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Historical scaling trends and impacts
A decade of turbine scaling in the US: larger rotors outpaced greater turbine capacity, leading to lower “specific power”

- The average tower or hub height has only grown by 12% since 2009: from 79 m to 88 m
- The swept area of the rotor (m²) has *doubled* since 2009, outpacing the 40% growth in capacity rating (W), resulting in a 30% reduction in specific power (W/m²): from 329 W/m² to 230 W/m²
A visual representation of scaling

• The most-noticeable difference between the 2009 and 2018 average turbines is the growth in rotor swept area (growth in tower height and capacity are comparatively modest)

• Later, we’ll analyze the prospects of a much-larger, low-specific-power (“Low SP”) turbine
Focusing only on changes in specific power (W/m²), by holding capacity (and tower height) constant

- For a given/fixed turbine capacity (e.g., 5 MW), the reduction in average specific power from 329 W/m² in 2009 to 230 W/m² in 2018 is equivalent to increasing blade length by 20%

- 20% longer blades expand the swept area of the rotor by 44% ($\pi r^2$)

- The 44% greater swept area captures more of the wind energy flowing by the turbine, causing the generator to run closer to (or at) full capacity more often—leading to a higher capacity factor

- Later, we’ll analyze the impacts of reducing specific power to 150 W/m²—the equivalent of a 50% increase in blade length compared to 2009 (or a 25% increase compared to 2018), assuming a constant 5 MW capacity
Deployment of taller towers and lower-specific-power turbines as of the end of 2018

- Low-specific-power turbines have been deployed at low- and high-wind-speed sites
- Tall towers concentrated in Great Lakes and Northeast regions (greater wind shear)

Low-specific-power projects

Tall-tower projects
Lower specific power has driven capacity factors higher, enabling lower PPA prices and LCOE.

Sample includes 614 projects totaling 63.2 GW built from 2009-2017.

Estimated Wind Resource Quality at Site:
- Specific Power ≥ 400 (1.8 GW)
- Specific Power range of 350–400 (1.6 GW)
- Specific Power range of 300–350 (21.2 GW)
- Specific Power range of 250–300 (19.6 GW)
- Specific Power < 250 (19.0 GW)

70% decline in average PPA price since 2009.

60% reduction in average LCOE since 2009.
Geospatial LCOE analysis of future scaling scenarios
The analysis presented on the next few slides relies on wind speed data from NREL’s Wind Integration National Dataset (WIND) Toolkit (https://www.nrel.gov/grid/wind-toolkit.html), a national mesoscale wind-resource data set that includes meteorological data for more than 1.85 million locations in the contiguous United States (each pixel in the data set reflects a 2-km-by-2-km grid cell).

But will this trend towards taller, lower-SP turbines continue? We analyzed several different turbine configurations...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nameplate Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>2018 Avg</th>
<th>Constant SP</th>
<th>Low SP</th>
<th>High SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotor Diameter (m)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Height (m)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>153.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Power (W/m²)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CapEx Assumptions by Scenario (2018 $/kW)</td>
<td>Favor Low SP</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favor High SP</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of hub height (HH) and specific power (SP) on capacity factor (CF) across the US

2018 Avg is the reference turbine

- Raising HH from 88 m to 140 m boosts median capacity factor (CF) by 7 percentage points
- Reducing SP from 230 W/m² to 150 W/m² boosts median CF by another 7 percentage points
- High SP turbine benefits from higher hub height (140 m), but is hurt by higher SP (270 W/m²)
If all three turbine configurations had the same CapEx, their LCOE distributions across the US would look like this...

This is the “Favor Low SP” scenario, which assumes that all three turbines have a CapEx of $1500/kW

Given identical CapEx, their LCOE distributions are driven solely by the capacity factor differences shown on the previous slide (all else being equal)

Thus, no surprise that the Low SP turbine has the lowest median LCOE, followed by Constant SP and High SP
Even under less-favorable CapEx scenarios, Low SP fares well

In all three scenarios:
• The Constant SP turbine (the point of reference) has a CapEx of $1500/kW
• The Low SP turbine always has a lower LCOE than the Constant SP turbine

In the “Reference” scenario, the median LCOE for Low SP is $6/MWh less than for Constant SP ($7/MWh less than High SP)

The High SP turbine only beats Constant SP—and also starts to encroach upon Low SP—in the “Favor High SP” scenario

Conclusion: Low SP has a lot of CapEx headroom
Low SP dominates the “Reference” scenario; High SP only makes inroads in the “Favor High SP” scenario

• Constant SP turbine never deploys in these two scenarios
• Given that Low SP already dominates in the “Reference” scenario, we do not need to map the more-favorable “Favor Low SP” scenario
Wholesale market value impacts
(based on historical prices in 2018)
In addition to LCOE, we also need to consider the impact of turbine design on the wholesale market value of wind.

Wholesale market value of wind expected to decline over time as penetrations increase, all else equal.

Hirth (2015)
How do taller, low-specific-power turbines impact market value?

Taller, low-SP turbines operate at rated capacity more often, and generate relatively more power at lower wind speeds (when prices tend to be higher)

- They boost generation during low-wind-speed hours more than during high-wind-speed hours (when they were likely already operating at rated capacity)
- Because low wind hours are often correlated with higher market prices (and vice versa), this shift in generation profile can enhance market value
- The higher capacity factors and lower variability in output can also lead to better utilization of transmission, lower forecast error, and more-favorable financing terms (all discussed later)
Scope of value assessment

- We focus on **energy value** and **capacity value** in organized wholesale power markets.

- We base our assessment on **historical hourly wholesale prices and wind speeds** at existing wind project locations within all seven ISO regions:
  - We use hourly wholesale energy prices and ISO-specific capacity rules and costs from 2018.
  - We developed refined estimates of plant-level hourly wind speeds and capacity factors.
  - Details of how we estimated wind speeds, assigned project locations to pricing nodes, and developed estimates of capacity credit are beyond the scope of this presentation.

- We analyze the same **2018 Average and Low SP** turbine configurations as described earlier in the LCOE analysis (along with the **2009 Average** turbine).

*Note: Historical impacts are not necessarily indicative of future impacts, as wholesale pricing patterns can shift and greater wind penetration can erode market value.*
Average nationwide results

- We’ve already enhanced value since 2009 (by +$0.41/MWh), but more gain is possible.
- Low SP value boost is due to both energy value and capacity value, but energy value dominates.
- Low SP value boost comes from both higher HH and lower SP, but SP effect is 2-3x greater than HH effect (a function of the relative change in HH and SP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turbine Specs</th>
<th>2009 Avg</th>
<th>2018 Avg</th>
<th>Low SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nameplate Capacity (MW)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor Diameter (m)</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>206.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Height (m)</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>140.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Power (W/m²)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Market Value (vs. 2018 Avg turbine)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Value ($/MWh)</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Value ($/MWh)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value ($/MWh)</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value (% difference)</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plant-level ABSOLUTE change in value (energy + capacity) when moving from 2018 Avg to Low SP turbine

- Value boost is greatest in regions with highest wind penetration levels (ERCOT and SPP), and/or with transmission constraints (ISO-NE)
- ISO-NE boost is highly location dependent—much higher where transmission constraints are greatest
- Relatively little value enhancement for most sites in CAISO, PJM, NYISO
ISO-level ABSOLUTE change in value (energy + capacity) when moving from 2018 Avg to Low SP turbine

- National change in market value is normally distributed around a mean $1-$2/MWh value boost
- ERCOT and SPP are centered on a $2-$3/MWh boost
- ISO-NE change varies across an exceptionally large range of values based on location due to transmission constraints
- CAISO and PJM are centered on no change in market value
ISO-level PERCENTAGE change in value (energy + capacity) when moving from 2018 Avg to Low SP turbine

- Nationally, there is a normal distribution centered on a 5% to 10% increase in value
- ERCOT and SPP are centered on a 10% to 15% increase
- CAISO and PJM are centered on a 0% change
- Other regions are in between these two groupings
- Project-level results are distributed widely around these central values
Average percentage change in value when moving from 2018 Avg to Low SP turbine is correlated with regional wind penetration levels.

Note: The same is not true for absolute $/MWh value enhancement, because that metric is also highly impacted by general wholesale price variations from one ISO to the next (e.g., ISO-NE has relatively high overall wholesale prices compared to other regions).
Average percentage change in value when moving from 2018 Avg to Low SP turbine is driven more by energy value than capacity value

- Low wind penetration in ISO-NE and PJM lead to small decreases in energy value, although the capacity value increase is large in ISO-NE
- ERCOT has no capacity requirement, due to its energy-only market design
- In CAISO, the capacity credit is not currently calculated based on each turbine’s generation profile → and so capacity value effect is negative as total MWh increases but absolute $ credit is unchanged
- In other markets, the relative size of the change in capacity value depends on rules around the determination of wind’s capacity credit, and the price or cost of capacity
Industry has already made progress boosting market value via turbine design, but more progress is possible.

Value enhancement is greatest in markets with high wind penetrations (and/or with transmission constraints).

- And value enhancement is dominated by energy value enhancement rather than capacity value enhancement.

A reduction in specific power from 230 W/m² to 150 W/m² has a greater impact than raising hub height from 88m to 140m.
Possible additional benefits of taller, lower-specific-power-power turbines
We explore three *additional* possible benefits, beyond those related to LCOE and market value presented earlier.

- Lower transmission expenditures
- Lower balancing / ancillary service costs
- Lower cost of wind-plant financing
Low SP turbine reduces transmission costs by ~$1.6/MWh relative to 2018 Avg turbine

- Low SP’s higher capacity factor increases the utilization of transmission lines, reducing the $/MWh-wind cost of transmission by ~$1.6/MWh on average
  - ~25% ($0.4/MWh) of this accrues to the wind project owner, due to lower spur line and interconnection costs
  - ~75% ($1.2/MWh) is a socialized benefit, due to lower network expansion costs
Low SP turbine reduces balancing costs by ~$0.2/MWh relative to 2018 Avg turbine

- Low SP imposes slightly greater reserve requirements, but this extra cost is spread over much more energy

- Non-Spinning Reserves:
  - The price for non-spinning reserves in ERCOT was $9.2/MWh in 2018
  - With current turbines, ERCOT increases non-spin reserves by ~40 MW per GW of wind at a cost of $0.88/MWh-wind with a capacity factor of 42%
  - Slightly greater forecast errors for Low SP turbines (3.6% greater) increases the incremental reserve requirement to ~42 MW per GW of wind, which costs only $0.7/MWh-wind with a Low SP capacity factor of 55%

- Regulation Reserves:
  - The average price for regulation up and down in ERCOT was $14.0/MWh and $5.2/MWh, respectively, in 2018
  - With current turbines, ERCOT increases regulation up by ~3 MW and regulation down by ~2 MW per GW of wind
  - Incremental regulation requirements would be nearly identical with Low SP turbines
  - With the higher capacity factor for Low SP turbines, regulation costs go from $0.13/MWh-wind with current turbines to $0.10/MWh-wind with Low SP turbines
The *Low SP* turbine should have less-variable annual energy production over time, enabling better financing terms.

- The graph shows capacity factors by calendar year at a site in Texas for the 2009 Avg (329 W/m², 79m HH), 2018 Avg (230 W/m², 88m HH), and *Low SP* (150 W/m², 140m HH) turbines.

- With lower specific power, the average capacity factor increases while the coefficient of variation (i.e., the standard deviation of capacity factor divided by the average capacity factor over the same period) declines.

- If recognized by lenders through a corresponding reduction in the required debt service coverage ratio (DSCR), the *Low SP* turbine’s lower coefficient of variation would allow for greater debt leverage (i.e., more low-cost debt, and less higher-cost equity), leading to a lower LCOE (by ~$0.3/MWh).
These 3 supplemental factors sum to a ~$2/MWh benefit of the Low SP turbine relative to the 2018 Avg turbine

- All of the financing benefits and some of the transmission benefits accrue to wind project owners: $0.7/MWh
- All of the balancing benefits and the remaining transmission benefits accrue to the overall electricity system: $1.4/MWh
- These benefits are in addition to the energy and capacity value impacts shown earlier
Conclusions
Conclusions

• Significant turbine scaling has already provided both LCOE and value benefits

• Further benefits are possible through a continuation of this trend:

  ➢ **LCOE:** ~$6/MWh median LCOE advantage for Low SP turbine (150 W/m²), presuming it has an 8% ($120/kW) higher CapEx than the Constant SP turbine (230 W/m²)

  ➢ **Market Value:** $1-$2/MWh median value boost ($2-$3/MWh in higher penetration areas) in 2018 when moving from 230 W/m² to 150 W/m²
    • Lower specific power is a stronger lever for value enhancement than is higher hub height
    • Value boost is mostly due to higher energy value; capacity value is a smaller driver

  ➢ **Other:** ~$1.6/MWh from better transmission utilization; ~$0.2/MWh from lower balancing costs; ~$0.3/MWh from improved financing terms

**In Aggregate:** ~$10/MWh of incremental savings/value in moving from 230 W/m² to 150 W/m²
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