What We Do and Do Not Know About How Electricity Markets Work: implications for energy modeling and policy

James Bushnell University of California Energy Institute www.ucei.org

Outline

- Energy Policy and Modeling
 - traditional goals of modeling
 - deregulation and the new paradigm
- A generic blueprint of electricity restructuring
- Measuring market efficiency
- What we do and do not know

Energy Policy in the 21st Century

- Deregulation of supply is a reality
 - Utilities aren't investing in new production
 - Regulators don't get to firms what kind of production to invest in any more
 - » policies setting goals for nuclear, coal, and renewable technologies need to recognize this reality
- Policy-makers have two main levers through which to influence energy markets
 - Competition policy
 - » anti-trust policy, RTOs as regulators
 - Environmental policy/ regulation
 - » straighten out the ends and the means

Modeling Energy Markets

- Traditional models rely upon cost-based approaches
 - Deregulated firms act differently than regulated ones
 - example on transmission planning
 - example on ethanol in California
- Deregulation of energy markets creates a need for two new modeling approaches
 - modeling imperfect competition
 - » equal emphasis on strategic behavior and costs
 - Competitive benchmarking models
 - » 'backcasting' market performance to measure market efficiency

Competitive Benchmark Analysis in Electricity Markets

- Nature vs. Nurture argument in electricity
 - is it market structure or market design??
- Estimate perfectly competitive price levels and compare to observed price levels. Accounts for
 - fuel costs, shortages, outages, reserves, imports, hydro and must-take production
- Produces estimates of margins (p MC) and Lerner Indices (p-MC)/p
 - Borenstein, Bushnell & Wolak (California)
 - Mansur (PJM)
 - Bushnell & Saravia (New England)

US Electricity Restructuring: a generic blueprint

- Deregulate power production
 - in some areas many assets retained by IOUs
- Create ISOs responsible for operating grid and maintaining system balance
 - ISOs run operating reserve and `imbalance energy' markets
 - market-based prices for energy overseen by FERC
- Customers can choose their retailers
 - but most of the retailers buy power from the same place at the same price
- 'default' rates frozen for transition period
 - mechanism for funding `stranded' investments (i.e. nukes) by locking in `high' retail rates for some period
 - transition charge cannot be bypassed by switching retail providers
- No serious efforts to implement direct demand-side participation in wholesale markets

Important differences between US electricity markets

- Ownership structure
 - eastern markets more concentrated
 - more capacity was retained by incumbent utilities in PJM than other markets (roughly 50%)
 - sale of capacity usually accompanied by 'buy-back' contracts in the east
 - by this measure, California was more 'deregulated'
- Market Design
 - Eastern markets are more 'centralized' (PJM >>NE>>Cal)
 - » history of integrated operations
 - Differences in transmission pricing (PJM >>Cal>>NE)
- Regulation
 - price-caps (California & PJM) vs. bid-caps (NE, PJM)
- Relative capacity?

Monthly Average Wholesale Electricity Prices





Market Power

- Market power is the ability to raise prices above marginal costs
- It exists in a lot of industries
 - although a lot of commodity markets are perfectly competitive
- Unilateral market power is not illegal (in U.S.)
- Electricity markets are particularly vulnerable
 - lack of storage,
 - binding capacity limits,
 - lack of price-responsive demand
- It does not require near scarcity or collusion to exist
 - Lerner Index (p-mc)/p ~ θ /(n ϵ)

Average California PX price and MC





New England Energy Clearing Price and MC



Month

Measuring Relative Demand

- Is California producing higher margins because of `tight' capacity conditions?
- How to compare market tightness?
- Residual Demand demand net of
 - imports
 - hydro & nuclear
 - very small thermal, renewables, cogeneration
- Residual Capacity capacity of large fossilfired generation within the ISO system

August & September Demand Comparison



Residual Demand Level (MW)

Cumulative Distributions of Residual Demand August & September





University of California Energy Institute

Kernel Regressions of Lerner Index August & September



Residual Demand

Relative Residual Demand

May - December 99



Residual Demand/ Capacity

Relative Residual Demand May - December 00





Residual Demand/Capacity

Kernel Regression of Lerner Index vs. Capacity Ratio May - December 1999

-Cal - NE - PJM



Kernel Regressions of Lerner Index vs. Capacity Ration (May - October 2000)



What we do know

- Electricity markets are vulnerable to market power
 - collusion not necessary to create large transfers
- Eastern markets have experienced less market power than California
 - at least when markets are not highly capacity constrained
- The higher market power in California does not appear to be due to `tighter' markets

- the *dollar* consequences of that market power are

- Transmission pricing methods do not explain these differences
 - New England (1 zone) and PJM (4000 zones) perform comparably, California (23 zones) does worse

What We Don't Know

- Why did the eastern markets do better?
 - Mix of generation technologies?
 - More vertical integration & buy-back contracts?
 - Tougher market power mitigation measures?
 - Market design?
- How have the markets performed according to other standards?
 - Costs of transmission congestion?
 - Efficiency of operations (& reserves)?
 - Environmental consequences?
 - Investment environment?
- What's the best market standard?
- Is restructuring a good idea?