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**Extended Abstract**

Renewable energy technologies have seen considerable adoption over the last few decades (EIA 2019). Unlike the alternatives, wind and solar power are particularly unique in that the amount of energy they supply is intermittent. Consequently, designing economically efficient policy to promote their adoption is not straightforward given that they cannot easily substitute for traditional technologies such as coal power which handles base load demand. Some of the literature has approached the problem by constructing numerical models that find the cheapest renewable technology set while accounting for intermittent supply. Müsgens and Neuhoff (2006) model uncertain renewable output with intertemporal generation constraints, while Neuhoff, Cust, and Keats (2007) model temporal and spatial characteristics of wind output to optimize its deployment in the UK. On the other hand, other literature focuses on the effect of intermittent technologies on the market itself; Ambec and Crampes (2010) study the interaction between intermittent renewables and traditional reliable sources of energy in decentralized markets, and Chao (2011) models alternative pricing mechanisms for intermittent renewable energy sources. Additionally, Borenstein (2010) reviews the effects of present public policies used to promote renewables and the challenges posed by intermittency.

In this paper, we present a theoretical model of electricity markets with intermittent renewable energy and derive the optimal public policy to handle pollution externalities. In contrast with other theoretical models of intermittency which optimize a pubic electricity sector, our model assumes utility and profit maximization. Additionally, it represents the energy sector over multiple periods with electricity output for each technology varying over time for intermittent technologies. This approach is better suited for studying the dynamics of present US electricity markets which are primarily funded by private sector investment and have prices that vary over time. We first consider a simpler version of our model with two periods and two energy generation technologies, derive the comparative statics for this model, and detail the policy implications. Then, we produce numerical results for optimal policy prescriptions with a multi-period, multi-technology version of our model using electricity generation data on the PGM region.

Present models of the energy sector concerned with the adoption of renewable energy often discuss the elasticity of substitution between clean and dirty energy; this elasticity is meant to capture factors such as intermittency and reliability that impede perfect substitution between energy sources. Additionally, this elasticity is often estimated empirically or modelled in a CGE using a CES production function with capital inputs for each energy technology. However, this top down approach may be missing the actual source of the substitution effects while also being unrealistic. For instance, consider a simple case where energy output is a Cobb-Douglas function (a special case of CES) of two energy inputs: solar and coal. According to this function, increasing the amount of coal input causes the marginal product of solar input to rise; this makes little sense in practical terms, since the output of additional solar panels should not be related to the amount of coal input. Moreover, this approach, while possibly relevant for other sectors' goods, weakens the accuracy of theoretical and CGE models focused on the energy sector.

However, it is still possible to produce a more accurate model of the electricity sector that can capture trade-offs between the energy output of different technologies from both cost and intermittency. To start, rather than energy production following a general CES function, we first assume that energy follows a linear production function where total energy is instead the sum of the energy output of each source. The purpose of using a linear production function is that increasing the input of one energy source does not change the marginal product of another source as it does in a CES function. Additionally, we split this production function up across periods; that is, in each period, the electricity generation is equal to the energy output of each source in that period. For intermittent technologies, energy output varies in each period, so total output would as well. Next, we assume that firms pick a profit-maximizing level of investment in each energy technology. This investment stays fixed in all periods, but the total energy output can vary over time due to intermittency; for instance, a solar plant provides a variable output by time of day, while nuclear plant cannot easily vary its output within 24 hours. Moreover, we assume that firms face linear costs and electricity prices are set equal to their marginal cost; the former assumption is temporarily made for mathematical tractability while the latter is realistic given the competitiveness of electricity markets.

While the production function described so far is linear, we may still find a non-zero elasticity of substitution between energy sources. That is, consider a representative agent with a CES utility function that captures intertemporal variation in the utility gained from energy consumption. Specifically, the utility function is composed of energy consumption differentiated by period; so, for example, in a two-period model, we may have off-peak consumption and on-peak consumption as our two goods. Because people prefer to consume energy at different proportions based on the time of day, this variation can be modeled through the share parameters in the CES function. Moreover, since people may substitute energy consumption across time by availability and prices, the CES elasticity parameter captures the intertemporal elasticity of substitution. Thus, in this model, the intermittency of an energy generation technology plays a key role in determining its substitutability with other technologies. For instance, solar power may be a good substitute for coal power during the day, but obviously not at night; consequently, this pair complements each other, since coal handles the base load while solar handles the peak load. Alternatively, wind and solar are a poor combination, since both produce intermittently; this pair is closer to being substitutes. All in all, the result of using CES preferences with temporally differentiated energy consumption is that we can capture substitutability/complementarity between energy sources in an accurate way.

The first significant result in this model is that the optimal quantity of investment in intermittent renewable technology is concave with respect to both cost efficiency (cost per unit) and output efficiency (energy output per unit). So, for example, suppose some location has a coal-fired plant and is considering investing in a solar power plant. A 10% increase in the output per solar panel may increase the optimal quantity of solar panels by x%, while a 20% increase in solar efficiency will increase the optimal quantity of solar by y% where y < 2x. Because of this concavity, exponential increases in efficiency of intermittent renewable sources over time, as Moore’s Law may predict, is not enough to fully substitute out reliable energy technology. Hence, we argue that a full transition to renewable energy requires more emphasis on technologies such as nuclear, biomass, hydro, and geothermal energy sources; although these sources compete with intermittent energy technology, they are able fully substitute out for fossil fuel energy. Additionally, the reliable output of these technologies can handle base loads; this allows them to complement the intermittency of renewables such as wind and solar.

Secondly, suppose that we would like to promote clean energy adoption and replace dirty energy to reduce the pollution emissions. Because we have diminishing returns from both forms of efficiency, it is optimal to subsidize both research and the cost of intermittent renewable technology. This is because we expect research subsidies to increase both output efficiency and cost efficiency, while subsidies would increase the cost efficiency of renewables for a market participant. A mix of both instruments leads to improving both forms of efficiency at once, thus replacing dirty energy technology in the most cost-efficient way. Alternatively, since we would see symmetrical effects from taxing dirty energy sources rather than subsidizing clean ones, taxing dirty energy sources can substitute for renewable cost subsidies. Consequently, a carbon tax plus a research subsidy for renewables is another optimal choice for pollution abatement.

Finally, our model implies that the optimal level of subsidies/taxes on energy generation should vary by the state of the local energy market. That is, the change in optimal quantity of intermittent energy technology with respect to both types of efficiency is also a function of the efficiencies of the other technologies available. Consequently, the marginal benefit of a subsidy or tax varies spatially, since different geographies have access to different energy sources. For instance, one community may be relying on hydropower while another may be using coal power; the effect of a 1% cost subsidy on solar installments in these two communities would vary because of the differences in the communities’ pre-existing energy generation technologies. Hence, local communities that aim to promote clean energy and reduce pollution should optimize their policy instruments to suit their local energy markets.
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