# Executive Summary

This document provides a detailed description of the most important default assumptions used for modeling the US distributed wind market using the dGen Model. Table ES-1 provides a high level of the assumptions, including a description of the level and type of support for each assumption, as well as areas for improvement and planned future work. Overall, most of the critical modeling assumptions for current or near-term settings are well supported with empirical data, often supplemented by engineering judgment an analysis. The major areas for improvement in assumptions are limited primarily to long-term future projections, the most critical of which are: technology improvement schedule and future installation and O&M cost trajectories.

Table ES-1. Summary of Major dGen Assumptions for distributed wind modeling.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Assumption** | **Wind-Specific** | **Level of Support** | **Type of Support** | **Areas for Improvement** | **Future Work** |
| 2.1 | Turbine Performance (Current) | TRUE | Very Well Supported | Empirical + Analysis | - | Review by TRC |
| 2.2 | Turbine Performance (Future) | TRUE | Very Well Supported | Empirical + Engineering Judgment + Analysis | - | Review by TRC |
| 2.3 | Turbine Performance Improvement Schedule | TRUE | Poorly Supported | Engineering Judgment? | Short- and long-term projections? | NEED TO COME UP WITH A PLAN, e.g.: - more research/interviews - Technical review committee? - sensitivity analyses with the model? |
| 2.4 | Installation Costs (Current) | TRUE | Well Supported | Empirical + Analysis | Marginal tower height costs for mid-size turbines | Additional research into mid-size turbine marginal tower costs |
| 2.4 | Installation Costs (Future) | TRUE | Poorly Supported | Empirical (short-term) Engineering Judgment (long-term) | Long-term (post-2020?) projections? | NEED TO COME UP WITH A PLAN, e.g.: - more research/interviews - Technical review committee? - sensitivity analyses with the model? |
| 2.5 | O&M Costs (Current) | TRUE | Well Supported | Empirical + Analysis | Unschedule maintenance costs at the extremes of turbine sizing (<10 kw, > 500 kw)  Additional data points throughout size classes | Additional data collection and interviews, focused on extreme size classes  If data supports, split at 50-100 kw and fit separate O&M cost regressions |
| 2.5 | O&M Costs (Future) | TRUE | Poorly Supported | Engineering Judgment? | Long-term (post-2020?) projections? | NEED TO COME UP WITH A PLAN, e.g.: - more research/interviews - Technical review committee? - sensitivity analyses with the model? |
| 2.6 | Financing | TRUE | Very Well Supported | Empirical + Engineering Judgment | Wind-specific lessor hurdle rates  Long-term financing projections | Additional data collection from current wind lessors  TRC/financial expert review of long-term projections? |
| 2.7 | Incentives | TRUE | Poorly Supported | Empirical | State and local incentives | Replace/update DSIRE database with PNNL policy data |
| 2.8 | Electricity Rates and Rate Escalations | FALSE | Very Well Supported | Empirical + Analysis | - | - |
| 2.9 | Net Metering | FALSE | Very Well Supported | Empirical + Analysis | - | Possibly update projected NEM expiration years by state |
| 2.1 | Maximum Market Share Curves | FALSE | Very Well Supported | Empirical | - | Possibly update MMS curve for leasing |
| 2.11 | Load Growth | FALSE | Very Well Supported | Empirical | - | - |

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Table of Contents 4

1 Introduction 5

2 Economic Drivers of Customer Adoption 6

2.1 Current Turbine Performance (Wind-Specific) 6

2.2 Future Turbine Performance (Wind-Specific) 7

2.3 Technology Improvement Schedule (Wind-Specific) 8

2.4 System Installation Costs (Wind-Specific) 9

2.5 System Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Costs (Wind-Specific) 11

2.6 Financing (Wind-Specific) 13

2.7 Wind Incentives (Wind-Specific) 15

2.8 Electricity Rates and Rate Escalations (Technology Agnostic) 16

2.9 Net Energy Metering Policies (Technology Agnostic) 18

2.10 Maximum Market Share Curves (Technology Agnostic) 21

2.11 Load Growth (Technology Agnostic) 23

3 Non-Economic Drivers of Customer Adoption 24

# 1 Introduction

This document details the modeling assumptions for the dGen Model, focusing primarily on the most significant factors for interpreting model results. It is separated into two major sections, based on their priority in driving model results:

* Economic Drivers of Customer Adoption
* Non-Economic Drivers of Customer Adoption

In both sections, the following information is provided for individual model settings:

* An indication whether the setting and corresponding assumptions are specific to wind or technology agnostic (i.e., also used in solar modeling)
* A brief summary describing the setting and available options
* The default settings for the assumption in model distributed wind
  + If applicable, these settings are broken out into separate discussions by time period (e.g., current/near-term and future projections)
  + Assumptions with nontrivial uncertainty, insufficient empirical support, or planned improvements are specifically noted
* A discussion of planned future work to improve or further support default settings

# 2 Economic Drivers of Customer Adoption

## 2.1 Current Turbine Performance (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

The dGen model uses eight turbine power curves to represent differences in turbine performance across size classes and into the future. Four of the eight power curves in the dGen model are used to represent current (2014) wind turbine technology.

#### Default Settings

NREL derived these four power curves representing current technology using the methodology detailed in Appendix B, Section B2 of the dGen Model Documentation (Sigrin et al. 2015). This process was based on a detailed review and subsequent analysis of existing turbine power curves, spanning the range of turbine sizes used in the model. Data sources used in this review include: … . This analysis resulted in four generic power curves, each associated with a different size class, outlined in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power Curve | Rotor Efficiency | Capacity Factor | Power Curve ID |
| Current Small Residential (2.5‑20 kw) | 3.07 m2/kWp | 29.0% | 1 |
| Current Small Commercial (50‑100  kw) | 4.9 m2/kWp | 37.5% | 2 |
| Current Midsize (250‑1000 kw) | 3.1 m2/kWp | 42.0% | 3 |
| Current Large (1500 kw) | 4.9 m2/kWp | 38.5% | 4 |

NREL uses these power curves as the default settings for the first model year (2014).

#### Future Planned Work

NREL has performed substantial work, grounded in both empirical data and experienced engineering judgment, to develop the default assumptions for current power curves. Nonetheless, to ensure our full confidence in them, we plan to submit these assumptions to review by a technical review committee.

## 2.2 Future Turbine Performance (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

The dGen model uses eight turbine power curves to represent differences in turbine performance across size classes and into the future. Four of the eight power curves in the dGen model are used to represent future technology performance in both the near term (5 – 15 year) and long term (10 – 35).

#### Default Settings

The four future power curves were derived based on assumptions about the maturity of existing technology at different turbine size classes, along with engineering judgment regarding the technical factors limiting future technology improvements. Refer to Appendix B, Section B2 of the dGen model documentation for a thorough description of the methodology and assumptions used in development of these four power curves. The resulting near and far future power curves are described in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power Curve | Rotor Efficiency | Capacity Factor | Power Curve ID |
| Near Future Small Residential (2.5‑20 kw) | 4.0 m2/kWp | 38.5% | 5 |
| Far Future Small Residential (2.5‑20 kw) | 5.2 m2/kWp | 40.0% | 6 |
| Near Future Small Commercial, Midsize, and Large (50-1500 kw) | 4.2 m2/kWp | 43.0% | 7 |
| Large (1500 kw) | 5.2 m2/kWp | 44.0% | 8 |

#### Future Planned Work

NREL has performed substantial work, grounded in both empirical data and experienced engineering judgment, to develop the default assumptions for current power curves. Nonetheless, to ensure our full confidence in them, we plan to submit these assumptions to review by a technical review committee.

## 2.3 Technology Improvement Schedule (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

The dGen model uses eight turbine power curves to represent differences in turbine performance across size classes and into the future. Users of the model must assign one of the power curves to each of the turbine size classes (2.5 – 1500 kw) and model years (2014 – 2050). This approach allows for transitions in turbine performance over time and across size classes at varying rates.

#### Default Settings (2014)

Although the names of the power curves indicate their applicability to general time periods (current, near future, far future), the schedule by which transitions between power curves occurs is defined on an annual basis. NREL determined the default settings for the schedule of power curve transitions by … . The default settings for power curve transitions are show in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Turbine Size (kw)** | **2014** | **2016** | **2018** | **2020** | **2022** | **2024** | **2026** | **2028** | **2030** | **2032** | **2034** | **2036** | **2038** | **2040** | **2042** | **2044** | **2046** | **2048** | **2050** |
| **2.5** | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **10** | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **20** | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **50** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **100** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **250** | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **500** | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **750** | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **1000** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **1500** | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |

#### Future Planned Work

Given the uncertainty in projecting the pace of future improvements in turbine performance, we plan to submit these assumptions to review by a technical review committee.

## 2.4 System Installation Costs (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

Distributed wind system installation costs are parameterized in dGen with three inputs: capital costs ($/kw), default tower height (hub height in m), and marginal costs for higher towers above the default height ($/kw/m). Costs are customizable for each rated turbine size (2.5, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, 250, 500, 750, 1000, and 1500 kw) and model year.

#### Default Settings (2014)

Initial system costs for the first model year (2014) are detailed in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Turbine Rated Power (kW)** | **Adjusted Cost ($/kW)** | **Installed Cost**  **($)** | **Default (minimum) Hub Height (m)** | **Marginal Tower Cost ($/[kW\*m])** |
| 2.5 | $10,045 | $25,113 | 20 | $211 |
| 5 | $7,785 | $38,925 | 30 | $164 |
| 10 | $6,914 | $69,145 | 30 | $118 |
| 20 | $6,459 | $129,186 | 30 | $71 |
| 50 | $5,858 | $292,879 | 30 | $15.7 |
| 100 | $5,402 | $540,238 | 40 | $11.3 |
| 250 | $3,525 | $881,232 | 50 | $10.8\* |
| 500 | $2,961 | $1,480,283 | 50 | $9.9\* |
| 750 | $2,630 | $1,972,827 | 50 | $9.0\* |
| 1,000 | $2,396 | $2,396,206 | 80 | $8.1 |
| 1,500 | $2,185 | $3,277,628 | 80 | $6.4 |

NREL determined these costs through a methodology described in detail in the dGen documentation (Appendix B, Section B4) (Sigrin et al., 2015). In summary, this analysis included:

1. Reviewing and analyzing multiple data sets with project cost information and determining adjusted costs ($ per kw of rated power) for each of the 11 turbine sizes evaluated in the model. Specific data sources used include:

* A non-public database of project-level characteristics funded under the US Department of Treasury 1603 program
* … .

1. Interviewing several turbine and tower manufacturers to determine tower prices for various turbine sizes, then fitting a piecewise, best-fit curve to the empirical data to estimate marginal tower height costs. Only sparse data was available for turbines in the range of 250-750 kw. Industry sources for data included: … .
2. Adjusting project cost data from step 1 using the marginal tower height costs from step 2 to determine adjusted costs for each turbine size at the default (minimum) hub height.

#### Future Projections (2016 – 2050)

[ need to come up explanation for how we have or will set these future cost projections ] [ can break this discussion up by short and long term, if that helps]

#### Planned Future Work:

We plan to perform the following work to develop further empirical support for the following assumptions:

1. Marginal tower height costs for mid-size turbines (250-750 kw)

* Add description

1. Future projections of costs

* Add description

## 2.5 System Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Costs (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

The dGen model considers two types of O&M costs: scheduled (i.e., preventative) and unscheduled (i.e., repair) maintenance costs. Both of these costs are treated as fixed annual costs and given in terms of the $/kw. The model assumes no variable O&M costs because … . Fixed O&M costs are input to the model separately for each turbine rated size (kw) and model year.

#### Default Settings (2014)

Initial O&M costs for the first model year (2014) are detailed in the table below.

Operation and Maintenance Cost Assumptions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Turbine**  **Rating (kW)** | **Total Fixed O&M ($/kW)** | **Scheduled Maintenance ($/kW)** | **Unscheduled Maintenance ($/kW)** |
| 2.5 | $38.94\* | $27.64 | $11.30 |
| 5 | $38.92\* | $27.62 | $11.30 |
| 10 | $38.88 | $27.58 | $11.30 |
| 20 | $38.80 | $27.50 | $11.30 |
| 50 | $38.56 | $27.27 | $11.29 |
| 100 | $38.15 | $26.87 | $11.28 |
| 250 | $36.94 | $25.69 | $11.25 |
| 500 | $34.91 | $23.71 | $11.20 |
| 750 | $32.89\* | $21.74 | $11.15 |
| 1,000 | $30.86\* | $19.76 | $11.10 |
| 1,500 | $26.81\* | $15.81 | $11.00 |

NREL derived these estimates for fixed O&M costs through statistical analysis of O&M estimates provided by a variety of sources, including manufacturers (add refs), leasing companies (add refs), installers (add refs), and consultants (add refs). Specifically, NREL fit a linear regression to the various cost estimates, predicting scheduled and unscheduled maintenance costs as a function of turbine rated size.

Appendix B, Section B4 of the dGen Model Documentation (Sigrin et al. 2015) provides a detailed discussion of the caveats and limitations of cost estimates received. The primary weaknesses noted in this document are:

1. Total lack of data for unscheduled maintenance for small turbines less than 10 kw
2. Minimal data for unscheduled maintenance for turbines > 660 kw.
3. The single best-fit regression line may not account for important mechanical transitions in turbine design around 2.5 and 50-100 kw that may affect O&M costs in a non-linear fashion.

#### Future Projections (2016 – 2050)

[ need to come up with plan and justification for this ]

#### Planned Future Work:

In order to better support the caveats noted above, we plan to perform a second round of O&M data collection and interviews, focused primarily on the extreme sizes (2.5-5 kw and 750-1500 kw), where initial empirical support was lacking. In addition, if we are able to increase sample size sufficiently, we may try to split the data at the system sizes corresponding to important mechanical transition and fit separate regressions for each subset of data.

## 2.6 Financing (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

dGen Model agents may finance a DER system via either a loan (for host-owned system) or a lease (for third-party-owned systems). Each of these financial structures is parameterized in the model with multiple user-defined inputs:

* Host-owned: Loan rate, loan term (length in years), down payment percent, discount rate, and tax rate
* Third-party-owned: Lessor hurdle rate, lease term (length in years), discount rate and tax rate

All inputs can be customized for different market sectors (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial) and model years.

#### Default Settings (2014 - 2020)

The default settings for near-term financing assumptions by sector are detailed in the tables below. These settings are based on current market conditions, which have remained fairly stable for several years. Therefore, they apply for model years 2014-2020.

These settings are based on…

* Commercial/industrial Loans: Based on a 12-year historical average of real yields of corporate bonds rated Aa and A by Moody’s (SIFMA 2010).
* Residential Loans: Based on a 3-year historical average of real rates for $30,000 U.S. home equity loans. Accessed January 20, 2010: [www.wsjprimerate.us/home\_equity\_loan\_rates.htm](http://www.wsjprimerate.us/home_equity_loan_rates.htm).
* Leasing hurdle rate and term\*:
  + Some source..?
* Discount Rate

Default Financing Assumptions for Host-Owned Systems by Sector

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market Segment | Residential | Commercial | Industrial |
| Loan Rate | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| Loan Term (years) | 15 | 20 | 20 |
| Down Payment | 20% | 20% | 20% |
| Discount Rate | 10% | 12% | 12% |
| Tax Rate | 33% | 35% | 35% |

Financing Assumptions for Third-Party-Owned Systems by Sector

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market Segment | Residential | Commercial | Industrial |
| Lessor Hurdle Rate | 10% | 10% | 10% |
| Lease Term (years) | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Discount Rate (Lessee) | 10% | 12% | 12% |
| Tax Rate | 33% | 35% | 35% |

#### Future Projections (2022 - 2050)

Add tables giving assumptions and supporting text here

#### Planned Future Work:

We plan to acquire additional empirical support for and potentially refine the settings for both current and future leasing hurdle rates by… talking to existing lessors of wind (united wind?), reviewing historical lease terms for solar (research by Davidson, etc.).

In addition, we plan to have our long-term financial projections reviewed by other financial modeling experts within NREL’s Strategic Energy Analysis Center.

## 2.7 Wind Incentives (Wind-Specific)

#### Summary

The dGen model can account for either empirically-derived or user-defined wind policy incentives. For state and local policy incentives, the dGen model uses the Database of State Incentives for Renewables & Efficiency (DSIRE) database (DSIRE 2014) as the current data sources. Alternatively, users may choose to overwrite the DSIRE incentives with user-defined, state-level policy incentives; however, this option is intended for modeling of different policy scenarios and is generally unsuitable for business-as-usual or reference case modeling.

At the federal level, the dGen model allows users to edit the tax credit level for the federal Incentive Tax Credit (ITC) by model year and market sector.

#### Default Settings (All Years)

The default setting for the dGen model is to use the DSIRE incentives for state and local incentives. This database was most recently updated in 2013 and has become increasingly out-of-date during the ongoing development of the dGen model. It is also missing several important parameters (e.g., incentive expiration dates) that require additional model assumptions. Currently, due to the uncertainty in the DSIRE database, we assume all incentives with unknown expiration dates will expire at the end of 2020To address these issues, NREL will perform additional work in FY16 Q1 and Q2, as detailed in the Planned Future Work section below.

For federal incentives, the default settings are to assume that the federal ITC will continue as currently written into law. Under the existing policy, the ITC will continue at its current level (30 percent for all sectors) through the end of 2016, at which point it will expire for residential systems and reduce to 10 percent for industrial and commercial systems. These settings are based on “business-as-usual” assumptions where only existing policies are used.

#### Planned Future Work

In Q1 and Q2 of FY16, NREL plans to replace and/or update the DSIRE data currently used for state and local incentives with more up-to-date and complete policy data curated by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) for their Distributed Wind Policy Comparison Tool (DOE 2011)

## 2.8 Electricity Rates and Rate Escalations (Technology Agnostic)

#### Summary

The cost of electricity in the dGen model can be evaluated using three different, location-specific estimates of current (2014) electricity rates:

1. Real-world tariffs based on the Utility Rate Database (URDB) (OpenEI 2014)
2. Annual average flat rates by county ($/kWh) from EIA 861 forms (EIA 2015a)
3. User-defined flat rate structures by state

These electricity rates are assumed to change over time according to the following rate escalation options:

1. AEO 2015 Reference Case (Constant after 2040)
2. AEO 2015 Reference Case (Projected after 2040)
3. AEO 2014 Reference Case (Constant after 2040)
4. AEO 2014 Reference Case (Projected after 2040)
5. No Change

All options are applied by sector on a regional (Census Division) basis.

Options 1 through 4 are based on EIA’s AEO Reference Case projections (EIA 2014a; EIA 2015b). These projections for rate escalations end in 2040; however, the dGen model considers rate escalations through 2075 to accommodate customers considering adoption in 2050 and evaluating future rate growth. To account for these later model years, NREL modified the AEO projections using two different methods. With the first method (“Constant after 2040”), we assume that the project rate escalation for the final forecast year (2040) holds constant through 2075. Therefore, rates continue to grow after 2040, but simply at a constant rate for each year thereafter. With the second method (“Projected after 2040”), we applied time-series modeling to project rate escalations from 2041 through 2075. This method tends to use short-term temporal trends to forecast future values, and therefore has significant uncertainty in later years. It also tends to cause compounding escalation of rates. The figure below compares AEO 2015 Constant and Projected rate escalations for a single Census Division.

[add figure]

#### Default Settings (All Years)

The default setting for rates used by the model for all model years are the URDB real-world tariffs. These data most closely represent the actual electricity costs incurred by current electricity consumers in the US. Refer to Section 4.4 of the dGen Model Documentation (Sigrin et al. 2015) provides a detailed discussion of these data.

The default setting for rate escalations used by the dGen model is the AEO 2015 (Constant after 2040). Similarly to the load growth assumptions, this is an objective, well-informed basis for estimating future rate escalations in the US. Furthermore, compared to the AEO 2015 (Projected after 2040) rate escalations, these escalations are more conservative and, therefore, help to place lower bounds on customer adoption levels.

#### Planned Future Work

We are confident that the default settings for both rates and rate escalations are based on a strong empirical basis, and therefore, do not plan to perform research to further support them.

## 2.9 Net Energy Metering Policies (Technology Agnostic)

#### Summary

The dGen model allows users significant flexibility in modeling Net Energy Metering (NEM) policies. NEM configurations are defined in the input sheet by state, sector, outflow credit value (e.g., full retail rate, avoided fuel cost, none, or user-specified), and maximum system size that qualifies for the outflow credit. Users may also specify a transition period after which the “avoided cost” value will be used for all subsequent years (e.g., full credit through 2020, avoided cost credit for 2022‒2050).

#### Default Settings (All Years)

As default, NREL models NEM based on current regional rules, system size caps, cumulative installed capacity caps, and valuation, derived from Barnes et al. (2013). Regions with NEM caps for cumulative installations are applied based on NREL projections when the cap is projected to hit. These projections were based on recent runs of the dGen model for the solar market only, for which technology deployment significantly outpaces wind. Existing system size limits and projected NEM expiration by state are detailed in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State | System Size Limit (kW) | | | Projected Expiration |
| Residential | Commercial | Industrial |
| AK | 25 | 25 | 25 | 2014 |
| AL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2014 |
| AR | 25 | 300 | 300 | 2050 |
| AZ | - | - | - | 2050 |
| CA | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 2016 |
| CO | - | - | - | 2050 |
| CT | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2050 |
| DC | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2050 |
| DE | 25 | 1500 | 1500 | 2022 |
| FL | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2050 |
| GA | 10 | 100 | 100 | 2016 |
| HI | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2014 |
| IA | 500 | 500 | 500 | 2050 |
| ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2020 |
| IL | - | 2000 | 2000 | 2034 |
| IN | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 2030 |
| KS | 25 | 200 | 200 | 2028 |
| KY | 30 | 30 | 30 | 2028 |
| LA | 25 | 300 | 300 | 2016 |
| MA | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2022 |
| MD | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2030 |
| ME | 660 | 660 | 660 | 2050 |
| MI | 150 | 150 | 150 | 2026 |
| MN | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 2050 |
| MO | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2050 |
| MS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2014 |
| MT | 50 | 50 | 50 | 2050 |
| NC | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 2050 |
| ND | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2050 |
| NE | 25 | 25 | 25 | 2028 |
| NH | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 2024 |
| NJ | - | - | - | 2050 |
| NM | 80000 | 80000 | 80000 | 2050 |
| NV | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 2022 |
| NY | 25 | 2000 | 2000 | 2022 |
| OH | - | - | - | 2050 |
| OK | 17 | 17 | 17 | 2050 |
| OR | 25 | 2000 | 2000 | 2050 |
| PA | 50 | 3000 | 3000 | 2050 |
| RI | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 2050 |
| SC | 20 | 100 | 100 | 2018 |
| SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2014 |
| TN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2014 |
| TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2014 |
| UT | 25 | 2000 | 2000 | 2050 |
| VA | 20 | 500 | 500 | 2028 |
| VT | 500 | 500 | 500 | 2026 |
| WA | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2018 |
| WI | 20 | 20 | 20 | 2050 |
| WV | 25 | 500 | 2000 | 2050 |
| WY | 25 | 25 | 25 | 2050 |

Unless specified by policy, non-net metered electricity is assumed to be valued at projected wholesale rates (by state) in $2014/kWh. The assumption of wholesale rate valuation is in between the two extremes (full retail valuation or no NEM). Our projections of wholesale rates are based on … . Due to the size of the table, these rate projections are not provided here for review, but can be provided separately, upon request.

#### Planned Future Work

If necessary, NREL may update our projections for expirations based on cumulative NEM caps using future dGen model runs. These revised projections will incorporate updated modeling assumptions and, if possible, will incorporate both wind and solar market deployment projections.


## 2.10 Maximum Market Share Curves (Technology Agnostic)

#### Summary

One of the major factors driving the deployment of DER systems under the Bass diffusion framework used by the dGen model is the maximum market share (MMS). MMS is the maximum fraction of eligible agents who would eventually install a DER system if economic remained unchanged and is defined as a function of the economic attractiveness of a DER system. This relationship between economic attractiveness and MMS is parameterized in dGen using MMS curves, which relate the MMS to either payback period (for host-owned systems) or percent monthly bill savings (for leased systems with no down payment). As described in Section 5 of the dGen Model Documentation (Sigrin et al. 2015), there are several sources for MMS curves; the dGen model incorporates many of these curves and allows model users to select which curves to apply to which market sectors.

#### Default Settings (All Years)

The default settings for all model years in the dGen model is to use MMS curves defined by Navigant (Paidipati et al. 2008) for host-owned systems and a MMS curve defined by Sigrin and Drury (2014) for leased systems. We have selected the Navigant host-ownership MMS curves for consistency with other NREL DER modeling studies (DOE 2012). In addition, compared to other MMS curves, the Navigant curves tend to provide a moderate, midline estimate of the relationship between payback period and MMS (see figure below). Due to the relatively recent emergence of the third-party-ownership model, the MMS curve for leased systems defined by Sigrin and Drury (2014) represents the only currently available option.



Both of the default MMS curves were derived based on data for the distributed solar market, which is significantly more mature than the distributed wind market and, thus, has greater data availability on historical adoption patterns. Given the similarity in technologies and infeasibility of deriving statistically sound MMS specific to the wind industry, NREL believes it is justified to use these MMS curves.

#### Planned Future Work

NREL is confident that the default settings used for MMS curves in the dGen model are based on the best publicly available data. We anticipate that ongoing and independently funded work by NREL in the distributed solar market may yield a revised MMS curve for leased systems by FY16 Q2. If this revised curve is available, we will integrate into the dGen model.

## 2.11 Load Growth (Technology Agnostic)

#### Summary

Growth in the aggregate consumption of electricity (i.e., load growth) in the dGen model is implemented as population growth: individual household and business level consumption is kept constant, while total number of hosueholds and businesses increases over time. This approach is consistent with the SolarDS (and REEDS?) models, used in NREL analyses like SunShot, Wind Vision, etc.

Load growth is applied by market sector at a regional level (Census Divisions) using projections from EIA’s Annual Electricity Outlook (add ref). Users may select from AEO’s 2014 or 2015 projections, including five options for each:

1. No Load Growth After 2014
2. Low Growth Case
3. Reference Case
4. High Growth Case
5. 2x Growth Rate of Reference Case

All 10 load growth scenarios are shown in the figure below. In all cases, the selected option is applied as a scalar multiplier on the initial number of customers in the starting model year (2012). Only one option can be selected for each model run.

[ add figure? ]

#### Default Settings (All Years)

The default setting used by the dGen model is the AEO 2015 Reference Case. This is the most up-to-date projection available from AEO, which is presented by EIA as “a business-as-usual trend estimate, given known technology and technological and demographic trends” (EIA 2015b, iii). While these projections have significant uncertainty, they provide an objective, well-informed basis for estimating future load growth and are a standard input to other NREL models (e.g., Short et al. 2011).

#### Planned Future Work

We are highly confident in the empirical basis for the dGen load growth assumptions and do not plan on performing additional work to support this assumption.

# 3 Non-Economic Drivers of Customer Adoption

* Sizing targets
  + NEM and nonNEM
  + Sources? (only wind source is NY data, showing 75% sizing. Solar sizing tends to be higher – 90-95%)
* Existing market deployment (2012)
  + Based on state-level data by system size from PNNL
  + Disaggregated to sectors based on turbine size
  + Disaggregated to counties and agents based on solve-year 2014 economics
* Bass Diffusion parameters
  + Do we need to calibrate p/q and TEQ for year 1? (similar to work for solar)
    - TEQ yr 1 will not be possible until we gain approval of the rest of our default settings
* Maximum Market Potential (number of potential customers)
  + Residential – single-family owner occupied homes only
  + Commercial – owner and non-owner occupied buildings, all commercial customers

# References Cited

Barnes, Justin, Culley, Thad, Haynes, Rusty, Passera, Laurel, Wiedman, Joseph, and Jackson, Rosalind. 2013. *Freeing the Grid 2013: Best Practices in State Net Metering Policies and Interconnection Procedures*. Interstate Renewable Energy Council. Accessed July 7, 2014: http://freeingthegrid.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/FTG\_2013.pdf.

DOE (U.S. Department of Energy). 2011. *Distributed Wind Policy Comparison Tool*. DOE/GO-102011-3453. Washington, DC.

DOE (U.S. Department of Energy). 2012. *The SunShot Vision Study*. DOE/GO-102012-3037. Washington, DC.

EIA (U.S. Energy Information Administration). (2014a). *Annual Energy Outlook 2014 with Projections to 2040*. Washington, DC: DOE.

EIA (U.S. Energy Information Administration). (2015a). Annual Electric Power Industry Report (Survey form No. EIA-861). Washington, DC: DOE. Available online: http://www.eia.gov/electricity. Accessed 7/15/2015.

EIA (U.S. Energy Information Administration). (2015b). *Annual Energy Outlook 2015 with Projections to 2040*. Washington, DC: DOE.

OpenEI. (2014). U.S. Utility Rate Database (URDB). Accessed December 15, 2014. http://en.openei.org/wiki/Utility\_Rate\_Database.

Paidipati, J., Frantzis, L., Sawyer, H., Kurrasch, A. (2008). *Rooftop Photovoltaics Market Penetration Scenarios*. Subcontract Report NREL/SR-581-42306. Burlington, MA: Navigant Consulting.

Sigrin, B. Drury, E. (2014). Diffusion into New Markets: Economic Returns Required by Households to Adopt Rooftop Photovoltaics. *AAAI Energy Market Prediction Symposium*. Washington, November 13-15, 2014.

Short, W., Sullivan, P., Mai, T., Mowers, M., Uriarte, C., Blair, N., Heimiller, D., and Martinez, A. 2011. *Regional Energy Deployment System (ReEDS)*. NREL/TP-6A20-46534.National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Golden, CO (US). http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/reeds/pdfs/reeds\_documentation.pdf.

Sigrin, B.; Sullivan, P.; Ibanez, E.; Margolis, R. (2014). [Representation of Solar Capacity Value in the ReEDS Capacity Expansion Model](http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy14osti/61182.pdf). 25 pp.; NREL Report No. TP-6A20-61182. March.