\$11,347,186.4	\$7,583,966.2	\$520,850.7	\$0.0
Sep	\$2,222,742,250.0	\$2,271,640.2	\$546,674.0	\$0.0	\$2,234,089,436.4	\$9,855,606.3	\$1,067,524.7	\$0.0	\$11,347,186.4	\$7,583,966.2	\$520,850.7	\$0.0	\$37,362,865.4	\$11,325,855.9	\$834,904.0	\$0.0
Oct	\$2,024,751,056.9	\$3,481,601.1	\$845,140.1	\$0.0	\$2,062,113,922.3	\$14,807,457.1	\$1,680,044.1	\$0.0	\$37,362,865.4	\$11,325,855.9	\$834,904.0	\$0.0	\$2,305,248,950.4	\$13,485,785.4	\$1,531,255.5	\$0.0
Nov	\$2,273,655,880.6	\$2,530,961.9	\$608,868.5	\$0.0	\$2,305,248,950.4	\$13,485,785.4	\$1,531,255.5	\$0.0	\$31,593,069.8	\$10,954,823.6	\$922,387.0	\$0.0	\$26,248,925.0	\$12,561,401.2	\$1,144,160.8	\$0.0
Dec	\$2,094,561,286.0	\$1,254,060.2	\$283,817.4	\$0.0	\$2,120,810,211.0	\$13,815,461.4	\$1,427,978.3	\$0.0	\$26,248,925.0	\$12,561,401.2	\$1,144,160.8	\$0.0	\$28,312,589,686.1	\$170,770,064.5	\$18,512,542.5	\$6,807.5
Total	\$27,943,190,551.2	\$39,932,773.1	\$6,775,087.1	\$0.0	\$28,312,589,686.1	\$170,770,064.5	\$18,512,542.5	\$6,807.5	\$369,399,134.9	\$130,837,291.4	\$11,737,455.4	\$6,807.5				

Table 9 shows generator revenues by technology type. Consistent with their, roughly equal, high shares of energy output in PJM, steam, nuclear, and combined cycle gas units receive the greatest benefits from the ORDC.<sup>4</sup>

Revenues increase most for coal and gas steam units, not including combined cycles. This result is expected. Steam units, which are predominantly coal steam, have high capacity factors due to their moderate marginal costs and inflexibility in starting and shutting down, so steam units receive a large share of the benefit of higher energy prices. Steam units’ energy revenues increase by \$130.6 million, reserve revenues increase by \$25.8 million and total revenues increase by \$156.4 million.

Nuclear units also have high capacity factors due to their low marginal cost and inflexibility. Nuclear units’ energy revenues increase by \$110.1 million but nuclear units do not provide reserves.

Combined cycle units have high capacity factors, but not as high as nuclear and steam units. Combined cycle units’ energy revenues increase by \$75.0 million, reserve revenues increase by \$72.6 million, and total revenues increase by \$147.6 million. Combined cycle units greater flexibility leads to the largest increase in reserve revenues by technology type.

<sup>4</sup> See Monitoring Analytics, LLC, 2018 State of the Market Report for PJM, Vol. II, Section 3: Energy Market, Table 3-9.

**Table 9 Generator revenues by technology type: 2018, Case B to Case C**

	Case B			Revenue (\$)			Case C			Difference		
	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR			
Battery	\$148,766.5	\$0.9	\$0.0	\$151,937.2	\$533.1	\$55.4	\$3,170.7	\$532.2	\$55.4			
CC	\$7,759,725,631.2	\$22,947,672.0	\$563.7	\$7,834,745,587.7	\$95,559,023.1	\$4,333.1	\$75,019,956.5	\$72,611,351.1	\$3,769.4			
CT	\$937,069,970.0	\$7,732,867.4	\$6,477,616.2	\$974,813,399.2	\$32,734,619.1	\$17,732,719.7	\$37,743,429.2	\$25,001,751.6	\$11,255,103.5			
Diesel	\$12,472,477.6	\$73,916.3	\$104,367.6	\$12,674,486.3	\$355,125.0	\$265,462.8	\$202,008.6	\$281,208.7	\$161,095.1			
Fuelcell	\$7,469,775.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,556,319.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$86,544.3	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Hydro	\$484,669,838.3	\$2,887,448.2	\$104,804.6	\$489,809,456.5	\$9,556,905.8	\$265,559.0	\$5,139,618.2	\$6,669,457.6	\$160,754.5			
Landfill	\$57,922,197.9	\$271,169.1	\$79,734.3	\$58,565,464.2	\$743,175.1	\$198,804.1	\$643,266.3	\$472,006.0	\$119,069.9			
Nuclear	\$9,049,991,523.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$9,160,068,376.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$110,076,852.9	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Solar	\$66,827,029.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$67,156,170.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$329,140.5	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Steam	\$8,955,211,127.4	\$6,018,945.5	\$8,000.6	\$9,085,761,854.0	\$31,819,014.7	\$45,608.3	\$130,550,726.6	\$25,800,069.1	\$37,607.7			
Wind	\$611,688,031.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$621,289,059.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$9,601,028.6	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Total	\$27,943,196,368.3	\$39,932,019.4	\$6,775,087.1	\$28,312,592,110.7	\$170,768,395.8	\$18,512,542.5	\$369,395,742.4	\$130,836,376.4	\$11,737,455.4			

### Case A to Case C

The comparison of Case A to Case C provides a better estimate of the results of PJM’s proposed ORDC compared to the status quo, although the status quo is adjusted to incorporate optimal resource dispatch and fast start resource commitment. A comparison of Case A to Case C shows a higher increase in energy prices, because Case A has lower prices than Case B. Case A prices are lower because more generation is online in Case A, reflecting actual market operations. Case C and Case B allow the software to decommit uneconomic steam units, which are online for reliability or constraints at PJM’s instruction.

If it is the case, and PJM implies that it is, that the ORDC would replace manual operator commitments with market commitments, the relevant comparison is Case A to Case C, because Case A contains the steam unit commitments made by operators. Case B removes all uneconomic operator commitments.

Table 10 provides monthly load weighted average energy prices. The increases in LMP due to the ORDC are higher when comparing Case A to Case C, rather than Case B to Case C.

**Table 10 PJM load-weighted average LMP: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/Mwh)		
	Case A	Case C	Difference
Jan	\$68.39	\$75.01	\$6.62
Feb	\$25.67	\$28.00	\$2.33
Mar	\$28.82	\$30.97	\$2.16
Apr	\$33.19	\$34.73	\$1.54
May	\$30.80	\$32.33	\$1.53
Jun	\$28.75	\$30.48	\$1.72
Jul	\$33.64	\$34.85	\$1.21
Aug	\$35.42	\$36.22	\$0.80
Sep	\$34.73	\$35.72	\$0.99
Oct	\$32.92	\$34.52	\$1.60
Nov	\$36.87	\$38.05	\$1.18
Dec	\$32.37	\$33.66	\$1.29
Total	\$35.80	\$37.76	\$1.96

Table 11 shows the differences in annual average PJM trading hub LMPs.

**Table 11 Average hub LMP: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Average LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case C	Difference
AEP GEN HUB	\$31.08	\$32.68	\$1.60
AEP-DAYTON HUB	\$32.43	\$34.02	\$1.59
ATSI GEN HUB	\$33.18	\$34.87	\$1.69
CHICAGO GEN HUB	\$27.39	\$29.07	\$1.67
CHICAGO HUB	\$27.97	\$29.68	\$1.71
DOMINION HUB	\$35.66	\$37.73	\$2.07
EASTERN HUB	\$35.78	\$37.64	\$1.86
N ILLINOIS HUB	\$27.77	\$29.47	\$1.70
NEW JERSEY HUB	\$33.69	\$35.55	\$1.86
OHIO HUB	\$32.21	\$33.78	\$1.57
WEST INT HUB	\$34.01	\$35.75	\$1.74
WESTERN HUB	\$34.10	\$36.01	\$1.91

Table 12 shows the zonal load-weighted average LMP increases.

**Table 12 PJM load-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case C	Difference
AECO	\$36.31	\$38.30	\$1.99
AEP	\$35.36	\$37.17	\$1.80
AP	\$36.59	\$38.62	\$2.03
ATSI	\$35.98	\$37.71	\$1.74
BGE	\$40.04	\$42.63	\$2.59
COMED	\$29.47	\$31.15	\$1.68
CPP	\$34.87	\$36.21	\$1.34
DAY	\$35.17	\$36.97	\$1.79
DEOK	\$34.74	\$36.61	\$1.87
DOM	\$39.25	\$41.56	\$2.31
DPL	\$39.62	\$41.72	\$2.10
DUQ	\$35.67	\$37.42	\$1.75
EKPC	\$34.44	\$36.28	\$1.84
JCPL	\$36.23	\$38.22	\$1.99
METED	\$36.63	\$38.55	\$1.93
PECO	\$35.89	\$37.98	\$2.09
PENELEC	\$35.67	\$37.46	\$1.80
PEPCO	\$38.96	\$41.35	\$2.39
PPL	\$35.73	\$37.77	\$2.04
PSEG	\$35.84	\$37.72	\$1.88

Table 13 shows the increases in energy prices at generation pricing nodes.

**Table 13 PJM generation-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Generation Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case C	Difference
AECO	\$35.67	\$37.55	\$1.89
AEP	\$32.25	\$33.91	\$1.65
AP	\$33.90	\$35.75	\$1.85
ATSI	\$34.66	\$36.45	\$1.79
BGE	\$39.54	\$42.30	\$2.77
COMED	\$27.39	\$29.36	\$1.96
DAY	\$37.03	\$39.46	\$2.43
DEOK	\$32.40	\$33.94	\$1.54
DOM	\$38.59	\$40.85	\$2.26
DPL	\$41.79	\$45.12	\$3.34
DUQ	\$34.41	\$36.14	\$1.73
EKPC	\$34.99	\$36.87	\$1.88
JCPL	\$32.66	\$34.24	\$1.58
METED	\$32.61	\$34.45	\$1.85
OVEC	\$30.59	\$31.80	\$1.21
PECO	\$33.39	\$35.18	\$1.79
PENELEC	\$33.60	\$35.37	\$1.77
PEPCO	\$41.00	\$44.50	\$3.50
PPL	\$33.79	\$35.81	\$2.02
PSEG	\$33.55	\$35.21	\$1.66

Table 14 shows the increases in reserve prices. Both synchronized reserve and primary reserve prices are more than three times higher in Case C than in Case A.

**Table 14 Monthly PJM reserve market prices: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Reserve Weighted Average Market Clearing Prices (\$/MW)					
	Case A		Case C		Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	\$4.55	\$1.28	\$15.80	\$6.66	\$11.25	\$5.39
Feb	\$1.03	\$0.16	\$6.65	\$2.57	\$5.62	\$2.41
Mar	\$2.42	\$1.17	\$6.71	\$3.04	\$4.29	\$1.87
Apr	\$4.34	\$2.37	\$7.90	\$3.87	\$3.56	\$1.50
May	\$2.82	\$1.07	\$5.82	\$2.82	\$2.99	\$1.75
Jun	\$0.97	\$0.74	\$3.74	\$2.30	\$2.77	\$1.56
Jul	\$1.12	\$0.84	\$4.11	\$2.25	\$2.99	\$1.41
Aug	\$0.73	\$0.43	\$3.59	\$1.89	\$2.86	\$1.46
Sep	\$1.48	\$1.25	\$4.23	\$2.82	\$2.75	\$1.57
Oct	\$2.00	\$1.66	\$6.04	\$3.83	\$4.05	\$2.17
Nov	\$1.68	\$0.98	\$5.92	\$3.13	\$4.24	\$2.15
Dec	\$0.71	\$0.50	\$5.46	\$2.89	\$4.75	\$2.39
Annual	\$1.99	\$1.03	\$6.33	\$3.21	\$4.34	\$2.18

Table 15 shows monthly reserve market clearing results. Case A and Case B clear similar amounts of reserves, so the difference between Case A and Case C is very similar to the difference between Case B and Case C.

**Table 15 Monthly PJM reserve market clearing: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Cleared Reserve MWh							
	Case A		Case C		Difference		Percent Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	1,330,584.2	462,676.8	2,418,397.5	546,578.3	1,087,813.3	83,901.5	81.8%	18.1%
Feb	1,104,579.5	424,887.5	2,130,543.1	507,781.1	1,025,963.6	82,893.6	92.9%	19.5%
Mar	1,320,385.9	480,314.2	2,040,335.0	508,224.3	719,949.2	27,910.2	54.5%	5.8%
Apr	1,242,293.3	444,113.1	1,875,125.5	478,559.4	632,832.2	34,446.3	50.9%	7.8%
May	1,224,815.1	450,454.2	1,926,473.6	487,224.9	701,658.5	36,770.7	57.3%	8.2%
Jun	1,259,202.4	416,355.6	2,259,288.5	423,859.6	1,000,086.1	7,504.0	79.4%	1.8%
Jul	1,311,503.4	484,657.4	2,367,598.0	507,157.2	1,056,094.6	22,499.8	80.5%	4.6%
Aug	1,298,832.7	481,676.6	2,377,283.8	512,919.8	1,078,451.1	31,243.2	83.0%	6.5%
Sep	1,307,345.4	372,256.5	2,329,466.3	378,763.9	1,022,120.9	6,507.5	78.2%	1.7%
Oct	1,462,599.6	435,356.9	2,450,038.5	438,649.3	987,438.9	3,292.4	67.5%	0.8%
Nov	1,310,571.2	471,254.9	2,278,685.6	489,567.6	968,114.4	18,312.7	73.9%	3.9%
Dec	1,315,103.5	482,949.9	2,532,455.1	494,226.7	1,217,351.6	11,276.8	92.6%	2.3%
Total	15,487,815.9	5,406,953.4	26,985,690.1	5,773,512.0	11,497,874.2	366,558.6	74.2%	6.8%

Table 16 provides the monthly generator revenue comparison for Case A and Case C. Total generator revenues increase from Case A to Case C by \$1.7 billion. Increased energy revenues account for 90.8 percent of the increase and increased synchronized reserve payments account for 8.4 percent. The increase in generator revenues is more than \$1 billion higher when comparing Case C to Case A than when comparing Case B to Case C.

**Table 16 Monthly PJM generator revenue: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Case A				Revenue (\$) Case C				Difference			
	Generation	SR	PR	OR	Generation	SR	PR	OR	Generation	SR	PR	OR
Jan	\$4,721,942,931.8	\$6,059,690.0	\$590,123.9	\$0.0	\$5,179,435,042.5	\$38,219,472.1	\$3,640,986.1	\$6,807.5	\$457,492,110.7	\$32,159,782.1	\$3,050,862.3	\$6,807.5
Feb	\$1,415,723,162.9	\$1,141,654.3	\$68,865.7	\$0.0	\$1,543,724,380.7	\$14,175,045.2	\$1,307,337.2	\$0.0	\$128,001,217.8	\$13,033,390.9	\$1,238,471.6	\$0.0
Mar	\$1,747,326,457.6	\$3,196,953.8	\$563,993.6	\$0.0	\$1,880,105,031.9	\$13,687,271.3	\$1,546,359.5	\$0.0	\$132,778,574.3	\$10,490,317.6	\$982,365.9	\$0.0
Apr	\$1,772,922,354.2	\$5,387,102.6	\$1,053,933.7	\$0.0	\$1,859,479,992.5	\$14,809,220.0	\$1,853,779.5	\$0.0	\$86,557,638.3	\$9,422,117.5	\$799,845.8	\$0.0
May	\$1,708,618,722.9	\$3,458,761.1	\$482,879.6	\$0.0	\$1,796,050,045.9	\$11,202,492.5	\$1,372,517.0	\$0.0	\$87,431,323.0	\$7,743,731.5	\$889,637.5	\$0.0
Jun	\$1,847,286,164.8	\$1,220,012.8	\$307,677.3	\$0.0	\$1,958,510,650.6	\$8,451,910.9	\$976,354.2	\$0.0	\$111,224,485.8	\$7,231,898.1	\$668,676.9	\$0.0
Jul	\$2,505,939,506.7	\$1,468,835.0	\$405,465.1	\$0.0	\$2,604,621,249.7	\$9,728,911.1	\$1,140,853.8	\$0.0	\$98,681,743.0	\$8,260,076.1	\$735,388.7	\$0.0
Aug	\$2,691,708,750.5	\$944,817.0	\$205,406.4	\$0.0	\$2,768,400,772.2	\$8,531,431.0	\$967,552.5	\$0.0	\$76,692,021.7	\$7,586,614.0	\$762,146.1	\$0.0
Sep	\$2,165,046,703.9	\$1,935,343.8	\$466,280.8	\$0.0	\$2,234,089,436.4	\$9,855,606.3	\$1,067,524.7	\$0.0	\$69,042,732.5	\$7,920,262.5	\$601,243.9	\$0.0
Oct	\$1,960,059,046.6	\$2,923,290.1	\$722,045.5	\$0.0	\$2,062,113,922.3	\$14,807,457.1	\$1,680,044.1	\$0.0	\$102,054,875.7	\$11,884,167.0	\$957,998.7	\$0.0
Nov	\$2,228,604,987.3	\$2,198,883.6	\$461,822.2	\$0.0	\$2,305,248,950.4	\$13,485,785.4	\$1,531,255.5	\$0.0	\$76,643,963.1	\$11,286,901.8	\$1,069,433.3	\$0.0
Dec	\$2,031,396,902.8	\$931,137.4	\$241,804.3	\$0.0	\$2,120,810,211.0	\$13,815,461.4	\$1,427,978.3	\$0.0	\$89,413,308.2	\$12,884,324.0	\$1,186,173.9	\$0.0
Total	\$26,796,575,692.0	\$30,866,481.3	\$5,570,298.0	\$0.0	\$28,312,589,686.1	\$170,770,064.5	\$18,512,542.5	\$6,807.5	\$1,516,013,994.1	\$139,903,583.2	\$12,942,244.5	\$6,807.5

Table 17 shows the increases in revenues by generator technology from Case A to Case C. Because the energy revenues account for a larger share of the revenue increase from Case A to Case C, compared to Case B to Case C, the nuclear units receive the largest increase in revenues.

**Table 17 Generator revenues by technology type: 2018, Case A to Case C**

	Case A			Revenue (\$) Case C			Difference		
	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR
Battery	\$144,174.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$151,937.2	\$533.1	\$55.4	\$7,762.7	\$533.1	\$55.4
CC	\$7,484,861,343.8	\$17,275,747.1	\$539.5	\$7,834,745,587.7	\$95,559,023.1	\$4,333.1	\$349,884,243.9	\$78,283,276.0	\$3,793.6
CT	\$845,163,506.7	\$6,460,943.3	\$5,324,948.6	\$974,813,399.2	\$32,734,619.1	\$17,732,719.7	\$129,649,892.5	\$26,273,675.8	\$12,407,771.2
Diesel	\$11,587,696.3	\$49,858.8	\$87,662.8	\$12,674,486.3	\$355,125.0	\$265,462.8	\$1,086,790.0	\$305,266.2	\$177,799.9
Fuelcell	\$7,146,807.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,556,319.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$409,511.9	\$0.0	\$0.0
Hydro	\$467,552,732.7	\$2,305,817.9	\$87,871.0	\$489,809,456.5	\$9,556,905.8	\$265,559.0	\$22,256,723.8	\$7,251,087.8	\$177,688.0
Landfill	\$55,716,713.7	\$204,421.9	\$65,156.6	\$58,565,464.2	\$743,175.1	\$198,804.1	\$2,848,750.5	\$538,753.1	\$133,647.5
Nuclear	\$8,624,960,212.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$9,160,068,376.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$535,108,164.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Solar	\$63,794,993.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$67,156,170.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$3,361,176.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
Steam	\$8,654,134,313.3	\$4,569,102.1	\$4,119.5	\$9,085,761,854.0	\$31,819,014.7	\$45,608.3	\$431,627,540.7	\$27,249,912.5	\$41,488.9
Wind	\$581,516,370.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$621,289,059.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$39,772,689.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total	\$26,796,578,865.2	\$30,865,891.2	\$5,570,298.0	\$28,312,592,110.7	\$170,768,395.8	\$18,512,542.5	\$1,516,013,245.4	\$139,902,504.6	\$12,942,244.5

### Case A to Case A ORDC

The Market Monitor also compares Case A to Case A ORDC. The Case A ORDC adds PJM’s ORDC directly to the Case A model rather than to the Case B model.

Table 18 shows that the LMP increase between Case A and Case A ORDC is \$1.12 per MWh. This is lower than the \$1.96 per MWh LMP increase between Case A and Case C, and greater than the \$0.46 per MWh increase between Case B and Case C.



**Table 18 PJM load-weighted average LMP: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case A ORDC	Difference
Jan	\$68.39	\$70.74	\$2.34
Feb	\$25.67	\$27.26	\$1.59
Mar	\$28.82	\$29.58	\$0.76
Apr	\$33.19	\$34.18	\$0.99
May	\$30.80	\$31.45	\$0.65
Jun	\$28.75	\$29.31	\$0.56
Jul	\$33.64	\$34.07	\$0.43
Aug	\$35.42	\$36.01	\$0.59
Sep	\$34.73	\$35.46	\$0.73
Oct	\$32.92	\$34.16	\$1.25
Nov	\$36.87	\$38.27	\$1.40
Dec	\$32.37	\$34.49	\$2.12
Total	\$35.80	\$36.91	\$1.12

Table 19 provides average energy prices for the PJM hubs for Case A and Case A with the PJM proposed ORDC.

**Table 19 Average hub LMP: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Average LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case A ORDC	Difference
AEP GEN HUB	\$31.08	\$32.11	\$1.03
AEP-DAYTON HUB	\$32.43	\$33.47	\$1.04
ATSI GEN HUB	\$33.18	\$34.28	\$1.10
CHICAGO GEN HUB	\$27.39	\$28.30	\$0.91
CHICAGO HUB	\$27.97	\$28.89	\$0.92
DOMINION HUB	\$35.66	\$36.68	\$1.02
EASTERN HUB	\$35.78	\$36.98	\$1.19
N ILLINOIS HUB	\$27.77	\$28.68	\$0.92
NEW JERSEY HUB	\$33.69	\$34.86	\$1.17
OHIO HUB	\$32.21	\$33.25	\$1.04
WEST INT HUB	\$34.01	\$35.06	\$1.04
WESTERN HUB	\$34.10	\$35.18	\$1.07

Table 20 and Table 21 provide the increases in load and generation-weighted average energy prices by zone when PJM's proposed ORDC is applied to Case A.

**Table 20 PJM load-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case A1	Difference
AECO	\$36.31	\$37.53	\$1.22
AEP	\$35.36	\$36.45	\$1.09
AP	\$36.59	\$37.74	\$1.15
ATSI	\$35.98	\$37.13	\$1.15
BGE	\$40.04	\$41.11	\$1.07
COMED	\$29.47	\$30.41	\$0.94
CPP	\$34.87	\$36.46	\$1.58
DAY	\$35.17	\$36.32	\$1.14
DEOK	\$34.74	\$35.86	\$1.12
DOM	\$39.25	\$40.34	\$1.09
DPL	\$39.62	\$40.88	\$1.26
DUQ	\$35.67	\$36.80	\$1.12
EKPC	\$34.44	\$35.55	\$1.11
JCPL	\$36.23	\$37.45	\$1.22
METED	\$36.63	\$37.83	\$1.21
PECO	\$35.89	\$37.13	\$1.23
PENELEC	\$35.67	\$36.88	\$1.21
PEPCO	\$38.96	\$40.03	\$1.07
PPL	\$35.73	\$36.96	\$1.22
PSEG	\$35.84	\$37.02	\$1.18

**Table 21 PJM generation-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Generation Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case A	Case A ORDC	Difference
AECO	\$35.67	\$36.83	\$1.16
AEP	\$32.25	\$33.31	\$1.05
AP	\$33.90	\$34.99	\$1.09
ATSI	\$34.66	\$35.85	\$1.19
BGE	\$39.54	\$40.56	\$1.03
COMED	\$27.39	\$28.32	\$0.93
DAY	\$37.03	\$38.45	\$1.42
DEOK	\$32.40	\$33.48	\$1.08
DOM	\$38.59	\$39.67	\$1.08
DPL	\$41.79	\$43.17	\$1.39
DUQ	\$34.41	\$35.51	\$1.11
EKPC	\$34.99	\$36.17	\$1.18
JCPL	\$32.66	\$33.75	\$1.10
METED	\$32.61	\$33.78	\$1.17
OVEC	\$30.59	\$32.65	\$2.06
PECO	\$33.39	\$34.62	\$1.23
PENELEC	\$33.60	\$34.86	\$1.26
PEPCO	\$41.00	\$42.11	\$1.12
PPL	\$33.79	\$34.98	\$1.20
PSEG	\$33.55	\$34.72	\$1.16

Table 22 shows the increases in reserve prices when the PJM proposed ORDC is applied to Case A.

**Table 22 Monthly PJM reserve market prices: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Reserve Weighted Average Market Clearing Prices (\$/MW)					
	Case A		Case A ORDC		Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	\$4.55	\$1.28	\$14.44	\$6.11	\$9.88	\$4.84
Feb	\$1.03	\$0.16	\$6.49	\$2.53	\$5.46	\$2.37
Mar	\$2.42	\$1.17	\$5.56	\$2.47	\$3.14	\$1.30
Apr	\$4.34	\$2.37	\$7.55	\$3.71	\$3.22	\$1.34
May	\$2.82	\$1.07	\$5.60	\$2.70	\$2.78	\$1.63
Jun	\$0.97	\$0.74	\$3.20	\$2.00	\$2.23	\$1.26
Jul	\$1.12	\$0.84	\$3.72	\$2.06	\$2.60	\$1.22
Aug	\$0.73	\$0.43	\$3.47	\$1.85	\$2.75	\$1.42
Sep	\$1.48	\$1.25	\$4.21	\$2.82	\$2.73	\$1.56
Oct	\$2.00	\$1.66	\$5.97	\$3.78	\$3.97	\$2.12
Nov	\$1.68	\$0.98	\$5.92	\$3.17	\$4.24	\$2.19
Dec	\$0.71	\$0.50	\$6.26	\$3.37	\$5.55	\$2.87
Annual	\$1.99	\$1.03	\$6.05	\$3.08	\$4.05	\$2.05

Table 23 shows the monthly reserve clearing levels when the PJM proposed ORDC is applied to Case A.

**Table 23 Monthly PJM reserve market clearing: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Cleared Reserve MWh							
	Case A		Case A ORDC		Difference		Percent Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	1,330,584.2	462,676.8	2,445,062.7	548,353.4	1,114,478.5	85,676.6	83.8%	18.5%
Feb	1,104,579.5	424,887.5	2,138,010.4	507,611.7	1,033,430.9	82,724.1	93.6%	19.5%
Mar	1,320,385.9	480,314.2	2,096,359.6	508,626.9	775,973.7	28,312.8	58.8%	5.9%
Apr	1,242,293.3	444,113.1	1,886,322.7	478,023.9	644,029.4	33,910.8	51.8%	7.6%
May	1,224,815.1	450,454.2	1,938,602.6	487,486.4	713,787.5	37,032.3	58.3%	8.2%
Jun	1,259,202.4	416,355.6	2,286,218.0	424,304.8	1,027,015.6	7,949.2	81.6%	1.9%
Jul	1,311,503.4	484,657.4	2,387,740.2	508,090.9	1,076,236.8	23,433.5	82.1%	4.8%
Aug	1,298,832.7	481,676.6	2,387,116.6	512,981.3	1,088,283.9	31,304.7	83.8%	6.5%
Sep	1,307,345.4	372,256.5	2,335,838.7	379,079.1	1,028,493.3	6,822.7	78.7%	1.8%
Oct	1,462,599.6	435,356.9	2,456,927.0	439,048.7	994,327.4	3,691.8	68.0%	0.8%
Nov	1,310,571.2	471,254.9	2,291,506.6	489,321.5	980,935.4	18,066.6	74.8%	3.8%
Dec	1,315,103.5	482,949.9	2,525,861.3	494,245.9	1,210,757.8	11,296.0	92.1%	2.3%
Total	15,487,815.9	5,406,953.4	27,175,566.0	5,777,174.3	11,687,750.1	370,221.0	75.5%	6.8%

Table 24 shows the increases in generator revenue when PJM’s proposed ORDC is applied to Case A.

**Table 24 Monthly PJM generator revenue: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Case A				Revenue (\$) Case A ORDC				Difference			
	Generation	SR	PR	OR	Generation	SR	PR	OR	Generation	SR	PR	OR
Jan	\$4,721,942,931.8	\$6,059,690.0	\$590,123.9	\$0.0	\$4,903,702,907.4	\$35,303,787.8	\$3,352,958.5	\$6,853.3	\$181,759,975.6	\$29,244,097.9	\$2,762,834.6	\$6,853.3
Feb	\$1,415,723,162.9	\$1,141,654.3	\$68,865.7	\$0.0	\$1,505,390,913.7	\$13,879,148.9	\$1,284,741.5	\$0.0	\$89,667,750.8	\$12,737,494.6	\$1,215,875.8	\$0.0
Mar	\$1,747,326,457.6	\$3,196,953.8	\$563,993.6	\$0.0	\$1,793,996,326.8	\$11,661,958.2	\$1,257,380.7	\$0.0	\$46,669,869.2	\$8,465,004.5	\$693,387.1	\$0.0
Apr	\$1,772,922,354.2	\$5,387,102.6	\$1,053,933.7	\$0.0	\$1,827,296,170.8	\$14,247,039.3	\$1,775,546.7	\$0.0	\$54,373,816.6	\$8,859,936.7	\$721,613.0	\$0.0
May	\$1,708,618,722.9	\$3,458,761.1	\$482,879.6	\$0.0	\$1,747,120,599.4	\$10,865,845.1	\$1,316,140.9	\$0.0	\$38,501,876.5	\$7,407,084.1	\$833,261.4	\$0.0
Jun	\$1,847,286,164.8	\$1,220,012.8	\$307,677.3	\$0.0	\$1,884,384,743.0	\$7,316,486.5	\$848,315.9	\$0.0	\$37,098,578.2	\$6,096,473.7	\$540,638.6	\$0.0
Jul	\$2,505,939,506.7	\$1,468,835.0	\$405,465.1	\$0.0	\$2,539,745,703.8	\$8,890,634.9	\$1,044,746.0	\$0.0	\$33,806,197.1	\$7,421,800.0	\$639,280.9	\$0.0
Aug	\$2,691,708,750.5	\$944,817.0	\$205,406.4	\$0.0	\$2,738,981,078.8	\$8,294,350.9	\$948,480.0	\$0.0	\$47,272,328.3	\$7,349,534.0	\$743,073.6	\$0.0
Sep	\$2,165,046,703.9	\$1,935,343.8	\$466,280.8	\$0.0	\$2,217,133,432.6	\$9,834,664.3	\$1,067,937.8	\$0.0	\$52,086,728.7	\$7,899,320.5	\$601,657.1	\$0.0
Oct	\$1,960,059,046.6	\$2,923,290.1	\$722,045.5	\$0.0	\$2,037,984,679.1	\$14,665,751.7	\$1,660,008.2	\$0.0	\$77,925,632.5	\$11,742,461.7	\$937,962.8	\$0.0
Nov	\$2,228,604,987.3	\$2,198,883.6	\$461,822.2	\$0.0	\$2,317,394,164.9	\$13,568,427.3	\$1,549,689.7	\$0.0	\$88,789,177.6	\$11,369,543.7	\$1,087,867.5	\$0.0
Dec	\$2,031,396,902.8	\$931,137.4	\$241,804.3	\$0.0	\$2,166,214,528.6	\$15,817,395.2	\$1,667,131.7	\$0.0	\$134,817,625.8	\$14,886,257.9	\$1,425,327.4	\$0.0
Total	\$26,796,575,692.0	\$30,866,481.3	\$5,570,298.0	\$0.0	\$27,679,345,248.9	\$164,345,490.4	\$17,773,077.7	\$6,853.3	\$882,769,556.9	\$133,479,009.0	\$12,202,779.7	\$6,853.3

Table 25 shows the generator revenues by technology type, comparing Case A to Case A with the PJM proposed ORDC.

**Table 25 Generator revenues by technology type: 2018, Case A to Case A ORDC**

	Case A			Revenue (\$) Case A ORDC			Difference		
	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR
Battery	\$144,174.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$155,536.6	\$277.1	\$55.4	\$11,362.2	\$277.1	\$55.4
CC	\$7,484,861,343.8	\$17,275,747.1	\$539.5	\$7,680,684,082.1	\$90,320,363.5	\$5,000.2	\$195,822,738.3	\$73,044,616.4	\$4,460.7
CT	\$845,163,506.7	\$6,460,943.3	\$5,324,948.6	\$910,681,604.7	\$32,154,748.7	\$17,032,582.6	\$65,518,098.0	\$25,693,805.4	\$11,707,634.1
Diesel	\$11,587,696.3	\$49,858.8	\$87,662.8	\$12,485,511.0	\$365,165.8	\$248,611.5	\$897,814.7	\$315,307.0	\$160,948.7
Fuelcell	\$7,146,807.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,403,493.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$256,686.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
Hydro	\$467,552,732.7	\$2,305,817.9	\$87,871.0	\$486,117,032.0	\$9,186,724.4	\$250,957.8	\$18,564,299.3	\$6,880,906.5	\$163,086.9
Landfill	\$55,716,713.7	\$204,421.9	\$65,156.6	\$57,328,826.2	\$716,622.8	\$189,306.3	\$1,612,112.5	\$512,200.9	\$124,149.6
Nuclear	\$8,624,960,212.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$8,916,012,522.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$291,052,309.6	\$0.0	\$0.0
Solar	\$63,794,993.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$65,510,189.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,715,195.8	\$0.0	\$0.0
Steam	\$8,654,134,313.3	\$4,569,102.1	\$4,119.5	\$8,938,995,182.3	\$31,599,976.6	\$46,563.8	\$284,860,869.1	\$27,030,874.5	\$42,444.3
Wind	\$581,516,370.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$603,972,118.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$22,455,748.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total	\$26,796,578,865.2	\$30,865,891.2	\$5,570,298.0	\$27,679,346,098.9	\$164,343,879.0	\$17,773,077.7	\$882,767,233.7	\$133,477,987.8	\$12,202,779.7

**Case B to Case C 15 minute**

When PJM’s 30 minute ORDC is replaced with an ORDC based on 15 minute forecast error uncertainty, the price and revenue differences are lower.

Table 26 shows the increase in monthly energy prices between Case B and Case C 15 minute.

**Table 26 PJM load-weighted average LMP: 2018, Case B to Case C 15 minute**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case B	Case C15	Difference
Jan	\$73.87	\$74.91	\$1.04
Feb	\$27.58	\$27.88	\$0.30
Mar	\$30.64	\$30.73	\$0.09
Apr	\$34.10	\$34.47	\$0.37
May	\$31.96	\$32.13	\$0.17
Jun	\$30.13	\$30.18	\$0.05
Jul	\$34.53	\$34.70	\$0.16
Aug	\$36.02	\$36.15	\$0.13
Sep	\$35.59	\$35.75	\$0.16
Oct	\$33.90	\$34.26	\$0.36
Nov	\$37.45	\$38.02	\$0.57
Dec	\$33.23	\$33.51	\$0.28
Total	\$37.30	\$37.61	\$0.31

Table 27 shows the increase in energy prices at PJM hubs. The differences range from \$0.13 per MWh to \$0.35 per MWh, about \$0.15 per MWh less than the differences for Case B to Case C.

**Table 27 Average hub LMP: 2018, Case B to Case C 15 minute**

	Average LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case B	Case C15	Difference
AEP GEN HUB	\$32.20	\$32.52	\$0.32
AEP-DAYTON HUB	\$33.52	\$33.85	\$0.33
ATSI GEN HUB	\$34.40	\$34.69	\$0.29
CHICAGO GEN HUB	\$28.68	\$28.94	\$0.27
CHICAGO HUB	\$29.29	\$29.56	\$0.27
DOMINION HUB	\$37.25	\$37.55	\$0.30
EASTERN HUB	\$37.34	\$37.47	\$0.13
N ILLINOIS HUB	\$29.09	\$29.35	\$0.27
NEW JERSEY HUB	\$35.14	\$35.42	\$0.28
OHIO HUB	\$33.28	\$33.61	\$0.33
WEST INT HUB	\$35.30	\$35.61	\$0.31
WESTERN HUB	\$35.51	\$35.86	\$0.35

Table 28 and Table 29 show the differences in zonal load and generation-weighted average energy prices.

**Table 28 PJM load-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case B to Case C 15 minute**

	Load Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case B	Case C15	Difference
AECO	\$37.81	\$38.17	\$0.36
AEP	\$36.65	\$36.99	\$0.33
AP	\$38.12	\$38.47	\$0.35
ATSI	\$37.24	\$37.55	\$0.31
BGE	\$42.13	\$42.52	\$0.39
COMED	\$30.74	\$31.03	\$0.28
CPP	\$35.67	\$36.07	\$0.40
DAY	\$36.44	\$36.79	\$0.35
DEOK	\$36.12	\$36.46	\$0.34
DOM	\$41.06	\$41.37	\$0.31
DPL	\$41.46	\$41.59	\$0.13
DUQ	\$36.95	\$37.25	\$0.30
EKPC	\$35.75	\$36.10	\$0.35
JCPL	\$37.81	\$38.11	\$0.29
METED	\$38.14	\$38.44	\$0.31
PECO	\$37.55	\$37.85	\$0.30
PENELEC	\$36.94	\$37.32	\$0.38
PEPCO	\$40.86	\$41.21	\$0.35
PPL	\$37.40	\$37.67	\$0.27
PSEG	\$37.34	\$37.60	\$0.26

**Table 29 PJM generation-weighted average LMP by zone: 2018, Case B to Case C 15 minute**

	Generation Weighted LMP (\$/MWh)		
	Case B	Case C15	Difference
AECO	\$37.18	\$37.42	\$0.24
AEP	\$33.41	\$33.74	\$0.33
AP	\$35.26	\$35.59	\$0.33
ATSI	\$35.95	\$36.28	\$0.32
BGE	\$41.81	\$42.17	\$0.35
COMED	\$28.99	\$29.26	\$0.27
DAY	\$38.76	\$39.28	\$0.52
DEOK	\$33.44	\$33.78	\$0.34
DOM	\$40.34	\$40.65	\$0.30
DPL	\$44.92	\$45.15	\$0.23
DUQ	\$35.68	\$35.97	\$0.29
EKPC	\$36.29	\$36.67	\$0.38
JCPL	\$33.85	\$34.07	\$0.23
METED	\$34.06	\$34.35	\$0.29
OVEC	\$31.31	\$31.63	\$0.32
PECO	\$34.78	\$35.05	\$0.27
PENELEC	\$34.75	\$35.16	\$0.41
PEPCO	\$43.84	\$44.25	\$0.42
PPL	\$35.42	\$35.69	\$0.27
PSEG	\$34.80	\$35.10	\$0.30

Table 30 shows the change in reserve clearing prices between Case B and Case C 15 minute. Reserve price increases are high, but they do not more than double as in Case B or Case A to Case C.



**Table 30 Monthly PJM reserve market prices: 2018, Case B to Case C 15 minute**

	Reserve Weighted Average Market Clearing Prices (\$/MW)					
	Case B		Case C 15		Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	\$6.03	\$1.43	\$12.45	\$5.25	\$6.41	\$3.82
Feb	\$2.36	\$0.31	\$5.52	\$2.18	\$3.16	\$1.87
Mar	\$3.85	\$1.94	\$4.63	\$1.93	\$0.78	(\$0.01)
Apr	\$4.96	\$2.47	\$5.48	\$2.74	\$0.52	\$0.27
May	\$3.20	\$1.09	\$3.43	\$1.67	\$0.23	\$0.58
Jun	\$1.29	\$1.06	\$2.30	\$1.47	\$1.01	\$0.41
Jul	\$1.45	\$1.08	\$2.77	\$1.55	\$1.32	\$0.47
Aug	\$0.81	\$0.45	\$2.35	\$1.26	\$1.54	\$0.81
Sep	\$1.74	\$1.47	\$3.07	\$2.10	\$1.34	\$0.63
Oct	\$2.38	\$1.94	\$4.51	\$2.84	\$2.12	\$0.90
Nov	\$1.93	\$1.29	\$4.47	\$2.41	\$2.53	\$1.12
Dec	\$0.95	\$0.59	\$4.42	\$2.33	\$3.47	\$1.75
Annual	\$2.58	\$1.25	\$4.66	\$2.34	\$2.08	\$1.09

Table 31 shows that the amount of synchronized reserves cleared with the 15 minute ORDC is much less than the amount cleared with the 30 minute ORDC. The difference in primary reserves changes little.

**Table 31 Monthly PJM reserve market clearing: 2018, Case B to Case C 15**

	Cleared Reserve MWh							
	Case B		Case C 15		Difference		Percent Difference	
	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve	Synchronized Reserve	Primary Reserve
Jan	1,333,092.8	460,168.2	2,228,540.3	549,776.7	895,447.5	89,608.6	67.2%	19.5%
Feb	1,104,579.4	424,887.5	1,965,775.9	507,575.8	861,196.4	82,688.2	78.0%	19.5%
Mar	1,320,246.7	480,453.2	1,797,395.2	507,862.2	477,148.5	27,409.0	36.1%	5.7%
Apr	1,242,142.7	444,263.6	1,636,792.8	477,526.3	394,650.1	33,262.8	31.8%	7.5%
May	1,224,596.4	450,672.8	1,705,638.6	486,468.2	481,042.2	35,795.4	39.3%	7.9%
Jun	1,260,166.9	415,391.3	2,008,779.8	423,307.1	748,612.9	7,915.8	59.4%	1.9%
Jul	1,311,952.1	484,208.9	2,092,166.6	505,553.7	780,214.6	21,344.8	59.5%	4.4%
Aug	1,298,609.1	481,900.0	2,097,757.4	510,334.8	799,148.3	28,434.8	61.5%	5.9%
Sep	1,307,381.3	372,220.2	2,190,349.4	380,285.2	882,968.1	8,065.0	67.5%	2.2%
Oct	1,462,476.9	435,479.7	2,257,125.9	438,064.3	794,649.0	2,584.6	54.3%	0.6%
Nov	1,310,593.5	471,232.5	2,088,334.8	488,764.7	777,741.2	17,532.3	59.3%	3.7%
Dec	1,315,281.3	482,772.0	2,354,808.2	494,782.0	1,039,526.9	12,009.9	79.0%	2.5%
Total	15,491,118.8	5,403,649.7	24,423,464.6	5,770,300.8	8,932,345.8	366,651.1	57.7%	6.8%

Table 32 provides monthly and annual generator revenue by product. Total generator revenues increase by \$329.3 million from Case B to Case C 15 minute.

**Table 32 Monthly PJM generator revenue: 2018, Case B to Case C 15**

	Case B				Revenue (\$) Case C 15				Difference			
	Generation	SR	PR	OR	Generation	SR	PR	OR	Generation	SR	PR	OR
Jan	\$5,081,623,092.5	\$8,041,039.6	\$657,447.2	\$0.0	\$5,164,719,346.6	\$27,737,483.1	\$2,885,555.4	\$13,623.1	\$83,096,254.1	\$19,696,443.5	\$2,228,108.2	\$13,623.1
Feb	\$1,519,472,468.7	\$2,603,153.7	\$132,698.2	\$0.0	\$1,536,564,230.3	\$10,850,811.1	\$1,108,521.8	\$0.0	\$17,091,761.6	\$8,247,657.4	\$975,823.6	\$0.0
Mar	\$1,859,115,556.6	\$5,089,052.2	\$933,042.7	\$0.0	\$1,864,570,295.1	\$8,327,706.0	\$980,355.9	\$0.0	\$5,454,738.5	\$3,238,653.7	\$47,313.2	\$0.0
Apr	\$1,826,358,822.0	\$6,159,167.4	\$1,098,624.4	\$0.0	\$1,846,381,111.9	\$8,969,897.6	\$1,308,754.1	\$14,835.2	\$20,022,289.9	\$2,810,730.2	\$210,129.7	\$14,835.2
May	\$1,775,298,936.7	\$3,915,318.4	\$492,517.1	\$0.0	\$1,784,878,867.9	\$5,846,893.8	\$812,023.9	\$0.0	\$9,579,931.2	\$1,931,575.3	\$319,506.8	\$0.0
Jun	\$1,935,187,664.6	\$1,628,149.4	\$439,857.2	\$0.0	\$1,939,986,706.5	\$4,623,571.9	\$623,395.9	\$0.0	\$4,799,041.9	\$2,995,422.5	\$183,538.7	\$0.0
Jul	\$2,580,228,898.0	\$1,907,918.9	\$521,565.1	\$0.0	\$2,592,662,571.0	\$5,800,174.5	\$783,547.7	\$0.0	\$12,433,673.0	\$3,892,255.6	\$261,982.5	\$0.0
Aug	\$2,750,194,638.6	\$1,050,710.0	\$214,835.1	\$0.0	\$2,761,741,273.6	\$4,927,006.9	\$642,904.1	\$0.0	\$11,546,635.0	\$3,876,296.8	\$428,068.9	\$0.0
Sep	\$2,222,742,250.0	\$2,271,640.2	\$546,674.0	\$0.0	\$2,234,223,570.8	\$6,730,050.8	\$799,958.9	\$0.0	\$11,481,320.8	\$4,458,410.6	\$253,284.9	\$0.0
Oct	\$2,024,751,056.9	\$3,481,601.1	\$845,140.1	\$0.0	\$2,045,976,189.9	\$10,168,382.5	\$1,246,072.1	\$0.0	\$21,225,133.0	\$6,686,781.4	\$400,932.0	\$0.0
Nov	\$2,273,655,880.6	\$2,530,961.9	\$608,868.5	\$0.0	\$2,308,388,830.5	\$9,324,641.1	\$1,176,746.4	\$0.0	\$34,732,949.9	\$6,793,679.3	\$567,877.9	\$0.0
Dec	\$2,094,561,286.0	\$1,254,060.2	\$283,817.4	\$0.0	\$2,111,816,591.9	\$10,414,915.4	\$1,155,014.1	\$0.0	\$17,255,305.9	\$9,160,855.1	\$871,196.6	\$0.0
Total	\$27,943,190,551.2	\$39,932,773.1	\$6,775,087.1	\$0.0	\$28,191,909,586.0	\$113,721,534.5	\$13,522,850.2	\$28,458.3	\$248,719,034.8	\$73,788,761.3	\$6,747,763.1	\$28,458.3

Table 33 shows the change in generator revenues by technology with the 15 minute ORDC. The distribution of increased revenue across technology types is similar to the 30 minute ORDC, but the magnitudes are smaller.

**Table 33 Generator revenues by technology type: 2018, Case B to Case C 15 minute**

	Case B			Revenue (\$) Case C 15			Difference		
	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR	Generation	SR	PR
Battery	\$148,766.5	\$0.9	\$0.0	\$151,503.7	\$305.4	\$37.9	\$2,737.2	\$304.5	\$37.9
CC	\$7,759,725,631.2	\$22,947,672.0	\$563.7	\$7,816,207,204.6	\$64,143,239.3	\$2,772.2	\$56,481,573.4	\$41,195,567.3	\$2,208.5
CT	\$937,069,970.0	\$7,732,867.4	\$6,477,616.2	\$956,547,267.5	\$20,421,587.6	\$12,957,364.5	\$19,477,297.4	\$12,688,720.1	\$6,479,748.3
Diesel	\$12,472,477.6	\$73,916.3	\$104,367.6	\$12,650,822.2	\$215,010.1	\$192,553.7	\$178,344.6	\$141,093.8	\$88,186.1
Fuelcell	\$7,469,775.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,527,969.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$58,194.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
Hydro	\$484,669,838.3	\$2,887,448.2	\$104,804.6	\$487,308,991.8	\$6,771,463.1	\$188,746.2	\$2,639,153.5	\$3,884,014.9	\$83,941.6
Landfill	\$57,922,197.9	\$271,169.1	\$79,734.3	\$58,346,873.1	\$531,820.2	\$146,888.4	\$424,675.2	\$260,651.2	\$67,154.1
Nuclear	\$9,049,991,523.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$9,129,040,875.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$79,049,352.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
Solar	\$66,827,029.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$66,845,393.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$18,364.4	\$0.0	\$0.0
Steam	\$8,955,211,127.4	\$6,018,945.5	\$8,000.6	\$9,039,431,056.9	\$21,636,933.5	\$34,487.2	\$84,219,929.5	\$15,617,987.9	\$26,486.6
Wind	\$611,688,031.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$617,855,871.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6,167,840.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total	\$27,943,196,368.3	\$39,932,019.4	\$6,775,087.1	\$28,191,913,830.5	\$113,720,359.2	\$13,522,850.2	\$248,717,462.2	\$73,788,339.8	\$6,747,763.1