

Supplementary Material

Contents

List of Notes

1	Instrument relevance and exclusion restrictions in the IV reduced-translog model.	10
2	Translog response-surface geometry and preferred operating region.	24


List of Figures

1	Public availability of ERCOT day-ahead forecast information before 2021. . .	3
2	Geographic context for Bitcoin-mining operations in Texas.	4
3	Historical occurrence of coincident peaks in Texas (2001–2014).	7
4	Weekday and weekend mining load during daytime hours (12:00 – 19:00 CST) by season.	8
5	Estimated timing of miners’ intraday response window during summer months. .	9
6	Daily hashprice time series over the study period (¢/TH/s/day).	11
7	Treatment–control covariate support in the full sample and after restricting to the matched support.	20
8	Distributions of electricity price, hashprice, and growth-adjusted mining load inside and outside the CEM overlap region.	21
9	Schematic of translog response-surface regions.	25



List of Tables

1	Summary statistics for Bitcoin-mining load, electricity prices, ERCOT system conditions, and weather variables used in the analysis.	5
2	Annual estimates of load actively pursuing reduction during ERCOT coincident-peak intervals.	6
3	First-stage diagnostics for the IV-2SLS reduced-translog specification.	12
4	Endogeneity diagnostics for the IV reduced-translog specification.	13
5	OLS difference-in-differences estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under alternative definitions of the SDT intention-to-treat window.	14

6	Bitcoin-mining load estimates under alternative month $\times$ year fixed-effects specifications.	15
7	Bitcoin-mining load estimates under alternative capacity-growth controls. . .	16
8	OLS difference-in-differences estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under alternative temperature measures.	17
9	CEM-weighted IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under alternative electricity-price measures.	18
10	Full-sample IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under increasing minimum electricity-price cutoffs.	19
11	IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load outside the CEM overlap region. .	22
12	Matched-sample IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under increasing minimum electricity-price cutoffs.	23
13	Load-zone-specific IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load using CEM weights. .	26
14	Endogeneity diagnostics for the IV-2SLS NP-risk specification.	27
15	First-stage diagnostics for the IV-2SLS NP-risk specification.	28
16	IV-2SLS estimates of mining-load responses to NP-risk under an alternative NP-risk definition.	29
17	IV-2SLS estimates of mining-load responses to NP-risk in the baseline summer-daytime sample and placebo season-by-time samples.	30



Supplementary Figure 1: Public availability of ERCOT day-ahead forecast information before 2021. (a) Archived "Load Forecast vs. Actual" dashboard view showing that ERCOT's public interface reported day-ahead load forecasts [1]. (b) Archived ERCOT public "GridInfo" landing page linking to load-forecast products [2]. (c) Archived ERCOT "Generation" page documenting publicly posted wind and solar forecast products [3]. These archived pages document that day-ahead load and renewable-generation forecasts were publicly available from ERCOT before the study period and therefore observable to market participants.



Supplementary Figure 2: Geographic context for Bitcoin-mining operations in Texas. (a) Approximate locations of large-scale Bitcoin-mining facilities in Texas in 2022, based on a compiled map shared on X/Twitter [4]. The map also marks three nearby reference locations: Midland, the Dallas–Fort Worth area, and Bryan/College Station. (b) ERCOT load zones [5], with the same three reference locations marked. Together, these panels indicate Bitcoin-mining activity in 2022 was concentrated primarily in ERCOT’s West, North, and South load zones. These are the three zones covered in our sample.

Supplementary Table 1: Summary statistics for Bitcoin-mining load, electricity prices, ERCOT system conditions, and weather variables used in the analysis.


	N	Mean	Median	P25	P75	P95	Min/Max
Mining load (MW)							
South	13,339	239.51	249.31	197.21	280.38	380.94	0.00 / 400.45
North	3,418	129.96	138.95	124.10	146.76	156.42	32.93 / 239.44
West	12,878	109.80	78.84	72.51	96.27	269.96	17.22 / 352.85
Electricity price (\$/MWh)							
South	13,339	54.47	41.12	29.11	59.53	108.74	0.09 / 2759.61
North	3,418	75.29	51.48	37.34	72.21	161.68	0.34 / 3003.86
West	12,878	122.88	30.42	19.39	50.48	129.74	0.01 / 9107.24
Hashprice (\$/TH/s/day)	728	0.22	0.22	0.11	0.32	0.39	0.06 / 0.42
ERCOT demand (MW)	17,158	47111.78	44535.72	39849.76	52569.45	68131.29	29425.60 / 80037.84
Wind generation (MW)	17,158	11483.73	11063.57	6116.13	16660.27	21704.04	179.17 / 28490.41
BTC price, log	728	10.46	10.56	10.05	10.78	11.01	9.67 / 11.12
Houston CDD (base 65°F)	728	9.16	8.75	0.00	16.63	22.03	0.00 / 26.27
Temperature (°F)							
Bryan/College Station	13,339	70.62	73.40	60.80	82.40	93.20	14.00 / 105.80
Dallas–Fort Worth	3,418	76.05	78.08	66.02	87.08	98.06	24.98 / 109.04
Midland	12,878	64.76	68.00	51.08	78.98	93.02	-2.02 / 105.08
ERCOT demand forecast (MW)	17,158	47269.77	44455.31	39776.90	52860.36	68781.56	28643.92 / 81430.82
Renewable generation forecast (MW)	17,158	14622.38	13989.05	9389.35	19270.92	26505.80	817.20 / 38408.70

Notes: The table reports descriptive statistics for variables used in the analysis. Zone-specific variables are reported separately for the South, North, and West load zones. Electricity price is defined as the simple average of zone-level day-ahead and real-time market prices. Temperature series are collected from representative weather stations assigned to each zone. Mining load, electricity price, temperature, ERCOT demand, wind generation, and ERCOT forecast variables are measured hourly. Hashprice, logged Bitcoin price, and Houston cooling degree days are measured daily and merged into the hourly panel by date. The number of observations therefore differs across variables because of differences in measurement frequency and geographic coverage. P25, P75, and P95 denote the 25th, 75th, and 95th percentiles, respectively; Min/Max reports the minimum and maximum observed values. Hours with missing observations or non-positive electricity prices are excluded.


Supplementary Table 2: Annual estimates of load actively pursuing reduction during ERCOT coincident-peak intervals.

Year	MW	Description used in report	Source
2015	800	“ERCOT estimates that over 800 MW of load is actively pursuing reduction during these intervals.”	[6, p. 90]
2016	1,163	“ERCOT estimates that 835-1,491 MW of load were actively pursuing reduction during the 4CP intervals in 2016, an increase from the estimated response in 2015.”	[7, p. 84]
2017	1,500	“ERCOT estimates that as much as 1500 MW of load were actively pursuing reduction during the 4CP intervals in 2016 and 2017.”	[8, p. 92]
2018	1,700	“ERCOT estimates that as much as 1700 MW of load were actively pursuing reduction during the 4CP intervals in 2018, an increase of about 200 MW from 2017.”	[9, p. 91]
2019	2,200	“ERCOT estimates that as much as 2,200 MW of load were actively pursuing reduction during the 4CP intervals in 2019, much higher than the 2018 estimate.”	[10, p. 30]
2020	2,800	“ERCOT estimates that as much as 2,800 MW of load were actively pursuing reduction during the 4CP intervals in 2020, higher than the 2019 estimate.”	[11, p. 30]

Notes: This table reports the annual report-based estimates used to construct our series of load actively pursuing reduction during ERCOT coincident-peak intervals. Values are hand-collected from the text of Potomac Economics’ “State of the Market Report for the ERCOT Electricity Markets.” When a report provides a range, we use the midpoint of that range as the representative value.




(a)




(b)

Supplementary Figure 3: Historical occurrence of coincident peaks in Texas (2001–2014). (a) Distribution of coincident-peak events by hour of day, reported in CST. ERCOT timestamps are recorded in Central Prevailing Time (CPT) [12]; because these events occur during summer months, we subtract one hour from CPT to express event times in CST. (b) Distribution of coincident-peak events by day of week. Events occur primarily on weekdays and in the late afternoon.



Supplementary Figure 4: Weekday and weekend mining load during daytime hours (12:00 – 19:00 CST) by season. Mean $\log(\text{Mining Load}/\text{growth})$ is shown by load zone, year, season, and weekday/weekend status. Seasons are defined as pre-summer, summer, and post-summer periods. Error bars show the interquartile range (25th–75th percentiles) within each zone–year–season–day-type cell.




Supplementary Figure 5: Estimated timing of miners’ intraday response window during summer months. Average summer intraday load profiles are constructed for each load zone, year, and month from June through September using hourly mining-load data. For each year–month–zone profile, we fit a five-segment piecewise linear function of hour of day, using the first interior breakpoint as the estimated start of the response window and the last interior breakpoint as the estimated end. The figure overlays the fitted profiles and shows histograms of the estimated start and end times across year–month–zone combinations. The estimated response window generally begins in the late morning and ends in the early evening, roughly from 10:00 to 19:00 CST.

Supplementary Note 1: Instrument relevance and exclusion restrictions in the IV reduced-translog model.

Our IV reduced-translog specification treats $\log(\text{electricity price})$, $\log(\text{hashprice})$, and their interaction as endogenous. We instrument these variables using ERCOT wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Supplementary Table 3 reports strong first-stage relationships for all three endogenous regressors.

ERCOT wind generation shifts short-run electricity supply conditions and therefore wholesale electricity prices. This interpretation is consistent with prior work [13, 14]. Bitcoin price shifts hashprice because the Bitcoin price enters directly into the hashprice calculation. Bitcoin price is determined in global trading markets. Mining-load curtailment decisions in a small number of ERCOT load zones are unlikely to affect the contemporaneous Bitcoin price. This interpretation is also consistent with firm-level industry practices, where curtailment decisions are based on comparing electricity-price-based operating costs with hashprice-based mining revenue rather than on short-run Bitcoin inventory choices (personal communication with a senior executive at a large Texas Bitcoin-mining facility, Sept. 2024). Because $\log(\text{electricity price}) \times \log(\text{hashprice})$ is a product of two endogenous regressors, we also treat it as endogenous. We therefore include the interaction of the excluded instruments, $\text{Wind} \times \log(\text{BTC price})$, as an additional excluded instrument for the first stage. Supplementary Table 4 reports endogeneity diagnostics supporting the use of IV estimation.

The regressions include zone-specific mining-load growth, temperature controls, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. Conditional on these controls and fixed effects, the exclusion restriction is that variation in ERCOT wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction affects mining load only through $\log(\text{electricity price})$, $\log(\text{hashprice})$, and their interaction.



Supplementary Figure 6: Daily hashprice time series over the study period (¢/TH/s/day).

Supplementary Table 3: First-stage diagnostics for the IV-2SLS reduced-translog specification.

Endogenous variable	Partial R^2	Shea's R^2	Partial F-stat.	p-value
log(electricity price)	0.1804	0.1419	869.27	0.0000
log(hashprice)	0.9301	0.1602	20,370.97	0.0000
log(electricity price) × log(hashprice)	0.4161	0.1345	2,708.27	0.0000

Notes: The endogenous regressors are log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction. The excluded instruments are ERCOT wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. The included controls are the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. Partial F -statistics test the joint significance of the excluded instruments in each first-stage regression, conditional on the included controls and fixed effects, using the full sample. Standard errors used to compute the reported p -values are clustered by date. All first-stage partial F -statistics exceed conventional weak-instrument thresholds, indicating strong first-stage relevance of the excluded instruments.

Supplementary Table 4: Endogeneity diagnostics for the IV reduced-translog specification.

Variables	Test	Statistic	p-value	Distribution	Conclusion
Joint (all endogenous variables):					
	Wu–Hausman	58.6623	0.0000	F(3, 29,580)	Reject (1%)
	Durbin	175.2715	0.0000	$\chi^2(3)$	Reject (1%)
	Wooldridge score	264.5737	0.0000	$\chi^2(3)$	Reject (1%)
Individual endogenous variables:					
log(electricity price)	Wu–Hausman	83.0346	0.0000	F(1, 29,582)	Reject (1%)
	Durbin	82.9505	0.0000	$\chi^2(1)$	Reject (1%)
log(hashprice)	Wu–Hausman	18.2864	0.0000	F(1, 29,582)	Reject (1%)
	Durbin	18.3079	0.0000	$\chi^2(1)$	Reject (1%)

Notes: Endogeneity is assessed using the Wu–Hausman [15], Durbin [16], and Wooldridge score [17] tests as implemented in the *linearmodels* package in Python. The null hypothesis is exogeneity of the indicated regressor set conditional on the included controls and fixed effects. The included controls are the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. In the joint tests, the endogenous regressor set consists of log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction. Standard errors are clustered by date. For the full sample, the tests reject exogeneity jointly and for log(electricity price) and log(hashprice) individually, so we treat these variables and their interaction as endogenous in the reduced-translog specifications.

Supplementary Table 5: OLS difference-in-differences estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under alternative definitions of the SDT intention-to-treat window.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
SDT window	12:00–19:00	10:00–21:00	14:00–17:00
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)		
SDT	-0.0921*** (0.0279)	-0.0694*** (0.0210)	-0.1427*** (0.0407)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.4050*** (0.0533)	-0.2888*** (0.0413)	-0.5435*** (0.0771)
log(growth)	0.9906*** (0.0299)	0.9923*** (0.0305)	0.9810*** (0.0295)
temperature	0.0185*** (0.0048)	0.0165*** (0.0048)	0.0185*** (0.0047)
temperature ²	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)
Estimator	FE-OLS	FE-OLS	FE-OLS
CEM weights	No	No	No
Observations	29,635	29,635	29,635
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (within)	0.4687	0.4584	0.4721
R^2 (overall)	0.6540	0.6473	0.6562

Notes: Column (1) uses the preferred SDT window of 12:00–19:00, column (2) uses a wider window of 10:00–21:00, and column (3) uses a narrower window of 14:00–17:00. All specifications are estimated on the full sample and include the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels. The estimated SDT effects remain negative and statistically significant across alternative window definitions.

Supplementary Table 6: Bitcoin-mining load estimates under alternative month×year fixed-effects specifications.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Month×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)			
SDT	-0.0798*** (0.0255)	-0.1431*** (0.0314)	-0.1721*** (0.0521)	-0.0194 (0.0630)
SDT × 2022	-0.4229*** (0.0507)	-0.2111*** (0.0580)	-0.0382 (0.0862)	-0.2623*** (0.0649)
log(electricity price)	—	-0.1165*** (0.0282)	-0.2740*** (0.0628)	-0.3050*** (0.0636)
log(hashprice)	—	0.1058 (0.0779)	-0.2741** (0.1251)	0.3030** (0.1269)
log(electricity price)× log(hashprice)	—	0.2466*** (0.0498)	0.6660*** (0.1371)	0.5311*** (0.1099)
log(growth)	0.9905*** (0.0408)	0.9656*** (0.0406)	1.0316*** (0.1083)	0.9350*** (0.1218)
temperature	0.0171*** (0.0044)	0.0206*** (0.0046)	0.0057 (0.0154)	0.0431*** (0.0158)
temperature ²	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001 (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)
Estimator	FE-OLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	29,635	29,635	8,637	8,637
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (within)	0.4744	—	—	—
R^2 (overall)	0.6577	0.6615	0.6768	0.6675
First-stage partial R^2	—	0.17–0.87	0.14–0.82	0.17–0.80
First-stage partial F	—	516–5,547	106–2,462	77–1,407

Notes: Column (1) reports the full-sample OLS difference-in-differences specification. Columns (2)–(4) report IV-2SLS specifications. Columns (3) and (4) are estimated on the matched sample using CEM weights. All specifications include SDT, SDT×2022, the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day and day-of-week fixed effects. Columns (1)–(3) include month×year fixed effects; column (4) instead includes separate month and year fixed effects. In columns (2)–(4), log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction are instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specifications are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels.

Supplementary Table 7: Bitcoin-mining load estimates under alternative capacity-growth controls.

Growth covariate	(1) Piecewise	(2) Preferred	(3) Piecewise	(4) Preferred
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)			
SDT	-0.0916*** (0.0277)	-0.0921*** (0.0279)	-0.0148 (0.0639)	-0.0194 (0.0630)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.4176*** (0.0537)	-0.4050*** (0.0533)	-0.2656*** (0.0657)	-0.2623*** (0.0649)
log(electricity price)	—	—	-0.3135*** (0.0647)	-0.3050*** (0.0636)
log(hashprice)	—	—	0.2901** (0.1244)	0.3030** (0.1269)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	—	—	0.5409*** (0.1111)	0.5311*** (0.1099)
log(piecewise growth)	0.9937*** (0.0275)	—	0.8932*** (0.0917)	—
log(growth)	—	0.9906*** (0.0299)	—	0.9350*** (0.1218)
temperature	0.0204*** (0.0046)	0.0185*** (0.0048)	0.0457*** (0.0151)	0.0431*** (0.0158)
temperature ²	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)
Estimator	FE-OLS	FE-OLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	29,635	29,635	8,637	8,637
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (within)	0.4646	0.4687	—	—
R^2 (overall)	0.6513	0.6540	0.6696	0.6675
First-stage partial R^2	—	—	0.18–0.79	0.18–0.80
First-stage partial F	—	—	77–1,365	77–1,407

Notes: Columns (1) and (3) use the piecewise linear growth covariate; columns (2) and (4) use the preferred cumulative-maximum growth covariate from the main analysis. All specifications include SDT, SDT $\times$ 2022, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. Columns (1)–(2) report full-sample OLS difference-in-differences specifications. Columns (3)–(4) report CEM-weighted IV-2SLS specifications estimated on the matched sample. In columns (3)–(4), log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction are instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specification are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels.

Supplementary Table 8: OLS difference-in-differences estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under alternative temperature measures.

	(1) 3-hour lag	(2) 6-hour lag	(3) 9-hour lag	(4) 12-hour lag
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)			
SDT	0.0051 (0.0219)	-0.0601*** (0.0232)	-0.0921*** (0.0279)	-0.0977*** (0.0288)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.3700*** (0.0512)	-0.3925*** (0.0527)	-0.4050*** (0.0533)	-0.4073*** (0.0534)
log(growth)	0.9978*** (0.0295)	0.9967*** (0.0294)	0.9906*** (0.0299)	0.9884*** (0.0304)
temperature	0.0253*** (0.0041)	0.0210*** (0.0042)	0.0185*** (0.0048)	0.0193*** (0.0049)
temperature ²	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0001*** (0.0000)
Estimator	FE-OLS	FE-OLS	FE-OLS	FE-OLS
CEM weights	No	No	No	No
FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	29,635	29,635	29,635	29,635
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (within)	0.4740	0.4703	0.4687	0.4699
R^2 (overall)	0.6574	0.6550	0.6540	0.6547

Notes: Columns (1)–(4) use 3-hour, 6-hour, 9-hour, and 12-hour lagged temperature and its square, respectively. All specifications are estimated on the full sample and include the growth covariate, SDT, SDT $\times$ 2022, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels. We use the 9-hour lag in the main specification as an intermediate choice that is consistent with delayed responses to ambient conditions.

Supplementary Table 9: CEM-weighted IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under alternative electricity-price measures.


Price specification	(1) Average price	(2) RTM prices only	(3) DAM prices only
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)		
SDT	-0.0027 (0.0571)	-0.0136 (0.0514)	-0.0012 (0.0651)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.2842*** (0.0633)	-0.3733*** (0.0543)	-0.2032** (0.0814)
log(electricity price)	-0.3047*** (0.0615)	-0.2588*** (0.0530)	-0.3745*** (0.0868)
log(hashprice)	0.3186*** (0.1181)	0.2829** (0.1165)	0.3995*** (0.1346)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.4683*** (0.1029)	0.4247*** (0.0947)	0.5426*** (0.1328)
log(growth)	0.9768*** (0.1214)	0.9337*** (0.1154)	1.0104*** (0.1292)
temperature	0.0329** (0.0163)	0.0355** (0.0151)	0.0295 (0.0183)
temperature ²	-0.0003** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0002* (0.0001)
Estimator	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	8,091	8,091	8,091
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.7048	0.6836	0.6770
First-stage partial R^2	0.18–0.80	0.16–0.80	0.17–0.80
First-stage partial F	73–1,442	59–1,442	64–1,442

Notes: Column (1) uses the average of day-ahead and real-time wholesale prices, column (2) uses real-time market prices only, and column (3) uses day-ahead market prices only. All specifications are estimated on the matched sample using CEM weights and include SDT, SDT $\times$ 2022, the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. The endogenous regressors are log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction, instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specification are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels. Hours with non-positive day-ahead, real-time, or average electricity prices are excluded.


Supplementary Table 10: Full-sample IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under increasing minimum electricity-price cutoffs.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Electricity price cutoff	> \$0/MWh	> \$10/MWh	> \$20/MWh	> \$30/MWh
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)			
SDT	-0.1747*** (0.0362)	-0.1982*** (0.0400)	-0.2127*** (0.0432)	-0.1930*** (0.0370)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.1447** (0.0686)	-0.0952 (0.0730)	-0.0611 (0.0750)	-0.0442 (0.0736)
log(electricity price)	-0.1154*** (0.0272)	-0.1332*** (0.0327)	-0.1468*** (0.0377)	-0.1923*** (0.0432)
log(hashprice)	0.2010*** (0.0475)	0.2428*** (0.0534)	0.3042*** (0.0630)	0.3828*** (0.0869)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.2359*** (0.0469)	0.3171*** (0.0588)	0.4069*** (0.0714)	0.5386*** (0.0863)
log(growth)	0.9835*** (0.0318)	0.9852*** (0.0330)	0.9650*** (0.0373)	0.9367*** (0.0466)
temperature	0.0204*** (0.0051)	0.0238*** (0.0058)	0.0280*** (0.0068)	0.0389*** (0.0074)
temperature ²	-0.0001*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)
Estimator	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	No	No	No	No
Observations	29,635	28,073	25,064	19,212
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.6562	0.6401	0.5985	0.5724
First-stage partial R^2	0.18–0.93	0.13–0.93	0.09–0.92	0.08–0.92
First-stage partial F	642–20,371	402–18,801	232–13,697	110–10,934

Notes: Each column re-estimates the hourly IV specification after restricting the sample to observations with electricity prices above the stated cutoff. All specifications include SDT, SDT $\times$ 2022, the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. The endogenous regressors are log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction, instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specification are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels.



Supplementary Figure 7: Treatment–control covariate support in the full sample and after restricting to the matched support. (a) Treated and control observations in the joint forecast space defined by ERCOT load forecasts and renewable-generation forecasts in the full sample. (b) The same comparison after year-by-year CEM. Before matching, covariate overlap is limited, with L_1 imbalances of 0.847 in 2021 and 0.876 in 2022. After matching, imbalance falls to approximately zero in both years ($L_1 \approx 0$). Overall, 29.1% of observations are retained, including 91.1% of treated observations and 20.5% of control observations. Standardized mean differences also decline sharply. In 2021, the standardized mean difference falls from -0.134 to -0.012 for renewable forecasts and from 3.086 to 0.183 for ERCOT load forecasts. In 2022, the corresponding changes are from 0.027 to -0.012 for renewable forecasts and from 3.235 to 0.345 for ERCOT load forecasts. These patterns indicate substantially improved within-year balance in the forecast covariates used for matching.



Supplementary Figure 8: Distributions of electricity price, hashprice, and growth-adjusted mining load inside and outside the CEM overlap region. (a) Box plots of hourly electricity prices for observations outside and inside the CEM overlap region. (b) Box plots of hashprice for observations outside and inside the CEM overlap region. (c) Box plots of growth-adjusted mining load for observations outside and inside the CEM overlap region. Outlier points beyond the box-plot whiskers are omitted to improve readability.

Supplementary Table 11: IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load outside the CEM overlap region.

	(1)
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)
SDT	-0.2165*** (0.0604)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.5503*** (0.1690)
log(electricity price)	-0.0512* (0.0284)
log(hashprice)	0.1363** (0.0539)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.1185** (0.0486)
log(growth)	1.0231*** (0.0247)
temperature	0.0047 (0.0032)
temperature ²	-0.0000 (0.0000)
Estimator	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	No
Observations	20,998
Covariance type	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.7374
First-stage partial R^2	0.21–0.95
First-stage partial F	802–25,407

Notes: The sample consists of observations with zero CEM weight, which lie outside the CEM overlap region. The specification includes SDT, SDT $\times$ 2022, the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. The endogenous regressors are log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction, instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specification are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels.

Supplementary Table 12: Matched-sample IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load under increasing minimum electricity-price cutoffs.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Electricity price cutoff	> \$0/MWh	> \$10/MWh	> \$20/MWh	> \$30/MWh
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)			
SDT	-0.0194 (0.0630)	-0.0149 (0.0642)	-0.0056 (0.0649)	0.0298 (0.0685)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.2623*** (0.0649)	-0.2566*** (0.0655)	-0.2457*** (0.0654)	-0.2376*** (0.0663)
log(electricity price)	-0.3050*** (0.0636)	-0.3147*** (0.0644)	-0.3342*** (0.0646)	-0.3613*** (0.0617)
log(hashprice)	0.3030** (0.1269)	0.3037** (0.1272)	0.2999** (0.1262)	0.2809** (0.1354)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.5311*** (0.1099)	0.5457*** (0.1119)	0.5629*** (0.1129)	0.5925*** (0.1103)
log(growth)	0.9350*** (0.1218)	0.9402*** (0.1220)	0.9579*** (0.1204)	0.9666*** (0.1208)
temperature	0.0431*** (0.0158)	0.0432*** (0.0162)	0.0423** (0.0166)	0.0412** (0.0175)
temperature ²	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0003** (0.0001)
Estimator	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	8,637	8,598	8,500	7,659
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.6675	0.6671	0.6689	0.6677
First-stage partial R^2	0.17–0.80	0.17–0.80	0.16–0.80	0.16–0.80
First-stage partial F	77–1,407	70–1,406	63–1,402	55–1,281

Notes: Each column re-estimates the hourly IV specification on the CEM-matched sample after restricting the sample to observations with electricity prices above the stated cutoff. All specifications use CEM weights and include SDT, SDT $\times$ 2022, the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. The endogenous regressors are log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction, instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specification are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels.

Supplementary Note 2: Translog response-surface geometry and preferred operating region.

Suppressing controls and fixed effects, the reduced-translog specification can be written as a smooth response surface in electricity price and hashprice:

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\text{Mining Load}) = & \alpha + \beta_E \log(\text{electricity price}) + \beta_H \log(\text{hashprice}) \\ & + \beta_{E \times H} \log(\text{electricity price}) \log(\text{hashprice}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The estimates in our preferred specification imply $\beta_{E \times H} > 0$, and the geometry below describes that case.

The local elasticities implied by the reduced-translog block are

$$\varepsilon_E = \beta_E + \beta_{E \times H} \log(\text{hashprice}), \quad \varepsilon_H = \beta_H + \beta_{E \times H} \log(\text{electricity price}).$$

Here, ε_E and ε_H are local elasticities of mining load with respect to electricity price and hashprice, respectively. Thus, electricity-price elasticity varies with hashprice, while hashprice elasticity varies with electricity price. Because electricity price is a cost shifter and hashprice is a revenue shifter, the economically interpretable operating region is one in which $\varepsilon_E \leq 0$ and $\varepsilon_H \geq 0$.

When $\beta_{E \times H} > 0$, the zero-slope loci are defined by two thresholds. The electricity-price elasticity changes sign at the hashprice threshold H^* , defined by $\log H^* = -\frac{\beta_E}{\beta_{E \times H}}$; the hashprice elasticity changes sign at the electricity-price threshold E^* , defined by $\log E^* = -\frac{\beta_H}{\beta_{E \times H}}$. Therefore, the economically interpretable price-responsive region is characterized by $\log(\text{hashprice}) \leq \log H^*$ and $\log(\text{electricity price}) \geq \log E^*$.


Let $\log(\text{Mining Load}^*)$ denote fitted mining load at the point (E^*, H^*) . The fitted surface can then be written relative to this benchmark as

$$\log\left(\frac{\text{Mining Load}}{\text{Mining Load}^*}\right) = \beta_{E \times H} (\log(\text{hashprice}) - \log H^*) (\log(\text{electricity price}) - \log E^*).$$

Within the economically interpretable price-responsive region, the first bracketed term is weakly negative and the second is weakly positive. Their product is therefore weakly negative, implying that fitted mining load is no greater than Mining Load*. The point (E^*, H^*) therefore provides an upper benchmark for fitted load within the economically meaningful curtailment region. This benchmark should not be interpreted as a physical capacity estimate. In practice, the growth covariate used in the empirical specification proxies for changes in installed mining capacity over time. We therefore use the growth-adjusted load scale to identify whether fitted load is near this effective capacity ceiling. When fitted growth-adjusted load is close to or above this ceiling, the reduced-translog surface should not be interpreted as describing economically meaningful increases in electricity consumption.

Outside the economically interpretable region, at least one local elasticity has the opposite sign from the expected economic relationship. We interpret fitted values in these regions as reflecting curvature from the smooth reduced-translog approximation. In particular, lower electricity prices or higher hashprice move the fitted surface toward a capacity-ceiling region, where most mining load remains online and further improvements in operating conditions do not imply meaningful increases in electricity use.

Supplementary Figure 9 summarizes this geometry schematically.



Supplementary Figure 9: Schematic of translog response-surface regions. Axes show $\log(\text{electricity price})$ and $\log(\text{hashprice})$. The heatmap represents an example reduced-translog response surface. Dashed lines indicate the zero-elasticity loci: $\log E^*$, where the implied hashprice elasticity is zero, and $\log H^*$, where the implied electricity-price elasticity is zero. The solid curve indicates where fitted mining load equals the installed-capacity proxy. The hatched region denotes a near-capacity region in which observed price responsiveness is expected to be limited; the unhatched region denotes the physically and economically meaningful region. The figure is conceptual and not to scale.

Supplementary Table 13: Load-zone-specific IV-2SLS estimates of Bitcoin-mining load using CEM weights.

	(1) West	(2) South	(3) North
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)		
SDT	-0.0411 (0.0388)	-0.0825 (0.2273)	-0.2473*** (0.0879)
SDT $\times$ 2022	-0.2989*** (0.0612)	0.1958 (0.1226)	— —
log(electricity price)	-0.1586*** (0.0452)	-0.3914*** (0.1232)	-0.6335*** (0.2213)
log(hashprice)	-0.0785 (0.1280)	-0.4686*** (0.1789)	-0.0418 (0.1949)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.1568* (0.0886)	1.3525*** (0.2448)	-0.4332 (0.5104)
log(growth)	0.4416* (0.2627)	1.8239*** (0.6490)	1.0579** (0.5106)
temperature	0.0195*** (0.0074)	0.0286* (0.0152)	-0.1545*** (0.0518)
temperature ²	-0.0002*** (0.0001)	-0.0002** (0.0001)	0.0009*** (0.0003)
Estimator	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
CEM weights	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,501	4,156	980
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.9392	0.3322	0.5905
First-stage partial R^2	0.25–0.62	0.10–0.78	0.21–0.99
First-stage partial F	112–431	80–1,308	49–11,556
Wald test: $\log(\text{electricity price}) = 0$ and $\log(\text{electricity price}) \times \log(\text{hashprice}) = 0$			
$\chi^2(2) = 14.80$ $\chi^2(2) = 30.55$ $\chi^2(2) = 49.11$			
$(p = 0.0006)$ $(p < 0.0001)$ $(p < 0.0001)$			

Notes: All specifications are estimated separately by ERCOT load zone on the matched sample using CEM weights. All specifications include the growth covariate and 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square. The West and South specifications include SDT and SDT $\times$ 2022 terms together with hour-of-day, day-of-week, month, and year fixed effects. The North specification includes SDT together with hour-of-day, day-of-week, and month fixed effects. The endogenous regressors are log(electricity price), log(hashprice), and their interaction, instrumented with wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and their interaction. Price variables are centered at \$75/MWh for electricity price and \$0.15/TH/s/day for hashprice before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the translog specification are interpreted at that reference point. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels. Individual coefficient estimates are less precise for the North load zone because that zone contributes fewer matched observations, but joint Wald tests reject the null that the electricity-price block is zero in every load zone.

Supplementary Table 14: Endogeneity diagnostics for the IV-2SLS NP-risk specification.

Test	Statistic	p-value	Distribution	Conclusion
Wu–Hausman	7.0489	0.0000	F(5, 3601)	Reject (1%)
Durbin	35.1842	0.0000	$\chi^2(5)$	Reject (1%)
Wooldridge score	66.3108	0.0000	$\chi^2(5)$	Reject (1%)

Notes: Endogeneity is assessed using the Wu–Hausman [15], Durbin [16], and Wooldridge score [17] tests as implemented in the *linearmodels* package in Python. The null hypothesis is joint exogeneity of the NP-risk terms, the electricity-price terms, $\log(\text{hashprice})$, and their interactions, conditional on the included controls and fixed effects. The included controls are the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, and month $\times$ year fixed effects. The specification is estimated on the summer–daytime sample. Standard errors are clustered by date. All three tests reject joint exogeneity, so we treat these regressors as endogenous in the preferred specification.

Supplementary Table 15: First-stage diagnostics for the IV-2SLS NP-risk specification.

Endogenous variable	Partial R^2	Shea's R^2	Partial F-stat.	p-value
NP-risk	0.4734	0.4410	562.8738	0.0000
NP-risk $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.4441	0.3824	510.5973	0.0000
log(electricity price)	0.3635	0.3237	222.5208	0.0000
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.4104	0.3330	230.7439	0.0000
log(hashprice)	0.8505	0.3189	3084.5844	0.0000

Notes: The excluded instruments are Houston cooling degree days (CDD), ERCOT-wide wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and the interaction instruments CDD $\times$ log(BTC price) and Wind $\times$ log(BTC price). The endogenous regressors are NP-risk, NP-risk $\times$ log(hashprice), log(electricity price), log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice), and log(hashprice). Partial F -statistics test the joint significance of the excluded instruments in each first-stage regression, conditional on the included controls and fixed effects. The included controls are the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, and month $\times$ year fixed effects. Standard errors used to compute the reported p -values are clustered by date. All first-stage partial F -statistics exceed conventional weak-instrument thresholds, indicating strong first-stage relevance of the excluded instruments.

Supplementary Table 16: IV-2SLS estimates of mining-load responses to NP-risk under an alternative NP-risk definition.

	(1) NP-risk IV	(2) Electricity price IV	(3) NP-risk + Electricity price IV
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)		
NP-risk	-1.1112*** (0.1894)	—	-0.7747*** (0.1485)
NP-risk $\times$ log(hashprice)	1.1855*** (0.2516)	—	0.6564*** (0.2059)
log(electricity price)	—	-0.3231*** (0.0554)	-0.2438*** (0.0578)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	—	0.6530*** (0.0845)	0.6158*** (0.0862)
log(hashprice)	-0.8809*** (0.2207)	-0.5553*** (0.2015)	-0.7921*** (0.2114)
log(growth)	1.1170*** (0.1026)	1.2015*** (0.1047)	1.1632*** (0.1043)
temperature	-0.0361 (0.0258)	-0.0311 (0.0218)	-0.0315 (0.0224)
temperature ²	0.0003 (0.0002)	0.0001 (0.0002)	0.0002 (0.0002)
Estimator	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
Observations	3,630	3,630	3,630
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.3310	0.4004	0.4181
First-stage partial R^2	0.53–0.85	0.32–0.85	0.32–0.85
First-stage partial F	281–2,947	165–2,947	165–2,947

Notes: Column (1) includes only the NP-risk block, column (2) includes only the electricity-price block, and column (3) includes both blocks jointly. The sample is restricted to SDT hours. All specifications include the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, and month $\times$ year fixed effects. The excluded instruments are Houston cooling degree days, ERCOT-wide wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and the interaction instruments CDD $\times$ log(BTC price) and Wind $\times$ log(BTC price). The NP-risk, electricity-price, and hashprice terms are centered at NP-risk = 0.5, \$75/MWh, and \$0.15/TH/s/day, respectively, before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients in the model are interpreted at those reference points. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels.

Supplementary Table 17: IV-2SLS estimates of mining-load responses to NP-risk in the baseline summer–daytime sample and placebo season-by-time samples.

	(1) Summer, Daytime	(2) Summer, Nighttime	(3) Non-summer, Daytime	(4) Non-summer, Nighttime
Dependent variable:	log(Mining Load)			
NP-risk	-0.8313*** (0.1579)	0.1230 (0.1124)	0.0703 (0.1020)	0.3232 (0.2276)
NP-risk $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.6018*** (0.2123)	0.1936 (0.1439)	-0.2668 (0.1721)	-1.0346** (0.5124)
log(electricity price)	-0.2349*** (0.0568)	-0.1739*** (0.0489)	-0.0725** (0.0367)	-0.0320 (0.0403)
log(electricity price) $\times$ log(hashprice)	0.6210*** (0.0852)	0.4004*** (0.0804)	0.1540** (0.0703)	0.1274* (0.0739)
log(hashprice)	-0.7706*** (0.2011)	0.0712 (0.0775)	0.2793* (0.1585)	0.0933 (0.1344)
log(growth)	1.1575*** (0.1048)	1.0989*** (0.0426)	0.7311*** (0.0804)	0.9226*** (0.0541)
temperature	-0.0433** (0.0218)	-0.0058 (0.0064)	0.0281*** (0.0078)	0.0348*** (0.0089)
temperature ²	0.0003** (0.0002)	0.0000 (0.0000)	-0.0002*** (0.0001)	-0.0002*** (0.0001)
Estimator	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS	IV-2SLS
Observations	3,630	7,254	6,340	12,411
Num. clusters	242	244	483	484
Covariance type	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
R^2 (overall)	0.4160	0.8888	0.6267	0.6807
First-stage partial R^2	0.32–0.85	0.08–0.85	0.21–0.89	0.05–0.89
First-stage partial F	165–2,947	246–2,911	274–3,577	79–3,684

Notes: Column (1) is estimated on the baseline summer–daytime sample. Columns (2)–(4) report placebo estimates for summer nights, non-summer days, and non-summer nights, respectively. All specifications include the growth covariate, 9-hour-lagged temperature and its square, load-zone fixed effects, and hour-of-day, day-of-week, and month $\times$ year fixed effects. The excluded instruments are Houston cooling degree days, ERCOT-wide wind generation, logged Bitcoin price, and the interaction instruments CDD $\times$ log(BTC price) and Wind $\times$ log(BTC price). The NP-risk, electricity-price, and hashprice terms are centered at NP-risk = 0.5, \$75/MWh, and \$0.15/TH/s/day, respectively, before interactions are formed, so lower-order coefficients are interpreted at those reference points. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered by date. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***), 5% (**), and 10% (*) levels. The NP-risk main effect is largest in magnitude and most consistently aligned with curtailment in the baseline SDT sample, whereas estimates in the placebo samples are generally weaker and less stable.

References

- [1] Internet Archive. ERCOT load forecast vs. actual (archived dashboard page). Wayback Machine (2020). URL <https://web.archive.org/web/20201218172554/http://www.ercot.com/content/cdr/html/loadForecastVsActualCurrentDay.html>. Accessed 18 December 2025.
- [2] Internet Archive. ERCOT grid information (archived page). Wayback Machine (2020). URL <https://web.archive.org/web/20200222201935/http://ercot.com/gridinfo>. Accessed 18 December 2025.
- [3] Internet Archive. ERCOT grid information: Generation (archived page). Wayback Machine (2020). URL <https://web.archive.org/web/20200222201904/http://www.ercot.com/gridinfo/generation>. Accessed 18 December 2025.
- [4] Mellerud, J. X/Twitter post about Texas Bitcoin mining (2022). URL <https://x.com/JMellerud/status/1572525597317808130>. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [5] Electric Reliability Council of Texas. ERCOT load zone map. URL https://www.ercot.com/files/assets/2023/06/05/ERCOT-Maps_Load-Zone.jpg. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [6] Potomac Economics, Ltd. 2015 state of the market report for the ERCOT wholesale electricity markets (2016). URL <https://www.potomaceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/2015-ERCOT-State-of-the-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [7] Potomac Economics, Ltd. 2016 state of the market report for the ERCOT electricity markets (2017). URL <https://www.potomaceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2016-ERCOT-State-of-the-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [8] Potomac Economics, Ltd. 2017 state of the market report for the ERCOT electricity markets (2018). URL <https://www.potomaceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/2017-State-of-the-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [9] Potomac Economics, Ltd. 2018 state of the market report for the ERCOT electricity markets (2019). URL <https://www.potomaceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2018-State-of-the-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [10] Potomac Economics, Ltd. 2019 state of the market report for the ERCOT electricity markets (2020). URL <https://www.potomaceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/2019-State-of-the-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [11] Potomac Economics, Ltd. 2020 state of the market report for the ERCOT electricity markets (2021). URL <https://www.potomaceconomics.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/2020-ERCOT-State-of-the-Market-Report.pdf>. Accessed 21 October 2025.

- [12] Electric Reliability Council of Texas. Communication protocols procedure, Version 1, Revision 7. Tech. Rep. (2021). URL https://www.ercot.com/files/docs/2021/09/30/Communication_Protocols.doc. Accessed 21 October 2025.
- [13] Knaut, A. & Paulus, S. When are consumers responding to electricity prices? An hourly pattern of demand elasticity. EWI Working Papers 2016-7, Energiewirtschaftliches Institut an der Universitaet zu Koeln (EWI) (2016).
- [14] Hirth, L., Khanna, T. M. & Ruhnau, O. How aggregate electricity demand responds to hourly wholesale price fluctuations. *Energy Economics* **135**, 107652 (2024).
- [15] Hausman, J. A. Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* **46**, 1251–1271 (1978).
- [16] Durbin, J. Errors in variables. *Revue de l'Institut International de Statistique* **22**, 23–32 (1954).
- [17] Wooldridge, J. M. Score diagnostics for linear models estimated by two stage least squares. In Maddala, G. S., Phillips, P. C. B. & Srinivasan, T. N. (eds.) *Advances in Econometrics and Quantitative Economics: Essays in Honor of Professor C. R. Rao*, 66–87 (Blackwell, Oxford, 1995).