

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison) Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating)
Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for)
Authority to Provide a Standard Service Offer)
Pursuant to R.C. § 4928.143 in the Form of an)
Electric Security Plan.)
)

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH E. BOWRING
ON BEHALF OF THE INDEPENDENT MARKET MONITOR FOR PJM

1 Q PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND POSITION.

2 A My name is Joseph E. Bowring. I am the Market Monitor for PJM. I am the President of
3 Monitoring Analytics, LLC. Monitoring Analytics serves as the Independent Market
4 Monitor for PJM, also known as the Market Monitoring Unit. Since March 8, 1999, I have
5 been responsible for all the market monitoring activities of PJM, first as the head of the
6 internal PJM Market Monitoring Unit and, since August 1, 2008, as President of
7 Monitoring Analytics. The market monitoring activities of PJM are defined in the PJM
8 Market Monitoring Plan, Attachment M and Attachment M-Appendix to PJM Open
9 Access Transmission Tariff. I am a Ph.D. economist and have substantial experience in
10 applied energy and regulatory economics. I have taught economics as a member of
11 faculty at Bucknell University and at Villanova University. I have served as a senior staff
12 economist for the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities and as Chief Economist for the
13 New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate’s Division of Rate Counsel. I have
14 worked as an independent consulting economist.

15 Q WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

16 A Ohio Edison Company (“Ohio Edison”), The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company
17 (“CEI”) and The Toledo Edison Company (“Toledo Edison”) (the “Companies”) are
18 requesting Commission approval of their fourth electric security plan (“ESP IV”). ESP IV
19 includes the Retail Rate Stability Rider (“Rider RRS”). The purpose of my testimony is
20 to explain why Rider RRS would constitute a subsidy which is inconsistent with
21 competition in the PJM wholesale power market.

22 Q PLEASE BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE RIDER RRS

1 A Rider RRS would transfer all responsibility for paying all the historic and future costs
2 associated with the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (“Davis-Besse”) and the W.H.
3 Sammis Plant (“Sammis”) (the “Plants”) and FirstEnergy’s share of the output of two
4 generating plants owned and operated by Ohio Valley Electric Corporation (“OVEC”)
5 from FirstEnergy to the ratepayers of the Companies. The OVEC plants are the Kyger
6 Creek Plant in Cheshire, Ohio and the Clifty Creek Plant in Madison, Indiana. The costs
7 would include what witness Mikkelsen refers to as Legacy Costs which are all historical
8 costs incurred at these plants and under these contracts, prior to the proposed transfer of
9 all cost responsibility to ratepayers under Rider RRS.

10 Rider RRS also provides that the Companies would sell the capacity from these plants
11 and under these contracts in the PJM capacity market and would sell the associated
12 energy and ancillary services in the PJM energy and ancillary services markets.

13 Rider RRS would credit the market revenues against the costs and charge the net costs to
14 the ratepayers of the Companies.

15 Q **DOES FIRSTENERGY BELIEVE THAT THE PLANTS ARE A GOOD**
16 **INVESTMENT?**

17 A No. FirstEnergy does not believe that the units are profitable and does not believe that
18 current and expected market conditions will make the units profitable.

19 As stated by witness Moul (P 2): “The economic viability of the Plants is in doubt.
20 Market-based revenues for energy and capacity have been at historic lows and are
21 insufficient to permit FES to continue operating the Plants and to make the necessary
22 investments.” Witness Moul also states (P 3): “Markets have not, and are not, providing
23 sufficient revenues to ensure continued operation of the Plants.”

24 Nonetheless, FirstEnergy wants to shift the costs and risks of these resources to
25 ratepayers. FirstEnergy has not made clear why customers should take these risks, if a
26 well informed generation owner is not willing to take these risks.

27 Q **WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR RIDER RRS OF PJM’S PROPOSED**
28 **CHANGES TO THE DESIGN OF THE CAPACITY MARKET?**

29 A On December 12, 2014, PJM filed a proposal to significantly change the design of the
30 PJM capacity market. One of the most significant elements of the PJM proposal is to
31 increase the performance incentives for capacity resources. If units do not perform as
32 required, units will pay substantial penalties. Those penalties would be paid to units
33 that did perform when called. While FirstEnergy has not explicitly addressed these
34 issues because PJM’s filing was made after FirstEnergy’s filing, PJM’s filing raises issues

1 relevant to FirstEnergy's Rider RRS. If FirstEnergy's proposal remains internally
2 consistent, I would expect that Rider RRS would require ratepayers to pay any
3 performance penalties associated with the Plants or the OVEC resources. I would also
4 expect that FirstEnergy would retain any performance payments at other FirstEnergy
5 units even if paid for in part by these ratepayer penalties.

6 This highlights the incentive issues that arise when the responsibility for operating
7 plants and the financial consequences of that operation are separated, as would occur
8 under Rider RRS. This is another reason to reject Rider RRS.

9 **Q IS RIDER RRS CONSISTENT WITH COMPETITION IN THE PJM WHOLESALE**
10 **POWER MARKET?**

11 **A** No. Rider RRS is not consistent with competition in the PJM wholesale power market.
12 Rider RRS would constitute a subsidy analogous to the subsidies proposed in New
13 Jersey and Maryland, both of which were found to be inconsistent with competition in
14 the wholesale power markets.¹

15 Rider RRS would shift responsibility from FirstEnergy for all historical and future costs
16 to the ratepayers of the Companies. The Companies are requesting that the plants and
17 the contracts be returned to the cost of service regulation regime that predated the
18 introduction of competitive wholesale power markets.

19 Rider RRS would require that the ratepayers of the Companies subsidize the costs of the
20 plants and the contracts to the benefit of the Companies. The logical offer price for these
21 resources in the PJM capacity market, under these conditions, would be zero. A zero
22 offer would be rational because this would maximize the revenue offset to the customers
23 who would be required to pay 100 percent of the costs of this capacity. This would have
24 an anti-competitive, price suppressive effect on the PJM capacity markets.

25 This type of subsidy is inconsistent with competition in the wholesale power markets
26 because of its price suppressive effects. Such effects would make it difficult or
27 impossible for generating units without subsidies to compete in the market. Competition
28 depends on units making competitive offers that reflect their costs and on recovering
29 revenues only from the markets and not from subsidies. Such subsidies would
30 negatively affect the incentives to build new generation and would likely result in a
31 situation where only subsidized units would ever be built.

¹ See PPL EnergyPlus, LLC, et al. v. Nazirian, et al., slip op. no. 13-2419 (4th Cir. June 2, 2014); PPL EnergyPlus, LLC, et al. v. Solomon, et al., slip op. no. 13-4330 (3rd Cir. March 27, 2014) .

1 Q **HOW DOES COMPETITION IN THE PJM WHOLESALE POWER MARKET WORK?**

2 A It is essential that any approach to the PJM markets and the PJM capacity market
3 incorporate a consistent view of how the preferred market design is expected to work to
4 provide competitive results in a sustainable market design over the long run. A
5 sustainable market design means a market design that results in appropriate incentives
6 to retire units and to invest in new units over time such that reliability is ensured as a
7 result of the functioning of the market. There are at least two broad paradigms that
8 could result in such an outcome. The market paradigm includes a full set of markets,
9 most importantly the energy market and capacity market, which together ensure that
10 there are adequate revenues to incent new generation when it is needed and to incent
11 retirement of units when appropriate. This approach will result in long term reliability
12 at the lowest possible cost.

13 The quasi-market paradigm includes an energy market based on LMP but addresses the
14 need for investment incentives via the long-term contract model or the cost of service
15 model. In the quasi-market paradigm, competition to build capacity is limited and does
16 not include the entire PJM footprint. In the quasi-market paradigm, customers absorb
17 the risks associated with new investment through guaranteed payments under either
18 guaranteed long term contracts or the cost of service approach. In the quasi-market
19 paradigm there is no market clearing pricing to incent investment in existing units or
20 new units. In the quasi-market paradigm there is no incentive for entities without cost of
21 service treatment to enter and thus competition is effectively eliminated.

22 I believe that the market paradigm is the preferred alternative and that FirstEnergy's
23 proposal is not consistent with the market paradigm. Whatever the decision, it is
24 essential at a minimum that the choices about incentives and regulatory approaches be
25 made with an explicit understanding of the short run and long run implications of these
26 choices for the design of wholesale power markets and the interaction between
27 wholesale power markets and retail markets.

28 Q **PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RECOMMENDATION.**

29 A Rider RRS would constitute a subsidy which is inconsistent with competition in the PJM
30 wholesale power markets. Rider RRS should be rejected for that reason.

31 Q **DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

32 A Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Direct Testimony of Joseph E. Bowring on Behalf of Monitoring Analytics, LLC, was served via electronic transmission to the persons listed below on this 22th day of December 2014.

/s/ Jeffrey W. Mayes

Jeffrey W. Mayes

General Counsel

SERVICE LIST

Thomas.mcnamee@puc.state.oh.us	callwein@wamenergylaw.com
Thomas.lindgren@puc.state.oh.us	joliker@igsenergy.com
Ryan.orourke@puc.state.oh.us	rnswhite@igsenergy.com
mkurtz@BKLLawfmn.com	Bojko@carpenterlipps.com
kboehm@BKLLawfmn.com	Allison@carpenterlipps.com
jkylercohn@BKLLawfmn.com	hussey@carpenterlipps.com
stnourse@aep.com	barthroyer@aol.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com	athompson@taftlaw.com
yalami@aep.com	ChristopherMiller@icerniller.com
joseph.clark@directenergy.com	Gregory.dunn@icerniller.com
ghull@eckertseamans.com	Jeremy.grayem@icerniller.com
myurick@taftlaw.com	blanghenry@city.cleveland.oh.us
dparram@taftlaw.com	hmadorsky@city.cleveland.oh.us
Schmidt@sppgrp.com	kryan@city.cleveland.oh.us
ricks@ohanet.org	tdougherty@theOEC.org
tobrien@bricker.com	jfmnigan@edf.org
mkl@bbrslaw.com	Marilyn@wflawfmn.com
gas@bbrslaw.com	todonnell@dickinsonwright.com
ojk@bbrslaw.com	matt@matthewcoxlaw.com
wttpmlc@aol.com	mfleisher@elpc.org
lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com	drinebolt@ohiopartners.org
dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com	meissnerjoseph@yahoo.com
blanghenry@city.cleveland.oh.us	selisar@mwncmh.com
hmadorsky@city.cleveland.oh.us	ccunningham@akronohio.gov
kryan@city.cleveland.oh.us	asonderman@keglerbrown.com
mdortch@kravitzllc.com	sechler@carpenterlipps.com
rparsons@kravitzllc.com	gpoulos@enemoc.com
gkrassen@bricker.com	toddm@wamenergylaw.com
dstinson@bricker.com	Gregory.price@puc.state.oh.us
dborchers@bricker.com	Mandy.willey@puc.state.oh.us
mitch.dutton@fpl.com	LeslieKovacik@toledo.oh.gov

burkj@frrstenergycorp.com
cdunn@frrstenergycorp.com
jlang@calfee.com
talexander@calfee.com
dakutik@jonesday.com
sam@mwncrnh.com
fdarr@mwncrnh.com
mpritchard@mwncrnh.com
cmooney@ohiopartners.org

trhayslaw@gmail.com
Jeffrey.Mayes@monitoringanalytics.com
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com
msoules@earthjustice.org
sfisk@earthjustice.org

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/22/2014 4:35:12 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-1297-EL-SSO

Summary: Testimony Direct Testimony of Joseph E. Bowring on behalf of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM. electronically filed by Miss Maeve C Tibbetts on behalf of Monitoring Analytics, LLC and Mr. Jeffrey W Mayes