2014 Report on Ethanol Market Concentration

I. Introduction

This Report presents the Federal Teradommission's ("Commission" or "FTC") concentration analysis of the hanol production industry for 2014Section 1501(a)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 requires the FTC equebar to "perform a market concentration analysis of the ethanol produced industry using the Herfindahlidechman Index to determine whether there is sufficient competition among istedy participants to void price-setting and other anticompetitive behavior?."The statute also requires the FTC to consider all marketing arrangements among industry participants in preparing its analysis The FTC must report its findings to Congress and to the ministrator of the Environmetal Protection Agency ("EPA") by December 1.

As in previous reports, FTC staff ("staffp) repared Herfindahl-Hirschman Index ("HHI") calculations for the U.S. ethan poloduction industry using two fitterent measures of market share – production capacity and actual production previous years, staff calculated market shares by attributing share to (1) each produce peal the producer or the third-party firm that marketed that capacity; and (3) etthird-party marketer alone that marketer sold production volumes pursuant to a pooling agreement. In the start is basis. Based on production capacity, the

¹ Prior Ethanol Reports are available on the FTC's web**Sitee**FTC, Oil and Gas Industry Initiatives, Competition Policy: Report**a**vailable athttp://www.ftc.gov/tipsadvice/competition-guidance/diustry-guidance/oil-and-gas. This Report builds upon Commission reports from previoysars, which contain relevabackground information that this Report does not repeat.

² Energy Policy Act of 2005, Pub. L. No. 109-58, § 1501, 119 Stat. 594, 1074 (2005) (amended 2007). For purposes of this Report, we presthrateCongress used the term "price-setting" to mean "price fixing."

³ Id.

⁴ Id.

HHIs for the domestic ethanol productiondustry range from 333 to 693, depending on the method of market share allocizan. Based on actual production HHIs range from 343 to 743. Compared to the HHI levels in 2013, the leveconficentration in the U.S. ethanol industry in 2014 has increased slightly.

The level of concentration and the large number arket participants in the U.S. ethanol production industry suggest that exercise of mappiceter to set prices coordination on price or output levels is unlikely. As has betwee case each year since the Commission began reporting, each of the 2014 HHIs indicates that indicestry is unconcentrate At this level of concentration, a single ethanol producemarketer lacks market power. Successful anticompetitive coordination would require agreemariam a very large number of producers and thus would be unlikely. Imports and the provisity of entry would also act as a serious impediment to exercise of market power by any group of domestic firms.

II. Recent Industry Developments

A. <u>Renewable Fuel Standard</u>

Congress requires the domestic constion of minimum annual volumes of

2

The annual RFS mandate for renewable fixelescreasing faster than the market's ability to consume ethanol. Nearly all gaselisold in the United States today is \vec{E} tond the industry's limited ability to provide and course higher blends is known as the E10 blend wall.⁸ The 2014 statutory goal of 18.15 billion graits exceeds the achievable overall ethanol production and use given current motor vehicted demand with E10 blending and estimated year-end operable ethanol capacity of 15.6 billion graits EPA subsequently modified the proposed consumption of all renewables futo 15.2 billion graits. Fuel ethanol represents approximately 13 boilt gallons of that tral – a level attainate with E10 blending at current gasoline demand levels plus the modeuse of banked credits for previous ethanol consumption exceeding required levels While the EPA has not finalized the requirements for 2014, some observers believe the final 2001ef could raise the target somewhat.

The RFS also sets targets for cellulos **hae**bl. The 2013 target was approximately 1 billion gallons, and the 2014 target was 1.75 billion gallone cellulosic ethanol production capacity, however, has been slower to dev**thap** anticipated. Cons

B. <u>Margins</u>

As in prior years, fuel ethanol pricesdacosts have been vol



A decrease in corn pricesy more than half from eak 2012-2013 levels (\$8.15 per bushel in August 2012 to \$3.09 per bushelate September 2014) hd strong exports were the principal causes of the cent increase in profits. Ethanol profit margins increased, leading to a 9.3 percent increase than ol production from the previous year. Output of ethanol-blendegasoline also ros². Ethanol inventorly evels increased by about 100 million gallons between June 2013 and June 201². In the wake of Brazil's ethanol production problems, U.S. imports that nation decased by 40 perce². The fall in imports, coupled the higher demand elsewhere the world, made the United States a net exporter of 500 linon gallons of ethanol form July 2013 to June 20².

The lower margins of 2012, followed by revival in 2013, facted industry structure. Consolidation courred between mid-2012 and dr2014, as more than a dozen plants (with a combined capacity of more the second margins grear) were acquired by existing producers. As ethanol margins impred from mid-2013 to September 2014, at least six long-closed than of plants reoped, some after extensive renovation. Another

²² SeeEIA, Today in Energy, Abundant 2013 Corn Harvest Boosts Ethanol Production (Dec. 13, 2013), <u>http://www.eia.gov/todayinergy/detail.cfm?id=1417</u>, Price data: CARD, Iowa State University, Historical Etanol Operating Margins,

http://www.card.iastate.edu/research/bio/tools/hist_eth_gm.(asstxviewed Oct 19, 2014). ²³ Derived from EIA data. See EIA, Monthly Energy Rev(Sept. 2014), Table 10.8vailable at http://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/archive/00351409.pdf

²⁴ SeeEIA, Ending Stocks of Fuel Ethanglupranote 20.

²⁵ SeeEIA, Today in Energy, U.S. Ethanol Imports from Brazil Down in 2013, <u>http://www.eia.gov/todayimergy/detail.cfm?id=1613</u>1 (May 5, 2014).

²⁶ See EIA, U.S. Exports of Fuel Ethanol, <u>http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/hist/Lea&Hdler.ashx?n=pet&s=m_epooxe_eex_nus-z00_mbbl&f=m(last modified Oct. 30, 2014).</u>

large plant, now shut dowand under renovationshould reopen in 2015, adding more capacity²⁷.

The industry also faced logistical issues this past year. Some producers, particularly in the upper Midwest, were temporarily unable to m

The number of firms producing ethanol has **dese**d slightly since last year's Report. As of September 2014, 148 firms produce or likely begin producing ethaol within the next 12 to 18 months, compared to 156 firms in 20**T**Be largest ethanol producer's share of domestic capacity is 10.9 percentchanged from its percent share in 20°13.

IV. Analysis

Section 1501(a)(2) of the energy Policy Act of 2005 instructs the Commission to measure concentration in the Uethanol production dustry using HHIs³³. HHIs can provide a snapshot of market concentration based upentumber of market participants and their respective sales, orduction, or capacit³⁴. An analysis of competition among market participants using these HHIs assess that the U.S. ethanol product industry is an appropriate antitrust market²⁵. This assumption precludes consideration broader relevat product market

available at<u>http://ethanolrfa.org/page</u>/-/PDFs/RFA%202013%20Ethanol%20dlustry%20Outlook.pdf?nocdn=1

that includes other gasolinbeending components that might be economically viable and environmentally acceptable substitutes for ethalmothe event that ethanol competes with other blending components, HHIs based on a fulce below market would understate the amount of competition in the industry. This assumptions captrecludes consideration of a broader or narrower relevant geographic market than the definition of the further insight about competition in ethanol.

This Report presents four HHIs for the **etbb**industry, calculatedsing two different measures of market share – production capacid actual production and two different methods of allocating those market sharesst,Fsitaff calculated market shares based on domestic ethanol production capacity. In previous protects, staff attributed the producer's market share to: (1) the producer itself; (2) the produce the third-party firm that actually marketed the producer's ethanol output; a(3) the third-party marketing firm only if that firm marketed the producer's volumes pursuand a pooling agreement (and, abuse uch a pooling agreement, to the producer). Pooling agreements, how ever no longer common in the industry today, and thus they no longer provide a meaningful wayaltocate market share. Thus, this Report does not measure concentration on this basis.

Second, EIA staff calculated market shares ed on actual production, attributing the market shares as described in the preceding paper. Due to the coid fential nature of the

10

and provided the resulting prodicon-based HHIs to our staff. FTC staff relied on publicly available information and intervices with producers, marketerend other industry participants to determine the production capacityeach ethanol plant and tealculate the market shares based on marketing arrangements.

A. <u>Concentration with Market Shares Based on Production Capacity</u>

For each of the HH³ calculations described below taff first calculated producers' market shares based on the event ethanol production capacity. Production capacity provides a useful and easily confirmable indicator approducer's competitive significance. In determining the aggregate capacity each producer, staff included the capacity of existing plants, as well as the projected capacity entry under construction and plants

³⁷ Because the production data are confider **EIA**, staff did not disclose to FTC staff the volumes of ethanol attributable any individual producer or **e**hmarket shares based on those volumes.

³⁸ The Commission and the U.S. Department **stide** characterize markets in which the HHI is below 1500 as unconcentrated. HHIs between **1500**(2500 indicate moderately concentrated markets, which may or may not raise competitive concerns in the context of a horizontal merger or acquisition. Markets with HHIs over 2500 **big**hly concentrated, arhtbrizontal mergers or acquisitions in such markets are more likely to pose competitive concerns. Merger Guidelinessupranote 34, § 5.3.

³⁹ The RFA's website provides frequently updated on ethanol plant pacity and capacity expansion plans. Capacity information is also allable on many individul producers' websites, some of which also provide details construction and expansion plans.

⁴⁰ SeeHorizontal Merger Guidelines, upranote 34, § 5.2. In markets for homogeneous products (such as ethanol), a firm may derise competitive significance primarily from its available capacity i.e., its ability and incerive to increase production in the event of a competitor's price increase or output reduction.

a measure of industry concentitora that captures this aggretional. For those producers that engage in direct sales, staff attributed thanket shares to the producers thems the staff ves.

This approach yields an HHI of 693, comcentrated under the Horizontal Merger Guidelines. This HHI is higher atm the corresponding HHI of 586 in 20⁴⁶3.

B. <u>Concentration with Market Shares Based on Actual Production</u>

Firms that produce more than eight millignallons of oxygenates (such as ethanol) per year must report to EIA their on the production volumes by production groduction data is instructive because capacity datave certain limitations, partically insofar as stated capacity does not necessarily represent abproduction capacities. Ethanol plats often can produce as much as 10 to 15 percent more than the itest design capacities attended to operate at increasing rates as their owners and oper attendes over the production process and gain expertise in operating their plants. In this respect, actual productionary reflect a market participant's competitive significance more accurately more than the plants' capacities.

There are some limitationousn the accuracy of HHIs based actual production, just as there are limitations on capacitogased HHIs. HHIs based **pr**oduction over a given period may overstate or understate actual centration due to entry a

13

the concentrating impact of plant closured adlings during the peord. In both cases, these facilities will have produced only a fraction of adhthey otherwise would produce in a full year, leading to an understatement (line case of new facilities) or an erstatement (in the case of idled facilities) of their competitive significanine the market. Similarly, the HHIs below do not account for the effects on concentration of plant projections within the last 12 months and capacity-enhancing improvement projections.

These production-based HHIs reflect at **pro**duction volume from July 2013 through June 2014. Where EIA attributed the actual **produce** market share directly to individual producers, the resulting HHI is 343, slightly **phe** than the 2013 HHI of 328. The production-

into the United States as import levels respondute tulations in the price dul.S. ethanol relative to foreign ethanol prices, placularly prices for sugarane-based ethanol from Bra⁴⁹/₂.

V. Conclusion

Regardless of the particular easure of market sharetbe market share allocation method used to calculate concentration aebl production remains unconcentrated. The industry is less concentrated today than it wats eatime of the first Report on Ethanol Market Concentration in 2005. Furthermore, the posisyboil entry and the availability of ethanol imports provide additional constints on the exercise of market by current industry participants. These dynamics make it extrement likely that a single ethanol producer or marketer or a group of such firms could exercise ket power to set prices or coordinate on price or output levels.

⁴⁹ The expiration of the ethanol import tariff \$0.54 per gallon at thend of 2011 has made Brazilian fuel ethanol more costor petitive relative todomestic productionSee2013 Renewable Fuel Standards pranote 13, at 49818. For example, Brazilian producers responded to the high cost of U.S. conthine second half of 2012 bexporting record amounts of ethanol into the United StateSeeEIA, U.S. Imports from Brazil of Fuel Ethanol, <u>http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/hist/Leafhdler.ashx?n=PET&s=MFEIM_NUS-NBR_1&f=</u>M (last modified Oct.30, 2014); 20 Renewable Fuel Standards pranote 13, at 49818.

Concentration Based on Capacity	2013 HHI	2014 HHI
Shares attributed teach producer	290	333
Shares attributed to marketeos all marketing agreements	586	693
Concentration Based on Production	2013 HHI	2014 HHI
Shares attributed to each producer	328	343
Shares attributed to marketeos all marketing agreements	687	743

Figure 1: Domestic Fuel Ethanol Concentration

Source: Production HHIs from EIA

Note: Capacity for 2013 include the current capacity as Steptember 2013 and the capacity additions under construction and pected to be completed thin 12 to 18 months after September 2013. Capacity for 2014 includes threat capacity as of September 2014 and the capacity additions undepostruction and expected to be completed within 12 to 18 months after September 2014. Production data for 2014 Sfrom July 2012 through June 2013, and production data for 2014 are from July 2013 through June 2014.

⁵⁰ As discussed in note 38 upra the Commission and the Depracent of Justice characterize markets with HHIs below 1500 as unconcentrated. HHIs between 1500 and 2500 indicate moderately concentrated markets and HHIs over 2500 indicate highconcentrated markets that are more likely to pose competitive concerns. informease in the HHI of less than 100 points is unlikely to have adverse competitive effects. Horizontal Merger Guidesings anote 34, § 5.3.



Figure 2: Historical Fuel Ethanol Canacity and HHIs