


October | 13



A REGULATOR'S GUIDEBOOK: Calculating the Benefits and Costs of Distributed Solar Generation

Interstate Renewable Energy Council, Inc.



About the Authors

Interstate Renewable Energy Council

Jason B. Keyes, Partner, Keyes, Fox & Wiedman, LLP. Mr. Keyes has represented the Interstate Renewable Energy Council in state utility commission rulemakings regarding net energy metering for the past six years. Prior to becoming an attorney, he managed government contracts for a solar energy R&D company and developed load forecasts and related portions of integrated resource plans at a large electric utility. Mr. Keyes can be reached at jkeyes@kfwlaw.com.

Rábago Energy LLC.

Karl R. Rábago, Principal. Mr. Rábago is an attorney with more than 20 years experience in utility regulation and clean energy, including as a former utility executive with Austin Energy and the AES Corporation, Commissioner for the Texas Public Utility Commission, and Deputy Assistant Secretary for the U.S. Department of Energy. Mr. Rábago can be reached at karl@rabagoenergy.com.

Executive Summary

As distributed solar generation ("DSG") system prices continue to fall and this energy resource becomes more accessible thanks to financing options and regulatory programs, regulators, utilities and other stakeholders are increasingly interested in investigating DSG benefits and costs. Understandably, regulators seek to understand whether policies, such as net energy metering ("NEM"), put in place to encourage adoption of DSG are appropriate and cost-effective. This paper first offers lessons learned from the 16 regional and utility-specific DSG studies summarized in a recent review by the Rocky Mountain Institute ("RMI"),¹ and then proposes a standardized valuation methodology for public utility commissions to consider implementing in future studies.

As RMI's meta-study shows, recent DSG studies have varied widely due to differences in study assumptions, key parameters, and methodologies. A stark example came to light in early 2013 in Arizona, where two DSG benefit and cost studies were released in consecutive order by that State's largest utility and then by the solar industry. The utility-funded study showed a net solar value of less than four cents per kilowatt-hour ("kWh"), while the industry-funded study found a value in excess of 21 cents per kWh. A standard methodology would be helpful as legislators, regulators and the public attempt to determine whether to curtail or expand DSG policies.

Valuations vary by utility, but the authors contend that valuation methodologies should not. The authors suggest standardized approaches for the various benefits and costs, and explain how to calculate them regardless of the structure of the program or rate in which this valuation is used. Whether considering net NEM, value of solar tariffs, fixed-rate feed-in tariffs, or incentive programs, parties will always want to determine the value provided by DSG. The authors seek to fill that need, without endorsing any particular DSG policy in this paper.

Major Conclusions

Three conclusions stand out based on their potential to impact valuations:

- DSG primarily offsets combined-cycle natural gas facilities, which should be reflected in avoided energy costs.
- DSG installations are predictable and should be included in utility forecasts of capacity needs, so DSG should be credited with a capacity value upon interconnection.
- The societal benefits of DSG policies, such as job growth, health benefits and environmental benefits, should be included in valuations, as these were typically among the reasons for policy enactment in the first place.

¹ A Review of Solar PV Benefit & Cost Studies (RMI), July 2013 ("RMI 2013 Study"), available at http://www.rmi.org/elab_empower.

I. Introduction

There is an acute need for a standardized approach to distributed solar generation ("DSG") benefit and cost studies. In the first half of 2013, a steady flow of reports, news stories, workshops and conference panels have discussed whether to reform or repeal net energy metering ("NEM"), which is the bill credit arrangement that allows solar customers to receive full credit on their energy bills for any power they deliver to the grid.² The calls for change are founded on the claim that NEM customers who "zero out" their utility bill must not be paying their fair share for the utility infrastructure that they are using, and that those costs must have shifted to other, non-solar customers. Only a thorough benefit and cost analysis can provide regulators with an answer to whether this claim is valid in a given utility service area. As the simplicity and certainty of NEM have made it the vehicle for nearly all of the 400,000+ customer-sited solar arrays installed in the United States,³ changes to such a successful policy should only be made based on careful analysis. This is especially so in light of a body of studies finding that solar customers may actually be subsidizing utilities and other customers.

The topic of NEM impacts on utility economics and on rates for non-solar customers seems to have risen to the top of utility priorities with the publication of an industry trade group report in January 2013 calling NEM "the largest near-term threat to the utility model."⁴ Extrapolating from the current NEM penetration of just over 0.1% of U.S. energy generation to very high market penetration assumptions (e.g., if "everyone goes solar"), some have speculated that unchecked NEM growth will lead to a "utility death spiral." One Wall Street rating agency questioned the value of utility stocks in light of the continued success of NEM programs, claiming that it was "a scheme similar to net metering that led to the destabilization of the power markets in Spain in late 2008."⁵

² NEM allows utility customers with renewable energy generators to offset part or all of their electric load, both at the time of generation and through kWh credits for any excess generation. This enables customers with solar arrays to take credit at night for excess energy generated during the day, for instance. Forty-three states have implemented NEM (see www.freeingthegrid.org for details on state NEM policies).

³ Larry Sherwood, *U.S. Solar Market Trends 2012* (Interstate Renewable Energy Council), at p. 5 (316,000 photovoltaic installations connected to the grid at year-end 2012, with 95,000 in 2012 alone), July 2013, available at <http://www.irecusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Solar-Report-Final-July-2013-1.pdf>.

Forecasts for 2013 installations surpass 2012. See, e.g., *U.S. Solar Market Insight Report Q1 2013*, Greentech Media, Executive Summary, at p. 14, June 2013, available at <http://www.greentechmedia.com/research/ussmi>.

⁴ Peter Kind, *Disruptive Challenges: Financial Implications and Strategic Responses to a Changing Retail Electric Business* (Edison Electric Institute), at p. 4, Jan. 2013.

⁵ *Solar Panels Cast Shadow on U.S. Utility Rate Design* (FitchRatings), July 17, 2013, available at http://www.fitchratings.com/gws/en/fitchwire/fitchwirearticle/Solar-Panels-Cast?pr_id=796776. The piece was wrong on its facts. The Spanish model used a feed-in tariff ("FIT") based on solar energy costs and set at over US \$0.60/kWh, leading to a massive build-out in a single year when solar prices dipped below the FIT rates. See *Spain's Solar Market Crash Offers a Cautionary Tale About Feed-In Tariffs*, N.Y. Times, Aug. 18, 2009, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2009/08/18/18greenwire-spains-solar-market-crash-offers-a-cautionary-88308.html?pagewanted=all> (for up to 44 eurocent incentives, and using 0.711 average euro to U.S. dollar exchange rate in 2008, per IRS tables).

Numerous trade and industry publications have joined the chorus, with little indication that the rhetoric will abate anytime soon.⁶

DSG benefit and cost studies are important beyond the context of NEM. To address concerns about the cost-effectiveness of NEM, Austin Energy implemented the first Value of Solar Tariff ("VOST") in 2012, which is now under consideration in other jurisdictions. Under the Austin Energy approach, all of the customer's energy needs are provided by the utility, just as they would be if the customer did not have DSG, and the utility credits the residential solar customer for the value of all of the energy produced by the customer's solar array.⁷ Though intended to offer a new approach to address the valuation issue, Austin Energy's VOST did little to quell the larger debate; indeed, this new policy highlights the fact that valuation is the key issue for any solar policy—NEM, VOST or otherwise.

Austin Energy's VOST rate, as initially calculated, was about three cents higher than retail rates, giving customers an even greater return than the NEM policy that the VOST replaced. However, as with NEM, discussions about "value of solar" rates have now turned to how to calculate the benefits of customer-generated energy. Claiming the use of their own VOST approach, City Public Service, the municipal utility serving San Antonio, Texas (just 80 miles from Austin) used an undisclosed, annualized value approach to conclude that the value of customer-sited energy from solar arrays was roughly half of the retail rate. A competing study for San Antonio, sponsored by Solar San Antonio and using publicly available data, showed twice that value.⁸ As with NEM, the VOST approach is still subject to significant variation in valuation methodologies.

In early 2013, competing studies looking at DSG values for Arizona Public Service ("APS") kept the debate over valuation raging. APS funded a study that concluded DSG value was only 3.56 cents per kilowatt-hour ("kWh"), based on the present value of a kWh from DSG in the year 2025. Subsequently, APS filed an application to either change the rate schedule available to NEM customers or switch to a Feed-In Tariff ("FIT"), with both approaches relying on valuation in the range of 4 to 5.5 cents per kWh. At the same time, a solar industry-sponsored study found a 21 to 24 cent range for the value of each kWh of DSG, far exceeding costs, which it found to be in the range of 14 to 16 cents per kWh.⁹ The lack of a consistent study approach drives the disparity in results.

⁶ See David Roberts, *Solar panels could destroy U.S. utilities, according to U.S. utilities*, Grist, April 2013, available at <http://grist.org/climate-energy/solar-panels-could-destroy-u-s-utilities-according-to-u-s-utilities/>; Herman Trabish, *Solar's Net Metering Under Attack*, GreenTech Media, May 2012, available at <http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/solars-net-metering-under-attack>.


⁷ See Austin Energy's Residential Solar Tariff, available at www.austinenenergy.com/About%20Us/Rates/pdfs/Residential/ResidentialSolar.pdf (last accessed September 9, 2013).

⁸ See N. Jones and B. Norris, *The Value of Distributed Solar Electric Generation to San Antonio*, March 2013 ("San Antonio Study"), available at www.solarsanantonio.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Value-of-Solar-at-San-Antonio-03-13-2013.pdf.

⁹ Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-01345A-13-0248 regarding NEM valuation opened with APS's application in July, 2013, and is available at <http://edocket.azcc.gov/>. The May 2013 APS study prepared by SAIC is available at <http://www.solarfuturearizona.com/2013SolarValueStudy.pdf>. The May 2013 solar industry-sponsored study prepared by Crossborder Energy is available at <http://www.solarfuturearizona.com/TheBenefitsandCostsofSolarDistributedGenerationforAPS.pdf>.

Figure 1 displays the 150% difference between the Austin Energy and San Antonio City Public Service DSG valuations, alongside the 6X difference in values found in the two APS studies.

Figure 1: Disparate DSG Valuations in Texas Studies (cents/kWh).



The figure above shows that Austin Energy's latest valuation of 12.8 cents per kWh is 150% greater the 5.1 cent valuation by City Public Service in San Antonio, just 80 miles away. Even more dramatic is the difference in DSG values for APS, with 3.56 cents by the utility consultant and a range of 21.5 to 23.7 cents by the solar industry consultant.

Overview of a proposed standardized approach. This paper explains how to calculate the benefits and costs of DSG, regardless of the structure of the program or rate in which this valuation is used. Whether considering NEM, VOST, FiTs or incentive programs, parties will always want to understand DSG value. Indeed, accuracy in resource and energy valuation is the cornerstone of sound utility ratemaking and a critical element of economic efficiency. Fortunately, at least 16 studies of individual utilities or regions have been performed over the past several years, providing a backdrop for the types of benefits and costs to consider. While the variation in the purposes, assumptions and approaches in these studies has been wide, the body of published work is sufficient to draw some conclusions about best practices via a meta-analysis.

Rocky Mountain Institute ("RMI"), a Colorado-based not-for-profit research organization, looked at these 16 studies and summarized the range of valuations for each benefit and cost category in *A Review of Solar PV Benefit and Cost Studies* ("RMI 2013 Study"), providing a very useful tool for regulators determining whether a new study has considered all of the relevant benefits and costs. As well, an IREC-led report in early 2012 summarized these key benefits and costs and provided a generalized, high-

level approach for their inclusion in any study ("Solar ABCs Report").¹⁰ Together, the Solar ABCs Report and the RMI 2013 Study provide a detailed summation of efforts to date to assess the net benefits and costs of DSG.

This paper discusses various studies, but does not attempt to replicate RMI's thorough meta-analysis. Rather, this paper proposes *how* each benefit should be calculated and *why*. To assist state utility commissions and other regulators as they consider DSG valuation studies and the fate of NEM, VOST, or other programs or rate designs, we offer a set of recommended best practices regulators can use to ensure that a DSG benefit and cost study accurately measures the net impact of DSG.¹¹

This paper synthesizes the prevalent and preferred methods of quantifying the categories of benefits and costs of DSG. One point of agreement is that DSG-related energy benefits are well accepted and are typically employed in cost-effectiveness testing, as well as in avoided cost calculations. Additional benefits and costs, related to capacity, transmission and distribution ("T&D") costs, line losses, ancillary services, fuel price impacts, market price impacts, environmental compliance costs, and administrative expenses are less uniformly treated in regulation and in the literature, and are addressed here in an effort to establish more commonality in approach. The quantification of societal benefits (beyond utility compliance costs) is also addressed. While typically not quantified in cost-effectiveness tests, these benefits—especially as related to evaluation of the risk associated with alternate resources—also merit more uniform treatment.

Organizationally, this paper covers the types of studies undertaken in relation to DSG valuation and overarching issues in DSG valuation studies, followed by the benefits and costs considered in various studies, the rationale for them, and the authors' recommendations on how to approach them.

The premise of this paper is that while calculated values will differ from one utility to the next, the approach used to calculate the benefits and costs of distributed solar generation should be uniform.

II. DSG Benefit and Cost Studies

A history of DSG benefit and cost studies. There have been an increasing number of studies conducted and published over the past 10-15 years addressing the value of DSG and other distributed energy resources. The first comprehensive effort to

¹⁰ J. Keyes and J. Wiedman, *A Generalized Approach to Assessing the Rate Impacts of Net Energy Metering* (Solar America Board of Codes and Standards), January 2012 ("SolarABCs Report"), available at www.solarabcs.org/about/publications/reports/rateimpact.

¹¹ In addition, the Interstate Renewable Energy Council, Inc. ("IREC") is proactively working with state utility commissions to ask these questions before studies are undertaken, with the expectation that having clarified the assumptions, commissioners will be more confident in the results.

characterize the value of distributed energy resources was *Small Is Profitable: The Hidden Economic Benefits of Making Electrical Resources the Right Size*, published by RMI in 2002. Drawing from hundreds of sources, pilot project reports, and studies, *Small Is Profitable* set the stage for more specific technology-based studies, including the NEM cost-benefit studies and solar valuation studies that followed. Studies specific to DSG systems have appeared with increasing frequency since the Vote Solar Initiative published Ed Smeloff's *Quantifying the Benefits of Solar Power for California* in 2005 and Clean Power Research ("CPR") published its evaluation of *The Value of Solar to Austin Energy and the City of Austin* in 2006.

The reasons behind the appearance of these studies are several. DSG represents an increasingly affordable, interconnected form of distributed generation, creating the potential for significant penetration of small-scale generation into grids generally built around a central station model. In addition, economic and policy pressure on rebates and other mechanisms to foster DSG penetration has increased interest in improving understanding of the DSG value proposition. Utilities, policymakers, regulators, advocates, and service and hardware providers share a common interest in understanding what benefits and costs might be associated with such increased deployment of DSG, and whether net benefits outweigh net costs under a variety of deployment and analysis scenarios.

Many recent DSG valuation studies have been cost-effectiveness analyses of NEM policies for a given utility or group of utilities. NEM has proven to be one of the major drivers of distributed generation in the United States; 43 states and the District of Columbia feature some form of NEM.¹² The success of NEM as a policy to drive distributed generation market growth has caused several states to examine the impact that the policy has on other non-participating ratepayers. Efforts are currently underway in California, Arizona, Hawaii, Colorado, Nevada, North Carolina and Georgia to quantify the benefits and costs of the policy in order to inform the appropriate level of support for distributed energy generation, particularly rooftop solar photovoltaic ("PV") generation. Other states may follow soon, even those with relatively few DSG installations; for example, the Louisiana Public Service Commission indicated that it would launch a cost-benefit analysis for net-metered systems.

Another major use for DSG value analysis is in resource planning and other regulatory proceedings. In December 2012, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory ("LBNL") published a review of how several utilities account for solar resources in *An Evaluation of Solar Valuation Methods Used in Utility Planning and Procurement Processes*.¹³ At this writing, Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP"), avoided cost, or renewable plan dockets are, or soon will be, underway at several utilities¹⁴ where the value of DSG is directly at issue. In addition, the state of Minnesota has recently adopted legislation that establishes a

¹² See Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Energy Efficiency ("DSIRE"): Summary Maps – Net Metering Policies, available at www.dsireusa.org (last accessed Aug. 18, 2013).

¹³ Andrew Mills & Ryan Wiser, *An Evaluation of Solar Valuation Methods Used in Utility Planning and Procurement Processes* (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), LBNL-5933E, December 2012 ("LBNL Utility Solar Study 2012"), available at <http://emp.lbl.gov/publications/evaluation-solar-valuation-methods-used-utility-planning-and-procurement-processes>.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 36989 (Georgia Power Rate Case); North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-100, Sub 136 (Biennial Avoided Cost); Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 13A-0836E (Public Service Company Compliance Plan).

Value of Solar rate for DSG.¹⁵ The authors anticipate that additional valuation studies will result from one or more of these proceedings.

As of this writing, relatively few jurisdictions have conducted full cost-effectiveness studies for DSG and fewer still provide sufficient detail to guide development of a common methodology. CPR's Austin Energy study, updated in 2012, established an approach that has been applied in other regions, including a recent study on the value of DSG in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.¹⁶ The California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") and APS commissioned comprehensive studies in 2009; both commissioned revised studies in 2013.¹⁷ In January 2013, Vermont's Public Service Department¹⁸ completed a cost-benefit analysis of NEM policy.

While not identical in structure, these works typify the recent reports and illustrate some commonalities in approaching the valuation of distributed energy. NEM-specific studies include the 2009 California Energy and Environmental Economics ("E3") Study, Crossborder Energy's 2013 updated look at that E3 study,¹⁹ Crossborder Energy's 2013 analysis of DSG cost-effectiveness in Arizona,²⁰ and the Public Service Department's own analysis for Vermont.

As noted earlier, this paper complements IREC's recent publication, *A Generalized Approach to Assessing the Rate Impacts of Net Energy Metering*.²¹ That paper reviews the DSG valuation studies that had been published to date and provides general approaches to calculating the widely recognized categories of benefits and costs that are relevant to the consideration of the cost-effectiveness of VOST, NEM, and other policy mechanisms impacting DSG. The intent of this examination is to dive deeper, find more common ground for discussion and foster greater consistency in how these values are determined across jurisdictions.

Also as noted earlier, this paper benefits from analysis recently published by RMI, entitled *A Review of Solar PV Benefit and cost Studies*.²² That report reviews 16 studies in a meta-analysis that examines methodologies and assumptions in great detail. Figure 2 is from that study, and characterizes the differences and similarities in the studies. As

¹⁵ Minn. Stat. § 216B.164, subd. 10 (2013); Chapter 85--H.F. No. 729, Article 9, Distributed Generation, Section 10.

¹⁶ Richard Perez, Thomas Hoff, and Benjamin Norris, *The Value of Distributed Solar Electric Generation to New Jersey and Pennsylvania*, 2012 ("CPR 2012 MSEIA Study"), available at <http://communitypowernetwork.com/sites/default/files/MSEIA-Final-Benefits-of-Solar-Report-2012-11-01.pdf>.

¹⁷ APS studies: *Distributed Renewable Energy Operating Impacts and Valuation Study*, RW Beck, Jan. 2009, available at <http://www.solarfuturearizona.com/SolarDEStudy.pdf>; *2013 Updated Solar PV Value Report*, SAIC, May 2013, available at <http://www.solarfuturearizona.com/2013SolarValueStudy.pdf>.

CPUC studies conducted by Energy and Environment Economics ("E3"): http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Solar/nem_cost_effectiveness_evaluation.htm.

¹⁸ *Evaluation of Net Metering in Vermont Conducted Pursuant to Act 125 of 2012*, January 15, 2013 ("Vermont Study"), available at www.leg.state.vt.us/reports/2013ExternalReports/285580.pdf.

¹⁹ Thomas Beach and Patrick McGuire, *Evaluating the Benefits and Costs of Net Energy Metering in California* (Vote Solar Initiative), 2013 ("Crossborder 2013 California Study"), available at <http://www.seia.org/research-resources/evaluating-benefits-costs-net-energy-metering-california>.


²⁰ Thomas Beach and Patrick McGuire, *The Benefits and Costs of Solar Distributed Generation for Arizona Public Service* (Vote Solar Initiative), at p.12, 2013 ("Crossborder 2013 Arizona Study"), available at <http://www.solarfuturearizona.com/TheBenefitsandCostsofSolarDistributedGenerationforAPS.pdf>.

²¹ See SolarABCs Report, *supra*, footnote 10.

²² See RMI 2013 Study, *supra*, footnote 1.

well as considering benefits and costs the RMI 2013 Study points out that the various studies differ significantly in the amount of DSG penetration considered, which can drastically impact values. Another important differentiator is whether the studies are based on high-level, often secondary, review of benefits and costs, or whether they rely on more granular and detailed modeling of impacts.²³

Figure 2: Rocky Mountain Institute Summary of DSG Benefits and Costs



The RMI 2013 Study figure is reprinted here to make three important points. First and foremost, the calculated benefits often exceed residential retail rates, shown in the figure with diamonds, implying that NEM would not entail a subsidy flowing from non-solar to solar customers. Second, commercial customers almost always have unbundled rates and NEM has minimal impact on their demand charges because they still have demand after the sun sets. That means that DSG benefits compared to commercial customer energy rates would be strongly positive based on almost all of these studies. And third, costs are accounted for in varying ways: three studies show costs including lost retail rate payments, with large bars below the zero line indicating total costs, one shows costs other than retail rate payments (CPR NJ/PA), and the rest include costs as a deduction within the benefits calculation. As an overarching point,

²³ *Id.* at p. 21.

the RMI 2013 Study figure confirms that there is no single standard DSG valuation methodology today.

Types of Studies. Distributed solar valuation requires quantitative analysis of a wide range of data in an organized way. Fortunately, there are abundant existing approaches that can contribute to estimation of DSG value. This section briefly introduces the two major types of studies that underlie DSG valuation. The first category of studies is input and production cost models. These have general application in the utility industry in the comparison of resource alternatives. The second category, DSG-specific studies, includes three sub-types, depending on the purpose for which the study was conducted. In practice, most DSG-specific studies rely on inputs from input and production cost models.

A. Input and Production Cost Models

Utility planners and industry experts rely on a wide range of models and analytical tools for calculating costs associated with generation and systems. Power flow, dispatch, and planning models all provide input to the financial models used to evaluate DSG cost effectiveness and value. While detailed treatment of the utility models providing input to the DSG models is beyond the scope of this paper, they impact the DSG models and need to be understood. Often, these utility models are deemed proprietary, creating "black box" solutions regarding what generation is needed and when. Among the most critical decisions made at this juncture is whether the generation that will be offset by DSG is a relatively efficient natural gas combined-cycle combustion turbine ("CCGT") or a less efficient single cycle "peaker" plant running on natural gas, or some combination of the two.

As most of the gas-fired energy delivered by utilities comes from CCGTs, and peakers will still be needed to handle changes in load, models should reflect that DSG is primarily offsetting CCGTs. However, the APS 2013 study is an example in which the input model results are confounding, and there is no way to review the black box solution. Oddly, APS found that baseload coal would be displaced for part of the year. We believe that such an example deserves more careful study; it is a nearly universal truth that coal plants are run as much as possible. While many coal plants have been shut down in the past decade, those that remain are typically only curtailed for maintenance. Regulators should consider whether input assumptions such as coal or nuclear displacement are reasonable, particularly if the results are based on proprietary, opaque modeling.

Capacity needs in planning models are typically forecasted several years in the future and, because of the legacy of the central station utility plant paradigm, in large increments of capacity. These so-called "lumpy" capacity investments generally overshoot capacity requirements in order to ensure resource adequacy in the face of multi-year development lead times. As a result, the opportunity for DSG to provide useful capacity is generally seen as too little and too early. For example, a typical utility resource plan might state that capacity is adequate until the year 2018, at which time the company forecasts a need for an additional 200 megawatts ("MW") of generation capacity. In such a situation, traditional resource planning and avoided cost estimates assign no capacity value to DSG installed on customer roofs before 2018, and none in

2018 unless the systems provide the equivalent to 200 MW of capacity. This ignores the benefit of DSG's modularity—the utility does not need 200 MW in 2018, at that point it only starts to need more than it already has available. DSG can provide for that capacity through incremental installations starting in 2018. Likewise, if the utility has projects under development prior to 2018, it could have deferred or avoided some of that need if it had accurately predicted and valued DSG installations.

Today, many input and production cost planning models include the opportunity to adjust assumptions about customer adoption of DSG (and energy efficiency), which assume that those resources are going to play a role in the utility's near term capacity requirements. With these adjustments, the in-service requirement date can possibly be deferred, generating both energy and capacity savings attributable to the distributed resources. Accordingly, models that do not address DSG installations are inadequate and could lead to costly overbuilding and, given planning and construction lead times associated with large plants, premature expenditure of development costs.

B. DSG-Specific Studies

DSG-specific studies often start with inputs from the models just described. These studies are themselves usually of three types:

Studies of studies. Like this white paper, these studies start with work conducted by one or more experts and organize the information and data in a form that addresses questions of interest. In some cases, the authors report the results and the source conditions for the data. In others, study authors attempt to adjust the results for different local conditions. The RMI 2013 Study on solar PV reports the results of 16 different studies spanning some eight years. These studies provide useful introductions to the emerging discipline and demonstrate the ways in which differences in assumptions, methodologies, and underlying data can impact outcomes. In addition, when adjusting for outlier conditions, the studies can demonstrate where there exists relatively strong coherence in approach and results.

Cost-Benefit Analysis studies. Cost-benefit studies focus on using avoided cost methodologies and cost-benefit test approaches to review large-scale DSG initiatives and programs. They seek to answer the question of whether total costs or total benefits are greater over a specified period of time. For these studies, forward-looking cost estimates for DSG interconnection, lost revenues, avoided RPS costs, and incentive programs are important inputs. The best-known examples of this study approach were conducted by E3, reviewing the California Solar Initiative and NEM programs, and those by Crossborder Energy, reviewing the E3 reports. Most of the studies reviewed by the RMI 2013 Study are of this sort. There are several cost-benefit analysis variants, as described in the California Standard Practice Manual and summarized in the box below.

Value of Solar studies. Smeloff and CPR pioneered the "value of solar" genre of study. As the name implies, this study approach focuses on using avoided cost and financial analysis methods in discerning the future investment value of distributed solar to the utility, ratepayers, and society. Generally, these evaluations ignore utility lost revenues, instead focusing on valuation that can be used in designing and setting incentive levels, program limits, and other features of utility DSG programs. The studies stop short

of rate or tariff design features, and as a result, do not typically address lost revenue issues. Perhaps best known is the Austin Energy Value of Solar study conducted by CPR in 2006 and updated in 2012.²⁴

With reference to the California Standard Practice Manual study descriptions summarized in the prior box, the type of test that the authors suggest in this paper is a blend of the Ratepayer Impact Measure ("RIM") and Societal Cost Test ("SCT") approaches. The RIM test addresses the impact on non-participating ratepayers in terms of how benefits and costs impact the utility and are passed along to those ratepayers. That necessarily does not account for the participating ratepayers' outlay for DSG systems, nor should it. The SCT approach looks at whether it is a good idea for society as a whole to pursue a policy, and includes participating ratepayers' investment in DSG systems. The authors contend that the participants' investment is outside of the scope of the appropriate investigation. The goal should be to determine whether non-participants have a net benefit from the installation of DSG systems. As the job creation, health and environmental benefits accrue to non-participants just as much as they accrue to participants, there is no apparent reason why societal benefits should not be included. In its consideration of benefits, this approach aligns with the VOST methodology which aims to include all benefits that can reasonably be quantified and assigned to utility operations.

Utilities often object, stating that valuing societal benefits conflates customers with citizens, and note that utility rates must be based on costs directly impacting utilities. By this line of reasoning, job creation and health benefits may be the basis of legislative policies supportive of DSG, but should not be considered when developing DSG tariffs. We are reluctant to accept an artificial division between citizens and utility customers; the overlap is complete for most benefits and costs. Moreover, a major reason for establishing NEM, VOST or other DSG programs is primarily related to the same broad societal benefits that drive utility regulatory systems—economic efficiency, and rates and services in the public interest—so those benefits should be considered in any programmatic or policy analysis.

Recommendation: Use a blend of the Ratepayer Impact Measure ("RIM") and Societal Cost Test ("SCT") Cost-Benefit Tests

²⁴ Author K. Rábago, while at Austin Energy, helped establish the nation's first VOST. See K. Rábago, *The Value of Solar Rate: Designing an Improved Residential Solar Tariff*, Solar Industry, at p. 20, Feb. 2013, available at <http://solarindustrymag.com/digitaleditions/Main.php?MagID=3&MagNo=59>.

Cost-Benefit Tests

The California Standard Practice Manual is used for economic analysis of demand-side management ("DSM") programs in California. The cost-benefit tests in the Standard Practice Manual have also been used to evaluate DSG value, most notably in California, where the tests have been applied to a review of the cost effectiveness of the California Solar Initiative. The various tests differ in the perspective from which cost effectiveness is assessed.

- **Participant Cost Test ("PCT").** Measures benefits and costs to program participants.
- **Ratepayer Impact Measure ("RIM") Test.** Measures changes in electric service rates due to changes in utility revenues and costs resulting from the assessed program.
- **Program Administrator Cost Test ("PACT").** Measures the benefits and costs to the program administrator, without consideration of the effect on actual revenues. This test differs from the RIM test in that it considers only the revenue requirement, ignoring changes in revenue collection, typically called "lost revenues."
- **Total Resources Cost Test ("TRC").** Measures the total net economic effects of the program, including both participants' and program administrator's benefits and costs, without regard to who incurs the costs or receives the benefits. For a utility-specific program, the test can be thought of as measuring the overall economic welfare over the entire utility service territory.
- **Societal Cost Test ("SCT").** The SCT is similar to the TRC, but broadens the universe of affected individuals to society as a whole, rather than just those in the program administrator territory. The SCT is also a vehicle for consideration of non-monetized externalities, such as induced economic development effects, which are not considered in the TRC.

III. Key Structural Issues for DSG Benefit and Cost Studies

Underlying study assumptions and major study components. The evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of a given DSG policy, particularly NEM, is a complex undertaking with many potential moving parts. Before delving into the specific benefits and costs, it is important to recognize that the ultimate outcome of the analysis is highly dependent on the base financial and framework assumptions that go into the effort. Much of the work involves forecasting—estimating the future benefits and costs, performance, and cumulative impacts associated with increasing penetration of distributed generation

into the electric grid. It is important to develop a common set of base assumptions that reflect the resource being studied and to be as transparent as possible about these assumptions when reporting the results of the analysis. At the outset of a study, it is important to define these structural parameters. Below we present key questions for regulators to explore at the onset of a study:

Q1: WHAT DISCOUNT RATE WILL BE USED?

The discount rate should reflect how society evaluates costs over time. Utilities use a discount rate based on the time value of money, using the rate of return available for investments with similarly low risk, now in the 6% to 9% range. However, society may prefer the use of a lower discount rate, closer to the rate of inflation. The difference is important. High discount rates improve the evaluation of resources with continuously escalating or high end-of-life costs. For instance, an 8% discount rate may favor a natural gas generator because much of the cost (the fuel, operation and maintenance) to run the generator is incurred over the life of the generator, while the cost of DSG is almost entirely at the front end. A low discount rate improves the valuation of resources with high initial costs and low or zero end-of-life costs. The same analysis based on a 3% inflation rate may favor DSG resources, as there are no fuel costs over time and the operations and maintenance ("O&M") costs are low because there are fewer or no moving parts. While the utility's discount rate is appropriate when considering utility procurement because those funds could be invested elsewhere at competitive rates, the utility is not procuring the DSG resources in the case of NEM, VOST or FiT arrangements. It is worth questioning whether the future benefits of DSG resources should be heavily discounted, based on the utility's cost of capital, when the customer (or a third party owning a system at the customer's site) is making the investment. As utility valuation techniques improve, is it reasonable to discount future benefits and costs by the inflation rate rather than the utility's cost of capital.

Recommendation: We recommend using a lower discount rate for DSG than a typical utility discount rate to account for differences in DSG economics.

Q2: WHAT IS BEING CONSIDERED – ALL GENERATION OR EXPORTS ONLY?

Under NEM, utility customers can take advantage of a federal law²⁵ allowing for on-site generation to offset consumption, with the opportunity to sell excess generation to the utility at the utility's avoided cost. Because the customer has a right to avoid any and all consumption from the utility, studies of NEM cost-effectiveness will often look only at the utility cost associated with exports to the grid. The assumption under NEM is effectively that at or below the total consumption level, the value of offset consumption is the retail rate. This valuation is supported by the concept behind cost-of-service rate regulation—that the retail rate is the accumulation of costs to generate and deliver energy for the customer.²⁶ Note that to the extent that NEM benefits are calculated to

²⁵ See Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act ("PURPA"), 16 U.S.C. *et seq.*

²⁶ VOST studies, on the other hand, presume a difference between the value of generation at or near the point of consumption and the level of the rate. That is, the customer with DSG may well be generating electricity of greater value than that being provided by the utility.

outweigh costs, consideration of all generation amplifies the calculated net benefit. However, if NEM costs outweigh benefits, the opposite is true.

Recommendation: We recommend assessing only DSG exports to the grid.

Q3: OVER WHAT TIMEFRAME WILL THE STUDY EXAMINE THE BENEFITS AND COSTS OF DSG?

Utility planners routinely consider the lifecycle benefits and costs of traditional utility generators, typically over a period in excess of 30 years. Solar arrays have no moving parts and are generally expected to last for at least 30 years, with much less maintenance than fossil-fired generation. Solar module warranties are typically for 25 years, and many of the earliest modules from the 1960s and 1970s are still operational, indicating that modules in production today should last for at least 30 years. This useful life assumption creates some data challenges, as utilities often plan over shorter time horizons (10-20 years) in terms of estimating load growth and the resources necessary to meet that load. As described below, methods can be used to estimate the value in future years that interpolate between current market prices or knowledge, and the most forward market price available or data that can accurately be estimated, just as planners do for fossil-fired generators that are expected to last for decades.

Recommendation: We suggest that the most appropriate timeframe for evaluating DSG and related policy is 30 years, as that matches the currently anticipated life span of the technology.

Q4: WHAT DOES UTILITY LOAD LOOK LIKE IN THE FUTURE?

Key to determining the value of DSG is a reasonable expectation of what customer loads will look like in the future, as much of the value of distributed resources derives from the utility's ability to plan around customer-owned generation. Other DSG rate or program options involving sale of all output to the utility do not reduce utility loads, as customer facilities contribute to the available capacity of utility resources as small contracted generators.

Recommendation: Given that NEM resources are interconnected behind customer meters, and result in lower utility loads, we recommend that the assigned capacity value of the distributed systems reflect the fact that the utility can plan for lower loads than it otherwise would have.

Q5: WHAT LEVEL OF MARKET PENETRATION FOR DSG IS ASSUMED IN THE FUTURE?

Many benefits and costs are sensitive to how much customer-owned generation capacity is on the grid. Most studies assume current, low penetration rates. Several of the studies consider higher penetration levels, as well, typically out to 15% or 20% of peak load, with some outlier studies looking at 30% and 40% penetration levels. In a high-penetration scenario, the utility may face higher integration expenses that might undermine the specific infrastructure benefits of distributed generation. Studies that address the issue often find that marginal capacity benefits decline with high penetration.

On the other hand, some studies such as those by APS, conclude that capacity benefits are dependent on having enough DSG to offset the next natural gas generator, and therefore that there are no capacity benefits in low-penetration scenarios. Market penetration estimates should also be reasonable in light of current supply chain capacity and local market conditions. Generally, the most important penetration level to consider for policy purposes is the next increment. If a utility currently has 0.1% of its needs met by DSG and a study shows that growth to 5% is cost-effective, but growth to 40% is not, then it would be economically efficient to allow the program to grow to 5% and then be reevaluated.

Recommendation: We recommend the establishment of an expected level of DSG penetration, and the development of low and high sensitivities to consider the full range of future impacts.

Q6: WHAT MODELS ARE USED TO PROVIDE ANALYTICAL INPUTS?

Analysts have used a wide variety of tools to calculate the benefits and costs of DSG. There is almost no commonality at the model level, even though many of the analyses address similar or identical issues. Several studies use some version of investment and dispatch models in order to determine which resources are displaced by solar and the resulting impacts. As noted earlier, utility DSG studies have often relied on proprietary models for these inputs. The fact that CPR and Professor Richard Perez²⁷ have published a number of studies creates some commonality among those studies, but over time, even the CPR approaches have evolved as tools have been improved.

Recommendation: We suggest that transparent input models accessible to all stakeholders are the proper foundation for confidence and utility of DSG studies. If necessary, non-disclosure agreements can be used to overcome data sharing sensitivities.

Q7: WHAT GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES ARE ASSUMED IN THE ANALYSIS?

Value of solar analysis is heavily influenced by local resource and market conditions. Most published studies are geographically scoped at the state, service territory, or interconnected region level. Given its leadership in solar deployment, California also leads as the subject of studies and as a data source. Some studies relating to economic development and environmental impacts use a national and regional scope.

Recommendation: We suggest that it is important to account for the range in local values that characterize the broader geographical area selected for the study. In some cases, quantification according to similar geographical sub-regions may be appropriate.

Q8: WHAT SYSTEM BOUNDARIES ARE ASSUMED?

The majority of studies consider benefits and costs in the generation, transmission, and distribution portions of the system. Of the studies that consider environmental impacts,

²⁷ Richard Perez is a Research Professor at the University at Albany-SUNY.

most only look at avoided utility environmental compliance costs at the generation level.

Recommendation: We recommend considering impacts associated with adjacent utility systems, especially at higher (above 10%) penetration levels of DSG.²⁸

Q9: FROM WHOSE PERSPECTIVE ARE BENEFITS AND COSTS MEASURED?

Nearly all the studies consider impacts from the perspective of the utility and ratepayers. Several also consider customer and societal benefit and costs. Cost-benefit studies apply California Standard Practice Manual tests for Demand Side Management, discussed earlier.

Recommendation: We suggest that rate impacts and societal benefits and costs should be assessed.

Q10: ARE BENEFITS AND COSTS ESTIMATED ON AN ANNUALIZED OR LEVELIZED BASIS?

When a DSG system is installed, it is like commissioning a 30-year power plant that will, if properly maintained, produce energy and other benefits during that entire period. Several studies look at snapshots of benefits and costs in a given year, which fails to answer the basic question of whether DSG is cost-effective over its lifetime. Levelization involves calculating the stream of benefits and costs over an extended period and discounting to a single present value. Such levelized estimates are routinely used by utilities in evaluating alternative and competing resource options. As such, levelization of the entire stream of benefits and costs is appropriate.

Recommendation: We recommend use of a levelized approach to estimating benefits and costs over the entire DSG life of 30 years.

Q11: WHAT DATA AND DATA SOURCES ARE USED?

As the number of solar valuation studies has increased, so has the frequency with which newer studies cite data provided in prior studies. There are two reasons behind this trend, cost and availability of data, which we discuss in detail below.

As with any modeling exercise, models are only as good as the data fed into them. The ability to precisely calculate the benefits of DSG often rests on the availability and granularity of utility operational and cost data. More granular data yields more reliable analysis about the impacts of DSG deployment and operation.

Calculating many of the benefit and cost categories requires that analysts address utility-specific or regional conditions that can vary significantly from utility to utility, even within the same state. In addition, the availability of the type of granular data needed

²⁸ Mills and Wiser point out that consideration of inter-system sales of capacity or renewable energy credits could mitigate reductions in incremental solar value that could accompany high penetration rates. See A. Mills & R. Wiser, *An Evaluation of Solar Valuation Methods Used in Utility Planning and Procurement Processes* (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), LBNL-5933E, at p. 23, December 2012, available at <http://emp.lbl.gov/publications/evaluation-solar-valuation-methods-used-utility-planning-and-procurement-processes>.

to accurately project location and time-specific benefits varies from one utility to the next. Much of the data needed to quantify the benefits of DSG resides with utilities.

Fortunately, additional data, such as energy market prices, is often publicly available, or can be released by the utility without proprietary concerns. In some limited cases, the utility may have proprietary, competitive, or other concerns with plant- or contract-specific information. And in some cases, the form and format of utility data may require adjustments.

These problems are not insurmountable. Utility general rate cases and regulatory filings with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") are good sources for data relevant to utility peak demand and for the components of cost of service, including transmission costs, line loss factors, O&M costs, and costs of specific distribution upgrades or investments, among other cost categories. Additionally, the federal Energy Information Administration ("EIA") and various state agencies compile utility cost data that can be used as a reference to determine heat rates, the costs of O&M associated with various plants, and the overall capital cost of new construction of generating capacity.²⁹

Recommendation: Require that utilities provide the following data sets, both current information and projected data for 30 years³⁰:

- 1) The five or ten-year forward price of natural gas, the most likely fuel for marginal generation, along with longer-term projections in line with the life of the DSG.
- 2) Hourly load shapes, broken down by customer class to analyze the intra-class and inter-class impacts of NEM policy.
- 3) Hourly production profiles for NEM generators. The use of time-correlated solar data is important to correctly assess the match of solar output with system loads. In the case of solar PV, this could vary according to the orientation of the system. For example, while south-facing systems may have greater overall output, west or southwest facing systems may produce more overall value with fewer kWh because of peak production occurring later in the day than a south-facing system.
- 4) Line losses based on hourly load data, so that marginal avoided line losses due to DSG can be calculated.
- 5) Both the initial capital cost and the fixed and variable O&M costs for the utility's marginal generation unit.
- 6) Distribution planning costs that identify the capital and O&M cost (fixed and variable) of constructing and operating distribution upgrades that are necessary to meet load growth.
- 7) Hourly load data for individual distribution circuits, particularly those with current or expected higher than average penetrations of DSG, in order to capture the potential for avoiding or deferring circuit upgrades.


²⁹ See *Updated Capital Cost Estimates for Electricity Generation Plants* (EIA), November 2012, available at http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/beck_plantcosts/pdf/updatedplantcosts.pdf (providing estimate of capital cost, fixed O&M, and variable O&M for generation plants with various technical characteristics).

³⁰ Note: Where a utility or jurisdiction does not regularly collect some portion of this data, there may be methods to estimate a reasonable value to assign to DSG.

IV. Recommendations for Calculating the Benefits of DSG

Benefits of DSG get categorized and ordered in various ways from study to study, typically based on the relative magnitude of the benefits. The RMI 2013 Study is structured around a list of "services," encompassing flows of benefits and costs to and from solar PV. That list is replicated here in an effort to coordinate with that study.³¹ The RMI services categories are depicted in the graphic below.

Figure 3: Rocky Mountain Institute Summary of DSG Benefits



While replicating the RMI services categories, we have subdivided them in recognition that the divide between utility avoided costs and other societal benefits is not clear from the list above. For instance, utilities can avoid certain environmental compliance costs, which are direct utility avoided costs, while other environmental benefits inure to society more generally. As another example, reliability or resiliency is only a utility avoided cost to the extent that the utility was going to take some other measures to achieve the levels enabled by DSG. If DSG enables higher reliability than would have otherwise been achieved, that is undoubtedly a benefit, though it is most notably realized by utility customers when a storm event does not cause a major service interruption, which may occur once in a decade. As a further example, market price

³¹ See RMI 2013 Study.

response benefits can be felt by the utility itself but will also extend to citizens who are customers of nearby utilities.

To track utility avoided costs and societal benefits separately, separate subsections are provided below, with the final three RMI environmental and social benefit categories covered after utility avoided costs. We note where some categories listed under utility avoided costs have societal benefits as well, and we separately create an environment category under utility avoided costs to capture utility avoided environmental compliance costs.

Calculating Utility Avoided Costs

1. Avoided energy benefits

To determine the value of avoided generation costs, the first step is to identify the marginal generation displaced. In most instances, the next marginal generator will be a natural gas-fired simple-cycle combustion turbine ("CT") or a more efficient CCGT. Avoiding the operation of that marginal generating facility to produce the next increment of electricity means that the solar generator allows the utility to avoid both variable O&M activities (i.e., those activities and expenses that vary with the volume of output of the CT or CCGT plant) and the fuel that would be consumed to produce that next unit at the time that the customer-generator allows the utility to avoid that operation.

To calculate the avoided generation cost over the life of the DSG system—assumed throughout this paper to be 30 years—the calculation must estimate the market price of energy throughout that time span. Given the limitations on the availability of data, including the future price of a historically volatile commodity like natural gas, many studies have used interpolation and extrapolation to estimate gas prices in the 30 year horizon by taking the readily attainable current market price for natural gas and referencing it against the most forward natural gas price available.

Additionally, the calculation of avoided generation costs over time must account for degradation in the marginal generation plant and adjust expected heat rates (i.e., the measure of efficiency by which a unit creates electricity by burning fuel for heat to power a turbine). Over time, the marginal generation plant will become less efficient and require incrementally more fuel to reach the same production levels. Production cost modeling enables the utility to cumulate value of avoided costs throughout the useful life of the solar generating system. However, due to built in constraints or other issues, such modeling can produce results that are illogical, as has been seen in Arizona (baseload coal generation displaced by DSG) and Colorado (high cost of frequent unit startups reducing energy benefits).

A standard approach to determining the value of avoided generation over the life of a DSG system is to develop: (1) an hourly market price shape for each month and (2) a forecast of annual average market prices into the future.³² One way to forecast the annual market prices, with less reliance on forward market prices, is to project the rolled-in costs of the marginal generation unit, accounting for variable O&M and

³² E3 Study, Appendix A at pp.10-11.

Comparison with PURPA Avoided Cost Calculations

Value of solar analysis literature is complemented by other studies and reports related to the issue. These include studies relating to avoided cost methodologies under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 ("PURPA"), and those addressing utility resource planning evaluation of distributed resources.

Because both the cost-benefit and value-of-solar approaches start with avoided cost calculations, publications and processes used in conducting such calculations are informative in establishing the costs and benefits of DSG. State utility commissions and public utility regulators have approached PURPA valuation of avoided costs quite differently, and FERC has rarely constrained the approach selected. Rather than attempt to discern a consensus approach, a more fruitful approach is to consider what PURPA allows.

IREC recently published a paper to do this, cataloguing the kinds of DSG-related avoided cost calculations that could improve understanding of DSG value, and citing most of the utility avoided costs discussed in this paper.

See the full report:

<http://www.irecusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Unlocking-DG-Value.pdf>

degradation of heat rate efficiency in future years. This method still relies on forecasts of natural gas prices in future years, but provides more certainty for variable O&M costs.³³

In the Vermont study, the Public Service Department assumed that the New England Independent System Operator ("ISO-NE") wholesale market would provide the marginal generation price for energy displaced by solar generation. To account for the high correlation of solar PV with system peak, and therefore the offset of higher value generation, the Department created a hypothetical avoided cost for 2011 using real output data that was matched with actual hourly market data from the ISO-NE market.³⁴ This adjusted hourly market price was then scaled to future years by utilizing an energy price forecast, based on the forward market energy prices for the first five years and for the forward natural gas prices for years five to ten.³⁵ Prices for years after year ten were based on an extrapolation of the market prices for electricity and natural gas for years one through ten.

As CPR observes, there are inherent shortcomings in relying on future market prices for marginal generation decades into the future.³⁶ A more straightforward method would be to "explicitly specify the marginal generator and then to calculate the cost of the generation from this unit."³⁷ In this way the avoided fuel and O&M cost savings are roughly equivalent to capturing the future wholesale price. Of course, this approach still relies on forward projections in the natural gas market.

³³ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at pp. 28-29.

³⁴ Vermont Study at p. 16.

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at pp. 28-29.

³⁷ *Id.* at p. 29.

2. Calculating system losses

DSG sited at or near load avoids the inefficiencies associated with delivering power over great distances to the end-use customer due to electric resistance and conversion losses. When a DSG customer does not consume all output as it is being produced, the excess is exported to the grid and consumed by neighboring customers on the same circuit, with minimal losses in comparison to electricity generated by and delivered from a utility's centralized but distant plant. Without DSG and its local load reduction impact, utilities are forced to generate additional electricity to compensate for line losses, decreasing the economic efficiency of each unit of electricity that is delivered.

Including avoided line losses as a benefit is relatively straightforward and should be non-controversial. For instance, FERC's regulations implementing PURPA recognize that distributed generation can account for avoided line losses.³⁸ This benefit exists for all types of DG technologies and, to some extent, in all locations. Typically, average line losses are in the range of 7%, and higher during heavier load periods, which can correlate with high irradiance periods for many utilities.³⁹ Additional losses termed "lost and unaccounted for energy" are also likely associated with T&D functions and, with further research, may also be avoided by DSG.⁴⁰

Average line loss is often used as the primary approach to adjusting energy and capacity-related benefits. However, because line losses are not uniform across the year or day, the use of average losses ignores significant value because it fails to quantify the "true reduction in losses on a marginal basis."⁴¹ Considering losses on a marginal basis is more accurate and should be standard practice as it reflects the likely correlation of solar PV to heavy loading periods where congestion and transformer thermal conditions tend to exacerbate losses. In its Austin Energy study, CPR evaluated marginal T&D losses at times of seasonable peak demand using load flow analysis. CPR decided to average the marginal energy losses on the distribution system, for purposes of the study, and added marginal transmission losses in order to report hourly marginal loss savings due to solar generation. According to one APS study, the degree of line losses may decrease as penetration increases.⁴²

As with the effect of reducing market prices by reducing load at times of peak demand, and therefore reducing marginal wholesale prices (see below), DSG-induced reduction of losses at times of peak load has a spillover effect. The ability of customers to serve on-site load without use of the distribution system reduces transformer

³⁸ See FERC Order No. 69, 45 Fed. Reg. 12214 at 12227. ("If the load served by the [QF] is closer to the [QF] than it is to the utility, it is possible that there may be net savings resulting from reduced line losses. In such cases, the rates should be adjusted upwards.").

³⁹ For example, the E3 study assumes an average loss factor of 1.073, which indicates that 7.3% more energy is supplied to the grid than is ultimately delivered and metered by the end-use customers. In contrast, Vermont's study noted that the Department's energy efficiency screening tool concluded that typical marginal line losses are about 9%. Vermont Study at p.17.

⁴⁰ See, e.g., A. Lovins et al., Small Is Profitable: The Hidden Economic Benefits of Making Electrical Resources the Right Size, Rocky Mountain Institute, at p. 212, August 2002; U.S. Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Review, available at <http://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/annual/diagram5.cfm>.

⁴¹ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at p. 27.

⁴² Distributed Renewable Energy Operating Impacts and Valuation Study, R. W. Beck for Arizona Public Service, Jan. 2009, at p. 4-7 and Table 4-3. (Finding that a "law of diminishing returns" applies to solar distributed energy installations.) Available at: <http://www.solarfuturearizona.com/SolarDEStudy.pdf>.

overheating, a major driver of transformer wear and tear, and in turn allows customers to receive power from utility generators at lower marginal loss rates. Without on- or near-peak DSG, all customers would face higher marginal loss rates with the contribution to thermal transformer conditions caused by all customers seeking grid delivered power for all on-site needs at times of peak load.

With consideration of the line losses avoided in relation to both the energy that did not have to be delivered due to DSG, and the marginal improvement in line losses to deliver power for the rest of utility's customers' needs, the appropriate methodology developed by CPR is to look at total line losses without DSG and total line losses with DSG. In practice this can equal 15-20% of the energy value.

Separately, line losses figure into capacity value as well, as a peak demand reduction of 100 MW means in turn that a generation capacity of more than 100 MW is avoided. This aspect of avoided line losses should be included with generation and T&D capacity benefits, discussed below.

3. Calculating generation capacity

Determining the capacity benefits of intermittent, renewable generation is a more complex undertaking than analyzing energy value, but there is a demonstrated capacity value for DSG systems. Capacity value of generation exists where a utility can count on generation to meet its peak demand and thereby avoid purchasing additional capacity to generate and deliver electricity to meet that peak demand.

While individual DSG systems (without energy storage) provide little firm capacity value to a utility given the potential for cloud cover, there is compelling research supporting the consideration of the aggregate value of DSG systems in determining capacity value. A recent study by LBNL demonstrates that geographic diversity tends to smooth the variability of solar generation output, making it more dependable as a capacity resource.⁴³ As well, FERC considered the fact that distributed solar and wind should produce some capacity value when considered in the aggregate when it was developing its avoided cost pricing regulations.⁴⁴ Capacity value for DSG systems should look to the characteristics of all DSG generators in the aggregate, including the smoothing benefits of geographic diversity.

Solving for Intermittency. CPR developed the most prominent and widely used method to address the intermittency of DSG technologies. This method recognizes a capacity value for intermittent, non-dispatchable resources, and is referred to as the "effective load carrying capability" ("ELCC"). ELCC is a statistical measure of capacity that is "effectively" available to a utility to meet load. "The ELCC of a generating unit in a utility grid is defined as the load increase (MW) that the system can carry while

⁴³ See Andrew Mills and Ryan Wiser, *Implications of Wide-Area Geographic Diversity for Short-Term Variability of Solar Power* (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), LBNL-3884E, September 2010.

⁴⁴ FERC Order No. 69, 45 Fed. Reg. 12214 at 12227 ("In some instances, the small amounts of capacity provided from [QFs] taken individually might not enable a purchasing utility to defer or avoid scheduled capacity additions. The aggregate capability of such purchases may, however, be sufficient to permit the deferral or avoidance of a capacity addition. Moreover, while an individual [QF] may not provide the equivalent of firm power to the electric utility, the diversity of these facilities may collectively comprise the equivalent of capacity.").

maintaining the designated reliability criteria (e.g., constant loss of load probability)."⁴⁵ In this way, ELCC provides a reliable statistical method to project the capacity value of intermittent resources.

On the other hand, the ELCC method can be data intensive and complex to some stakeholders. Simpler methods may also yield reasonable results. For example, an alternate method, based on the utility's load duration curve, looks at the solar capacity available for the highest load hours, usually the top 50 hours.

Implemented in a rate, a capacity credit for DSG denominated in kWh represents the best approach. This ensures that DSG only receives capacity credit for actual generation.

Valuing Small, Distributed Capacity Additions. An often controversial issue in determining avoided capacity value is the fact that distributed generation provides small, incremental additions and utility resource planning typically adds capacity in large, or "lumpy," blocks of capacity additions. For example, if a utility has ample capacity to meet its reserve margin and its next capacity addition will be a 500 MW CCGT, a utility might argue that incremental additions of 1 MW or 20 MW do not allow them to avoid capacity costs. FERC's regulations recognize that distributed generation provides a more flexible manner to meet growing capacity needs and can allow a utility to defer or avoid the "lumpy" capacity additions.⁴⁶ Therefore, it is inappropriate to hold that there is no capacity benefit for deployment of distributed generation in years that come before the time where the "lumpy" capacity investment is required. Distributed generation resources, like other demand-side resources that are continuously pursued to address load growth and to reduce peak demand, provide immediate benefit and a hedge against unexpected outages that could lead to a shortage in capacity. There is, therefore, no good reason to value DSG capacity for its long-term value only in years where it physically displaces the next marginal generating unit.

One solution around the valuation of incremental capacity additions versus lumpy additions that would follow more traditional utility planning is laid out in Crossborder Energy's 2013 update to the 2009 E3 Net Metering Cost-effectiveness study for California. In the E3 study, a mix of short-run and long-run avoided capacity costs are applied to renewable generators based on the fact that additional capacity would not be required until a certain year, called the "Resource Balance Year" in the E3 study. Crossborder's update recognizes the incremental value of small capacity additions for the years leading up to the Resource Balance Year and uses a long-run capacity value methodology for the life of the distributed generation system.⁴⁷ In other words, utilities are responsible for predicting load growth and planning accordingly, so the full penetration of DSG installations should already be built into their plans, reflecting the incremental capacity benefits these systems provide.

Adding It All Together: Determining the capacity credit for DSG systems. There are two basic approaches taken to determine capacity credit: (1) determine the market value

⁴⁵ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at pp. 32-33.

⁴⁶ 18 C.F.R. 292.304(e)(2)(vii) (providing that avoided cost may value "the smaller increments and shorter lead times available with additions of capacity from qualifying facilities").

⁴⁷ Crossborder 2012 California Study, Appendix B.1.

of avoided capacity; or (2) estimate the marginal costs of operating the marginal generator, typically a CCGT.⁴⁸ For the same reasons that it is less than ideal to rely solely on the future projected market price for energy, it is also unreliable to credit DSG based on the projected future capacity market. The preferred approach is to determine the capacity credit by looking at the capital and O&M costs of the marginal generator.⁴⁹

The resulting value is often termed a capacity credit—a credit for the utility capacity avoided by DSG. It is important to recognize that this credit is different from the “capacity value” of DSG. Capacity value is a term for the percentage of energy delivered as a fraction of what would be delivered if the DSG unit was always working at its rated capacity, that is, as if the sun were directly overhead with no clouds and the temperature was a constant 72 degrees at all times. Capacity value is typically in the range of 15-25% in the United States, depending on location. Because DSG generates electricity during daylight hours, often with high coincidence with peak demand periods, it earns a capacity credit based on the higher value of its generation during the hours in which it operates—a higher amount than simple capacity value. Alternatively, for a utility with an early evening peak or a winter peak, the capacity credit may be based on a lower percentage of its rated capacity than the capacity value.

Once the ELCC is determined for DSG resources for a given utility, the calculation of generation capacity is straightforward. The capacity credit for a DSG system is “the capital cost (\$/MW) of the displaced unit times the effective capacity provided by PV.”⁵⁰ Inherent in the ELCC calculation are the line losses associated with capacity, as discussed earlier.

4. Calculating transmission and distribution capacity

Distributed solar generation, by its nature, is usually located in close proximity to load on the distribution system, which may help reduce congestion and wear and tear on T&D resources. These benefits can reduce, defer, or avoid operating expenses and capital investments. Tactical and strategic targeting of distributed solar resources could increase this value.

The ability of DSG systems to yield T&D benefits is location-specific and also depends on the extent to which system output correlates to cost-causing local load conditions, especially before and during peak load periods. Utilities undertake system resource planning (i.e., planning for upgrades or additions to T&D capacity) to meet peak load conditions, so the correlation of DSG output to peak load conditions is important to understand. On the distribution system, unlike the bulk transmission system, this is a more difficult undertaking because local cost-causing load conditions (i.e., the timing, duration, and ramping rates associated with peak load on a given circuit) will vary according to a number of factors. These factors include customer mix, weather conditions, system age and condition, and others. As a simple example, a circuit that carries predominantly single-family residential load is likely to rise relatively smoothly to a peak in early evening, when solar PV output is waning. A circuit primarily serving

⁴⁸ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at p. 32.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at pp. 32-33.

⁵⁰ *Id.*

commercial customers in a downtown setting will typically peak in the early afternoon. All other things being equal, DSG systems on circuits primarily serving commercial customers are more likely to avoid distribution capacity costs.

It is also important to consider system-wide T&D impacts. Transmission lines, and to an extent, substations, serve enough of a cross-section of the customer base to peak at approximately the same time as the utility as a whole. DSG coincidence with system peak means that DSG, even located on residential circuits, contributes to reduced demand at the substation level and above. Based on interconnection procedures, DSG systems in the aggregate on a circuit do not produce enough to export power off of the circuit; they simply reduce the need for service to the circuit. The avoided need for transmission infrastructure creates an avoided cost value to a utility and should be reflected as a benefit for DSG systems. Combining any granular distribution value with avoided, peak-related transmission costs, all DSG may demonstrate significant T&D value in allowing the utility to defer upgrades or avoid capital investments.

Estimating T&D Capacity Value. To determine the ability of DSG systems to defer T&D upgrades or capacity additions, it is critical to have current information on the system planning activities of utilities, and to periodically update that information. Often, the cost information is obtainable through rate case proceedings, where the utility ultimately seeks to include the upgrade or capital project in rate base. To make use of any cost data, however, it is important to have a sufficient amount of hourly data on both load and solar resource profiles. Much of the relevant information is also contained in utility maintenance cost data, grid upgrade and replacement plans, and capital investment plans. Beyond the planning horizon, expense and investment trends must be extrapolated to match the expected useful generating life of DSG.

With the data in hand, T&D capacity savings potential can be determined in a two-step process.⁵¹ As described by CPR, "The first step is to perform an economic screening of all areas to determine the expansion plan costs and load growth rates for each planning area. The second step is to perform a technical load-matching analysis for the most promising locations."

For solar PV profiles, output can be estimated at particular places using irradiance data and various methods of estimating the output profile.⁵² By looking at the load profile for a year, it is possible to isolate peak days at the circuit or substation level and calculate a capacity credit by measuring the net load with solar PV production. By reducing absolute peak load, DSG systems may allow a utility to avoid overloading transformers, substations or other distribution system components and, thereby, to defer expensive capital upgrades.

To determine deferral value, it is necessary to monetize the length of time that DSG allows a utility to defer a capital upgrade. Deferring an upgrade allows a utility to avoid the carrying cost or the cost of ownership of an asset and defers substantial expenditures that may be, at least to some extent, debt financed. Generally, the

⁵¹ *Id.* at p. 33 (citing T. E. Hoff, *Identifying Distributed Generation and Demand Side Management Investment Opportunities*, *Energy Journal*: 17(4), 1996).

⁵² M. Ralph, A. Ellis, D. Borneo, G. Corey, and S. Baldwin, *Transmission and Distribution Deferral Using PV and Energy Storage*, published in Photovoltaic Specialists Conference (PVSC), 2011 37th IEEE, June 2011, available at <http://energy.sandia.gov/wp/wp-content/gallery/uploads/TransandDistDeferral.pdf>.

avoided capital is multiplied by the utility's weighted average cost of capital or authorized rate of return to determine the value of deferring that investment.⁵³ However, as noted earlier, a lower discount rate could be used. For instance, the avoidance of a million dollar transmission upgrade five years from now—for a utility with a 7% discount rate—is arguably worth that amount divided by $(1.07)^5$, or approximately \$713,000. From the ratepayers' perspective, avoiding the million dollar upgrade in five years might be worth more; based on an estimated inflation rate of 3%, the value would be \$862,000.

System-Wide Marginal Transmission and Distribution Costs. When conducting a statewide or utility-wide analysis, it may be difficult to hone in on specific locations to determine the ability of DSG systems to enable deferment or avoidance of system upgrade activity. In some cases, distribution deferral value manifests in changes in distribution load projection profiles and should be calculated as the difference in what would have happened without the DSG. E3's approach to valuing avoided T&D takes a broader look at the ability to avoid costs and estimates T&D avoided costs in a similar manner to other demand-side programs, such as energy efficiency. E3's avoided cost methodology develops "allocators" to assign capacity value to specific hours in the year and then allocates estimates of marginal T&D costs to hours. E3 acknowledges that it lacks sufficient data to base its allocators on local loads and that, ideally, "T&D allocators would be based upon local loads, and T&D costs would be allocated to the hours with the highest loads."⁵⁴

E3 determined that temperature data, which is available in a more granular form for specific locations in the many climate zones of California's major utilities, would be a suitable proxy method for allocating T&D costs. After determining these allocators and assigning them to specific hours, E3 determined the marginal distribution costs by climate zone, using a load-weighted average. Since marginal transmission costs are specific to each utility, those are added to the marginal distribution costs to arrive at the overall marginal T&D for a specific climate zone. This approach lacks the potential for capturing high-value, location-specific deferral potential, but it does approximate some value without requiring extensive project planning cost and load data for specific feeders, circuits, and substations. E3's methodology may be suitable in circumstances where there is limited local load data to develop what E3 described as an "ideal" methodology, but it does come with drawbacks. For example, allocating costs to certain hours by temperature may not correlate to peak conditions in certain locations.

Alternative Approaches to T&D Valuation. Clean Power Research also approached T&D value broadly in its study of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, taking utility-wide average loads in a conservative approach to valuation. CPR's Pennsylvania and New Jersey report notes that T&D value may vary widely from one feeder to another and that "it would be advisable to . . . systematically identify the highest value areas."⁵⁵

Where information on specific upgrade projects is known, and there is sufficiently detailed local load data, a more detailed analysis of deferral potential should yield far more accurate results that better reflect the T&D value of DSG. For example, CPR was

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ E3 Study, Appendix A at p. 16.

⁵⁵ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at p. 20.

able to take a more granular and area-specific look at T&D deferral values of DSG in its Austin Energy study, where it had specific distribution system costs for discrete sections of the city's distribution system.⁵⁶

In Vermont, the Public Service Department took a reliability-focused approach. Noting that T&D upgrades are driven by reliability concerns, the Department determined that the "critical value is how much generation the grid can rely on seeing at peak times." To capture this benefit, the Department calculated a "reliability" peak coincidence value by calculating the average generator performance of illustrative generators for June, July and August afternoons.⁵⁷ The resulting number reflects the percentage of a system's nameplate capacity that is assumed to be available coincident with peak, as if it is "always running or perfectly dispatchable."⁵⁸ Accordingly, the generation system receives the same treatment as firm capacity in terms of value for providing T&D upgrade deferrals at that coincident level of output.

The risk of the Vermont approach is that it may overstate the ability of certain generators to provide actual deferral of T&D upgrades, since system planners often require absolute assurance that they could meet load in the event that a particular distributed generation unit went down. Another apparent weakness of this approach is the inability to target or identify location-specific values in the dynamic, granular nature of the distribution system.

T&D Capacity Value Summary. Distributed solar systems provide energy at or near the point of energy consumption. When they are generating, the loads they serve are therefore are less dependent on T&D services than other loads. In addition, because DSG provides energy in coincidence with a key driver of consumption—solar insolation—these resources can reduce wear and tear. Calculating the T&D benefits of DSG requires data that allows estimation of marginal T&D energy and capacity related costs. Ideally, utilities will collect location-specific data that can support individualized assessment of DSG system value. In the absence of such data, system-wide estimations of T&D offset and deferral value can be used with reasonable confidence.

5. Calculating grid support (ancillary) services

Grid support services, also referred to as ancillary services in many studies, include VAR support, and voltage ride-through. Existing studies often include estimates of ancillary services benefits as well as costs associated with DSG, as reported in the RMI 2013 Study. Costs, also called grid integration costs, are discussed below.

Currently, DSG systems utilize inverters to change direct current to alternating current with output at a set voltage and without VAR output, and with the presumed functionality of disconnecting in the event of circuit voltage above or below set limits. This disconnection feature has become a concern, as a voltage dip with the loss of a major utility generator could lead to thousands of inverters disconnecting DSG systems, reducing voltage inputs and exacerbating the problem. In practice, inverters could be

⁵⁷ Vermont Study at p. 19 (The Department looked at ten two-axis tracking solar PV systems, four fixed solar PV systems, and two small wind generators.).

⁵⁸ *Id.* at p. 19.

much more functional or "smart"; indeed Germany is in the process of changing out hundreds of thousands of inverters to achieve added functionality.

Because U.S. electrical codes generally preclude inverters that provide ancillary services, many valuation studies have concluded that no ancillary service value should be calculated. While that approach had some merit in the past, when more versatile inverters were generally unavailable and regulatory change seemed far off, the present circumstances warrant a near-term recognition of ancillary services value. With proof of the viability of advanced inverters, it is highly likely that advanced inverters will be standard in the next few years, and ancillary services will be provided by DSG.

A group of Western utilities and transmission planners recently issued a joint letter on the issue of advanced inverters, calling for the deployment as soon as feasible to avoid the sort of cascading problem described above, which could lead to system-wide blackouts.⁵⁹ With the utilities themselves calling for advanced inverter deployment, and costs expected to be only \$150 more than current inverters, there will be good reason to collect the data and develop the techniques to quantify ancillary services benefits of DSG. Modeling these ancillary services is important to inform policy decisions such as whether to require such technology as a condition of interconnection, and under what circumstances.

6. Calculating financial services: fuel price hedge⁶⁰

DSG provides a fuel cost price hedge benefit by reducing reliance on fuel sources that are susceptible to shortages and market price volatility. In addition DSG provides a hedge against uncertainty regarding future regulation of greenhouse gas and other emissions, which also impact fuel prices. DSG customer exports help hedge against these price increases by reducing the volatility risk associated with base fuel prices—effectively blending price stability into the total utility portfolio.

The ideal method to capture the risk premium of natural gas uncertainty is to consider the difference between an investment with "substantial fuel price uncertainty" and one where the uncertainty or risk has been removed, such as through a hypothetical 30-year fixed price gas contract. As CPR explains, a utility could quantitatively set aside the entire fuel cost obligation up front, investing the dollars into a risk free instrument while entering into natural gas futures contracts for future gas needs.⁶¹ Performing this calculation for each year that DSG operates isolates the risk premium and provides the value of the price hedge of avoiding purchases involving that risk premium.

Interestingly, utilities often used to hedge against fuel price volatility, but do less such hedging now. That leads some utilities to conclude that since the fuel price hedge benefit is not avoiding a utility cost, it should not be included. In practice, the risk of fuel price volatility is falling on customers even if the utility is not mitigating the risk. Reducing that risk has value to utility customers, even if the utility would not otherwise protect against it.

⁵⁹ See L. Vestal, *Utility Brass Call for Smart-Inverter Requirement on Solar Installations*, California Energy Markets No. 1244, at p. 10, August 11, 2013.

⁶⁰ Clean Power Research now uses the term "Fuel Price Guarantee" in order to distinguish this benefit from traditional utility fuel price hedging actions.

⁶¹ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at p. 31.

7. Calculating financial services: market price response

Another portfolio benefit of DSG is measured in reductions to market prices for energy and capacity. By reducing demand during peak hours, when the price of electricity is at its highest, DSG reduces the overall load on utility systems and reduces the amount of energy and capacity purchased on the market. In this way, DSG reduces the cost of wholesale energy and capacity to all ratepayers.⁶² This benefit is not captured by E3's methodology; it is reflected in CPR's most recent Pennsylvania and New Jersey study, where it is illustrated and explained in much greater detail.⁶³

The premise of this benefit is that total expenditures on energy and capacity are less with DSG generation than without. The total expenditure, as CPR explains, is the current price of power times the current load at any given point in time. Because the amount of load affects the price of power, a reduced load condition, such as occurs as a result of DSG generation, reduces the market price of all other power purchases at those times.⁶⁴ While this change in market price is incrementally small, it represents a potentially significant system-wide benefit. This means that all customers, including non-solar customers, enjoy the benefit of lower prices during these reduced load conditions. As CPR notes, however, the reduction in price cannot be directly measured, as it is based on a hypothetical of what the price would have been without the load reduction, and must be modeled. The total value of market price reductions is the total cost savings calculated by summing the savings over all time periods during which DSG operates.⁶⁵ A similar analysis for capacity market prices can be conducted as well.

8. Calculating security services: reliability and resiliency

Particularly with the extended blackouts from Hurricane Sandy in 2012, a value is being attributed to added reliability and resiliency due to DSG, at both the grid and the individual customer levels. For grid benefits, this value in particular is difficult to quantify; it depends on the assumed risk of extended blackouts, the assumed cost to strengthen the grid to avoid that risk, and the assumed ability of DSG to strengthen the grid. With utility generation and T&D out of service, DSG can only do so much, and storm conditions often occur during periods of limited sunshine, so it is particularly hard to determine what DSG can do in this regard.

The ancillary services benefit discussed earlier is closely related to this benefit when considering the potential for the grid as a whole to continue operation. Even at the level of a circuit outage, the ancillary services benefit is capturing the value of providing VAR support and voltage ride-through. Arguably, the ancillary services benefit captures this level of grid support.

On the other hand, CPR noted in its first Austin Energy study that reliability and resiliency are very real DSG benefits at the individual customer level. The hospital with traditional backup generation powers up during an outage, and can be supported during a prolonged outage by the addition of DSG. Instead of relying entirely on the traditional generation and a substantial fuel supply, it can get by with less fuel. Likewise the

⁶²*Id.* at 15.

⁶³*Id.* at pp. 33-43.

⁶⁴ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at p. 34.

⁶⁵*Id.* at p. 36.

residential customer with a medical condition requiring certainty can rely on DSG plus battery storage rather than a generator.

To the extent that utilities have an obligation to provide heightened reliability to vulnerable customers, DSG can be counted as avoiding those utility costs. On a larger scale, to the extent that customers enjoy greater reliability than the utility would otherwise provide, that is a benefit to participating customers that can be included.

9. Calculating environmental services

A. Utility avoided compliance costs. The cost of complying with regulatory and statutory environmental requirements is a real operating expense of a generating plant and should be included in the avoided cost of generation. This avoided cost typically is included in the studies as a direct utility cost. In the CPUC's 2010 CSI Impact Evaluation report, conducted by Itron, the CSI general market program and the Self-Generation Incentive Program ("SGIP") were estimated to be responsible for reducing over 400,000 tons of CO₂ emissions in 2010. Additionally, the report estimated that the CSI general market program and the SGIP provided over 52,000 pounds of PM₁₀ and over 92,000 pounds of NO_x emissions reductions in 2010.⁶⁶ These reductions can be quantified and calculated against the market price for the relative compliance instrument. To the extent these values are fully reflected in the cost of the avoided energy, they should not be counted again in a DSG valuation analysis. It is important to account for only residual environmental compliance costs in estimating the benefit of DSG.

While certain emissions credit markets will be geographically tied to a small area with no established compliance market, the markets for NO_x, SO_x, and CO₂ are more readily identified and quantified with publicly available sources. Accordingly, any study of DSG should include the value of avoided compliance costs reflected in air emissions, land use, and any consumption and discharge costs associated with water.

Likewise, utilities in states with Renewable Portfolio Standards ("RPS") avoid RPS compliance costs due to DSG. For example, if a utility must comply with a 20% RPS and has a billion megawatt hours ("MWh") of annual load, it has to secure 200 million MWh of renewable generation. If instead, 100 million MWh is generated by DSG facilities, the utility's annual load is reduced by that amount and its RPS compliance obligation is reduced by 20 million MWh. The utility's cost of procuring those 20 million MWh should be considered, to the extent that the procurement is greater than the utility's avoided natural gas energy and capacity costs already attributed to those 20 million MWh.

Quantification of societal benefits is particularly difficult and controversial. Regarding environmental benefits, avoided utility compliance costs capture what society has decided are the proper tradeoffs of electricity generation for pollution, but society recognizes additional value related to not generating electricity from fossil generation in the first place. If DSG within a given utility service territory avoids a 100 million MWh of gas-fired generation, the utility avoids paying for the required clean up the emissions

⁶⁶ *California Solar Initiative 2010 Impact Evaluation* (California Public Utilities Commission), prepared by Itron, at p. ES-2, 2011, available at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/NR/rdonlyres/E2E189A8-5494-45A1-ACF2-5F48D36A9CA7/0/CSI_2010_Impact_Eval_RevisedFinal.pdf.

that never occurred. However, had the utility generated those 100 million MWh, millions of pounds of pollutants would have gotten past the required emissions controls, and not emitting all of those pollutants is a significant benefit to the society.

While most utility avoided costs benefit the utility's ratepayers directly, societal benefits tend to be spread beyond the utility's customers. Job creation can be expected to center in the utility's service territory, but will also lead to jobs in adjoining service territories. Emissions benefits are even more dispersed. The benefits are regional or global, with utility generation often far removed from utility customers. This is the traditional "tragedy of the commons"⁶⁷ problem, but on a global scale. As with the problem of colonial farmers not having an incentive to care for the commons on which their cows grazed, utilities use the environment but have no incentive to care for it beyond what is legally required. By recognizing the value of not emitting pollutants in a DSG valuation study, analysts capture this value that utilities would otherwise ignore. To say that this benefit is realized by society, but somehow not by utility customers, is to ignore the reality that society is made up of utility customers.

Again, we use the benefits categories outlined in the RMI 2013 Study, of which the last three address societal benefits and are listed here.

B. Carbon. The RMI 2013 Study breaks out carbon as a separate avoided cost, based on the significant uncertainty of carbon regulation. On the one hand, carbon markets and restrictions on carbon emissions have been frequently discussed, and tied to climate change. On the other hand, almost no carbon restrictions are currently in place, despite all of the discussion. Studies now five years old that presumed carbon costs by 2013 have been proven wrong. However, with the establishment of a carbon market in California, and the continuation of carbon markets in Europe, the likelihood of carbon costs throughout the U.S. is well beyond zero.

Even in the absence of a carbon market or carbon restrictions, the benefits of not emitting carbon are considered to be real by many people. While some have touted the benefits of carbon for plant life, the widespread view appears to be that emitting more carbon has a negative impact. One way to approach this is to consider what customers are willing to pay for reduced emissions of both carbon and other matter. For instance, Austin Energy uses the premium value for their GreenChoice® green power product in the absence of compliance cost information in its Value of Solar rate.

Another carbon valuation option is to use the added utility cost to comply with RPS targets. The argument for this approach is that if society has determined that a 20% RPS is appropriate, and renewable energy costs an extra \$10 per MWh to procure, then it would presumably value additional avoided emissions (both carbon and other matter) at the same rate. However, RPS systems are compliance systems that integrate price impact controls, credit trading schemes, and other features that impact compliance certificate prices without direct relationship to the value of associated emissions reductions. Caution should be used in applying a regulatory system designed to minimize the cost of compliance with an effort to accurately value benefits net of costs.

⁶⁷ G. Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons," *Science* 13 December 1968: 1243-1248. Available at: <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/162/3859/1243.full?sid=f031fb58-2f56-4c25-ac0e-d802771c92ef>

Where a state has a RPS mandate for its utilities, DSG provides a dual benefit. First, it lowers the number of retail sales that comprise the compliance baseline. Second, it results in the export of 100% renewable generation to the grid to offset some mix of renewable and fossil-fuel generation being produced to meet customer load.⁶⁸ The first benefit was discussed above, under avoided utility compliance costs. The second benefit accounts for the fact that energy exports from DSG are 100% renewable generation and arguably should be valued at 100% of the RPS value for purposes of a cost-benefit study.⁶⁹

Another way to look at this is to say that all exports from a DSG system should receive the value of a market-priced renewable energy certificate, even where such a generator cannot easily create a tradable certificate.⁷⁰ This is justified because DSG exports help meet other customers' load on the utility's grid with 100% renewable energy and displace grid delivered electricity, which is only partially renewable. If a state has an RPS of 33% renewables, as does California, then DSG exports give rise to at least a 67% improvement in the renewable component of electricity.⁷¹

C. Airborne Emissions Other than Carbon and Health Benefits. Exceeding utility compliance with air regulations can be taken into account in a manner akin to that described for valuation of avoided carbon emissions. The public health impacts of fossil fuel generation have been well documented, though not well reflected in electricity pricing. In particular, air pollution can increase the severity of asthma attacks and other respiratory illnesses in vulnerable populations living in close proximity to fossil fuel-fired plants. Impacts on crops and forest lands have also been documented.

DSG reduces fossil fuel generation, especially from less efficient peaker plants and potentially from thermal plants that emit higher levels of pollution during startup operations. We are not aware of a dominant methodology, but note that public health literature will continue to grow in the area of recognizing and quantifying the public health impacts of electric generation, including health impacts related to climate change. Valuing emissions of carbon and other matter based on green energy pricing programs or RPS compliance costs, as described earlier, is an effective way to capture this benefit. Even outside of states with such programs, the value of reduced emissions is not zero; the value ascribed by nearby states with programs could serve as a proxy.

D. Avoided Water Pollution and Conservation Benefits. The utility industry uses and consumes a substantial portion of the nation's freshwater supplies for thermoelectric generation.⁷² The benefit of not using the water for fossil-fuel generation should be

⁶⁸ A third benefit associated with reducing overall market costs for renewable energy certificates may also manifest with increased DSG penetration.

⁶⁹ Crossborder 2013 California Study at pp.18-21.

⁷⁰ For example, owners of California NEM systems rarely bother to establish RECs related to their output given required documentation, and the treatment of RECs from NEM systems in a lower value "bucket" than RECs from systems with in-state wholesale sales to utilities.

⁷¹ Crossborder 2013 California Study at p. 18.

⁷² *How It Works: Water for Energy* (Union of Concerned Scientists), July 2013, available at http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_energy/our-energy-choices/energy-and-water-use/water-energy-electricity-overview.html.

based on the value of the water to society, that is, the value of conserving water for other beneficial uses.

Valuing water is intrinsically difficult. The tangle of water rights laws among the states complicate the determination of water value. To the extent that utilities have specific contracts for delivery or withdrawal of water to serve particular plants, it is likely that those expenses are already captured as an operating expense of the plant, but those are often at historic, ultra-low rates. Where a plant uses potable water, the value should be based on what society is willing to pay for that water. Likewise, where a plant is using non-potable, reclaimed water for cooling purposes, the appropriate value might be the price that someone would pay for an alternate use, such as irrigation.

The value to society of conserving water, which is of growing importance in water constrained regions of the country, is not adequately captured by the contract price for water or in the retail price that one would pay for an alternate use. We are not aware of a dominant methodology for measuring the conservation value of water, but this value should be considered as utilities consume a tremendous amount of water each year and will be increasingly competing for finite water resources. Avoiding the increased risk associated with maintaining secure, reliable, and affordable supplies of water is a benefit that DSG, with its 30-year expected operating life, delivers to all customers of the utility system.

10. Calculating social services: economic development

Installation and construction associated with onsite generation facilities is inherently local in nature, as contractors or installers must be within reasonably close geographic proximity to economically install a system and be present for building inspections. Accordingly, the solar industry creates local jobs and generates revenue locally. Economic activity associated with the growing rooftop solar industry creates additional tax revenue at the state and local levels as installers purchase supplies, goods and other related services subject to state and local sales tax, and pay payroll taxes. Locally spent dollars displace those frequently sent out of state for fuel and other supplies.

Taking a conservative approach, CPR's Pennsylvania and New Jersey study focused solely on tax enhancement value, which derives from the jobs created by the PV industry in those states. CPR used representative job creation numbers from previous studies in Ontario and Germany that quantify the number of jobs created by installing a unit of solar PV. CPR used assumptions that construction of solar PV involves a higher concentration of locally traceable jobs than construction of a centralized CCGT plant and determined the net local benefit of a solar project on the economy.

There remains a legitimate regulatory policy question of whether economic development benefits should be considered in calculating the value of DSG for use in setting electricity rates, or avoided cost calculations, even though there is a long history of economic development factors influencing commercial rates and line-extension fees. In any event, the economic development and tax base benefits of DSG deployment and operation should be considered when evaluating the societal cost-effectiveness of the technology and policies to support it.

Checklist of Key Requirements for a Thorough Evaluation of DSG Benefits

- ☑ **Energy benefits should be based on the utility not running a CT or a CCGT.** It is highly unlikely that DSG will offset coal or nuclear generation. Some combination of intermediate and peaking natural gas generation, with widely accepted natural gas price forecasts, should establish the energy value.
- ☑ **Line losses should be based on marginal losses.** Losses are related to load and DSG lowers circuit loads, which in turn lowers losses for utility service to other customers. Average line losses do not capture all of the loss savings; any study needs to capture both the losses related to the energy not delivered to the customer and the reduced losses to serve customers who do not have DSG.
- ☑ **Generation capacity benefits should be evaluated from day one.** DSG should be credited for capacity based on its Effective Load Carrying Capacity ("ELCC") from the day it is installed. If the utility has adequate capacity already, it may not have taken into account DSG penetration in its planning and overbuilt other generation; the DSG units that are actually operating during utility peaks should be credited with capacity value rather than a plant that is never deployed.
- ☑ **T&D capacity benefits should be assessed.** If the utility has any transmission plans, then DSG is helping to defer a major expense and should be included. On distribution circuits, watch for a focus on circuits serving residential customers, which tend to peak in the early evening when solar energy is minimal. Circuits serving commercial customers tend to peak during the early afternoon on sunny days, and a capacity value should be recognized for them in the form of avoided or deferred investment costs.
- ☑ **Ancillary services should be evaluated.** Inverters that can provide grid support are being mass-produced, and utility CEOs in the United States are calling for their use; ancillary services will almost certainly be available in the near future. Modeling the costs and benefits of ancillary services can also inform policy decisions like those related to interconnection technology requirements, and provides a hedging benefit.
- ☑ **A fuel price hedge value should be included.** In the past, utilities regularly bought natural gas futures contracts or secured long-term contracts to avoid price volatility. The fact that this is rarely done now and the customer is bearing the price volatility risk does not diminish the fact that adding solar generation reduces the reliance on fuels and provides a hedging benefit.
- ☑ **A market price response should be included.** DSG reduces the utility's demand for energy and capacity from the marketplace, and reducing demand lowers market prices. That means that the utility can purchase for less, saving money.
- ☑ **Grid reliability and resiliency benefits should be assessed.** Blackouts cause widespread economic losses that can be avoided in some situations with DSG. As well, customers who need more reliable service than average can be served with a combination of DSG, storage and generation that is less expensive than the otherwise necessary standby generator.
- ☑ **The utility's avoided environmental compliance costs should be evaluated.** DSG leads to less utility generation, and lower emissions of NO_x, SO_x and particulates, lowering the utilities costs to capture those pollutants.
- ☑ **Societal benefits should be assessed.** DSG policies were implemented on the basis of environmental, health and economic benefits, and should not be ignored or not quantified.

V. Recommendations for Calculating the Costs of DSG

Distributed solar generation comes with a variety of costs. These include the costs for the purchase and installation of the DSG equipment, the costs associated with interconnecting DSG to the electric grid, the costs of incentives, the cost associated with administration and billing, and indirect costs associated with lost revenues and other system-wide impacts. As with cost of service regulation in general, the important principles of cost causation and cost allocation are critical in dealing with DSG costs as well.

DSG cost estimation depends on the perspective from which one seeks to examine policies. Some costs, depending on perspective, should not be treated as costs in a DSG valuation study at all. For example, the cost of a DSG system net of incentives and compensation that the individual solar customer ultimately bears—the net investment cost, does not impact other customers. Whether a customer pays \$100,000 or \$20,000 for a five kilowatt (“kW”) DSG system, the avoided utility costs and the societal benefits are unchanged.

In general, solar valuation studies address costs in varying degrees according to the aim of the individual study. A convenient way to characterize solar costs is according to who bears them. Costs relevant to determining value or cost effectiveness can generally be grouped into three categories:

1. **Customer Costs**—Customer costs are costs incurred by or accruing to the customers who use DSG. These include purchase and installation costs, insurance costs, maintenance costs, and inverter replacement, all net of incentives or payments received.
2. **Utility and Ratepayer Costs**—Utility and ratepayer costs are costs incurred by the utility and ratepayers due to the operation of DSG systems in the utility grid. These include integration and ancillary services costs, billing and metering costs, administration costs, and rebate and incentive expenses. In NEM valuation studies, utility lost revenues are potentially a significant utility cost, under the assumption that there are no other mechanisms to adjust for these losses.⁷³
3. **Decline in Value for Incremental Solar Additions at High Market Penetration**—A number of studies also identify modeled impacts associated with significant penetration of solar on the utility system. Most studies characterize low penetration as less than 5% of peak demand or total energy met by solar generation, and characterize high penetration as 10%-15% or more. These

⁷³ Lost revenues arise when market penetration of consumption-reducing measures like energy efficiency and distributed generation have sales impacts that exceed those forecasted in the last rate-setting procedure, and only last until the next rate-setting, when a true-up can occur. Between rate cases, trackers or other mechanisms to mitigate impacts of regulatory lag can also be installed. Valuation studies themselves do not dictate whether lost revenues occur or are recovered. This is a function of tariff design. In some jurisdictions, for example, stand-by charges are used to adjust for revenue losses under NEM. In others, Buy All-Sell All arrangements or Net Billing models are used.

impacts can be accounted for as a cost or as an adjustment to value credit for solar energy when long-term impacts are considered.

When evaluating the cost-effectiveness of NEM, most utilities have access to cost-of-service data that can measure energy-related impacts. As noted earlier, the most direct and obvious source of potential cost or benefit of NEM policy is the mechanism that sets NEM customers apart from general ratepayers—the ability to use electricity not consumed instantaneously (i.e., exported energy) against future purchases of electricity in the form of a kWh or monetary bill credit. The value that customers derive from these bill credits is solely assignable to NEM as a policy, as distinguished from changes in behind-the-meter consumption that could occur under PURPA, in the absence of NEM policy. Accordingly, it is only appropriate to examine the net value of exports, and not behind the meter consumption, as a cost to non-participating ratepayers. It is also appropriate to note that NEM export costs are likely different depending on the class of customer generating excess solar energy. The good news is that the easy starting point for calculating NEM export energy costs is the monthly sum of the bill credits appearing on the customer bill, already adjusted by customer class. These credit costs can then be netted against the value of avoided produced or purchased energy.

1. Recommendations for calculating customer costs

Most value of solar studies focus on utility, ratepayer, and society costs, but not private costs. Therefore, these studies do not address customer investments or expenses in DSG. On the other hand, these costs are part of the total cost effectiveness of solar and have been addressed in broader societal perspective studies or in evaluating cost effectiveness for a solar incentive program. NEM and VOST programs are not intended to be incentive programs, but rather to fairly compensate customers for DSG.

When customer costs are included for a broader societal test, a major challenge in evaluating forward-looking solar customer costs associated with a long-term policy relates to accurately predicting the market prices for solar systems and installation as well as maintenance costs.

Regarding customer O&M costs, NREL has estimated costs between 0.05 and 0.15 cents per kWh.⁷⁴ E3 estimates customer O&M costs at \$20 per kW with an escalator of .02% per year, factors inverter replacement at \$25 per kW, once every 10 years, and estimates insurance expenses at \$20 per kW, escalating at .02% per year.⁷⁵ Together, these O&M costs are fractions of a cent when converted to kWh, in line with the NREL estimate.

As noted, customer costs are rarely relevant to DSG policy valuation studies. The relevant question when evaluating DSG programs is what the net effect is on other utility customers.

2. Recommendations for calculating utility costs

⁷⁴ *Photovoltaics Value Analysis* (National Renewable Energy Laboratory), February 2008, available at <http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/pdfs/42303.pdf>.

⁷⁵ *Technical Potential for Local Distributed Photovoltaics in California: Preliminary Assessment* (Energy & Environmental Economics, Inc.), March 2012 ("E3 Technical Potential Study 2012"), available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/NR/rdonlyres/8A822C08-A56C-4674-A5D2-099E48B41160/0/LDPVPotentialReportMarch2012.pdf>.

The most significant utility cost for NEM program valuation purposes is avoided revenue. A customer who used to pay \$1000 per year to her utility and then installed a NEM system and cut her bills to only \$200 per year is seen as costing the utility \$800 of lost revenue. Again, to the extent that the customer could install the same system under PURPA and reduce her bill to \$300 per year, the net cost of the NEM program would only be \$100, representing the extra savings that she realized due to the NEM program. For a VOST program, the intent is to determine the value of the benefits and credit that amount to customers for all generation. In effect, the cost of the program is automatically equated to the benefits of the program, net of charges for consumption or network services.

The second largest utility or societal cost of DSG programs is the cost of incentives, though this cost is declining rapidly. Incentive costs are direct costs when the utility provides the funding from ratepayers, but are indirect when considering taxpayer-funded incentives. While incentive costs are real, they are primarily justified on market-stimulation bases, and scheduled to expire in a matter of years. Given that independent rationale for incentives, incentive costs are generally not included in DSG valuations. As the installed cost of DSG has declined, the need for incentives and rebates has diminished, with the California market reaching the end of its state incentive program almost entirely, and federal incentives slated to end in 2016.

Integration costs are the third most important utility cost for NEM programs, and the leading factor for value of solar studies addressing utility costs. Integration costs include the direct costs associated with administration of utility functions associated with distributed solar systems, rebates and incentives, and other administrative tasks. Direct costs can be addressed as a cost or as a decrement to the benefits of DSG, since these costs enable the benefits.

Reports of utility costs vary most significantly with the assumed solar penetration rate used in the study. Integration costs are variously labeled as "integration costs," "grid support expenses," or "benefits overhead." Estimates of these costs range from 0.1 to 1 cent per kWh in studies that attempt to account for increased variability in the overall generation mix and resulting increases in ancillary services costs starting from very low solar penetration rates. Solar integration costs for a 15% market penetration level were estimated at 2.2 to 2.3 cents per kWh by Perez and Hoff, based on an analysis that focuses on the need and cost of storage to complement solar intermittency in order to provide firm capacity.⁷⁶ Navigant and Sandia performed an assessment of high penetration of utility scale solar in 2011 and estimated integration costs associated with increasing production to account for solar variability at between 0.31 cents for low penetration and 0.82 cents for higher penetration of roughly one gigawatt of installed solar.⁷⁷

In states like California, where utilities are prohibited from charging solar customers for interconnection costs or upgrades, interconnection costs may be a substantial source of costs directly assignable to a DSG program. Where this is the case, it is necessary to have real, disaggregated data that tracks the exact interconnection costs of DSG. In

⁷⁶ CPR 2012 MSEIA Study at p. 47.

⁷⁷ *Large Scale PV Integration Study* (Navigant), July 2011, available at <http://www.navigant.com/insights/library/energy/2011/large-scale-pv-integration-study/>.

the E3 study, for example, utilities did not have sufficient detail on interconnection costs in 2009 to provide a clear or transparent picture on the extent of those costs, or whether the costs incurred were reasonable and not blended in with other upgrades that would have occurred without the solar generator's interconnection. Interconnection costs should, in theory, be clearly identifiable through utility-provided data. In analyzing the value of distributed solar, these costs should also be amortized against the useful life of the measures.

In states where customers are responsible for interconnection costs and upgrades, however, this would not be a cost assignable to DSG policy. As with other customer costs, this is not a cost borne by the utility and should not be factored into an evaluation of the impact of a DSG policy on other customers.

Experience and more sophisticated modeling will be required to understand the shape and ultimate level of the integration cost curve. While integration costs are likely low at low market penetration levels, they are also likely to increase with market penetration. But these increases may decline as solar systems become more widely dispersed and as utilities begin targeting deployment to high-value locations within the grid. In addition, increased deployment of other distributed technologies, such as electric vehicles, distributed storage, load control, and smart grid technologies will impact the costs associated with larger scale DSG deployment.

The billing and administration costs associated with DSG encompass the one-time setup expenses of processing and verifying applications and the ongoing expense of administering unique features of solar customer bills. In states with modest numbers of solar customers, it is not uncommon to manually adjust solar customer bills, with associated incremental costs. Depending on the utility's accounting practices and billing capabilities, solar-specific billings cost should be relatively easily segregated and allocated. In states with automated processes, the ongoing incremental costs of administering solar customer accounts should be, as was determined in the Vermont study, nearly zero.⁷⁸

In some cases, utilities will incur costs directly associated with DSG that are not fairly assignable to DSG policy. For example, in Texas, renewable energy generators under one MW are classed as "microgenerators," subject to registration and reporting requirements under the state's renewable energy portfolio standard law.⁷⁹ To the extent that the utility acts as a program manager and aggregator of renewable energy certificates assigned by solar generators, these costs are not fairly assigned to NEM or other solar promotional program unless also offset by the value of the assigned certificates.

3. Recommendations for calculating decline in value for incremental solar additions at high market penetration

The incremental positive value of additional solar deployment within a particular utility service territory is anticipated to decline as solar penetration levels increase. There are two major drivers of these impacts, which are not technically costs, but actually

⁷⁸ Vermont Study at p. 15.

⁷⁹ See 16 Tex. Admin. Code 15, available at <http://www.puc.texas.gov/agency/rulesnlaws/subrules/electric/25.173/25.173.pdf>.

decrement adjustments that impact value of solar in the context of expanding markets and higher solar penetration.

These impacts address the value of additional deployments and not past installations, and not replacement installations. The two major drivers are the expected reduction in capacity credit for solar and reduced peak energy value as market penetration increases. Capacity credits for solar are typically higher than capacity factor due to good solar coincidence with peak demand periods. However, as more solar is added to a system, the difference between peak and non-peak demand dissipates. Without storage, solar has a limited ability to reduce a system peak that is essentially shifted forward into evening hours. As a result, the incremental capacity benefit of solar is reduced for incremental additions as penetration increases. This impact could reduce capacity credit by 20-40% as penetration rates approach 15%.⁸⁰

To the extent that solar energy is generated at periods of high utility cost, it provides great value. As the penetration rate of solar increases, peak market prices are likely suppressed, reducing the value of incremental solar energy. E3 estimated the reduced energy value at 15% over ten years in a study for California.⁸¹

Much work is needed in measuring and modeling the impact of high penetrations of DSG to address exactly how much DSG creates high penetration impacts, and inserting this clarity in valuation and cost effectiveness studies. Most states receive less than 0.5% of peak energy from distributed solar generation, while most studies looking at high penetration model levels at 10-15%. As noted earlier, the most relevant costs to consider are those that will occur at more modest penetrations. For example, if capacity benefits decline significantly at higher penetrations, that does not justify finding low capacity benefits at early stages.

Other important issues to be addressed include the impacts of different assumptions regarding geographic region, system size, and long-term changes in energy demand. It is important to note that both the capacity credit and energy value deterioration could be mitigated through consideration of energy sales from areas of high solar penetration to areas of lower penetration. For example, utilities facing near term surplus capacity situations could incur short-term lost revenues that could be mitigated over the period that solar systems operate, creating the potential for net benefits over that longer term.

⁸⁰ See LBNL Utility Solar Study 2012, *supra*, footnote 13.

⁸¹ See E3 Technical Potential Study 2012, *supra*, footnote 74.

Checklist of Key Requirements for a Thorough Evaluation of DSG Costs

- ☑ **Is lost revenue or utility costs the basis of the study?** For NEM studies, lost revenue is the standard (what the DSG customer would have otherwise paid the utility). For other studies and even some NEM studies, the cost to serve the DSG customer is addressed instead, which should lead to an inquiry in particular regarding allocation of capacity costs.
- ☑ **Assumptions about administrative costs must reflect an industrywide move towards automation.** With higher penetration, costs per DSG customer tend to decline, so administrative costs should assume automation of processes.
- ☑ **Interconnection costs should not be included.** If the DSG customer pays for the interconnection, this should not be included as a cost to the utility. As well, the utility's interconnection costs should be compared to national averages to determine whether they are reasonable.
- ☑ **Integration costs should not be based on unrealistic future penetration levels.** Studies tend to find minimal grid upgrade requirements at DSG penetrations below a few percent. Looking ahead to what the grid might need to accommodate 50% penetration unnecessarily adds costs that are not actually being incurred.

VI. Conclusion

Valuations vary by utility, but valuation methodologies should not. In this report IREC and Rabago Consulting LLC suggests a standardized approach for calculating DSG benefits and costs that we hope proves helpful to regulators as they embark on commissioning or reviewing valuation studies. Please see the mini-guide at the end of this report for a quick reference guide to the recommendations in this report.



REGULATOR'S MINI-GUIDEBOOK

Calculating the Benefits and Costs of Distributed Solar Generation

Valuations vary by utility, but valuation methodologies should not. IREC and Rábago Energy LLC suggest a standardized approach for calculating DSG benefits and costs in the white paper "A REGULATOR'S GUIDEBOOK: Calculating the Benefits and Costs of Distributed Solar Generation." We hope that this paper proves helpful to regulators as they embark on commissioning or reviewing valuation studies. Below is a high-level summary of the recommendations in the white paper. Please see the full report for more detail per section.

A. KEY QUESTIONS TO ASK AT THE ONSET OF A STUDY

Q1: WHAT DISCOUNT RATE WILL BE USED?

Recommendation: We recommend using a lower discount rate for DSG than a typical utility discount rate to account for differences in DSG economics.

Q2: WHAT IS BEING CONSIDERED – ALL GENERATION OR EXPORTS ONLY?

Recommendation: We recommend assessing only DSG exports to the grid.

Q3: OVER WHAT TIMEFRAME WILL THE STUDY EXAMINE THE BENEFITS AND COSTS OF DSG?

Recommendation: Expect DSG to last for thirty years, as that matches the life span of the technology given historical performance and product warranties. Interpolate between current market prices (or knowledge) and the most forward market price available or data that can accurately be estimated, just as planners do for fossil-fired generators that are expected to last for decades.

Q4: WHAT DOES UTILITY LOAD LOOK LIKE IN THE FUTURE?

Recommendation: Given that NEM resources are interconnected behind customer meters, and result in lower utility loads, the utility can plan for lower loads than it otherwise would have. In contrast, other DSG rate or program options involving sale of all output to the utility do not reduce utility loads, but rather the customer facilities contribute to the available capacity of utility resources.

Q5: WHAT LEVEL OF MARKET PENETRATION FOR DSG IS ASSUMED IN THE FUTURE?

Recommendation: The most important penetration level to consider for policy purposes is the next increment: what is likely to happen in the next three to five years. If a utility currently has 0.1% of its needs met by DSG, consideration of whether growth to 1% or even 5% is cost-effective is relevant, but consideration of whether higher penetrations are cost-effective can be considered at a future date.

Q6: WHAT MODELS ARE USED TO PROVIDE ANALYTICAL INPUTS?

Recommendation: Transparent input models that all stakeholders can access will establish a foundation for greater confidence in the results of the DSG studies. When needed, the use of non-disclosure agreements can be used to overcome data sharing sensitivities.

Q7: WHAT GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES ARE ASSUMED IN THE ANALYSIS?

Recommendation: It is important to account for the range in local values that characterize the broader geographical area selected for the study. In some cases, quantification according to similar geographical sub-regions may be appropriate.

Q8: WHAT SYSTEM BOUNDARIES ARE ASSUMED?

Recommendation: It may also be appropriate to consider impacts associated with adjacent utility systems, especially at higher (above 10%) penetration levels of DSG.⁸²

Q9: FROM WHOSE PERSPECTIVE ARE BENEFITS AND COSTS MEASURED?

Recommendation: We recommend that ratepayer and societal benefits and costs should be assessed.

Q10: ARE BENEFITS AND COSTS ESTIMATED ON AN ANNUALIZED OR LEVELIZED BASIS?

Recommendation: We recommend use of a levelized approach to estimating benefits and costs over the full assumed DSG life of 30 years. Levelization involves calculating the stream of benefits and costs over an extended period and discounting to a single present value. Such levelized estimates are routinely used by utilities in evaluating alternative and competing resource options.

B. DATA SETS NEEDED FROM UTILITIES

- ☑ The five or ten-year forward price of natural gas, the most likely fuel for marginal generation, along with longer-term projections in line with the life of the DSG
- ☑ Hourly load shapes, broken down by customer class to analyze the intra-class and inter-class impacts of NEM policy
- ☑ Hourly production profiles for NEM generators, including south-facing and west-facing arrays
- ☑ Line losses based on hourly load data, so that marginal avoided line losses due to DSG can be calculated
- ☑ Both the initial capital cost and the fixed and variable O&M costs for the utility's marginal generation unit

⁸² Mills and Wiser point out that consideration of inter-system sales of capacity or renewable energy credits could mitigate reductions in incremental solar value that could accompany high penetration rates. See A. Mills & R. Wiser, *An Evaluation of Solar Valuation Methods Used in Utility Planning and Procurement Processes* (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), LBNL-5933E, at p. 23, December 2012 (not Processes energy credits could available at <http://emp.lbl.gov/publications/evaluation-solar-valuation-methods-used-utility-planning-and-procurement-processes>).

- ☑ Distribution planning costs that identify the capital and O&M cost (fixed and variable) of constructing and operating distribution upgrades that are necessary to meet load growth
- ☑ Hourly load data for individual distribution circuits, particularly those with current or expected higher than average penetrations of DSG, in order to capture the potential for avoiding or deferring circuit upgrades

Note: where a utility or jurisdiction does not regularly collect some portion of this data, there may be methods to estimate a reasonable value to assign to DSG.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ASSESSING BENEFITS

1. The following benefits should be assessed:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Energy | 6. Financial: Fuel Price Hedge |
| 2. System Losses | 7. Financial: Market Price Response |
| 3. Generation Capacity | 8. Security: Reliability and Resiliency |
| 4. Transmission and Distribution Capacity | 9. Environment: Carbon & Other Factors |
| 5. Grid Support Services | 10. Social: Economic Development |

2. **Energy benefits should be based on the utility not running a CT or a CCGT.** It is highly unlikely that DSG will offset coal or nuclear generation. Some combination of intermediate and peaking natural gas generation, with widely accepted natural gas price forecasts, should establish the energy value.
3. **Line losses should be based on marginal losses.** Losses are related to load and DSG lowers circuit loads, which in turn lowers losses for utility service to other customers. Average line losses do not capture all of the loss savings; any study needs to capture both the losses related to the energy not delivered to the customer and the reduced losses to serve customers who do not have DSG.
4. **Generation capacity benefits should be evaluated from day one.** DSG should be credited for capacity based on its Effective Load Carrying Capacity ("ELCC") from the day it is installed. If the utility has adequate capacity already, it may not have taken into account DSG penetration in its planning and overbuilt other generation; the DSG units that are actually operating during utility peaks should be credited with capacity value rather than a plant that is never deployed.
5. **T&D capacity benefits should be assessed.** If the utility has any transmission plans, then DSG is helping to defer a major expense and should be included. On distribution circuits, watch for a focus on circuits serving residential customers, which tend to peak in the early evening when solar energy is minimal. Circuits serving commercial customers tend to peak during the early afternoon on sunny days, and a capacity value should be recognized for them in the form of avoided or deferred investment costs.
6. **Ancillary services should be evaluated.** Inverters that can provide grid support are being mass-produced, and utility CEOs in the United States are calling for

their use; ancillary services will almost certainly be available in the near future. Modeling the benefits and costs of ancillary services can also inform policy decisions like those related to interconnection technology requirements.

7. **A fuel price hedge value should be included.** In the past, utilities regularly bought natural gas futures contracts or secured long-term contracts to avoid price volatility. The fact that this is rarely done now and that the customer is bearing the price volatility risk does not diminish the fact that adding solar generation reduces the reliance on fuels and provides a hedging benefit.
8. **A market price response should be included.** DSG reduces the utility's demand for energy and capacity from the marketplace, and reducing demand lowers market prices. That means that the utility can purchase these services for less, saving money.
9. **Grid reliability and resiliency benefits should be assessed.** Blackouts cause widespread economic losses that can be reduced or avoided in some situations with DSG. As well, customers who need more reliable service than average can be served with a combination of DSG, storage and generation that is less expensive than the otherwise necessary standby generator.
10. **The utility's avoided environmental compliance and residual environmental costs should be evaluated.** DSG leads to less utility generation, and lower emissions of NOx, SOx and particulates, lowering the utilities costs to capture or control those pollutants.
11. **Societal benefits should be assessed.** DSG policies were implemented on the basis of environmental, health and economic benefits, which should not be ignored and should be quantified.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ASSESSING COSTS

1. **Determine whether lost revenue or utility costs are the basis of the study.** For NEM studies, lost revenue is the standard (what the DSG customer would have otherwise paid the utility). For other studies and even some NEM studies, the cost to serve the DSG customer is addressed instead, which should lead to an inquiry in particular regarding allocation of capacity costs.
2. **Assumptions about administrative costs should reflect an industry-wide move towards automation.** With higher penetration, costs per DSG customer tend to decline, so administrative costs should assume automation of processes.
3. **Interconnection costs should not be included.** If the DSG customer pays for the interconnection, this should not be included as a cost to the utility. As well, the utility's interconnection costs should be compared to national averages to determine whether they are reasonable.
4. **Integration costs should not be based on unrealistic future penetration levels.** Studies tend to find minimal grid upgrade requirements at DSG penetrations below a few percent. Looking ahead to what the grid might need to accommodate 50% penetration unnecessarily adds costs that are not actually being incurred.