

# **Electric Market National Overview**




# **Regional Transmission Organizations**




Source: Energy Velocity

# Weekly U.S. Electric Generation Output and Temperatures



Source: Derived from EEI and NOAA data.

# **Financial Trading on ICE by Contract Month**




Source: Derived from ICE data. ICE on-peak swaps (financial) volume include monthly, dual monthly, quarterly, and calendar year contracts traded for each month.

### **Electric Market Overview: Wind Capacity Growth**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Market Oversight @ FERC.gov

# **Regional Wind Capacity Growth**



West w/o CA: CO, HI, ID, MT, NM, OR, UT, WA, WY Great Plains: KS, NE, ND, OK, SD Midwest: IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, OH, WI East: ME, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, TN, VT Source: Energy Velocity Generating Unit Capacity Dataset

### Electric Market Overview: 2008 Review of Wind

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Market Oversight @ FERC.gov

### **2008 Review of Wind Capacity and Generation**

- Installed wind capacity grew 8,358 MW to 25,170 MW in 2008 from 16,818 MW in 2007, a 50% increase. Wind power was 43% of new U.S. new electric capacity in 2008, surpassing gas-fired generation.
- Installed capacity grew at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 39% from 2004-08, compared to 28% for 2003-07

### National wind policy and developments included:

- Congress extended the production tax credit (PTC) through Dec 2009. Indexed to inflation, it is now worth 2.1¢ per kWh for the first ten years a project operates.
- In Feb. 2009, Congress extended the credit through 2012, its longest renewal ever. This extension provides developers and equipment companies better long-term assurance to invest in projects and manufacturing facilities. The three times the PTC lapsed this decade were followed by declines in new capacity in subsequent years: 2000, 2002, and 2004 (see next chart, "Growth in Installed U.S. Capacity").
- Foreign turbine, tower, and component manufacturers have opened U.S. facilities with the PTC's steady renewal, lowering equipment transportation costs. In 2008, 30 facilities were announced, 10 opened, and 18 existing facilities expanded; 9 came online and 11 were announced in 2007.
- The economic turndown has led to some facility cutbacks, employee layoffs, project delays, and equipment order postponements.

### State policies encouraged wind's growth:

- 16 of the top 25 states by cumulative MW had an RPS (14 in 2007), 3 had renewable goals (3 in 2007) while 6 had neither.
- 34% of 2008 capacity additions 7,454 MW were in the 20 states with the highest wind potential; 86% of total U.S. wind capacity 21,741 MW is in those states.

### State policies (continued):

- 80% of total U.S. wind is in the top ten states. The top 5 states by installed capacity (new 2008 MW) are:
  - Texas: 7,116 MW (2,670)
  - lowa: 2,790 MW (1,519)
  - California: 2,517 MW (78)
  - Minnesota: 1,752 MW (454)
  - Washington: 1,375 MW (212)
- Texas kept its lead as the state with the most wind capacity; lowa passed California for 2<sup>nd</sup> place. Oregon and Colorado each have more than 1,000 MW installed.

### The Commission acted to improve wind interconnection:

- Wind's rapid capacity growth created a backlog in many interconnection queues. FERC held a technical conference in December 2007 (AD08-2) to re-examine its Large Generator Interconnection Rule (Order 2003). ISOs and RTOs reported that queuing procedures specified in the Order impeded their timely interconnection of wind resources.
- In March 2008, FERC directed RTOs and ISOs to report on the status of their efforts to improve the processing of projects in their queues; it offered guidance on reforms including increased staffing, more efficient modeling, or clustering requests.\*\* Queue reform Orders were subsequently approved for the Midwest ISO (2008), California (2008), and ISO-New England (2009).
- FERC accepted the tariff provisions NYISO proposed, which allowed it to implement a centralized program to incorporate wind output into its day-ahead and real-time energy markets. Ongoing costs are recovered from wind plant operators.\*\*\*


**Source**: OE analysis, derived from data in Commission filings; American Wind Energy Association (AWEA); DOE, *Annual Report on U.S. Wind Power*; Energy Velocity; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; and trade press.

<sup>\*</sup> CAGR is a better indicator of growth rates over time than a straight percent.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Interconnection Queuing Practices, 122 FERC ¶ 61,252 (2008)

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> New York Independent System Operator, 123 FERC ¶61,267 (2008)

# U.S. Wind Capacity Growth, 1999 – 2008



10004

### Electric Market Overview: 2008 Review of Wind

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Market Oversight @ FERC.gov

## **2008 Review of Wind Capacity and Generation**

- Installed wind capacity grew 8,358 MW to 25,170 MW in 2008 from 16,818 MW in 2007, a 50% increase. Wind power was 43% of new U.S. new electric capacity in 2008, surpassing gas-fired generation.
- Installed capacity grew at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 39% from 2004-08, compared to 28% for 2003-07

### National wind policy and developments included:

- Congress extended the production tax credit (PTC) through Dec 2009. Indexed to inflation, it is now worth 2.1¢ per kWh for the first ten years a project operates.
- In Feb. 2009, Congress extended the credit through 2012, its longest renewal ever. This extension provides developers and equipment companies better long-term assurance to invest in projects and manufacturing facilities. The three times the PTC lapsed this decade were followed by declines in new capacity in subsequent years: 2000, 2002, and 2004 (see next chart, "Growth in Installed U.S. Capacity").
- Foreign turbine, tower, and component manufacturers have opened U.S. facilities with the PTC's steady renewal, lowering equipment transportation costs. In 2008, 30 facilities were announced, 10 opened, and 18 existing facilities expanded; 9 came online and 11 were announced in 2007.
- The economic turndown has led to some facility cutbacks, employee layoffs, project delays, and equipment order postponements.

### State policies encouraged wind's growth:

- 16 of the top 25 states by cumulative MW had an RPS (14 in 2007), 3 had renewable goals (3 in 2007) while 6 had neither.
- 34% of 2008 capacity additions 7,454 MW were in the 20 states with the highest wind potential; 86% of total U.S. wind capacity 21,741 MW is in those states.

\* CAGR is a better indicator of growth rates over time than a straight percent.

\*\* Interconnection Queuing Practices, 122 FERC ¶ 61,252 (2008)

\*\*\* New York Independent System Operator, 123 FERC ¶61,267 (2008)

**Source**: OE analysis, derived from data in Commission filings; American Wind Energy Association (AWEA); DOE, *Annual Report on U.S. Wind Power*, Energy Velocity; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; and trade press.


#### State policies (continued):

- 80% of total U.S. wind is in the top ten states. The top 5 states by installed capacity (new 2008 MW) are:
  - Texas: 7,116 MW (2,670)
  - lowa: 2,790 MW (1,519)
  - California: 2,517 MW (78)
  - Minnesota: 1,752 MW (454)
  - Washington: 1,375 MW (212)
- Texas kept its lead as the state with the most wind capacity; lowa passed California for 2<sup>nd</sup> place. Oregon and Colorado each have more than 1,000 MW installed.

### The Commission acted to improve wind interconnection:

- Wind's rapid capacity growth created a backlog in many interconnection queues. FERC held a technical conference in December 2007 (AD08-2) to re-examine its Large Generator Interconnection Rule (Order 2003). ISOs and RTOs reported that queuing procedures specified in the Order impeded their timely interconnection of wind resources.
- In March 2008, FERC directed RTOs and ISOs to report on the status of their efforts to improve the processing of projects in their queues; it offered guidance on reforms including increased staffing, more efficient modeling, or clustering requests.\*\* Queue reform Orders were subsequently approved for the Midwest ISO (2008), California (2008), and ISO-New England (2009).
- FERC accepted the tariff provisions NYISO proposed, which allowed it to implement a centralized program to incorporate wind output into its day-ahead and real-time energy markets. Ongoing costs are recovered from wind plant operators.\*\*\*

# June-August Implied Heat Rates, 2009 vs. 2008




Source: Implied heat rates derived from Platts Megawatt Daily data.

1206

### **Electric Market Overview: On-Peak Spot Electric Prices**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Market Oversight @ FERC.gov



Source: Derived from *Platts* data.

### **Electric Market Overview: Regional Spot Prices**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Market Oversight @ FERC.gov

#### **Regional Spot Prices: 2006-2008 On-peak Spot Prices Off-peak Spot Prices** % Change % Change % Change % Change 2006 2007 2008 06-07 07-08 2006 2007 2008 06-07 07-08 Northeast Mass Hub 69.85 77.39 91.55 10.8% 18.3% 47.93 54.73 66.50 14.2% 17.7% Ny Zone G\* 75.95 100.99 10.0% 20.9% 67.32 27.4% 83.51 48.86 NY Zone J\* 85.96 94.15 112.63 9.5% 19.6% 70.29 23.7% 53.66 NY Zone A\* 58.70 64.02 68.34 9.1% 6.7% 41.26 50.68 18.6% PJM West 61.90 71.15 83.70 14.9% 17.6% 37.45 42.23 12.8% 17.5% 51.21 Southeast VACAR 56.34 60.52 70.86 7.4% 17.1% 34.98 33.67 39.36 -3.7% 14.4% Southern 55.50 59.10 70.13 6.5% 18.7% 34.02 33.03 39.82 -2.9% 17.1% TVA 53.48 60.28 69.01 12.7% 14.5% 33.08 33.56 38.61 1.5% 13.1% Florida 64.02 65.59 74.66 2.5% 13.8% 39.79 35.80 41.35 -10.0% 13.4% Entergy 56.28 59.74 68.49 6.2% 14.6% 34.20 31.88 35.26 -6.8% 9.6% Midwest Cinergy 51.81 61.20 66.88 18.1% 9.3% 27.66 28.94 31.14 4.6% 7.1% Michigan Hub 55.29 64.43 69.15 16.5% 7.3% 30.20 31.04 31.81 2.8% 2.4% 21.6% -6.7% -13.8% Minnesota Hub 59.47 72.32 67.46 27.57 29.32 25.76 6.4% NI Hub 6.1% 52.52 58.93 66.13 12.2% 12.2% 29.09 29.32 31.24 0.8% Illinois Hub 16.7% 4.4% 3.8% 51.32 59.88 62.52 26.41 27.40 26.29 -4.3% MAPP South 55.11 61.18 69.18 11.0% 13.1% 32.73 30.80 34.00 -5.9% 9.4% South Central SPP North 55.84 60.21 68.77 7.8% 14.2% 33.96 31.24 33.66 -8.0% 7.2% -0.5% -1.2% ERCOT 57.83 58.27 62.78 0.8% 7.7% 39.03 38.83 38.36 Southwest 63.21 71.84 8.0% 13.7% 37.91 49.40 6.0% 18.7% Four Corners 58.52 40.19 Palo Verde 57.59 61.74 71.87 7.2% 16.4% 38.21 41.94 52.16 9.8% 19.6% Mead 59.93 64.49 75.63 7.6% 17.3% 39.92 44.15 54.90 10.6% 19.6% Northwest Mid-C 50.18 56.57 65.00 12.7% 14.9% 38.71 44.00 53.70 13.7% 18.1% COB 55.58 62.14 73.86 11.8% 18.9% 40.71 46.38 55.81 13.9% 16.9% California NP15 66.59 80.14 9.0% 20.3% 40.77 47.10 59.22 15.5% 20.5% 61.08 SP15 61.95 66.48 79.36 7.3% 19.4% 41.62 46.76 57.86 12.4% 19.2% Note: \* Off Peak as of April 2, 2007.

Source: Derived from Platts data.

# **Regional Electric and Input Prices: 2006-2008**


Electricity and Input Prices, 2006-08			
	2006	2007	2008
Electric Spot Prices (On-Peak \$ per MWh)			
Mass Hub	\$69.85	\$77.39	\$91.55
Cinergy	\$51.81	\$61.20	\$66.88
SP-15	\$61.95	\$66.48	\$79.36
Input Prices			
Natural Gas (\$ per MMBtu)			
Henry Hub	\$6.74	\$6.94	\$8.85
New York	\$7.37	\$8.46	\$10.13
Southern California	\$6.10	\$6.41	\$7.80
Coal (\$ per ton)			
Central Appalachian (Eastern)	\$51.64	\$45.00	\$92.37
Powder River Basin (Western)	\$13.21	\$10.24	\$13.62
Emissions (\$ per ton)			
SO <sub>2</sub> Allowances	\$738.12	\$527.58	\$280.43
NO <sub>x</sub> allowances	\$1,862.03	\$815.87	\$786.64
Oil			
WTI (Crude - \$ per barrel)	\$66.12	\$72.45	\$99.63
Residual Fuel, New York (\$ per barrel)	\$55.07	\$64.35	\$91.94
Distillate Fuel, New York (\$ per gallon)	\$2.04	\$2.22	\$3.08

Source: Derived from Platts & Bloomberg data.

### **National Electric Market Overview: Coal Prices**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Market Oversight @ FERC.gov

# **Central Appalachian and Powder River Basin Coal Prices**



Note: the Central Appalachian (CAPP) coal is priced at Big Sandy. All others are mine mouth prices. Prices do not include transportation costs to a plant, as those can vary widely by contract specifications. Prices exclude incremental cost of emissions allowances.

Source: Derived from Bloomberg data.

December 2009