

The Impact of Distributed Generation on Local Distribution Companies

Submitted to:

American Gas Association
400 N. Capitol St. NW
Washington, DC 20001

Submitted by:

Harry Chernoff
and
Robert Lorand
Science Applications International Corporation
8301 Greensboro Dr. ms E-5-8
McLean, VA 22102

703.676.5816 / chernoffh@saic.com
703.676.4439 / lorandr@saic.com

July 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ES. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	<u>i</u>
<u>ES.1 Background</u>	<u>i</u>
<u>ES.2 Objective</u>	<u>i</u>
<u>ES.3 Scope</u>	<u>i</u>
<u>ES.4 Findings</u>	<u>ii</u>
<u>1.0 INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>1.1 Background</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>1.2 Objective</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>1.3 Approach</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>1.4 Limitations</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>2.0 TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>3.0 MAKING MONEY FROM DG - THE VALUE PROPOSITION</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>3.1 Commercial / Industrial Baseload</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>3.2 Commercial / Aggregated Residential Full Requirements</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>3.3 Commercial / Industrial Full-Requirements Cogeneration (Isolated Operation)</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>3.4 Commercial / Industrial Partial-Requirements Cogeneration</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>3.5 Commercial / Industrial Peak Shaving</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>3.6 Commercial / Industrial Peak Sharing</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>3.7 Individual Residential Full Requirements</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>3.8 Electric LDCs</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>3.9 Summarizing the Value Elements</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>4.0 BARRIERS TO DG</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>4.1 Interconnection Standards</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>4.2 Charges for Standby, Backup, Exit Fees, and Other Utility Services</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>4.3 Permitting Processes</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>4.4 Electric Distribution System Requirements</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>5.0 VALUATION AND ALLOCATION OF DG BENEFITS</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>5.1 Valuation of Benefits</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>5.2 Allocation of Benefits</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>5.3 Stakeholders</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>5.4 Net Metering</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>6.0 FIFTEEN-YEAR OUTLOOK</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>6.1 Defining the DG Market</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>6.2 The Dynamics of the Market</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>6.3 Summary Outlook</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>7.0 REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF RELATED WORK</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>7.1 Related Studies, Including Review Comments</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>7.2 Related Studies, Without Review Comments</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>8.0 GLOSSARY</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>9.0 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>REFERENCE CONTACTS</u>	<u>49</u>

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES-1	Potential Benefits from Distributed Generation.....	ii
Table ES-2	Key Value Elements for Grid-Connected Commercial / Industrial DG.....	v
Table 2-1	Cost and Performance Characteristics of DG Technologies	4
Table 3-1	Example C/I Baseload Application.....	9
Table 3-2	Example Commercial / Aggregated Residential Full-Requirements Application.....	11
Table 3-3	Example C/I Full-Requirements Cogeneration (Isolated Operation) Application.....	12
Table 3-4	Example C/I Partial-Requirements Cogeneration Application.....	12
Table 3-5	Example C/I Peak-Shaving Application.....	14
Table 3-6	Example Individual Residential Full-Requirements Application	16
Table 3-7	Key Value Elements for Grid-Connected Commercial / Industrial DG.....	18
Table 4-1	DPCA Survey -- Ranking of Barriers to Distributed Energy Resources.....	21
Table 5-1	Potential Benefits from Distributed Generation.....	24
Table 5-2	Estimated Range of Benefits from Distributed Generation (DPCA).....	25
Table 5-3	What Non-DG Customers Want From DG	29
Table 5-4	States with Net Metering Programs Available for Gas-Fired DG.....	31

ES. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 BACKGROUND

Recent developments in the electric power and power supply industries have raised a great deal of interest in distributed power generation (DG). Advances in power generation (e.g., micro-turbines, fuel cells) and power control technologies have made DG increasingly competitive with conventional grid-supplied electricity in certain regions and for numerous applications. Changes in the operations of the electric system (e.g., reduced reserve margins, more price and supply volatility) and changes in the way electricity is priced (e.g., real-time pricing, competitive transition charges) have created new opportunities for supplying power on a value basis rather than a cost basis. Also, legislative and regulatory changes have reduced the cost of owning and operating DG. Overall, DG offers many customers, especially small to mid-sized commercial / industrial (C/I) customers, the potential to reduce costs and increase reliability and flexibility.

These changes provide gas local distribution companies (GLDCs) with significant new opportunities, including the potential to increase gas throughput, load factors, and operating margins; enter new businesses, e.g., unregulated engineering or energy service company (ESCO) subsidiaries; and offer new services, e.g., maintenance, insurance, and financing.

ES.2 OBJECTIVE

Because of the significance of DG to electric power supply in general and to gas LDCs in particular, the American Gas Association has requested SAIC to analyze the impact of distributed generation on the gas distribution companies. The objective is to provide a management-level review and 15-year outlook on market risks and opportunities, technologies, applications, gas sales, etc.

ES.3 SCOPE

This report addresses the potential impacts of DG on the gas LDCs from the perspective of customer value -- where does DG add value to the customer and under what conditions is it likely to succeed. The report covers technologies, applications, rules-of-thumb for commercial success, the response of the electric LDCs, and related factors.

In this report DG means a small electric power plant constructed at the customer's site to serve onsite loads, or constructed at the end of a distribution line to support the distribution system. The size of these plants is usually from a few tens of kW (excluding individual residential applications) to about 5-10 MW. Plants larger than 50 MW and merchant power plants selling at wholesale to the grid are excluded. Discussions with members of the industry indicate that DG (as an emerging concept) is usually limited to

plants below 5-10 MW. Above 5-10 MW, DG is viewed as a continuation of the established trend towards on-site generation and cogeneration.

ES.4 FINDINGS

A review of the literature on DG would suggest that technology drives the DG market: reciprocating engines, combustion turbines, micro-turbines, and fuel cells. This perspective is misleading. DG is not driven by technology. It is driven by value -- value to the customer, to the electric power system, and to society. DG is about demonstrating this value in a complete package, e.g., design, analysis, procurement, installation, operation, maintenance, financing, leasing, etc. DG also affects the value of the gas LDCs through increased throughput, higher load factors, and new opportunities for services. Table ES-1 summarizes the potential benefits from DG.

Table ES-1 Potential Benefits from Distributed Generation

- Reduced energy (\$/kWh) and demand (\$/kW) costs
- Increased reliability, including provision of standby or emergency power
- Reduced transmission and distribution line losses
- Reduced spinning and non-spinning reserve margins
- More peak shaving and interruptible loads
- Deferral of transmission and distribution expansion
- Reactive power support and power quality
- Cogeneration capability
- Improvement in utility load factors
- Fuel diversity
- Emissions reductions
- Reduced energy congestion
- Less societal disruption
- Faster response time
- Emergency start capability
- System operations benefits

Sources: Adapted from Liss, 1999a; Skowronski, 1999.

From the gas LDC perspective, peak shaving and standby are established markets for many types of customers, especially the multi-megawatt customers. The emerging opportunities offered by DG expand the market to smaller loads, especially loads below about 2 MW, and expand the market to more gas-intensive applications, including baseload, full requirements, and cogeneration. These trends imply significant increases in incremental gas sales because of the large number of units sold for these applications and because of the much higher load factors for baseload, full requirements, and cogeneration applications.

Assuming that the DG technologies discussed in the present report meet their cost and performance objectives, *incremental* installations of DG units for baseload applications (baseload, full requirements, cogeneration) could reach 2,000 MW per year by 2005 and 5,000 MW per year in the 2010-2015 period and beyond.¹ These numbers compare to an expansion of the grid in the range of 25-30,000 MW per year, excluding replacement capacity, and as much as 40-50,000 MW per year, including replacement capacity, through the 2015 period. Retirements of nuclear units become significant in the latter part of the 15-year forecast period. Overall, baseload DG units could capture a double-digit percentage of the total market for capacity additions. The rate of growth in DG installations would level off in the 2010-2015 period due to saturation of the key markets. At 2,000 MW per year of incremental baseload DG capacity, incremental sales of gas for DG would reach 100 trillion Btu per year. At 5,000 MW per year of incremental baseload DG capacity, incremental gas sales would reach 250 trillion Btu per year. LDCs, not pipelines, are likely to supply most of this gas. Below about 20 MW, it is usually not economical for the DG operator to bypass the LDC and go directly to the pipeline. Above about 20 MW, or if the DG is almost literally right on top of the pipeline, bypass becomes a factor.

Incremental installations of gas-fired DG units for peak-shaving and standby applications could also reach 2,000 MW per year by 2005 and 5,000 MW per year in the 2010-2015 period. At these levels, incremental gas sales would reach 20 trillion Btu per year by 2005 and 50 trillion Btu per year by 2010. Almost all of these DG units would be customer-owned and would use gas supplied at retail by the LDCs.

Overall, total sales of gas by the gas LDCs to the incremental DG market could reach 120 trillion Btu per year by 2005 and exceed 300 trillion Btu per year by 2010. At retail prices averaging \$4.00 per million Btu (heavily weighted towards C/I rates rather than the residential rates), the total market opportunity is in the range of \$500 million per year by 2005 and more than \$1.2 billion per year by 2010.

Key observations relating to these points include the following:

- **Market Potential** -- DG has the greatest long-term potential in markets where electric transmission and distribution costs are naturally high (e.g., the Northeast) and where the reliability of delivered power is less than adequate (various areas). The value placed on reliability is a particularly important factor. Because the value of reliability is often orders of magnitude greater than the price of electricity, especially for commercial / industrial users, small gains in reliability from

¹Incremental installations are installations above those that would take place at the current level of technology cost and performance. Achieving the incremental installation levels requires reaching the gas industry goals for cost and performance. Goals for turnkey costs (including the interconnection) are roughly \$500/kW for gas engines, \$500-600/kW for micro-turbines (at 30 percent electrical efficiency), and \$1,000-\$1,200 for fuel cells (at 40 percent electrical efficiency or higher). For gas engines, these cost goals are perhaps 25-35 percent less than current levels. For micro-turbines and fuel cells, the cost goals are 25 to 50 percent less than current levels.

DG will translate into large gains in market size. This relationship is especially important for DG systems providing baseload or full requirements service.

The contraction of spark spreads throughout the country (i.e., the difference in the prices per Btu of electricity and gas) will erode markets based on currently high electric generation costs relative to natural gas prices. Table ES-2 shows some of the key requirements for commercial success in the mid-sized, grid-connected C/I market. This market is one of the largest potential markets for DG. The values on Table ES-2 should be viewed in the context of a complete application, including opportunities for tradeoffs among the variables, not as individual values that must each be met for each variable.

DG has the least short-term potential in markets where exit fees and stranded cost recovery charges are high and unavoidable, e.g., Pennsylvania. Over the longer term, the elimination of these fees and charges will allow a market to develop. DG has little long-term potential in markets or applications that are based on mispriced peak resources. Retail access and performance-based ratemaking will eliminate arbitrage opportunities in these markets. Excluding high reliability applications, DG has little long-term potential in markets that have naturally low central station generation and T&D costs.

- **Market Evolution** -- During the next 10 years, rates for baseload power will decline the fastest in the regions and to the customers where DG is currently the most attractive, e.g., mid-size C/I customers in the Northeast. Success in this market will require marketing and packaging techniques that go beyond spark spreads.

Technology alternatives to non-utility DG, such as highly efficient MW-scale turbines, and economic alternatives, such as pricing electricity on a value basis, will narrow the market opportunities for DG and for gas LDCs.

Special circumstances in certain states or by certain companies offer opportunities for the DG industry and the gas LDCs. Some companies are targeting customers for isolated operation to avoid competitive transition charges. Others are targeting new customers to avoid both transition charges and exit fees. Many companies are targeting high-reliability customers and explicitly incorporating the value of avoiding outages into the payback calculations. Other companies are targeting residential customers with the highest electric rates. A common approach is to define the DG equipment as a break-even proposition and plan to profit from the increased gas throughput.

Table ES-2 Key Value Elements for Grid-Connected Commercial / Industrial DG

<i>Element</i>	<i>Favorable</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Load	200-2,000 kW	With current DG technologies, economies-of-scale become very important for loads exceeding about 200 kW. Smaller loads may be economical in certain applications, e.g., high-value cogeneration (for the user) or high-value gas throughput (for the LDC). Loads above a few MW tend to have existing opportunities without any changes in DG technology, interconnect standards and costs, restructuring, etc.
Load Factor	>60%	Sixty percent is often cited as the breakpoint needed to spread the fixed costs of the DG system over the kWh. Deviations from the 60 percent level would depend on offsetting factors, e.g., thermal value.
Thermal Value	>1 cent/kWh- equivalent	Capturing thermal value, e.g., water or space heating, requires additional equipment and systems. Unless the thermal value exceeds about 1 cent/kWh-equivalent, it is rarely economical to add these heat recovery systems. Thermal value rarely exceeds 2 cents/kWh-equivalent.
Spark Spread	>4	The spark spread is the difference between the delivered price of electricity and the price of the fuel input to the electric plant in some common unit. The convention is to compare electricity in cents/kWh to gas in \$/MMBtu. In this convention, a spark spread exceeding “4” (e.g., electricity at more than 8 cents/kWh and gas at less than \$4/MMBtu) is a favorable relationship.
Installed Cost	<\$700-800/kW	The \$700-800/kW price range is the most common breakpoint for most applications, assuming the electrical efficiency of the generator approaches 40 percent. For micro-turbines, where current efficiencies are no more than 25-30 percent, capital costs would have to be lower. For fuel cells, capital costs could be higher.
New Source Review Status	Non-attainment area	The higher the non-attainment category, the greater the advantage for fuel cells and micro-turbines, especially in NO _x non-attainment areas. If non-attainment is a minor issue or no issue, lower cost reciprocating engines are typically favored.
Reliability	Explicitly valued	In applications where reliability is the driving factor for DG, it is important for the reliability benefit to be explicitly valued and explicitly included in the payback calculation. The common

<i>Element</i>	<i>Favorable</i>	<i>Comment</i>
		practice of implicit valuation understates the benefits from DG.
Gas LDC Load Factor	Increase	Sales of gas for DG increase throughput on the gas system and thus help spread fixed costs. Sales of gas that increase the LDC load factor are the most beneficial. The greater the load factor benefit, the more incentives the gas LDC can afford to offer for DG investment.
Electric LDC Constraints	Significant	To the extent the electric LDC is significantly constrained from providing reliable, low-cost service (e.g., distribution congestion, unreliable peak supplies, etc.), the value to the customer from a low-cost, reliable alternative increases. Moreover, the incentives the electric LDC can afford to offer for DG investment increase. In these cases, coordinated activities among the three parties (gas distribution, electric distribution, and customer) have the maximum value.

Source: SAIC Estimates.

- **The Electric LDC Response** -- To retain markets at risk from DG, electric LDCs will expand the use of real-time pricing, increase backup or standby charges relative to energy charges, and may seek to site their own large DG (e.g., multi-megawatt turbines) at or near substations or industrial loads. Some electric LDCs are likely to delay or obstruct DG by requiring case-by-case reviews of interconnections and system impacts. Conflicts between the electric LDCs and potential DG users and within combination LDCs will increase. Electric LDC ownership of large-scale natural gas-fired DG may provide some benefit to the gas LDCs, depending on how the gas is procured, but less benefit than retail sales to mid-sized and large C/I customers. Electric transmission companies may be more supportive of DG, depending on the ability of DG to defer the need for new transmission capacity.

- **Technologies** – Reciprocating engines and small combustion turbines hold the most immediate potential for large-scale DG market penetration. While micro-turbines and, to a much lesser extent, fuel cells are entering commercial service today, large-scale market penetration is 5-10 years away for micro-turbines and 10 years or more for fuel cells. This stretched schedule is partly in recognition of the difficulty in commercializing new generating technologies and partly in recognition of the dynamic nature of the market for electric power generation and delivery. General issues in accelerating the acceptance of the new technologies include interconnection cost and technical barriers; and proof of reliability, maintainability, and operability. Specific issues are tied to the value propositions of the various applications, e.g., isolated operation and cogeneration potential.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report provides a management-level review of the market opportunities, risks, and issues facing the gas distribution companies in dealing with distributed generation (DG). In this report, distributed generation (DG) means a small electric power plant (less than 50 MW, and usually less than 25 MW) constructed at the customer's site to serve onsite loads, or constructed at the end of a distribution line to support the distribution system. Merchant power plants are excluded. Discussions with members of the industry indicate that DG (as an emerging concept) covers an even smaller range -- a few tens of kW (excluding individual residential applications) to about 5-10 MW. Above 5-10 MW, DG is a continuation of the established trend towards on-site and industrial cogeneration. Service from a DG plant may be in parallel with the grid, isolated from the grid, or alternating between parallel and isolated operations.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Numerous changes in the electric power industry in the past few years have raised a great deal of interest in DG. In particular:

- Advances in power generation and power control technologies have made DG, primarily natural gas-fired DG, increasingly competitive with conventional grid-supplied electricity in many applications in many parts of the U.S.
- Changes in the operations of the electric system (e.g., reduced reserve margins, more price and supply volatility) and changes in the way electricity is priced (e.g., real-time pricing, competitive transition charges) have created opportunities for non-traditional methods of supplying power on a value basis rather than a cost basis.
- The emergence of transmission and transmission-related issues (siting, interchange pricing, wires charges, capacity reservation, etc.) as obstacles to efficient, reliable power flows within and across utility and regional borders.
- Restructuring of the electric industry has made ownership and operation of DG less costly and less complicated than in the past.

Capitalizing on these changes is a key to success for the parties on each side of the electric meter:

- DG offers many customers, especially small to mid-sized commercial / industrial (C/I) customers, the potential to lower their electric and thermal power costs and increase their electric reliability and flexibility.

- DG offers gas local distribution companies (GLDCs) the potential to increase throughput and increase load factors.
- DG offers the gas LDCs the potential for good operating margins because the gas is usually supplied at the retail distribution level.
- DG offers the electric local distribution companies (ELDCs) system benefits, including reduced or deferred distribution system expansion, peak shaving, reduced air emissions, and increased voltage and system support.
- DG offers all of the LDCs the potential for related business activities, e.g., unregulated engineering or energy service company (ESCO) subsidiaries, maintenance services, insurance, financing, etc.

On the other hand, electric LDCs who face the loss of profitable loads to DG (whether selling bundled or unbundled electricity) have incentives to aggressively compete for the loads that would otherwise be lost. This competition can take many forms. Depending on regulatory approval, electric LDCs may install generation at or near substations or load centers, modify peak tariffs, offer incentives for retained or expanded loads, etc. Electric LDCs may also compete using less acceptable methods, including obstructing efforts to streamline interconnection requirements and imposing excessive exit fees or standby charges.

Each of these electric LDC responses has the potential to reduce DG usage or reduce the benefits to the gas LDCs from any given level of DG usage. For example, if the electric LDC owns the DG, the margins on gas LDC sales will be reduced or the gas LDC will be bypassed altogether.

1.2 OBJECTIVE

Because of the significance of DG to power supply in general and local gas distribution companies in particular, the American Gas Association has requested SAIC to analyze the impact of distributed generation on the gas distribution companies. The objective is to provide a 15-year outlook on market risks and opportunities, technologies, applications, gas sales, etc. This report addresses the potential impacts of DG on the gas LDCs from the perspective of customer value -- where does DG add value to the customer and under what conditions is it likely to succeed. The discussions in these areas cover technologies, applications, rules-of-thumb for commercial success, the response of the electric LDCs, and related factors.

1.3 APPROACH

The approach to the project is based on: 1) a review and assessment of related work on DG, 2) telephone interviews with leading authorities on DG, especially individuals involved in customer requirements, purchase

decision criteria, and business management, and 3) integration and analysis into a management-level report. Quantitative estimates of potential market shares and gas sales are based on the estimates of the authors.

1.4 LIMITATIONS

No consensus exists within the DG industry over the preferred DG technologies, the preferred applications, the dynamics of the electric LDC response to DG, the potential for increased gas throughput by the gas LDCs, or many other key factors. As a result, the observations and conclusions in the report are a synthesis of conflicting information. The experience of the authors in wholesale and retail gas and electric markets became a more important component of the analysis than usual. In cases where the conclusions in the report differ markedly from those supplied by a particular individual, the reason is a preponderance of evidence presented by other individuals or by an analysis of the dynamics of the electric market.

For example, while it is possible for DG as a whole to capture a large segment of the power market for many customers and applications, it is highly unlikely to be as broad as forecast by the individuals contacted for this report. Experience suggests that a few technologies will capture most related markets and applications, whether these technologies are DG or central station, and that a few pricing strategies will dominate all of the markets.

The key limitation of the analysis relates to the diversity and incompatibility of the market forecasts. It is not possible to analytically reconcile the strongly-held but incompatible views within the industry over technologies, applications, pricing strategies, electric LDC responses, etc. For example, it is not possible to know whether micro-turbines will be installed commercially at \$500/kW in the next few years and thus capture a large share of the new commercial market or whether fuel cells will be legislated into commercial existence by virtue of their near-zero local emissions. Similarly, it is not possible to know how large a share of the high-income residential market will accept isolated operation or the extent to which non-generating electric LDCs will be permitted to site multi-MW combustion turbines near loads for distribution system support. The authors of the present report have attempted to provide as much quantification and detail as possible given these limitations.

2.0 TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW

This section provides a brief overview of the major DG technologies (excluding renewables). Table 2-1 shows the cost and performance characteristics of these technologies, as assembled by GRI (GRI, 1999).

A more complete and comprehensive summary of the technologies is available on the GRI website in *The Role of Distributed Generation in Competitive Energy Markets* (www.gri.org).

Table 2-1 Cost and Performance Characteristics of DG Technologies

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Diesel Engine</i>	<i>Gas Engine</i>	<i>Simple Cycle GT</i>	<i>Micro-turbine</i>	<i>Fuel Cell</i>
Commercial Status	Commercial	Commercial	Commercial	1999 - 2000	1996 - 2010
kW Range	20 - 10,000+	50 - 5,000+	1,000+	30 - 200	50 - 1,000+
HHV Efficiency (%)	36 - 43	28 - 42	21 - 40	25 - 30	35 - 54
Gen-set Package (\$/kW)	125 - 300	250 - 600	300 - 600	350 -750 (target price)	1,500 - 3,000
Turnkey w/o heat recovery (\$/kW)	350 - 500	600 - 1,000	650 - 900	600 - 1,100	1,900 - 3,500
Heat recovery (\$/kW)	n.a.	75 - 150	100 - 200	75 - 350	Included
O&M (m/kWh)	5 - 10	7 - 15	3 - 8	5 - 10	5 - 10

Source: GRI, 1999.

The leading technologies for DG are reciprocating engines (diesel and natural gas) and combustion turbines. Reciprocating engines capture most of the market under 5 MW. Standby and peak shaving are the two most important applications. Sales of reciprocating engines for standby and peak shaving in 1998 amounted to roughly 4,400 MW and 2,500 MW, respectively (Kincaid, 1999). Sales of reciprocating engines for cogeneration were estimated at 300 MW. Within the reciprocating engine market, diesel predominates, especially in units smaller than 3.5 MW. The trend in the engine market, however, is towards natural gas, especially in the larger units (Wadman, 1999). Above about 5 MW, the market shifts to simple-cycle combustion turbines or gas turbines for all applications.²

²In terms of natural gas usage, the bigger story is large, non-DG turbines. *Diesel & Gas Turbine Worldwide's* 1999 Power Generation Survey shows that worldwide orders of gas turbines in the 60-120 MW, 120-180 MW, and greater than 180 MW classes were more than twice the 1998 levels (875 units in 1999 in all size classes for 64 GW vs. 754 units in 1998 in all size classes for 33 GW). The bulk of the increased orders are

Comments on various aspects of the technologies and technology trends are provided below. The authors of the report developed these comments, not GRI.³

- **Commercial Status** -- Reciprocating engines and simple-cycle turbines are fully commercial, as shown on Table 2-1. Micro-turbines and fuel cells are entering commercial usage in a few applications but are pre-commercial in terms of mass-market technical and economic competitiveness. There is disagreement in the industry over long-run reliability. Accelerated testing has been favorable in some cases but long-run field tests, including complete overhauls, have not been reported. For some products, especially larger turbines, multi-year ordering backlogs are common.
- **kW Range** -- Micro-turbine manufacturers are offering units ranging from about 30 kW to about 300 kW. Units 75 kW and above are generating the most interest. Unit costs for system design, analysis, permitting, interconnection, and other relatively fixed costs typically make the smaller DG units less economical. The most widely demonstrated fuel cells are about 200 kW. Units in the 3 - 7 kW range are planned for residential applications.
- **HHV Efficiency** -- Electrical efficiency for engines and simple cycle gas turbines is around 40 percent (higher heating value, or HHV). Electrical efficiencies for micro-turbines are in the low-to mid-20 percent range. Electrical efficiencies in the 27-30 percent range are expected shortly. Electrical efficiency for fuel cells depends on the type of fuel cell. Measured electrical efficiency for ONSI's phosphoric acid fuel cells in a large-scale program at U.S. military installations is currently 31.5 percent (DOD, 1999).⁴ The measured availability of these systems is 67.7 percent (DOD, 1999).⁵ Efficiencies claimed for other fuel cell technologies are higher but have not been demonstrated in large-scale field tests.

in North America (362 of the 875 units), with a strong trend towards peaking applications, and a slight trend towards natural gas and away from dual-fuel (Wadman, 1999).

³Distributed renewable resource technologies, such as photovoltaic cells, are not cost-competitive and are not likely to be cost-competitive in any major grid or grid-competitive applications for the foreseeable future. They are not discussed further in this report.

⁴Cumulative electrical efficiency measured at 14 Model B 200 kW phosphoric acid fuel cells at U.S. DOD installations. Cumulative efficiency levels on individual units range from 29.0% to 36.4%. Values include idle time (e.g., the fuel cell is awaiting the return to operation of the grid). Excluding idle time would increase efficiencies. DoD Fuel Cell Program electrical efficiency during unit acceptance tests ranged from 33.5% to 37.2%, HHV.

⁵Cumulative availability measured at 14 Model B and 14 Model C phosphoric acid fuel cells at U.S. DOD installations. Cumulative availability levels on individual units range from 33.9% to 85.1% (Model B) and 43.8% to 92.1% (Model C). Values include downtime that is unrelated to typical fuel cell operation (delays in maintenance personnel response, site operating conditions, etc.). Adjusting for these times would result in higher

- **Gen-set Package Costs** -- For small DG applications (e.g., a few hundred kW to perhaps 1 MW), gen-set package costs may represent ½ or less of the total turnkey costs. As the size of the system increases to the megawatt and multi-megawatt range, the relatively fixed costs for design, analysis, interconnection, etc. decline rapidly as a fraction of the total. For these reasons, turnkey costs are more important than gen-set costs.
- **Turnkey Costs Without Heat Recovery** -- Turnkey costs for systems without heat recovery represent the true measure of the installed and ready-to-operate costs of a straight electrical application. Turnkey costs may also include a fixed cost for maintenance for a period of years. Including maintenance in the turnkey costs provides the customer with a more accurate estimate of the cost to own and operate the unit (excluding fuel costs) over a specified period of time. There is some disagreement in the industry over the direction of capital costs. Capital costs in some cases are increasing, especially for fuel cells.

The gas industry goals for turnkey costs (including the interconnection) are roughly \$500/kW for gas engines, \$500-600/kW for micro-turbines (at 30 percent electrical efficiency), and \$1,000-\$1,200 for fuel cells (at 40 percent electrical efficiency or higher). For gas engines, these goals are perhaps 25-35 percent less than current levels. For micro-turbines and fuel cells, the goals are 25 to 50 percent less than current levels. The cost goals of the Electric Power Research Institute are even more aggressive, especially for fuel cells (EPRI, 1999). Areas where costs are expected to decline include power electronics, interconnection equipment, one-time design and analysis, and (especially for micro-turbines and fuel cells) new materials and designs. Some gas and electric LDCs are actively working with the equipment manufacturers to reduce equipment costs.

- **Heat Recovery Costs** -- Costs for heat recovery equipment can be as low as \$50/kW for water and \$50-100/kW for low-temperature space heating. Costs are higher for more specialized equipment and applications.
- **O&M Costs** -- O&M costs are often cited per kWh but cannot be averaged across an operating range that may go from standby to continuous. In many cases, O&M costs are rolled into turnkey costs as part of a complete siting, installation, and operation package. This is especially true when the customer leases the system. In other cases, the O&M costs are part of a long-term service agreement. Proponents of micro-turbines and fuel cells believe that O&M costs will decline substantially as the technologies mature and installed capacity increases.

An important issue only partially captured in the O&M cost estimates is the reliability and availability of the DG system. Reliability of the system is often achieved by using multiple small units or a single

availability.

large unit and a standby generator, e.g., a reciprocating engine. The use of multiple small units or the addition of a standby generator trades increased equipment costs for increased system availability. In the case of micro-turbines, which require compressed gas, there is concern about compressor reliability and the costs for redundant compressor capability. In the case of fuel cells, there is concern about balance-of-system reliability and long-term maintenance issues, such as contamination of the cells. Proponents of the various technologies, especially proponents of new technologies for high-reliability applications, offer multiple options for reliability, depending on the application. The tradeoff between the value of very high to near-absolute reliability and the costs for backup equipment and associated O&M is one of the key relationships in most DG evaluations.

3.0 MAKING MONEY FROM DG - THE VALUE PROPOSITION

The success of DG depends on the value of the complete DG package (design, analysis, equipment, installation, maintenance, financing, etc.) to a specific customer using a specific technology for a specific application. The segmentation of the overall gas and electric markets according to different value propositions is in its early stages. Most of the companies contacted for this report knew which customers they would contact for DG applications when they believed they could offer a complete, competitive package. While each of the companies (gas, electric, or non-utility) believes it can make money from the DG scenarios it suggested (Sections 3.1 through 3.8), it is clear that the bases for these value propositions are very different and often incompatible.

Close inspection shows that the companies in the DG market base their value propositions on different expectations about such central issues as:

- current and future restrictions on air emissions, especially NO_x
- the price and performance of micro-turbines one to two years from now or fuel cells a few years after that
- the value customers place on “hassle-free” maintenance
- the willingness of customers to accept isolated operation
- the ability of existing customers to avoid exit fees and competitive transition charges (i.e., stranded costs) when converting to isolated operation
- the willingness and ability of customers to explicitly value reliability
- the willingness of customers to adopt new technologies
- the ability of the DG supplier to offer a complete package (design, analysis, installation, maintenance, financing, leasing, etc.) to the customer.

These diverse expectations produce a variety of DG packages across technologies, applications, regions of the country, customer classes, etc. Many gas and electric LDCs view independent energy service companies (ESCOs) or unregulated subsidiaries as another key to profiting from DG. This ESCO / subsidiary approach is reflected in many of the example applications described below.