


STATE UTILITY FORECASTING GROUP

INDIANA RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES



2022 STUDY



Purdue Policy Research Institute

2022 INDIANA RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES STUDY

State Utility Forecasting Group

Purdue University

West Lafayette, Indiana

David Nderitu

Douglas Gotham

Cynthia Taylor Fate

Andrew Kain

Liwei Lu

Tim Phillips

Marco Velastegui

October 2022

Table of Contents

List of Figures	iii
List of Tables.....	vi
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	viii
Foreword.....	xi
1. Overview	1
1.1 Trends in renewable energy consumption in the United States	1
1.2 Trends in renewable energy consumption in Indiana	5
1.3 Cost of renewable resources	12
1.4 Renewable energy incentives in the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022	15
1.5 References.....	18
2. Energy from Wind.....	21
2.1 Introduction.....	21
2.2 Economics of wind energy	23
2.3 State of wind energy nationally	29
2.4 Wind energy in Indiana.....	35
2.5 Incentives for wind energy	42
2.6 References.....	44
3. Dedicated Energy Crops.....	49
3.1 Introduction.....	49
3.2 Economics of energy crops.....	53
3.3 State of energy crops nationally.....	58
3.4 Energy crops in Indiana	59
3.5 Incentives for energy crops.....	63
3.6 References.....	65
4. Organic Waste Biomass	69
4.1 Introduction.....	69
4.2 Economics of organic waste biomass	71
4.3 State of organic waste biomass nationally	74
4.4 Organic waste biomass in Indiana	79
4.5 Incentives for organic waste biomass	86

4.6	References.....	88
5.	Solar Energy	93
5.1	Introduction.....	93
5.2	Economics of solar technologies	96
5.3	State of solar energy nationally	100
5.4	Solar energy in Indiana.....	103
5.5	Incentives for solar energy.....	104
5.6	References.....	106
6.	Photovoltaic Cells.....	109
6.1	Introduction.....	109
6.2	Economics of PV systems.....	112
6.3	State of PV systems nationally	116
6.4	PV systems in Indiana.....	120
6.5	Incentives for PV systems.....	125
6.6	References.....	128
7.	Hydropower	131
7.1	Introduction.....	131
7.2	Economics of hydropower	134
7.3	State of hydropower nationally.....	137
7.4	Hydropower in Indiana	142
7.5	Incentives for hydropower	144
7.6	References.....	145
8.	Underground Pumped Storage Hydropower	149
8.1	Introduction.....	149
8.2	Economics of underground pumped storage hydropower	151
8.3	State of underground pumped storage hydropower nationally	153
8.4	State of underground pumped storage hydropower in Indiana.....	155
8.5	Incentives for underground pumped storage hydropower	157
8.6	References.....	158

List of Figures

1-1	Renewable energy consumption in the U.S. (1949-2021).....	1
1-2	U.S. energy consumption by source (1949-2021).....	2
1-3	U.S. total energy consumption by energy source in 2021	3
1-4	Renewable electricity generation in the U.S. (1949-2021)	4
1-5	U.S. electricity generation by source (1949-2021).....	4
1-6	Net U.S. electricity generation by energy source in 2020	5
1-7	Renewables share of Indiana total energy consumption (1960-2020)	6
1-8	Renewables share of Indiana electricity generation (1990-2020)	7
1-9	Wind energy capacity in Indiana.....	8
1-10	Average construction cost of generation installed 2013 to 2020	12
1-11	Estimated generating technologies capital costs	13
1-12	Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs.....	14
1-13	Historic average levelized cost of energy from various technologies	15
2-1	Horizontal wind turbine configuration	21
2-2	Estimated capital costs of various electric generation options.....	24
2-3	Average construction cost of generators installed 2013 to 2020 in the U.S.....	25
2-4	Installed wind power project costs 1982 to 2018	26
2-5	Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs.....	27
2-6	Average O&M costs for available data years.....	28
2-7	Wholesale energy value of wind	29
2-8	U.S. wind capacity growth	30
2-9	Renewable portfolio standards across the U.S.	31
2-10	Wind power capacity by state at the end of 2021 (MW).....	32
2-11	100-meter U.S. wind resource map	34
2-12	Utility-scale wind farm capacity installed and under construction in Indiana	36
2-13	Indiana wind speed at 100 meters height	40
2-14	Indiana wind speed at 50 meters height	41
3-1	Energy crops included in the <i>2016 Billion-Ton Report</i>	51
3-2	Schematic of steps in bioenergy conversion process	52
3-3	Production of energy crops at various farm-gate prices for select years.....	54
3-4	Supply curves of potential herbaceous energy crop production for select years under base-case assumptions	55
3-5	Supply curves of potential woody energy crop production for select years under base-case assumptions	55
3-6	Bioenergy crop trial stations.....	59
3-7	Estimated shares of energy crops and agricultural residues supplied at \$60 per dry ton in 2030	60
3-8	Projected production of energy crops in Indiana in 2030.....	61

4-1	Supply curves of potential production from primary crop residues for select years under 2016 Billion-ton study base-case assumptions	73
4-2	U.S. corn stover supply curve.....	74
4-3	U.S. renewable energy consumption 1949-2020.....	75
4-4	Landfill gas projects	77
4-5	Renewables share of Indiana total energy consumption (1960-2020)	80
4-6	Estimated biomass production potential in Indiana.....	86
5-1	The layout of a flat-plate collector	93
5-2	A parabolic trough CSP system.....	94
5-3	A linear Fresnel CSP system	95
5-4	A power tower CSP system.....	95
5-5	A dish/engine CSP system	96
5-6	Estimated capital cost of generating technologies.....	98
5-7	Operating and maintenance cost of generating technologies	99
5-8	Solar power resource in the U.S.	100
5-9	Solar thermal power capacity installed in the U.S.	101
5-10	Solar thermal power capacity installed worldwide	102
5-11	Direct normal solar radiation (flat-plate collector) in Indiana.....	103
6-1	Photovoltaic cell operation.....	109
6-2	Illustration of a cell, module, panel and array of a PV power plant.....	110
6-3	Illustration of concentrating photovoltaic cell.....	111
6-4	Installed price trends among grid-connected, distributed PV systems.....	112
6-5	Installed price of utility-scale PV systems over time	113
6-6	Average construction cost of generation installed in the U.S. (2013-2020).....	114
6-7	Estimated generating technologies capital costs	115
6-8	Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs.....	116
6-9	Installed U.S. PV capacity.....	117
6-10	Renewable portfolio standards and goals	118
7-1	Schematic of an impoundment hydropower facility	132
7-2	Schematic of a diversion hydropower facility.....	132
7-3	Oakdale run-of-river hydropower plant in Carroll County	133
7-4	Microhydro power facility.....	133
7-5	Schematic of a pumped hydro facility.....	134
7-6	Capital cost of new U.S. hydropower plants constructed (1980-2020).....	135
7-7	Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs.....	137
7-8	Net renewable electricity generation in the U.S. (1949-2021).....	138
7-9	Non-powered dams with potential capacity over 1 MW	140
7-10	Renewables share of Indiana net electricity generation (1990-2020)	142

8-1	Schematic of a pumped storage hydropower plant.....	149
8-2	Schematic of an underground pumped storage hydropower plant	150
8-3	Capital cost of underground pumped storage hydropower plant in an abandoned coal mine in Germany	152
8-4	Location of inactive mines in Indiana	156

List of Tables

1-1	Total installed Indiana PV capacity	9
1-2	Renewable generation capacity contracted under net metering.....	10
1-3	Renewable generation capacity contracted under feed-in tariffs.....	10
1-4	Utility-scale PV projects under construction in Indiana	11
1-5	Approved utility-scale PV projects in Indiana not yet under construction.....	11
1-6	Utility-scale PV projects whose approval is pending at the IURC	12
2-1	Wind resource classification	22
2-2	U.S. wind power rankings: top 25 states	33
2-3	Off-shore wind capacity targets by states on the Eastern Seaboard	35
2-4	Indiana wind farms; operating and proposed.....	37
2-5	Wind energy purchase agreements by Indiana utilities	38
2-6	Wind energy virtual purchase agreements from Indiana wind farms	39
3-1	Integrated biorefinery projects	53
3-2	Commercial integrated biorefinery projects	53
3-3	Ethanol plants in Indiana	57
3-4	Average farm-gate cost (\$/ton) for producing switchgrass in Indiana	62
3-5	Cost by category for producing corn stover, switchgrass and miscanthus in Wildcat Creek Watershed	62
4-1	Summary of secondary agricultural wastes potential at select prices and years under <i>2016 Billion-ton</i> study base-case assumptions	73
4-2	Location of the 75 municipal solid waste to energy plants in the U.S.	76
4-3	Top ten states for potential electricity generation from swine and dairy farms.....	78
4-4	Wastewater treatment combined heat and power systems in the U.S.	79
4-5	Electricity generating plants at Indiana landfills	81
4-6	Wabash Valley Power Association landfill electricity projects.....	81
4-7	Potential electricity generating capacity at Indiana landfills	82
4-8	Operational anaerobic digesters in Indiana.....	83
4-9	Potential electricity generating capacity at Indiana concentrated animal feeding operations.....	84
4-10	Potential electricity generating capacity at Indiana wastewater treatment plants.....	85
5-1	Estimated capital cost of CSP plants in the U.S.	97
5-2	Operating concentrating solar power plants in the U.S.	101
5-3	Concentrating solar power plants in the U.S. that are no longer operating... ..	102

6-1	PV systems with capacity above 100 MW installed in the U.S.....	119
6-2	Total installed Indiana PV capacity	120
6-3	Operating PV systems in Indiana with capacity greater than 2 MW	121
6-4	Utility-scale PV projects under construction in Indiana	122
6-5	Approved utility-scale PV projects in Indiana not yet under construction.....	123
6-6	Utility-scale PV projects whose approval is pending at the IURC.....	123
6-7	Purchase rates under NIPSCO renewable feed-in tariff	124
7-1	Initial capital costs of hydropower projects.....	136
7-2	Ten largest hydropower plants in the U.S.....	138
7-3	Top ten U.S. hydropower generating states in 2019 (GWh).....	139
7-4	Top ten U.S. hydropower capacity states at the end of 2020.....	139
7-5	Hydropower potential from non-powered dams by state.....	141
7-6	Indiana non-powered dams with potential capacity over 1 MW	143

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AC	Alternating current
AES	AES Indiana (formerly Indianapolis Power and Light)
AgSTAR	A joint program of EPA and USDA that promotes the use of biogas recovery systems to reduce methane emissions from livestock waste
AMP	American Municipal Power
Btu	British thermal unit
CAFO	Concentrated animal feeding operations
CAISO	California Independent Transmission System Operator
CC	Combined cycle power plant (gas turbine-generator combined with a steam turbine-generator powered by the exhaust heat of the gas turbine-generator)
CCS	Carbon capture and sequestration
CEITC	Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit
CEPTC	Clean Energy Production Tax Credit
CHP	Combined heat and power plant
CNG	Compressed natural gas
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CPV	Concentrating photovoltaic
CRP	Conservation Reserve Program
CSP	Concentrating solar power
DC	Direct current
DOC	U.S. Department of Commerce
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DSIRE	Database of state incentives for renewables and efficiency
EIA	Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERCOT	Electric Reliability Council of Texas
EERE	U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
ft	Feet
ft ³	Cubic feet

GIS	Geographical information system
GW	Gigawatt
GWh	Gigawatthour
IEA	International Energy Agency
IMPA	Indiana Municipal Power Agency
INL	Idaho National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy
IPL	Indianapolis Power and Light Company
IRA	Inflation Reduction Act 2022
IREC	Interstate Renewable Energy Council
ISO-NE	New England Independent Transmission System Operator
ITC	Business energy investment tax credit
IURC	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
I&M	Indiana Michigan Power
KDF	Bioenergy Knowledge Discovery Framework, U.S. Department of Energy
kW	Kilowatt
kWh	Kilowatthour
LLC	Limited liability company
LBNL	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy
LMOP	Landfill Methane Outreach Program, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy
m/s	Meters per second
MACRS	Modified accelerated cost-recovery system
MGD	Million gallons per day
MMGY	Million gallons per year
MISO	Midcontinent Independent System Operator
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
mmBtu	Million British thermal unit
mmscfd	Million standard cubic feet per day
MMTCO ₂ e/yr	Million metric ton of carbon dioxide-equivalent per year
mph	Miles per hour
MSW	Municipal solid waste
MTBE	Methyl tertiary butyl ether – a gasoline oxygenating additive
MW	Megawatt
MW _{AC}	Alternating current Megawatt

MWh	Megawatthour
NAABB	National Alliance for Advanced Biofuels and Bioproducts
NIPSCO	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
NO _x	Nitrogen oxide
NPD	Non-powered dams
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy
NSD	New stream-reach development
NYISO	New York Independent System Operator
O&M	Operation and maintenance
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy
PJM	Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection
POLYSYS	Policy analysis system
PPA	Power purchase agreements
PTC	Production tax credit
PV	Photovoltaic
REAP	Rural Energy for America Program, U.S. Department of Agriculture
RFS	Renewable Fuel Standard
RPS	Renewable portfolio standard
SEDS	State Energy Data System, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy
SEGS	Solar electric generation system
SEIA	Solar Energy Industries Association
SO _x	Sulfur oxides
SPP	Southwest Power Pool
SUFG	State Utility Forecasting Group
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
VEETC	Volumetric ethanol tax credit
W	Watts
W/m ²	Watts per square meter
WPCP	Water pollution control plant
WVPA	Wabash Valley Power Association
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant
yr	year

Foreword

This report represents the twentieth annual study of renewable resources in Indiana performed by the State Utility Forecasting Group. It was prepared to fulfill SUFG's obligation under Indiana Code 8-1-8.8 (added in 2002) to "conduct an annual study on the use, availability, and economics of using renewable energy resources in Indiana." The code was further amended in 2011 and 2022, clarifying the topics to be covered in the report.

The report consists of eight sections. Section one provides an overview of the renewable energy industry in the United States and in Indiana. It includes a discussion of trends in penetration of renewable energy into the energy supply, both nationally and in Indiana. It also includes a discussion of the incentives in the Inflation Reduction Act on 2022 for renewable and clean energy resources. The next six sections are each devoted to a specific renewable resource: energy from wind, dedicated crops grown for energy production, organic biomass waste, solar energy, photovoltaic cells, and hydropower. The final section covers underground pumped storage, which was added to the list in Senate Enrolled Act 147 (2022). The sections are arranged to maintain the format in the previous reports as follows:

- Introduction: This section gives an overview of the technology and briefly explains how the technology works.
- Economics of the renewable resource technology: This section covers the capital and operating costs of the technology.
- State of the renewable resource technology nationally: This section reviews the general level of usage of the technology throughout the country and the potential for increased usage.
- Renewable resource technology in Indiana: This section examines the existing and potential future usage for the technology in Indiana in terms of economics and availability of the resource.
- Incentives for the renewable resource technology: This section contains incentives currently in place to promote the development of the renewable resource.
- References: This section contains references that can be used for a more detailed examination of the particular renewable resource.

This report was prepared by the State Utility Forecasting Group. The information contained in it should not be construed as advocating or reflecting any other organization's views or policy position. For further information, contact SUFG at:

State Utility Forecasting Group
2550 Northwestern Ave.
West Lafayette, IN 47906
Phone: 765-494-4223
e-mail: sufg@purdue.edu
<https://www.purdue.edu/discoverypark/sufg/>

1. Overview

This first section of the 2022 Indiana Renewable Energy Resources Study report presents an overview of the trends in renewable energy penetration in the U.S. and in Indiana.

1.1 Trends in renewable energy consumption in the United States

Figure 1-1 shows the amount of renewable energy in quadrillion British thermal units (Btu) consumed in the U.S. from 1949 to 2021 as provided by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Until the early 2000s hydroelectricity and woody biomass were the dominant sources of renewable energy. Since then biofuels (mainly corn-based ethanol), wind and solar have increased rapidly as sources of renewable energy. In 2021, biofuels, wind and solar combined contributed 59 percent of the 12.2 quadrillion Btu of renewable energy consumed in the U.S., reducing hydroelectricity's share to 19 percent. The two main factors that caused the rise in corn-ethanol use as a fuel are its use as a replacement for the oxygenating additive MTBE in gasoline, which started being phased out in 2000, and the Federal Renewable Fuel Standard, first authorized in the 2005 Energy Policy Act and then expanded in 2007, which created mandates for the production of biofuels.




Figure 1-1: Renewable energy consumption in the U.S. (1949-2021) (Data source: Energy Information Administration (EIA) [1])

The rapid increase in wind energy started with the introduction of the Federal Production Tax Credit (PTC) in 1992, and continued with the enacting of renewable portfolio standards (RPS) in a number of states. The rapid expansion in solar capacity installations is attributed to a combination of state RPS, financial incentives offered by the federal government and the declining cost of

installing photovoltaic systems. These federal incentives for solar energy include the modification of the 30 percent Investment Tax Credit (ITC) to remove the \$2,000 cap and to allow utilities access to the ITC, the provision for investors to take a 30 percent cash grant in lieu of the ITC and PTC, and the provision of extra funds for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) loan guarantee program.

This cash grant provision and the special DOE loan guarantee program provided under Section 1705 of the Energy Policy Act were retired in 2011. However, the PTC and the ITC are still in place having been extended to include projects starting construction in 2021 and 2022 by the Taxpayer Certainty and Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2020 [2, 3].

Despite the growth in renewable resources shown in Figure 1-1, renewable energy's share of the total energy consumed in the U.S. in 2021 remains modest at approximately 12.5 percent. In 2021 fossil fuels supplied 79 percent of the energy consumed in the U.S while nuclear energy supplied 8.4 percent. Figure 1-2 shows the sources of total energy consumed in the U.S. from 1949 to 2021.




Figure 1-2: U.S. energy consumption by source (1949-2021) (Data source: EIA [4])

Figure 1-3 shows the contribution of the various energy sources to the total energy consumed in the U.S. in 2021. Petroleum (36 percent) and natural gas (32 percent) continue to be the largest sources of energy. Coal's share was 11 percent in 2021, while the total renewable energy share remained at 12.5 percent. Among renewable resources, biomass (including wood, biofuels, municipal solid waste, landfill gas and others) comprised 40 percent of the total renewable energy. Wind energy surpassed hydroelectricity in 2019, contributing 27 percent of the renewable energy in 2021 compared to hydroelectricity's 19 percent. Solar energy's contribution increased from 11 percent of renewable energy in 2020 to 12 percent in 2021 while geothermal stayed at 2 percent.




Figure 1-3: U.S. total energy consumption by energy source in 2021 (Data source: EIA [1, 5])

Figure 1-4 shows the growth of renewable resources in electricity generation in the U.S. from 1949 to 2021. Through the late 1980s hydroelectricity was the sole significant source of renewable electricity annual generation at which point wind started gaining prominence, contributing approximately 10 percent of the annual renewable generation. In the early 2000s wind energy's share of electricity generation started rising rapidly. In 2021 wind accounted for 46 percent of the renewable electricity generated, for the third-year surpassing hydroelectricity, whose share of the total renewable electricity generated dropped from 36 percent in 2020 to 31 percent in 2021. Solar electricity generation has risen rapidly in the last ten years contributing 14 percent of the U.S. renewable electricity generation in 2021, an increase of 3 percent from 2020.




Figure 1-4: Renewable electricity generation in the U.S. (1949-2021) (Data source: EIA [6])

Although the amount of electricity generated from renewable resources has increased rapidly in the last twenty years, fossil fuels continue to be the main source of electricity generated in the U.S. Figure 1-5 shows the amount of electricity generated from all sources from 1949 to 2021. Electricity generated from renewable resources has overtaken nuclear energy for the first time since the 1980s, generating 20 percent of net electricity generated in 2021 and nuclear dropping to 19 percent of the net electricity generated in 2021.




Figure 1-5: U.S. electricity generation by source (1949-2021) (Data source: EIA [6])

Figure 1-6 shows the share of electricity generated from various energy sources in the U.S. in 2021. Natural gas, coal and nuclear energy still comprise most electricity generation, jointly accounting for 79 percent of the electricity generated in 2021. Renewable resources jointly

contributed 20 percent and petroleum less than half of a percent. Among renewable resources hydroelectricity and wind played the dominant roles, jointly contributing 77 percent of the total renewable electricity generated (46 percent from wind and 31 percent from hydro). Solar contributed 14 percent, wood 5 percent, waste biomass 2 percent, and geothermal 2 percent. As expected, pumped hydroelectricity's net energy contribution was negative.¹




Figure 1-6: Net U.S. electricity generation by energy source in 2020 (Data source: EIA [6])

1.2 Trends in renewable energy consumption in Indiana

Figure 1-7 shows renewable energy consumption in Indiana from 1960 to 2020. In the 1980s, renewable resources contributed over 3 percent of total energy consumed in Indiana. In the 1990s the share fell to below 2 percent, until the expansions in ethanol and wind in the last decade increased renewable resources' share to 7.1 percent in 2020. Before the entry of ethanol and wind in the 2000s, woody biomass had been the main source of renewable energy in Indiana, comprising over 80 percent of the total renewable energy. This has since changed, with biofuels becoming the largest source of renewable energy, supplying 44 percent of the renewable energy consumed in 2020, followed by wind energy contributing 30 percent. Wood and wood waste

¹ Pumped hydroelectric facilities use electricity from the grid during periods of low demand and price to pump water from a lower reservoir to a higher one. That water is then available to generate electricity during high demand and price periods. Due to evaporation and inefficiencies in the pumping and generating processes, less energy is generated than is used. However, the value of the lost energy is more than compensated because low cost, off-peak electricity is converted to high cost, on-peak electricity.

contributed 20 percent, geothermal and solar 3 percent each. The share of the renewable resources to Indiana's total energy consumption increased from 6.7 percent in 2019 to 7.1 percent in 2020.




Figure 1-7: Renewables share of Indiana total energy consumption (1960-2020) (Data source: EIA [7])

Figure 1-8 shows the contribution of renewable energy to Indiana's net electricity generation from 1990 to 2020. The construction of utility-scale wind energy projects beginning in 2008 marked the beginning of a rapid increase in renewable energy's share of Indiana's electricity generation. The renewables share of annual electricity generation rose from 0.5 percent in 2007 to 8.2 percent in 2020. The share of hydroelectricity, which until 2007 was the primary source of renewable electricity, dropped to 0.3 percent of the net electricity generated in Indiana in 2020. Wind energy has become the dominant source of renewable electricity in Indiana, contributing 85 percent of the renewable electricity generated in 2020. Solar photovoltaic generation has grown from virtually none in 2011 to 359 GWh in 2020 which was approximately 0.4 percent of Indiana's total net generation.




Figure 1-8: Renewables share of Indiana electricity generation (1990-2020) (Data source: EIA [8])

As can be seen in Figure 1-9 Indiana's wind energy capacity has increased steadily since the installation of the first utility scale wind farm in 2008. At the end of July 2021, the installed utility scale wind farm capacity stood at 3,148 MW when the 200 MW Headwaters II Wind Farm in Randolph County was commissioned. When the 302 MW Indiana Crossroads Wind Farm currently under construction in White County is completed the total installed capacity of utility-scale wind farms in Indiana will be 3,450 MW.

Indiana utilities have a total 2,363 MW of wind capacity contracted through power purchase agreements, with 1,844 MW from wind farms in Indiana and 420 MW from out of state wind farms.




Figure 1-9: Wind energy capacity in Indiana (Data source: IURC [9], DOE [10])

The other renewable resource that has been experiencing rapid growth in Indiana in the last decade is solar photovoltaic, with its installed capacity increasing from virtually none in 2008 to more than 682 MW as of July 2022. As can be seen in Table 1-1 the PV capacity is connected to the grid as follows: 61 percent (415 MW) through either direct ownership by utilities or through power purchase agreements², 22 percent (149 MW) through net metering³ tariffs and 17 percent (118 MW) through feed-in tariffs⁴.

The factors credited for rapid growth in photovoltaic generation capacity in Indiana include federal, state and utility incentives. Federal incentives include the 30 percent ITC. In the recently

² For the sake of brevity, the following designations are used in this report to indicate each utility: AES – AES Indiana, Duke – Duke Energy Indiana, Hoosier – Hoosier Energy Rural electric Cooperative, IMPA – Indiana Municipal Power Agency, I&M – Indiana Michigan Power, NIPSCO – Northern Indiana Public Service Company, CenterPoint – CenterPoint Energy, and WVPA – Wabash Valley Power Association.

³ The net metering rule allows customers with eligible renewable resource generating facilities to receive credit for the self-generated electricity at the retail rate. At the end of each billing cycle the customer pays for the net electricity received from the utility. In the Indiana rule excess generation by the customer is credited to the next billing cycle.

⁴ A feed-in tariff is a long-term contract offered by a utility to buy electricity from a customer-owned renewable resource generating facility at incentive rates that reflect the cost of generating electricity from the renewable technology.

passed Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) the ITC has been extended to include projects beginning construction before the end of 2024. At the beginning of 2025 a new investment tax credit, the Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit (CEITC) kicks. The CEITC is identical to the ITC except it is expanded to include other net zero carbon emission generating technologies. The CEITC phases out at the end of 2032 or alternatively when greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity sector falls to 75 percent below the 2022 level [11]. More details about the incentives included in the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 are provided later (Section 1.4) in this report.

The favorable conditions at the state level include the expansion of the net metering rule to include all customer classes, increasing the capacity cap on renewable generating systems up to 1 MW, and the increase of the cap at which a utility may limit system-wide net metering capacity from one-tenth of a percent to one percent of its most recent summer peak [2]. The net metering rule has since been modified by Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 (2017) to change the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 will continue to receive full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until July 1, 2032 [2, 12].

	Feed-in-Tariff (MW_{AC})	Net Metered PV (MW_{AC})	Utility Owned or Purchase Agreement (MW_{AC})	Total (MW_{AC})
I&M		26	230	256
AES	96*	9		105
Duke		54	44	98
NIPSCO	22	42	0	64
CenterPoint		18	54	72
IMPA			68	68
Hoosier			12	12
WVPA			7	7
Total	118	149	415	682

*Includes 1,858 kW whose feed-in tariff contracts have expired

Table 1-1: Total installed Indiana PV capacity (Data source: IURC [9], CenterPoint [13], I&M [14])

Another major factor has been the feed-in tariffs offered by two of Indiana's utilities: AES and NIPSCO. The AES feed-in tariff ended in 2013. Table 1-2 shows the 151 MW of renewable capacity contracted via net metering in the respective territories of the two Indiana utilities at the end of 2021, while Table 1-3 shows the 133 MW of renewable capacity contracted to the two Indiana utilities under their feed-in tariffs at the end of 2021. The renewable capacity contracted under the net metering tariff has increased by 15 percent from the 132 MW connected under net metering at the end of 2020 while the renewables connected under the feed-in tariffs have increased by 2 percent from 130 MW connected at the end of 2020.

Utility	Solar PV (kW)	Wind (kW)	Biomass (kW)	Total (kW)
Duke	52,909	4,349	-	57,258
I&M	40,496	2,198	-	42,694
AES	24,290	150	240	24,680
NIPSCO	17,846	16	-	17,862
CenterPoint	8,478	50	-	8,528
Total kW	144,019	6,763	240	151,022

Table 1-2: Renewable generation capacity contracted under net metering (Data source: IURC [15])

Utility	Solar (kW)	Wind (kW)	Biomass (kW)	Total
AES	95,885*	-	-	95,885
NIPSCO	22,380	180	14,348	36,908
Total kW	118,265	180	14,348	132,793

*Includes 1,858 kW whose feed-in tariff contracts have expired

Table 1-3: Renewable generation capacity contracted under feed-in tariffs (Data source: IURC [9])

Indiana's PV capacity is set to increase substantially if all the currently proposed solar projects are constructed. Table 1-4 is a list of large-scale proposed PV projects that were under construction at the time this report was written in September 2022. Table 1-5 is a list of the projects which had received approval by the IURC but whose construction had not started while Table 1-6 is a list of the solar projects which had their application pending at the IURC. When the 7 projects under construction are completed Indiana's PV capacity will increase by 1,586 to 2,241 MW.

If all the approved projects are completed, Indiana's solar PV capacity will increase by 5,445 MW to 7,686 and if the 5 projects whose petitions were pending at the IURC at the writing of this report are completed Indiana's solar PV capacity will increase by another 800 MW to a total 8,486.

Project	County	Utility Owner or Buyer	Capacity (MW _{AC})	Planned In-service Date	IURC Cause Number
Dunn's Bridge I Solar	Jasper	NIPSCO	265	2022	45462
Indiana Crossroads Solar	White	NIPSCO	200	2022	45524
Fairbanks Solar Energy Center	Sullivan	NIPSCO	250	2023	45254
Speedway Solar	Shelby	Merchant	199	2023	45230
Lone Oak Solar Energy	Madison	Merchant	120	2023	45255

Total under construction **1,586**

Table 1-4: Utility-scale PV projects under construction in Indiana (Data source: IURC [9, 16])

Project	County	Utility Owner or Buyer	Capacity (MW _{AC})	In-service Date	IURC Cause Number
Dunn's Bridge II Solar	Jasper	NIPSCO	435	2023	45462
Gibson Solar	Gibson	NIPSCO	280	2023	45489
Calvary Solar	White	NIPSCO	200	2023	45462
Elliot Solar	Gibson	NIPSCO	200	2023	45529
Hardy Hills Solar	Clinton	AES	195	2023	45493
Posey County Solar	Posey	CenterPoint	300	2023	45501
Warrick County Solar	Warrick	CenterPoint	100	2023	45501
Petersburg Solar	Pike	AES	250	2024	45591
Ratts 1 Solar	Pike	Merchant	150	2024	45426
Brickyard Solar	Boone	NIPSCO	200	2023	45424
Wheatland Solar	Knox	Merchant	150	2023	45676
Honey Creek Solar	White	Merchant	400	2023	45704
Ratts 2 Solar	Knox	Merchant	150	2023	45615
Skycrest Solar Facility	Jay	Merchant	155	2024	45570
Mammoth Solar Phase 2	Pulaski	Merchant	300	2024	45586
Mammoth Solar Phase 3	Pulaski	Merchant	600	2024	45662
Sun Chief Solar Farm	Jay	Merchant	100	2025	45723
Greensboro Solar	Henry	NIPSCO	100	NA	45425
Trade Post Solar	Sullivan	Merchant	200	NA	45539
Crossroads Solar	Fountain	Merchant	200	NA	45681
Riverstart Solar Park III	Randolph	Merchant	100	NA	45682
Foundry Works Solar	Lake	Merchant	200	NA	45639
Crosstrack Solar	Pike	Merchant	130	NA	45652
Moss Creek Solar	Pulaski	Merchant	200	NA	45657
Rose Gold Solar	Jay	Merchant	150	NA	45672

Total approved but not started construction **5,625**

Table 1-5: Approved utility-scale PV projects in Indiana not yet under construction (Data source: IURC [9, 16])

Project	County	Utility Owner or Buyer	Capacity (MW _{AC})	In-service Date	IURC Cause Number
Rustic Hills Solar II	Warrick	Merchant	100 MW	NA	45716
Rustic Hills Solar	Warrick	Merchant	100 MW	NA	45718
Thalassa Solar	Dekalb	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45739
Twin Lakes Solar	White	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45741
Honeysuckle Solar	St. Joseph	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45742
Blackford Solar	Blackford	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45759

Total with approval pending at IURC **800**

Table 1-6: Utility-scale PV projects whose approval is pending at the IURC (Data source: IURC [9, 16])

1.3 Cost of renewable resources

Figure 1-10 shows the average construction cost of wind and solar photovoltaic installed in the U.S. from 2013 to 2020. Included also for comparison is the cost of combustion turbine and combined cycle plants installed in the same time period. As can be seen in the figure the capital cost of PV has dropped by 55 percent from \$3,705 in 2013 to \$1,655 in 2020. Onshore wind generation capital cost has dropped by 21 percent in the same time period.




Figure 1-10: Average construction cost of generation installed 2013 to 2020 (Data source: EIA [17])

Figure 1-11 shows the estimated cost of future generating plants modeled in the 2021 EIA Annual Energy Outlook. For the first time, the estimated capital cost of a PV plant is lower than that of a wind power plant; the capital cost of a PV plant with tracking capability is estimated \$1,248/kW as compared with \$1,846/kW for a wind power plant. The estimated cost of renewable generators is still for the most part higher than that of fossil fuel generators that would be considered for installation currently. For example, the capital cost of PV with tracking is 15 percent higher than that of a single-shaft combined cycle plant, 30 percent higher than that of multi-shaft combined cycle plant and 76 percent higher than that of an industrial frame combustion turbine.




Figure 1-11: Estimated generating technologies capital costs (Data source: EIA [18])

Figure 1-12 shows the EIA estimated fixed and variable operating and maintenance (O&M) costs of the future generating technologies modeled in the 2021 EIA Annual Energy Outlook. As can be seen in the figure, renewable resources do not have a clear advantage over conventional

generating technologies in terms of fixed O&M costs. But when it comes to variable O&M costs renewable resource generators, except for biomass based ones, have a clear advantage; renewable generators such as wind and solar have virtually no variable O&M costs. In addition, most renewable generators have no fuel cost, since their fuel (sunlight and wind) is free.





Figure 1-12: Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs (Data source: EIA [18])

The cost of generating electricity from renewable resources has fallen dramatically over time. Figure 1-13 shows the mean levelized cost of electricity generated from various sources. The levelized cost is the total cost of building and operating a power plant spread over the total energy generated by the power plant over its lifetime.

HISTORIC AVERAGE LEVELIZED COST OF ENERGY

Per megawatt-hour, unsubsidized values, 2009-2018



NOTE: Reflects average of unsubsidized high and low levelized cost of energy range.

Figure 1-13: Historic average levelized cost of energy from various technologies (Source: InsideClimateNews using data from Lazard [19])

1.4 Renewable energy incentives in the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022

The Inflation Reduction Act 2022 (IRA) signed into law on August 12, has extended and expanded the tax incentives available to renewable resources as follows [11, 20, 21].

Extended the production tax credit (PTC) and investment tax credit (ITC)

- The PTC has been extended to include projects beginning construction before the end of 2024 at its full value of 1.5 cents/kWh in 1993 dollars. The PTC for wind had expired at the end of 2021.
- The investment tax credit (ITC) has been extended at its full 30 percent value to include projects starting construction before the end of 2024. The ITC for solar, before this extension, had started scaling down and had been set at 26 percent for projects starting construction in 2022.
- The ability to draw the full value of the PTC or the ITC is subject to a project meeting the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions explained in more detail later in this sub-section of the report.

Expanded the PTC and ITC to other generating technologies

- The IRA expands the PTC to include solar generating technology. Previously, solar energy projects had access only to the ITC.
- The ITC has been expanded to include stand-alone energy storage equipment. Until this change, energy storage could only qualify for the ITC if it was coupled with a renewable generating resource such as solar or wind.
- The PTC was expanded to include electricity generated from existing nuclear power plants. The PTC for nuclear generation starts applying to electricity produced and sold from January 2024 to the end of 2032.
- The credits in this set are also subject the prevailing wage requirement mentioned earlier.

IRA introduced new Clean Energy Tax Credits (production tax credit and investment tax credit) which come into effect in 2025. That is, after the expiration date of the traditional PTC and the ITC. The two clean energy credits are

- The Clean Energy Production Tax Credit (CEPTC) is similar to the traditional PTC except it expands eligibility for the 1.5 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) to include, in addition to the traditional renewable generating technologies, all other net-zero greenhouse emission technologies. A nuclear power plant would qualify under this category. The CEPTC expires at the end of 2032 or when greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity industry is reduced to 75 percent below 2022 levels.
- The Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit (CEITC) is similar to the current ITC except it expands to include all net-zero greenhouse gas emitting technologies such as nuclear. Like the CEPTC the CEITC phases out at the end of 2032 or when the greenhouse gasses emissions from the electricity industry target of 75 percent below 2022 levels is reached.

Prevailing wage and apprenticeship condition. The IRA requires that before a project can draw the full value of any of the above tax credits all the employees in the project must be paid a wage that is no less than the prevailing wage for their profession at the locality hosting the project. In addition, a specified amount of the labor for the project must from workers participating in the apprenticeship program as defined by the National Apprenticeship Act. A project that does not meet the prevailing wage requirement will be eligible for a much-reduced credit as follows

- PTC and CEPTC – start at a base rate of 0.3 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) and only goes up to 1.5 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) for projects that meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements.
- ITC and CEITC – start at a base rate of 6 percent and only goes up to 30 percent for projects that meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirement

Projects can earn bonus tax credits if they satisfy the following conditions

- A project meeting the domestic content condition can earn 10 percent extra tax credit. To meet the domestic content condition a project has to do the following; use 100 percent U.S. steel and iron, use a specified percentage of its manufactured components using products made or mined in the U.S.
- A project locating in an “energy community qualifies for an extra 10 credit.” An energy community is defined as a brownfield site, an area that has had significant employment in the fossil fuel industry or an area that has had a coal mine close or a coal-fired power plant retire.
- A project locating in “an environmental justice community” qualifies for 10 percent extra tax credit. An environmental justice community is defined as a low-income community, Native American land, or a low-income economic development project or residential building
- A project locating in a low-income economic development project or residential building is eligible for 20 percent extra tax credit.
- These extra tax credits also apply to the production tax credits, except that for the production tax credits the 10 percent extra credit is calculated as a percentage of the underlying production tax credit. That is, as a percentage of the 1.5 cents/kWh (1993 dollars).

Direct pay option for non-profit organizations including local and state governments. The IRA now provides that non-profit organizations can receive cash payment for the tax credit that they would have qualified for if they had been a tax-paying entity.

Tax credits can now be transferred (sold) without attracting a tax liability on the revenue received by the selling entity.

Other clean energy incentives in the IRA that don’t directly apply to the renewable resources covered in this report but will have an impact on the broader clean energy industry include

- An investment tax credit for electric and hydrogen-fueled vehicles: \$7,500 tax credit for a new electric or hydrogen-fueled vehicle and \$4,000 for a used electric or hydrogen-fueled vehicle.
- Alternative Fuel Refueling Property Credit: Up to 30 percent investment tax credit for electric charger stations.
- A production tax credit for clean hydrogen production projects of up to \$3/kg.
- A carbon capture and sequestration credit of up to \$85/ton for carbon that is captured and sequestered geologically and up to \$60/ton for carbon oxide that is reused.
- Advanced Energy Project Credit; up to 30 percent investment tax credit for projects that contribute to domestic manufacture of renewable energy technologies.
- Advanced Manufacturing Production Tax Credit: a production tax credit for domestic production of certain solar and wind components such as such as inverters, battery components and critical minerals needed to manufacture them.
- Clean Fuel Production Credit; a production tax credit for clean transportation fuels.

1.5 References

1. Energy Information Administration (EIA). April 2022 Monthly Energy Review Table 10.1.
<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#renewable>
2. Database of State Incentives for Renewables & Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>
3. U.S.DOE Wind Technologies Office. Advancing the Growth of the U.S. Wind Industry: Federal Incentives, Funding, and Partnership Opportunities. February 2020.
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/projects/tax-credits>
4. EIA. April 2022 Monthly Energy Review Table 1.1
<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#summary>
5. EIA. April 2022 Monthly Energy Review Table 1.3
<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#summary>
6. EIA. April 2020 Monthly Energy Review, Table 7.2a.
<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#electricity>
7. EIA. State Energy Data System (SEDS): 1960-2020 (complete).
Table CT2. Primary Energy Consumption Estimates, Selected Years, 1960-2020, Indiana (Trillion Btu).
<https://www.eia.gov/state/seds/seds-data-complete.php?sid=IN>
https://www.eia.gov/state/seds/data.php?incfile=/state/seds/sep_sum/html/sum_btu_1.html&sid=IN
8. EIA. 1990-2020 Net Generation by State by Type of Producer by Energy Source. Release date: November 3, 2021
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/>
https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/annual_generation_state.xls
9. Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC). July 2021, July 2022.
10. U.S.DOE WINDEchange. U.S. Installed and Potential Wind Power Capacity and Generation.
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/321>
11. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
12. Indiana General Assembly, 2017 Session. Senate Bill 309
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>
13. CenterPoint Energy 2019/2020 Integrated Resource Plan, June 2020.
14. Indiana Michigan Power. St. Joseph Solar Farm Fact Sheet.
<https://www.indianamichiganpower.com/account/bills/programs/im-green/st-joseph-solar>
15. IURC Research Policy & Planning Division. 2022 Q1 Net Metering Quarterly Reporting Summary. <https://www.in.gov/iurc/research-policy-and-planning-division/>
<https://www.in.gov/iurc/files/2022-Q1-Net-Metering-Quarterly-Reporting-Summary.pdf>

16. IURC Online Services Portal.
<https://iurc.portal.in.gov/advanced-search/>
17. EIA. Generator Construction cost data.
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/generatorcosts/>
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data.php>
18. EIA. Cost and Performance Characteristics of New Generating Technologies, Annual Energy Outlook 2021. February 2021.
https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/assumptions/pdf/table_8.2.pdf
19. InsideClimateNews. Chart: Renewable Energy Costs Are Falling. December 1, 2018.
<https://insideclimatenews.org/content/chart-renewable-energy-costs-are-falling>
20. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. August 10, 2022. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions.
<https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
21. Megawatt Daily. August 18, 2022.

2. Energy from Wind

2.1 Introduction

Wind turbines convert the kinetic energy in moving air into mechanical energy and then into electricity by turning a generator. There are two main types of wind turbines, vertical and horizontal axis. The horizontal axis turbine with three blades facing into the wind is the most common configuration in modern wind turbines. The vertical wind turbines are more suitable for smaller urban applications where space is limited and safety of much greater concern. The horizontal axis wind turbines not only capture more energy per volume of moving air but they also can be mounted at much greater heights to capture higher speed and less turbulent winds [1]. Figure 2-1 shows the basic parts of a modern horizontal axis wind turbine used for electricity generation.




Figure 2-1: Horizontal wind turbine configuration (Source: Alternative Energy News [2])

Although utility-scale wind farms were not installed in the U.S. until the 1980s, windmills had been a source of energy for pumping water on farms and ranches in the 19th century and into the early parts of the 20th century. Until the rural electrification efforts of the federal government delivered reliable grid-connected electricity to rural areas, wind-powered generators were a major source of electricity for farms and ranches far removed from the grid [3]. Utility-scale wind farms in the U.S. began in California in the 1980s, with individual wind turbines on the order of 50 – 100 kilowatts (kW). Turbine capacity and wind farm sizes have grown steadily to the point where the two-megawatt (MW) turbine and wind farms with hundreds of MW of capacity are common [4].

Although wind farms’ capacities have grown to be comparable to fossil fuel-fired generators, the total electricity that can be produced from a wind farm annually is typically much less than the electricity that is available from a fossil fuel-fired power plant with the same name-plate capacity. A baseload coal or nuclear power plant in the U.S. may have an annual capacity factor⁵ of over 80 percent while typically the capacity factors of wind farms are estimated to range between 20 and 40 percent, depending on the average annual wind speed at their location [5].

Wind speeds are important in determining a turbine’s performance. Generally, annual average wind speeds of greater than 9 miles per hour (mph) are required for small electric wind turbines, whereas utility-scale wind plants require a minimum wind speed of 10 mph. The power available to drive wind turbines is proportional to the cube of the speed of the wind. This implies that a doubling in wind speed leads to an eight-fold increase in power output. A measurement called the wind power density is used to classify sites into “wind power classes”. Wind power density is measured in watts per square meter (W/m²) and is calculated from annual observed wind speeds and the density of air [6]. Table 2-1 shows the wind class categories currently used.

	10 m (33 ft) Elevation		50 m (164 ft) Elevation	
Wind Power Class	Wind Power Density (W/m ²)	Speed m/s (mph)	Wind Power Density (W/m ²)	Speed m/s (mph)
1	0–100	0- 4.4 (9.8)	0-200	0-5.6 (12.5)
2	100 – 150	4.4 – 5.1 (9.8 – 11.5)	200 – 300	5.6 – 6.4 (12.5 – 14.3)
3	150 – 200	5.1 – 5.6 (11.5 – 12.5)	300 – 400	6.4 – 7.0 (14.3 – 15.7)
4	200 – 250	5.6 – 6.0 (12.5 – 13.4)	400 – 500	7.0 – 7.5 (15.7 – 16.8)
5	250 – 300	6.0 – 6.4 (13.4 – 14.3)	500 – 600	7.5 – 8.0 (16.8 – 17.9)
6	300 – 400	6.4 – 7.0 (14.3 – 15.7)	600 – 800	8.0 – 8.8 (17.9 – 19.7)
7	400 - 1000	7.0 – 9.4 (15.7 – 21.1)	> 800	8.8-11.9 (19.7-26.6)

Table 2-1: Wind resource classification (Data source: MIT [7])

⁵ Annual capacity factor = $\frac{\text{Actual amount of energy produced in a year}}{\text{Energy that would have been produced if plant operated at full rated capacity all year}}$

Wind energy's main advantage is that it is a carbon-free virtually inexhaustible resource. The placement of a wind turbine does not materially diminish the power of the wind, the only limitation being the space available to build wind farms where good quality wind blows. By the same token wind has the main disadvantage in that it is intermittent. That is, the output from a wind farm is determined by the level of the wind blowing at the moment and is not at the control of the grid operator. The only control the grid operator can assert is to curtail the output from the wind farm from feeding into the grid. This intermittency reduces the wind generator's value at both the operational and the system capacity planning levels. At the capacity planning level, the system planner needs to know how much energy they can expect from a generator at a future planning date. Since the wind speeds on a particular day many years into the future is unknown it is difficult to quantify how much power one can expect from the wind farm at any future planning date. Another significant disadvantage of wind energy is that good wind sites tend to be located far from main load centers and from existing transmission lines. Concerns have also been raised about the death of birds and bats flying into wind turbines, the possibility of turbines causing radar interference, and potential adverse effects of the shadow flicker⁶ on people living in close proximity to the wind turbine.

2.2 Economics of wind energy

Figure 2-2 shows capital cost estimates for electricity generating plants modeled by the EIA in the 2022 Annual Energy Outlook. The national average cost for a wind farm on land is estimated at \$1,718/kW while the national average for offshore wind is estimated at \$5,096/kW. In these estimates EIA observes that the capital cost of wind (and solar) plants varies widely across the United States. The estimated capital cost of wind varies from a low of \$1,411/kW in regions such as Indiana to a high \$2,757/kW in such regions as Texas. According to EIA the locational factors affecting the variation in wind plant capital costs regionally includes such things such as the quality of the wind in the region, proximity to existing transmission lines, access to a road network and availability of lower development cost land.

⁶Shadow flicker is the pulse of shadows and reflections that are sometimes caused by the moving turbine blades.




Figure 2-2: Estimated capital costs of various electric generation options (Data source: EIA [8])

Figure 2-3 shows the capacity-weighted average construction cost for wind and other generation technologies projects installed in the U.S. from 2013 to 2020. As can be seen from the figure the cost has been decreasing steadily from \$1,895/kW in 2013 to \$1,391/kW in 2019 (27 percent) but then increased slightly in 2020 to \$1,498/kW.




Figure 2-3: Average construction cost of generators installed 2013 to 2020 in the U.S.
(Data source: EIA [9, 10])

Figure 2-4 shows the trend in installed wind power plant costs for the projects from 1982 to 2021 contained in the *2022 Land-Based Wind Market Report* from Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). As can be seen in the figure, after a period of increasing project cost between 2005 and 2009, the costs have been declining. The 2021 capacity-weighted average installed project cost of \$1,501/kW was 43 percent lower than the peak \$2,643/kW reported in 2009. The decline in installed costs of wind energy projects reflects the reduction in turbine prices that has been occurring since 2008.




Figure 2-4: Installed wind power project costs 1982 to 2018 (Source: LBNL [11])

Figure 2-5 shows the operating and maintenance (O&M) costs of electricity generating plants according to the EIA February 2022 estimates. EIA estimates the variable O&M to be zero for both land-based and offshore wind farms. The fixed O&M cost is estimated at \$28/kW and for land-based wind farms and \$115/kW for offshore wind farms.




Figure 2-5: Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs (Data source: EIA [8])

Figure 2-6 shows the median annual O&M costs by commercial operation date in the 2022 LBNL land-based wind market report. The chart groups the projects into three sets by their commercial operation date, that is, those commissioned from 1998 to 2005, those commissioned from 2006 to 2012 and those commissioned from 2013 to 2020. According to LBNL the O&M cost data shown should be read with caution because consistent O&M data is not readily available and even where it is, the costs included as O&M cost may not be consistent among projects. Therefore, LBNL recommends that the data and the chart should only be used as indicative of potential overall trends. As one would expect, projects commissioned 1998 to 2005 have a higher median annual O&M cost (\$33-78/kW-year) than newly commissioned projects; \$25-34/kW-year for projects commissioned between 2013-2020.




Figure 2-6: Average O&M costs for available data years (Source: LBNL [11])

Figure 2-7 shows a comparison between the wholesale value (capacity and energy) of wind across seven regional electricity markets and nationwide generation-weighted levelized wind power purchase agreement (PPA) prices based on the year the PPA was executed. The wholesale value of wind is obtained using the regional hourly wind output profiles and the real-time hourly wholesale energy prices at the nearest pricing point. As can be seen in the figure, the average value of wind has declined in the last decade falling to its lowest level in 2017 after which it has risen in the last three years but not to the highs of the 2008-2012 period.

With the sharp drop in wholesale electricity prices in 2009 precipitated by the 2007-2008 financial crisis, wind PPA prices exceeded the market value of wind energy in the period between 2009 and 2012. The declining prices of wind PPAs came back to within the range of wind's market value in 2013 and has mainly remained that way to date. The upwards trend in wind's market value in 2017 and 2018 caused some PPAs to be lower than wind's market value in a majority of the markets, making wind energy very competitive. During those years when the PPA prices were higher than the value of wind energy, wind energy's competitiveness was aided by the federal production tax credit.




Figure 2-7: Wholesale energy value of wind (Source: LBNL [11])

2.3 State of wind energy nationally

As can be seen in Figure 2-8, U.S. installed wind energy capacity has increased steadily from 1,512 MW total installed capacity at the end of 1998 to 138,630 MW total installed capacity at the end of March 2022. In that period wind energy has grown to rival hydroelectricity as the nation's main source of renewable electricity. In 2019 wind for the first time overtook hydroelectricity as the largest source of renewable electricity generation in the U.S. The 380,000 GWh of electricity generated from wind in 2021 constituted 46 percent of renewable generation in that year.

The 13,413 MW of wind generating capacity added in 2021 was 22 percent lower than the 17,213 MW installed in 2020. This slowdown in wind capacity installation was likely due to the supply chain and other disruptions associated with the Covid-19 pandemic.




Figure 2-8: U.S. wind capacity growth (Sources: LBNL [11], DOE [12])

Federal and state incentives and state renewable portfolio standards continue to play key roles in the growth in the wind industry. The various surges and sudden drops in capacity additions seen in Figure 2-8 are associated with the years when the production tax credit was heading to expiration. When the credit was extended in 2015, a provision was included to phase it down by reducing the credit by 20 percent for wind projects commencing construction in 2017, by 40 percent for projects commencing construction in 2018 and by 60 percent for projects commencing construction in 2019. The credit has since been extended several of times, most recently in December 2020 to include projects beginning construction in 2020 and 2021. The credit for 2020 and 2021 was set at 60 percent of the full rate.

Figure 2-9 is a map showing the states that have enacted some form of renewable or clean energy portfolio standard or set a non-binding goal. Thirty states and Washington, DC have binding renewable portfolio standards while eight states, including Indiana, have non-binding renewable portfolio goals. Five states have binding clean energy standards while five states have non-binding clean energy goals. Clean energy standards differ from renewable portfolio standards in that they also include low carbon resources such as nuclear energy and coal-bed methane that are deemed to contribute to a reduction in net greenhouse gas emissions.





Figure 2-9: Renewable portfolio standards across the U.S. (Source: DSIRE [13])

Figure 2-10 shows the distribution of the 138,630 MW cumulative capacity of utility-scale wind farms installed in the U.S. by state as of the end of 2021. Texas continued to lead with a total capacity of 36,808 MW installed, over three times the installed capacity its closest follower Iowa, which had 12,219 installed. Oklahoma is third with 11,992 MW installed. Indiana ranked 12th overall with 3,468 MW of wind capacity installed at the end of 2021.

Q1 2022 Installed Wind Power Capacity (MW)



Total Installed Wind Capacity: 138,630 MW

Figure 2-10: Wind power capacity by state at the end of 2021 (MW) (Source: DOE [12])

While Texas led in total capacity installed, Iowa led in percentage of electricity generated by wind in 2021 at 55 percent. South Dakota followed with wind contribution to electricity generated at 52 percent. Indiana ranked 19th overall in share of wind in the electricity generation in 2021 at 8 percent which was lower than the 9 percent wind contribution to the national electricity generation. Table 2-2 shows the top twenty rankings in wind energy capacity installed and wind electricity generation share of instate electricity generation.

State	Installed Wind Capacity December 2021 (MW)	State	Wind Share of Electricity Generation 2021 (Percent)
Texas	36,808	Iowa	55%
Iowa	12,219	South Dakota	52%
Oklahoma	11,992	Kansas	44%
Kansas	8,245	Oklahoma	41%
Illinois	7,037	North Dakota	34%
California	6,142	New Mexico	30%
Colorado	5,035	Colorado	26%
Minnesota	4,591	Nebraska	25%
North Dakota	4,302	Maine	23%
New Mexico	4,235	Minnesota	22%
Oregon	3,842	Texas	21%
Indiana	3,468	Wyoming	19%
Washington	3,396	Oregon	16%
Nebraska	3,239	Idaho	16%
Michigan	3,231	Montana	12%
South Dakota	3,219	Illinois	10%
Wyoming	3,178	Washington	9%
Missouri	2,435	Missouri	8%
New York	2,192	Indiana	8%
Pennsylvania	1,459	California	8%
U.S. Total	135,886	U.S. Total	9%

Table 2-2: U.S. wind power rankings: top 25 states (Data source: LBNL [11], EIA [14])

The U.S. has significant wind energy potential. NREL estimates the potential capacity that could be installed on available windy land areas across the U.S. is approximately 11 million MW, and the annual wind energy that could be generated from this potential capacity is approximately 33 million gigawatt hours (GWh). This is approximately eight times the 4,115,540 GWh electricity generated from all sources in the U.S. in 2021 [15, 16]. Figure 2-11 shows the distribution of the wind resource.




Figure 2-11: 100-meter U.S. wind resource map (Source: DOE [17])

As can be seen in Figure 2-11 there is an abundance of wind energy resources along the U.S. coast lines and in the Great Lakes. Offshore winds tend to be of higher speed and steadier relative to onshore wind. According to a 2016 DOE assessment, the technically feasible capacity of offshore wind in the U.S. is approximately 2,000 GW and is capable of generating 7,200,000 GWh in a year. This is more than one and a half times the 4,115,540 GWh of electricity generated from all generation resources in the U.S. in 2021 [18].

The outlook for offshore wind projects improved substantially last year with the beginning of the construction of the first commercial-scale offshore wind farm, the 800 MW Vineyard Wind Farm located off of the coast of Massachusetts in November of 2021. The farm had received its final approval by the Federal Government’s Bureau of Ocean Energy Management in March 2021. The construction of the Vineyard Wind Farm is expected to be fully completed in 2023. In addition, in March 2021 President Biden set a goal to install 30 GW of offshore wind generating capacity by the year 2030 and in May 2021 the state of California signed an agreement with the federal government to advance offshore wind farms off of the coast of California. The first U.S. offshore wind farm, the 30 MW Block Island Wind farm off of the coast of Rhode Island, was commissioned by the wind developer Deepwater Wind in 2016. The second one was a 12 MW pilot project in Virginia close to Virginia Beach known as The Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind project. [19-22].

Even before these recent efforts by the federal government, several states on the Eastern Seaboard of the U.S. had set targets for major installation of offshore wind farms to meet their renewable energy and climate mitigation goals. The targets are as shown in Table 2-3.

State	Target Capacity (MW)	Target Date
Connecticut	2,000	2030
Maryland	1,568	2035
Massachusetts	5,600	2035
New Jersey	7,500	2035
New York	9,000	2035
North Carolina	8,000	2040
Virginia	5,200	2034
Connecticut	2,000	2030
Total	38,868	

Table 2-3: Off-shore wind capacity targets by states on the Eastern Seaboard (Data Source: DOE [22])

A 21 MW demonstration project, the Icebreaker, is being developed jointly by Lake Erie Energy Development Corporation and Fred Olsen Corporation in Lake Erie offshore near Cleveland, Ohio. The project will study the challenges unique to offshore wind projects in fresh water bodies such as fresh water ice and interaction with migratory birds [23].

2.4 Wind energy in Indiana

Since the installation of the first utility-scale wind farm in Benton County in 2008, Indiana's wind generating capacity has grown steadily, increasing from 131 MW in 2008 to 3,468 MW at the end of 2021 when the 200 MW Headwaters II Wind Farm in Randolph County and the 302 MW first phase of the Indiana Crossroads Wind Farm in White County were commissioned. A second phase of the Indiana Crossroads wind farm with a planned capacity of 204 MW has been proposed and is expected to be completed in 2023.

In addition to the utility-scale wind farms, there are 20 MW of wind projects connected through net metering and feed-in tariffs offered by Indiana utilities. Figure 2-12 shows the utility-scale wind capacity installed or under construction in Indiana in 2021.




Figure 2-12: Utility-scale wind farm capacity installed and under construction in Indiana (Data source: DOE [12], IURC [24]).

Table 2-4 is a list of utility-scale wind farms in Indiana. As of the writing of this report there were 20 operational wind farms with a combined capacity of 3,464 MW. Two wind farms with a combined capacity of 407 MW had been proposed but construction had not started as of the writing of this report. They are the 204 MW Indiana Crossroads Wind Farm II in White County and the 203 MW Prairie Creek Wind Farm in Blackford County.

Wind Farm Name	County	Capacity (MW)	In-Service Date
----------------	--------	---------------	-----------------

Operating projects

Benton County Wind Farm	Benton	130.5	2008
Fowler Ridge Wind Farm I	Benton	301.3	2009
Fowler Ridge Wind Farm II-A	Benton	199.5	2009
Fowler Ridge Wind Farm III	Benton	99	2009
Hoosier Wind Farm	Benton	106	2009
Meadow Lake Wind Farm I	White	199.7	2009
Meadow Lake Wind Farm II	White	102.3	2010
Meadow Lake Wind Farm III	White	110.4	2010
Meadow Lake Wind Farm IV	White	98.7	2010
Wildcat Wind Farm I	Madison/Tipton	200	2012
Headwaters Wind Farm	Randolph	200	2014
Fowler Ridge IV Wind Farm (Amazon)	Benton	149.5	2015
Meadow Lake Wind Farm V	White	100	2017
Bluff Point Wind Farm	Jay/Randolph	119.7	2017
Meadow Lake Wind Farm VI	White	200.4	2018
Bitter Ridge Wind Farm	Jay	146.5	2020
Rosewater Wind Farm	White	102	2020
Jordan Creek Wind Farm	Warren	398.6	2020
Headwaters II Wind Farm	Randolph	198	2021
Indiana Crossroads Wind Farm I	White	302.4	2021

Total operating projects 3,464

Proposed

Indiana Crossroads Wind Farm II	White	204.4	2023
Prairie Creek Wind	Blackford	202.5	2023

Table 2-4: Indiana wind farms; operating and proposed (Data source: IURC [24], NIPSCO [25])

As far as SUFG is aware Indiana utilities have 2,091 MW of wind power contracted in power purchase agreements (PPAs). Out of the total PPAs 1,571 MW (75 percent) is with wind farms located in Indiana and 520 MW (25 percent) with wind farms in Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota and South Dakota. Table 2-5 shows the wind capacity contracted to Indiana utilities.

Utility	Wind Farm Name	State	Power Purchase Agreement (MW)
Duke Indiana	Benton County	Indiana	110.7
I&M	Fowler Ridge I	Indiana	100.4
I&M	Fowler Ridge II	Indiana	50
CenterPoint	Benton County	Indiana	30
CenterPoint	Fowler Ridge II	Indiana	50
I&M	Headwaters I	Indiana	200
I&M	Wildcat I	Indiana	100
I&M	Fowler Ridge II	Indiana	50
AES	Hoosier	Indiana	100
NIPSCO	Jordan Creek	Indiana	400
NIPSCO	Indiana Crossroads II	Indiana	204
WVPA	Meadow Lake V and VI	Indiana	100.4
Hoosier	Meadow Lake	Indiana	75
Hoosier	Rail Splitter Wind Farm	Illinois	25
NIPSCO	Barton	Iowa	50
NIPSCO	Buffalo Ridge	South Dakota	50.4
AES	Lakefield	Minnesota	201
WVPA	Agriwind, Pioneer Trail, Harvest Ridge	Illinois	118.4
IMPA	Alta Farms II	Illinois	75
Total Power Purchase Agreements			2,091

Table 2-5: Wind energy purchase agreements by Indiana utilities (Data sources: IURC [24], NIPSCO [25, 26], Hoosier [27], WVPA [28], IMPA [29])

In addition to the power purchase agreements in Table 2-5, three Indiana wind farms have signed a total of 349 MW in virtual power purchase agreements with corporate clients as shown in Table 2-6. Virtual power purchase agreements are financial instruments where the power purchaser buys the power and the renewable energy credits at a fixed price from a wind farm without receiving delivery of the power, while the wind farm sells the power into the wholesale market at the market price. If the market price is higher than the agreed virtual PPA price the wind farm pays the virtual client the difference and conversely if the market price is less than the virtual PPA price the client pays the wind farm the difference.

Wind Farm	Buyer	Virtual PPA (MW)	Year
Fowler Ridge Wind Farm Phase IV	Amazon Web Services	150	2015
Headwaters Wind Farm Phase II	Facebook	139	2020
Headwaters Wind Farm Phase II	Walmart	60	2021

Table 2-6: Wind energy virtual purchase agreements from Indiana wind farms (Data sources: IURC [24])

Figure 2-13 shows the distribution of Indiana wind energy resources at 100 meters and the location of major transmission lines, the two main factors influencing the location of utility-scale wind farms, while Figure 2-14 shows the distribution of the wind resource at 50 m, a height at which smaller scale community wind projects operate.




Figure 2-13: Indiana wind speed at 100 meters height (Source: DOE/NREL [30])




Figure 2-14: Indiana wind speed at 50 meters height (Source: DOE/NREL [30])

With the rapid expansion of utility-scale wind farms in Indiana and across the U.S., resistance has arisen in some communities resulting in the writing of local government ordinances restricting their installation in some counties. One such local ordinance was passed in Tippecanoe County in May 2019 restricting the maximum height of wind turbines to 140 feet. This effectively bans utility-scale windfarms, since the typical utility-scale wind turbine tower ranges anywhere from 300 to 600 feet [31].

2.5 Incentives for wind energy

The following federal and state incentives are available for wind energy projects.

Federal Incentives

- Renewable Electricity Production Tax Credit (PTC) credits wind energy producers with 1.5 cents/kWh in 1993 dollars adjusted by an inflation factor supplied by the IRS for the calendar year. The PTC has been extended by the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA) to include projects that begin construction before the end of 2024. For a project to qualify for the full credit it has to meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions. Details about the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions and other definitions in the IRA are given in Section 1.4 of this report. A project that does not meet the prevailing wages and apprenticeship conditions only qualifies for a credit of 0.3 cents/kWh (1993 dollars). Projects can also qualify for an extra 10 percent credit if they have the specified level of domestic content in the power plants or a located in an energy “community.” A project located in a low-income community economic development project or residential building is eligible for 20 percent extra tax credit. The percentage given here are percentages of the base 1.5 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) [32, 33]
- Clean Electricity Production Tax Credit (CEPTC) is similar to the PTC above except, in addition to renewable generating technologies like wind, it is available to all zero carbon emitting technologies. The CEPTC goes into the effect on January 1, 2025 and ends at the end of 2032 or when the carbon emissions from the electricity industry falls by 25 percent below 2022 level [32, 33]
- Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit (CEITC) is a new investment tax credit included in the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 that comes into effect in January 2025 and is available for all technologies that have zero greenhouse gas emissions. The CEITC credits wind projects with 30 percent of their construction cost in lieu of the production tax credit. The CEITC expires at the end of 2032 or when greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity industry drop by 25 percent below 2022 level [32, 33].

- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title XVII of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [13].
- Modified Accelerated Cost-Recovery System (MACRS) allows businesses to recover investments in qualified renewable energy technologies through depreciation deductions. In its history, bonus first year depreciation has been made available sporadically. The latest of these is a 100 percent first year depreciation for projects placed in service between September 27, 2017 to December 31, 2023 provided for by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 [13].
- USDA Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) promotes energy efficiency and renewable energy for agricultural producers and rural small businesses through the use of grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy systems. The program covers up to 25 percent of costs [13, 34].
- High Energy Cost Grant Program administered by USDA is aimed at improving the electricity supply infrastructure in rural areas having extremely high per-household energy costs; that is, 275 percent of the national average and above. Eligible infrastructure includes renewable resources generation [35].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [13].
- Energy Efficiency Mortgage can be used by homeowners to finance a variety of energy efficiency measures, including renewable energy technologies, in new or existing homes. The federal government subsidizes these mortgages by insuring them through the Federal Housing Authority or the Department of Veterans Affairs [13].

Indiana Incentives

- Net Metering Rule allows utility customers with renewable resource facilities having a maximum capacity of 1 MW to receive a credit for net excess generation in the next billing cycle. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 signed into law in May 2017 made changes to the net metering rule to modify the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 continue to receive the full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until June 30, 2032 [13, 36].

- Renewable Energy Property Tax Exemption provides property tax exemptions for solar thermal, PV, wind, hydroelectric and geothermal systems [13].
- Community Conservation Challenge Grant provides \$20,000-\$80,000 in grants for community energy conservation projects that reduce energy consumption or displace the use of traditional energy sources [13].
- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Electrical Generating Equipment exempts transactions involving manufacturing machinery, tools, and equipment used for the production of tangible personal property, which includes electricity, from state gross retail tax. However, only wind energy has clearly specified rules from the Department of Revenue [13].
- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects [13].
- NIPSCO offers feed-in tariff incentive rates for electricity generated from renewable resources for up to 15 years. The payment for wind turbines between 3kW and 10kW is \$0.23/kW and \$0.13/kWh for wind turbines larger than 10kW up to 200kW [37].

2.6 References

1. Arcadia blog.
<https://blog.arcadia.com/vertical-axis-wind-turbines-advantages-disadvantages/>
2. Encyclopædia Britannica
<https://cdn.britannica.com/48/121648-050-562F03B0/Components-wind-turbine.jpg>
3. U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration (EIA).
<https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/wind/history-of-wind-power.php>
4. U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE). Wind vision: a new era for wind in the United States. <http://www.energy.gov/windvision>,
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/WindVision_Report_final.pdf
5. Renewable Energy Research Laboratory. University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Wind power: Capacity factor, intermittency, and what happens when the wind doesn't blow?
<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/envy/Wind%20Power%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>
6. U.S.DOE.Wind Energy Technologies Office. Frequently asked questions on small wind systems. <https://energy.gov/eere/wind/frequently-asked-questions-small-wind-systems>
7. MIT Bates Linear Accelerator Center Wind Energy Resource Assessment Project. Preliminary Analysis Report. Table 5.
http://web.mit.edu/wepa/reports/Bates.Kalmikov_etal.2011.pdf

8. EIA. Cost and Performance Characteristics of New Generating Technologies, Annual Energy Outlook 2022. March 2022.
https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/assumptions/pdf/table_8.2.pdf
9. EIA. today in Energy, August 17, 2021
<https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/archive.php?my=Aug2021>
<https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=49176>
10. EIA. Generator Construction cost data
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/generatorcosts/>
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data.php>
11. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Land-Based Wind Market Report. 2022 Edition.
<https://emp.lbl.gov/wind-technologies-market-report>
https://emp.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/2022_land_based_wind_market_report.pdf
https://emp.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/2022_land_based_wind_market_report_ppt.pdf
https://emp.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/2022_land_based_wind_market_report_data.xlsm
12. U.S. DOE WINDEchange. U.S. Installed and Potential Wind Power Capacity and Generation. <https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/321>
13. Database of State Incentives for Renewables & Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>
14. EIA. Detailed State Data. Net Generation by State by Type of Producer by Energy Source. 2001-present. July 2022. <https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/>
15. NREL. Potential wind data.
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/321>
https://windexchange.energy.gov/files/docs/potential_capacity_and_generation_by_state.xlsx
16. EIA. April 2022 Monthly Energy Review Table 7.2a
<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#electricity>
17. U.S. DOE Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), WINDEchange. Wind energy maps and data. <https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data>
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data?height=110m>
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/324>
18. EERE. Computing America's Offshore Wind Energy Potential. September 9, 2016
<https://energy.gov/eere/articles/computing-america-s-offshore-wind-energy-potential>
19. Vineyard Wind.
<https://www.vineyardwind.com/>
<https://www.vineyardwind.com/press-releases/2021/11/19/vineyard-wind-breaks-ground-on-first-in-the-nation-commercial-scale-offshore-windfarm>
20. CNBC news – May 12 2021. A huge moment': U.S. gives go-ahead for its first major offshore wind farm.
<https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/12/us-gives-go-ahead-for-first-major-offshore-wind-farm-.html>

21. U.S. Department of Interior – May 25 2021. Press release. Biden-Harris Administration Advances Offshore Wind in the Pacific.
<https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/biden-harris-administration-advances-offshore-wind-pacific>
22. U.S. DOE. Offshore Wind Energy Strategies. January, 2022.
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/markets/offshore>
<https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/offshore-wind-energy-strategies-report-january-2022.pdf>
23. Lake Erie Energy Development Corporation.
<http://leedco.org/>
<http://leedco.org/index.php/about-icebreaker>
24. Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission.
25. NIPSCO. Second Stakeholder Advisory Meeting presentation. May 20, 2021. Page 90. 2023 anticipated generation footprint.
26. NIPSCO. News. March 24, 2021.
<https://www.nipsco.com/our-company/news-room/news-article/nipsco-edp-renewables-to-bring-indiana-crossroads-ii-wind-farm-and-indiana-crossroads-solar-park-to-northwest-indiana>
27. Hoosier Energy. 2020 Integrated Resource Plan, page 44, Table 8
https://www.in.gov/iurc/files/HoosierEnergy_IntegratedResourcePlan_Volume1_110220.pdf
28. Wabash Valley Power Association.
<https://www.wvpa.com/power-supply-diversity/renewable-energy/>
29. Indiana Municipal Power Agency. 2020 Integrated Resource Plan. Page 41.
<https://www.in.gov/iurc/files/IMPA-2020-IRP-REPORT.pdf>
30. U.S. DOE Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Indiana wind maps & reports.
<https://windexchange.energy.gov/states/in>
100 meters map <https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/350>
80 meters map. <https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/40>
31. Journal and Courier. May 6, 2019. Wind farms banned in rural Tippecanoe County, as environmentalists grumble. <https://www.jconline.com/story/news/2019/05/06/wind-farms-banned-rural-tippecanoe-county-environmentalists-grumble/3660870002/>
32. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
33. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
34. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development. Rural Energy for America Program Renewable Energy Systems & Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loans

- & Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/rural-energy-america-program-renewable-energy-systems-energy-efficiency>
35. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development. Grants.
<http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/high-energy-cost-grants>
36. Indiana General Assembly. Senate Bill 309
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>
37. NIPSCO. Feed-in Tariff
<https://www.nipsco.com/services/renewable-energy-programs/feed-in-tariff>

3. Dedicated Energy Crops

3.1 Introduction

This section discusses biomass in the form of crops grown exclusively for use as a source of energy. This is distinct from the use of organic waste and residues discussed in the section that follows (Section 4) and also differs from bioenergy from dual use crops such as corn and soybeans which are currently used to make transportation fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel. Although biomass is already the largest source of renewable energy in the U.S., the energy crops industry is still in its infancy. There are still significant technical and financial hurdles to be overcome before energy crops can widely be used as a commercially viable source of energy [1].

A substantial coordinated research and development effort across the federal government, led by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the U.S. Department of Energy, has been underway to build a national bioenergy industry with the objective to use non-food biomass to produce fuels, electricity and other products currently produced using fossil fuels [2].

Biomass is unique among renewable resources in that it can also be used as feedstock to produce liquid transportation fuels and industrial chemicals. This characteristic is the primary motivation behind the research on energy crops and organic waste biomass and the associated conversion technologies. The current state of this research effort is detailed in the DOE *2016 Billion Ton Study Update*. The crops being considered and developed as dedicated energy crops can be grouped into three main categories – perennial grasses, woody crops and annual crops [3].

Perennial grasses include switchgrass, big bluestem, Indian grass, miscanthus and sugarcane. Switchgrass, big bluestem and Indian grass are perennial grasses that are native to North America. They are already grown in a wide range of habitats and climates for pasture, hay production, soil and water conservation, and for wildlife habitat. With proper management they can remain productive for as long as ten years.


The Giant Miscanthus hybrid was developed in Japan and introduced to the U.S. as a landscape plant. The main attraction of Giant Miscanthus as an energy crop is its high level of biomass production. While a great deal of research has been done establishing its potential as an energy crop, there are still barriers to overcome before it can enter large scale commercial production. They include the development of low-cost reliable propagation methods since it is a seedless sterile hybrid. In addition, there is still work to be done to identify varieties suited to given regions of the country.

Sugarcane is attractive as an energy crop primarily due to its ability to store sugar in its stem. In addition, sugarcane ethanol is used as a fuel and is recognized to cut greenhouse gas emissions more than any other biofuel. However, sugarcane is a tropical crop and significant research is still to be done to develop varieties that do well in temperate climates.

Woody crops being developed as energy crops include poplars, willows, eucalyptus and southern pines. Poplars are well established trees native to North America. There are already commercial plantations of hybrid poplars (cottonwood) for the production of fiber, biofuels and for environmental remediation. High rates of biomass productivity, ease of propagation and management are cited as factors that make poplar attractive as an energy crop. The characteristics that make willows desirable as an energy crop include high yields, ease of propagation and high energy content. Eucalyptus is being developed for the southern United States where it is grown for lumber. It has been grown commercially for lumber in Florida since the 1960s.

Southern pines are already one of the main contributors to bioenergy in the United States. Their bark and the paper processing byproduct *black liquor* are used to produce energy in pulp and paper mills. The ability to grow rapidly in a wide range of sites has made the southern pine the most important and widely cultivated timber species in the U.S., mainly for lumber and pulpwood.

The main annual crop being developed as an energy crop is sorghum. According to the DOE Biomass Program, although perennial crops are considered better than annual crops for energy production sustainability purposes, an annual crop serves well as a bridge for a new bioenergy processing facility as it awaits the establishment and full productivity of perennial crops. The factors that make sorghum attractive as an energy crop include its composition (e.g. high in stalk sugar), high yield potential, drought resistance, water use efficiency, established production systems, and potential for genetic improvement [4]. Figure 3-1 shows the energy crops considered under the *2016 Billion-Ton Report*.



^{a, b, c} These energy crops are studied in more detail in the *2016 Billion-Ton Report* than in previous versions of the *Billion-Ton Study*.

Figure 3-1: Energy crops included in the *2016 Billion-Ton Report* (Source: DOE [3])

Biomass, including energy crops, can be converted into energy in the following ways:

- In direct combustion the biomass is burned directly in a boiler to produce steam that can then be used to drive a turbine to generate electricity. Combustion can be done either in a dedicated biomass-only boiler or cofired with other fuels such as coal. Cofiring of biomass in coal boilers has the advantage of lowering the emission of sulfur oxides (SO_x), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and net lifecycle carbon. However, the widespread application of cofiring with coal has been hindered by the occurrence of alkali deposits that cause slag and corrosion in boiler heat transfer surfaces in the coal boilers [5].
- In biochemical conversion processes the biomass material is broken down into sugars using either enzymes or chemical processes. These sugars are then fermented to make ethanol [6].

- In thermochemical conversion heat is used to break down the biomass material into intermediate products (synthetic gas) which can then be converted into fuels using heat, pressure and catalysts. Two common thermochemical processes are gasification and pyrolysis. Gasification is a high temperature conversion of solids into a flammable mixture of gases. Pyrolysis is a process of thermal decomposition of biomass at high temperatures in the absence of oxygen into charcoal, bio-oil and synthetic gas [7].

In recognition of the integrated nature of the processes involved in converting biomass to a biofuel or related products, the DOE Bioenergy Technology Office organizes its research funding effort into the following two broad areas in the conversion process - deconstruction and fractionation, and synthesis and upgrading as shown in Figure 3-2 below. The deconstruction and fractionating processes break down biomass, including energy crops, into its component chemicals (sugars, bio-oils etc.) while the synthesis and upgrading processes take these intermediate component chemicals and convert them into finished products such as fuel and chemicals.




Figure 3-2: Schematic of steps in bioenergy conversion process (Source: DOE [8])

To take full advantage of the strengths of the different biomass-to-energy conversion processes, the DOE Bioenergy Technologies Office has funded the construction of integrated biorefineries that combine all processes in one plant and produce multiple products. By producing multiple products, the integrated biorefineries, like refineries in the petroleum industry, will be able to take advantage of the differences in feedstocks and intermediate products to maximize the value obtained from the biomass feedstock. As of writing of this report there were 51 active DOE funded integrated biorefinery related projects spread across the United States working to develop the various bio-processing technologies needed as follows.

Project Scale	Number of Projects
Modeling	4
Engineering scale	10
Industrial relevant/Pre-pilot	26
Pilot scale	5
Demonstration	4
Commercial	2

Table 3-1: Integrated biorefinery projects (Data source: DOE [9])

At the pilot-scale projects the technologies developed at the much smaller engineering and pre-pilot scales are verified at a scale of at least one dry metric ton per day before being passed to the demonstration-scale facilities. The demonstration-scale facilities are sized to a scale sufficient to provide data and equipment specifications for the final commercial level pioneer projects. There are active demonstration-scale [10].

The two DOE-funded projects that are at the final commercial production scale are listed in Table 3-2.

Company	Location	Feedstock	Conversion Technology	Primary Product
Fulcrum	McCarran, Nevada	Municipal Solid Waste	Thermochemical	Renewable Hydrocarbons (jet fuel, diesel)
Red Rock Biofuels	Lakeview, Oregon	Woody Biomass	Thermochemical	Renewable Hydrocarbons (jet fuel, diesel)

Table 3-2: Commercial integrated biorefinery projects (Data source: DOE [9])

3.2 Economics of energy crops

The DOE vision of a large-scale bioenergy economy supported by large-scale farming of energy crops and collection of agricultural and forest residues is not yet realized. The economics of large-scale farming of energy crops are still unfavorable. For such a large-scale production of dedicated energy crops to occur, the price of the energy crops will have to be high enough to compete with the current cropland uses, while on the energy industry side the price must be low enough to compete with traditional fuels (e.g. petroleum and natural gas) currently in use. In the *2016 DOE Billion-Ton Report* the U.S. agricultural sector simulation model (POLYSYS) was used to estimate the quantities of the various energy crops that would be produced at various prices. The POLYSYS model is a detailed model of the U.S. agricultural sector that includes crop supply at

the county level, national crop demand and prices, national livestock demand and prices, and agricultural income.

Six types of energy crops are modeled in the POLYSYS simulation for the results presented in the *2016 Billion-Ton Report* – three perennial grasses (switchgrass, miscanthus, and energy cane), an annual energy crop (biomass sorghum) and four types of short rotation woody crops, two that are rotated by coppicing⁷ (willow and eucalyptus) and two rotated by other non-coppicing methods (poplar and pine). Switchgrass, miscanthus, and energy cane were modeled for 10-year, 15-year, and 7-year rotations, respectively. Hybrid poplar, pine and eucalyptus were each modeled as growing on an 8-year rotation, and willow was modeled as a coppiced crop over a 32-year period with harvest every 4 years.

Figure 3-3 shows the production of herbaceous and woody energy crops under the Billion-Ton study base-case scenario⁸ in selected years at various farm-gate prices. At a price of \$40 per dry ton energy crops do not enter the market until 2030. In 2030, they comprise approximately 21 percent of the 59 million tons of biomass offered to the market and 46 percent of the 108 million tons offered in 2040. At \$60, a small amount of biomass from energy crops enter the market in 2022. At this price, 62 percent of the 388 million tons of biomass offered to the market in 2030 is from energy crops, primarily herbaceous energy crops, and 70 percent of the 588 million tons offered to the market in 2040 is from energy crops. When prices increase to \$80 per ton, energy crops dominate the market supplying 70 percent of the biomass in 2030 and 75 percent in 2040.




Figure 3-3: Production of energy crops at various farm-gate prices for select years (Source: DOE [3])

⁷ Coppicing is a method of woody crop management that takes advantage of the property that some plants such as willows have where new growth occurs from the stump or roots when the plant is cut down.

⁸ The base-case scenario in the *2016 Billion-Ton Report* assumes 1% energy crop yield improvements per year.

Figures 3-4 and 3-5 show the total potential availability of herbaceous and woody energy crops expected to be produced in 2022, 2030, and 2040 under the Billion-Ton study base case scenario.




Figure 3-4: Supply curves of potential herbaceous energy crop production for select years under base-case assumptions (Source: DOE [3])




Figure 3-5: Supply curves of potential woody energy crop production for select years under base-case assumptions⁹ (Source: DOE [3])

⁹ The backward sloping supply curves in 2030 and 2040 show that at high biomass prices it is more profitable for the farmer to grow herbaceous energy crops (shown in Figure 3-4) than woody energy crops.

In addition to the series of Billion-Ton studies, DOE has developed a spatial web-accessible database, the *Bioenergy Knowledge Discovery Framework* (KDF), which brings together data from the various DOE supported bioenergy research efforts across the U.S. [11]. The research projects whose data is integrated into the KDF include:

- Biomass Resource Potential research prepared by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory whose results are presented in the 2016 *Billion-Ton Update* report referenced above,
- The Sun Grant Initiative Resource Assessment project that collects data from the energy crops field trials,
- The Feedstock Supply and Logistics Analysis research being conducted at the Idaho National Laboratory,
- The Microalgae Biofuel Potential project taking place at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,
- The Regional Land-Use Change Modeling project based at the Great Lakes Bioenergy Center,
- The International Projects Partnership based at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory that is working to identify areas of biodiversity concern to be avoided when planting energy crops,
- The National Biorefinery Siting Model that seeks to develop a geographical information system (GIS) based biomass supply and biorefinery location model of the U.S., and
- The Alternative Fuels and Advanced Vehicles Data Center at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory that is intended to provide interactive maps of alternative fuels infrastructure.

Corn and soybean use for biofuel production

Although corn and soybeans do not meet the strict definition of dedicated energy crops, they are included in this section in recognition of the fact that they are the largest source of renewable energy in Indiana. Ethanol and diesel biofuels experienced a rapid expansion in the mid-2000s. Before 2007 Indiana's ethanol production capacity consisted of one plant with a capacity of 100 million gallons per year (MMGY). Since then the capacity has grown to 1,420 MMGY in sixteen corn-ethanol plants. Towards the end of the 2000s the production of corn ethanol started outpacing the demand due to the weakened demand for gasoline associated with the recession, which brought an end to the expansion of the ethanol production industry. Table 3-3 shows the location and capacities of operating ethanol plants in Indiana.

Company	Location	Capacity (MMGY*)
Cardinal Ethanol LLC	Union City	140
The Andersons - Clymers Ethanol LLC	Clymers	135
Valero Renewable Fuels - Linden	Linden	135
Valero Renewable Fuels - Bluffton	Bluffton	130
South Bend Ethanol LLC	South Bend	100
Valero Renewable Fuels - Mount Vernon	Mount Vernon	100
Green Plains - Mt. Vernon	Mt. Vernon	90
POET Biorefining - Cloverdale	Cloverdale	90
POET Biorefining - Alexandria	Alexandria	80
POET Biorefining - North Manchester	North Manchester	80
POET Biorefining - Portland	Portland	80
POET Biorefining - Shelbyville	Shelbyville	80
Central Indiana Ethanol LLC (CIE)	Marion	60
Iroquois Bio-Energy Company LLC	Rensselaer	50
Grain Processing Corp. - Washington (wet mill)	Washington	35
MGPI of Indiana	Lawrenceburg	35

*MMGY denotes million gallons per year

Table 3-3: Ethanol plants in Indiana (Data source: Ethanol Producers Magazine [12], Renewable Fuels Association [13])

There are two biodiesel plants with a combined capacity of 97.42 million gallons per year operating in Indiana. They are the 9.42 MMGY Integrity Biofuels plant in Morristown and the 88 MMGY Louis Dreyfus plant in Claypool. The 9.42 MMGY Integrity Biofuels plant in Morristown ceased production in 2019 [14, 15].

The following factors account for the biofuel plant construction in the U.S. since 2005

- The use of corn-ethanol as an oxygenating additive in gasoline in place of the chemical methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE). The shift from MTBE was a result of its association with ground water pollution. The replacement of MTBE was mandated both by states and the 2005 Energy Policy Act [16].
- The renewable fuel standard (RFS) first enacted in 2005 and then expanded in 2007 required that 36 million gallons of renewable fuel (15 billion gallons from corn-ethanol and the balance from advanced biofuels) must be blended into gasoline by 2022. Starting in 2014, EPA began revising the annual volume requirements downwards in recognition of the fact that the demand for gasoline was lower than had been anticipated when the blending volumes were set in 2007. Although the minimum volumes of biofuels to be

blended into transportation fuels in the RFS were only specified up to 2022, the RFS does not expire at the end 2022. Beyond 2022 the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 mandates the Environmental Protection Agency to set the volumetric minimums no later than 14 months before beginning of the mandate year according to a specified set of criteria [17, 18, 19].

- The enactment of the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit (VEETC) in 2004 improved the cost competitiveness of corn-ethanol with gasoline and provided long-term protection for corn-ethanol producers against price volatility in the transportation fuel market. The VEETC allowed for a 45 cents/gallon tax credit to be given to entities who produce the mixture of gasoline and ethanol. This tax credit expired at the end of 2011 [20].

3.3 State of energy crops nationally

As discussed previously, the energy crop industry is still in its infancy with a substantial research and development effort under way to establish a sustainable supply of biomass to satisfy the Renewable Fuel Standard mandate of blending a specified amount of biofuels into the gasoline used for the transportation industry and also to increase electricity generation from biomass. As part of this research, DOE has partnered with universities, national laboratories and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to establish a *Regional Biomass Feedstock Partnership* to conduct research, development and outreach at the regional level to address the barriers associated with the effort to establish a sustainable bioenergy industry. Figure 3-6 shows the biomass feedstock field trial locations established by the *Regional Biomass Feedstock Partnership*.

In addition to the field test sites, the *Regional Biomass Feedstock Partnership* is also involved in education and outreach efforts to farmers and other stakeholders to prepare them for a future where energy crops are a substantial portion of the agricultural industry. The lead institutions for the five regions in the program are: South Dakota State University in the North Central region, Oregon State University in the Western region, Oklahoma State University in the South-Central region, Cornell University in the Northeast, and University of Tennessee in the Southeast region [22]. At the March 2015 project peer review conference, the following progress was reported on the feedstock research [23]:

- The completion of field trials for seven crop years (2008 to 2014),
- Making the yield and plot treatment data publicly available by uploading it onto the DOE *Knowledge Discovery Framework*,
- Collecting of soil samples for sustainability analysis at multiple locations, and
- Collecting of biomass samples from the field plots and sending them to the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) for composition analysis and archiving in the biomass resource library housed at INL.




Figure 3-6: Bioenergy crop trial stations (Source DOE [21])

3.4 Energy crops in Indiana

The results from the DOE Billion-Ton model show that in the national bioenergy economy, Indiana and other corn-belt states like Iowa and Illinois would mainly be suppliers of biomass in the form agricultural residues such as corn stover and only a limited amount of dedicated energy crops. This is because the price that energy crops would have to offer farmers to displace the food crops would be too high for the resulting biofuels to be competitive with petroleum in the transportation sector and traditional fuels such as natural gas in the electricity sector. Figure 3-7 shows the projected pattern of biomass feedstock production by the year 2030 at a biomass farm-gate price of \$60 per dry ton.




Figure 3-7: Estimated shares of energy crops and agricultural residues supplied at \$60 per dry ton in 2030 (Source: DOE [4])

Figure 3-8 shows the quantities of energy crops projected to be produced in Indiana in 2030 at biomass farm-gate prices of \$50, \$60, \$70 and \$80 per dry ton. At a biomass price of \$60 per dry ton, Indiana's projected production of all energy crops combined is 1.5 million dry tons. In comparison, the amount of agricultural residue biomass produced at \$60 per dry ton in 2030 is projected to be 9 million dry tons. As can be seen in the figure, perennial grasses are the preferred energy crop in Indiana, followed by woody crops. At prices above \$70 per dry ton some annual crops (e.g., sorghum) enter into the crop mix.




Figure 3-8: Projected production of energy crops in Indiana in 2030 (Data source: DOE [24])

In a 2011 paper, Brechbill, Tyner and Ileleji of Purdue’s College of Agriculture did a study of the estimated cost of producing switchgrass and harvesting corn stover for the energy industry in Indiana. Table 3-4 shows the average cost of producing switchgrass given in this study [25]. Allen, in his December 2011 Master’s thesis, estimated the cost of producing and transporting biomass from woody crops to be between \$43 and \$52 per dry ton [26].

Farm Size (Hectares)	Custom	200	400	600	800
Average Cost (\$/ton)	80.98	69.22	66.23	65.23	64.73

Table 3-4: Average farm-gate cost (\$/ton) for producing switchgrass in Indiana (Data source: Brechbill, Tyner & Ileleji [25])

In her 2013 Master's thesis, Song performed an integrated economic and environmental assessment of cellulosic biofuel production focusing on the Wildcat Creek Watershed. The study evaluated the costs of corn stover, switchgrass and miscanthus production within the watershed by looking at three cost components: production cost, loading-unloading cost, and hauling cost for each feedstock, as is shown in Table 3-5. A hypothetical biorefinery plant is assumed to be located at the centroid of the watershed, demanding biomass feedstock supply from cropland across the watershed. The nine scenarios shown in Table 3-5 are considered in order to compare candidate feedstocks and corn stover removal rates [27, 28].

Crop Scenario	Production Cost (\$/dry ton)	Loading-unloading (\$/dry ton)	Hauling (\$/dry ton)	Total Cost for Watershed (Million \$)	Unit Cost (\$/dry ton)
Baseline Corn-Soybean	0	0	0	0	0
Continuous Corn with 20% Residue Removal	54.19	5.42	5.37	21.92	64.98
Corn-Soybean with 30% Residue Removal	54.19	5.42	5.37	15.69	64.99
Corn-Soybean with 50% Residue Removal	57.08	5.42	5.37	27.79	67.86
Continuous Corn with 30% Residue Removal	54.19	5.42	5.37	33.03	64.98
Continuous Corn with 50% Residue Removal	56.98	5.42	5.36	57.56	67.75
Switchgrass	106.79	6.88	6.81	204.97	120.47
Switchgrass No Till	106.08	6.88	6.81	203.74	119.77
Miscanthus	92.66	6.88	6.84	350.78	106.37

Table 3-5: Cost by category for producing corn stover, switchgrass and miscanthus in Wildcat Creek Watershed (Data source: Song et al. [28])

3.5 Incentives for energy crops

The following incentives have been available to encourage the use of energy crops.

Federal Incentives

- Renewable Electricity Production Tax Credit (PTC) for dedicated energy crop energy systems (which fall under the category closed-loop biomass) credits 1.5 cents/kWh in 1993 dollars for the electricity produced, adjusted annually by inflation factors provided by the IRS. The PTC was extended to the end of 2024 at its full value for projects that meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements. Details about the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions and other definitions in the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) are given in Section 1.4 of this report. A project that does not meet the prevailing wages and apprenticeship conditions only qualifies for a credit of 0.3 cents/kWh (1993 dollars). Projects can also qualify for an extra 10 percent credit if they have the specified level of domestic content in the power plants or a located in an energy “community.” A project located in a low-income community economic development project or residential building is eligible for 20 percent extra tax credit. The percentage given here are percentages of the base 1.5 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) [29, 30].
- Clean Electricity Production Tax Credit (CEPTC) is similar to the PTC above except, in addition to renewable generating technologies, it is available to all zero carbon emitting technologies. The CEPTC goes into the effect on January 1, 2025 and ends at the end of 2032 or when the carbon emissions from the electricity industry falls by 25 percent below 2022 level [29, 330]
- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title IV of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [31].
- Modified Accelerated Cost-Recovery System (MACRS) allows businesses to recover investments in qualified renewable energy technologies through depreciation deductions. In its history, bonus first year deprecation has been made available sporadically. The latest of these is a 100 percent first year depreciation for projects placed in service between September 27, 2017 to December 31, 2023 provided for by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 [31].

- USDA Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) promotes energy efficiency and renewable energy for agricultural producers and rural small businesses through the use of grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy systems. The program covers up to 25 percent of costs [31, 32].
- High Energy Cost Grant Program administered by USDA is aimed at improving the electricity supply infrastructure in rural areas having extremely high per-household energy costs; that is, 275 percent of the national average and above. Eligible infrastructure includes renewable resources generation [33].
- USDA Biorefinery Assistance Program offers loan guarantees for the development, construction or retrofitting of commercial-sized biorefineries. The program finances 80 percent of the cost of the biorefinery up to a maximum of \$250 million [31].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [31].

Indiana Incentives

- Net Metering Rule allows utility customers with renewable resource facilities with a maximum capacity of 1 MW to receive a credit for net excess generation in the next billing cycle. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 of 2017 made changes to the net metering rule to modify the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 continue to receive the full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until June 30, 2032 [31, 34].
- Community Conservation Challenge Grant provides \$20,000-\$80,000 in grants for community energy conservation projects that reduce energy consumption or displace the use of traditional energy sources [31].
- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Electrical Generating Equipment exempts transactions involving manufacturing machinery, tools, and equipment used for the production of tangible personal property, which includes electricity, from state gross retail tax. However, only wind energy has clearly specified rules from the Department of Revenue [31].

- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects [31].
- NIPSCO offers feed-in tariff incentive rates for electricity generated from renewable resources for up to 15 years. The payment for biomass projects is negotiated with maximum possible payment set at \$0.0918/kWh. The size of biomass projects eligible for the feed-in tariff is between 100 and 1,000 kW [35].

3.6 References

1. Biomass Research and Development Board (BR&D). The Billion-Ton Bioeconomy Initiative: Challenges and Opportunities. 2016.
<https://biomassboard.gov/>
https://biomassboard.gov/sites/default/files/pdfs/the_bioeconomy_initiative.pdf
2. BR&D. Federal Activities Report on the Bioeconomy.
<https://biomassboard.gov/>
https://biomassboard.gov/sites/default/files/pdfs/Bioeconomy_Initiative_Implementation_Framework_FINAL.pdf
3. U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2016 Billion-Ton Report: Advancing Domestic Resources for a Thriving Bioeconomy, Volume 1: Economic Availability of Feedstocks. M. H. Langholtz, B. J. Stokes, and L. M. Eaton (Leads), ORNL/TM-2016/160. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. 448p. doi:10.2172/1271651
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/downloads/2016-billion-ton-report-advancing-domestic-resources-thriving-bioeconomy>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/12/f34/2016_billion_ton_report_12.2.16_0.pdf
4. DOE. U.S. Billion-Ton Update: Biomass Supply for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry, 2011. R.D. Perlack and B.J. Stokes (Leads), ORNL/TM-2011/224. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. 227p.
https://www1.eere.energy.gov/bioenergy/pdfs/billion_ton_update.pdf
5. EERE. Biopower technical strategy workshop summary report.
<http://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/downloads/biopower-technical-strategy-workshop-summary-report>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/04/f14/biopower_workshop_report_december_2010.pdf
6. EERE. Conversion Technologies
<http://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/processing-and-conversion>
7. National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). Thermochemical Conversion Capabilities
<http://www.nrel.gov/bioenergy/thermochemical-conversion-techno-economic-analysis.html>

8. EERE. Bioenergy Technologies Office Conversion technologies.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/conversion-technologies>
9. EERE. Integrated biorefineries interactive map
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/integrated-biorefineries>
10. EERE. Integrated biorefineries fact sheet.
<http://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/integrated-biorefineries>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/08/f33/ibr_overview_1.pdf
11. EERE. The bioenergy knowledge discovery framework. KDF fact sheet.
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/03/f14/kdf_fact_sheet.pdf
12. Ethanol producer magazine. U.S. ethanol plants.
<https://ethanolproducer.com/plants/listplants/US/Operational/All>
13. Renewable Fuels Association
<https://ethanolrfa.org/biorefinery-locations/>
14. Biodiesel Magazine, U.S. Biodiesel Plants.
<http://www.biodieselmagazine.com/plants/listplants/USA/>
15. Biodiesel Magazine, Indiana biodiesel producer falls victim to US policy uncertainty
<https://biodieselmagazine.com/articles/2516839/indiana-biodiesel-producer-falls-victim-to-us-policy-uncertainty>
16. EIA. U.S. ethanol production and the Renewable Fuel Standard RIN bank
<http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=11551>
17. EPA. Renewable Fuel Standard.
<https://www.epa.gov/renewable-fuel-standard-program/regulations-and-volume-standards-renewable-fuel-standards>
18. International Council on Clean Transportation. How the Renewable Fuel Standard works
http://www.theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/ICCTBriefing_RFS2_20140211.pdf
19. Advanced Biofuels USA. What Happens to the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) after 2022?
<https://advancedbiofuelsusa.info/what-happens-to-the-renewable-fuel-standard-rfs-after-2022/>
20. EERE. Alternative fuels data center. VEETC
<https://afdc.energy.gov/laws/399>
21. DOE Biotechnologies Office 2015 Project Peer Review. Sun Grant/DOE Regional Biomass Feedstock Partnership: Herbaceous Energy Crops and CRP Land for Biomass Production (Award # GO85041; WBS 7.6.2.5).
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/peer-review-2015>
https://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/04/f21/terrestrial_feedstocks_owens_7625%28herbaceous%29.pdf
22. Sun Grant Initiative.
<https://sungrantinitiative.tennessee.edu/>

23. EERE. DOE Bioenergy Technologies Office. 2015 Project Peer Review. SunGrant/DOERegional Biomass Feedstock Partnership (Award # GO85041; WBS 7.6.2.5).
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/peer-review-2015>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/04/f21/terrestrial_feedstocks_owens_7625.pdf
24. DOE. Bioenergy Knowledge Discovery Framework. <https://bioenergykdf.net/>
25. Brechbill, S. Tyner, W. and Ileleji K. The Economics of Biomass Collection and Transportation and Its Supply to Indiana Cellulosic and Electric Utility Facilities. Springer Bioenergy Research. January 2011.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12155-010-9108-0>
26. Allen, B. W. An economic and emissions analysis of electricity generation using biomass feedstock in co-fired and direct fired facilities. Master of Science Thesis, Purdue University August 2011. <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/dissertations/AAI1502105/>
27. Song, Jingyu. A Spatially Explicit Watershed Scale Optimization of Cellulosic Biofuels Production. Master of Science Thesis, Purdue University December 2013.
<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/dissertations/AAI1553620/>
28. Song, J., Gramig, B., Cibil, R., and Chaubey, I. 2016. Integrated economic and environmental assessment of cellulosic biofuel production in an agricultural watershed.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12155-017-9817-8>
29. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
30. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
31. Database of State Incentives for Renewables & Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>
32. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development. Rural Energy for America Program Renewable Energy Systems & Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loans & Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/rural-energy-america-program-renewable-energy-systems-energy-efficiency>
33. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development. Grants.
<http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/high-energy-cost-grants>
34. Indiana General Assembly, 2017 Session. Senate Bill 309
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>
35. NIPSCO. Feed-in Tariff.
<https://www.nipsco.com/services/renewable-energy-programs/feed-in-tariff>

4. Organic Waste Biomass

4.1 Introduction

This section presents the use of biomass in the form of organic waste and residues as a source of renewable energy, as opposed to the previous section (Section 3) that presented biomass energy feedstock in the form of dedicated energy crops. Unlike the dedicated energy crops industry, organic waste biomass is and has been for a long time in widespread use as a source of renewable energy. Historically organic waste biomass has been second only to hydroelectricity as the source of renewable energy consumed in the U.S. The organic waste biomass in this section is separated into two main categories: that which is in use currently as an energy source and that which is being considered for use in the expanded renewable energy future. The types of organic waste biomass already in use as energy sources include:

- Residues from the forestry and wood products industry, including material left from logging, residues from the paper and pulp industry and residues from wood milling;
- Municipal solid waste (MSW), which is the organic portion of the post-consumer waste collected in community garbage collection services;
- Gas extracted from landfills, which is naturally occurring gas resulting from decomposition of landfill material;
- Livestock manure, mainly from large swine and dairy farms where it is used to produce gas in bio digesters; and
- Municipal wastewater, or sewage, which is used to produce gas in bio digesters.

Organic waste biomass resources that are not yet in large-scale use as energy sources, but are being considered for future use, include:

- Agricultural crop residues, such as stalks, leaves and other material left in the fields when conventional food crops such as corn are harvested; and
- Aquatic plants, such as algae that have high oil content that can be converted to biofuel such as biodiesel.

Residues from the forestry and wood products industry and MSW are typically used to produce electricity and heat. These feedstocks are burned directly in a boiler to produce steam that is used to drive a turbine to generate electricity or steam that is used directly for heat.

The other sources of organic waste-based energy that are currently in use all take advantage of the production of biogas that contains a significant percentage of methane as the waste breaks down

through either natural or managed decay processes. This is the case for landfill gas, livestock manure or municipal wastewater that is processed through an anaerobic digester.

Anaerobic digestion of biomass waste consists of the breakdown of organic wastes by microorganisms in an oxygen deficient environment that produces biogas that can be burned as an energy source. Just like traditional fossil fuels, biogas can be used as a transportation fuel through an internal combustion engine or to generate electricity through a combustion turbine or a steam turbine. An additional benefit to converting biogas to energy is that it prevents the methane from being emitted into the atmosphere. Because methane has a greenhouse gas heat trapping effect 28 to 36 times that of carbon dioxide, its conversion to energy provides an added environmental benefit [1].

Biomass, including agricultural crop residues, is expected to play a significant role in the energy supply portfolio in the U.S. in the future. One of the characteristics that makes biomass a very attractive source of renewable energy is its ability to be converted both to electricity and to fuel for the transportation industry. Studies, like the DOE funded *Billion-Ton Study* referred to in Section 3 of this report, have shown that substantial energy resources in the form of biomass from crop residues could be harvested under appropriate economic conditions. Agricultural residues, unlike dedicated energy crops, have the added advantage that they do not require any further cultivation or the use of additional cropland, and therefore present a potential near-term feedstock into the bioenergy industry before a viable dedicated energy crop industry takes root.

Large scale farming of algae is another area being considered as a potential source of bioenergy. Algae encompass a wide range of organisms; from microscopic unicellular bacteria, through the common blue-green algae to sea weeds such as giant kelp that can grow to over 150 feet long. They are fast growing organisms that require some form of energy (e.g. sunlight or sugars), water, carbon dioxide and a few other nutrients to produce biomass usable for energy production. Several characteristics have made algae a favorable feedstock for biofuels, including [2, 3].

- Algae has a high biomass yield per acre, as much as 50 times more than crops such as soy beans,
- Algae can be grown in otherwise non-arable lands, reducing competition with conventional agricultural crops,
- Algae can be grown using wastewater, saline water, or water that is produced as a byproduct of oil and gas extraction,
- Algae has the potential for recycling of water and nutrients in the production cycle,
- Algae have the potential for recycling of carbon dioxide from fossil fueled power plants and other industrial carbon dioxide emitters, and
- Algae is relatively easy, compared to other biomass material, to convert into fuels and products compatible with current transportation industry uses.

Algae can be grown in either open ponds or in enclosed bioreactors. Open pond algae farms are much more cost competitive, but they have the disadvantages of being vulnerable to contamination by faster growing native algae, water loss through evaporation and exposure to extreme weather variations. Enclosed bioreactors overcome these drawbacks by growing the algae entirely enclosed in transparent containers of various forms. Enclosed bioreactors' main disadvantage is cost; bioreactors are much more expensive to build than open ponds.

One potential application for the use of algae is the coupling of an algae bioreactor with a coal power plant such that the power plant provides the carbon dioxide needed for algae growth. In this way a combined benefit of producing bioenergy while reducing carbon dioxide emissions is achieved. Such an experiment was conducted at the Arizona Public Service Red Hawk power plant in 2006 and 2007 [4].

The production of algae for energy is still in the development stage. The federal government through the DOE biotechnologies office is continuing to invest in funding the research and development to develop technologies needed to economically and sustainably produce, harvest, and convert algae into biofuels. DOE has the strategic goal for an algal biofuel with a selling price of \$2.50 per gasoline gallon equivalent [2, 3].

4.2 Economics of organic waste biomass

Most of the current waste biomass energy is generated and consumed in the paper and pulp industry where the paper and pulp making byproducts are combusted in combined heat and power plants to supplement the electricity and steam supply to the paper and pulp mills. Several factors have combined to make the use of these residues and byproducts as an energy source economically attractive at pulp and paper mills. They include:

- The burning of the pulp making residue (black liquor) serves not only to generate energy, but also to recover process chemicals,
- The co-location of electricity and steam demand in the mills greatly increases the efficiency of the energy conversion process, and
- The ability to sell excess generation through either the favorable provisions of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 or through the open transmission access associated with wholesale electricity markets provides a market for times when the plant's generation exceeds internal demand.

In the case of municipal solid waste, the need to reduce the amount of material going into landfills is the main motivation for building municipal solid waste-based energy conversion facilities. Without this motivation, municipal solid waste power plants would be hard to justify financially since they are some of the most expensive plants to build and operate. In the 2019 EIA plant cost estimates, the municipal solid waste power plant was listed as having the highest capital cost

(\$8,895/kW) among the technologies considered and the highest fixed O&M cost (\$425/kW/yr) [5]. EIA has not included MSW power plants that burn solid waste in subsequent annual power plant cost estimates.

Another waste stream that is currently a major source of renewable energy, especially in Indiana, is landfill gas; that is, tapping the methane-rich gas in already established landfills. Unlike the municipal solid waste energy conversion facilities that rely on burning solid waste in a boiler to extract the energy, landfill gas projects on existing landfills do not need a boiler, since the biogas is a byproduct of the decomposing waste. As a result, their capital costs are much lower than that of municipal solid waste energy conversion facilities since it primarily consists of the cost of the combustion engine and generator set.

Like landfill gas, other organic waste streams such as animal waste and municipal wastewater treatment plants generate methane-rich biogas. The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is a major benefit of the process of converting the biogas to energy. Further, except for landfill gas, the energy conversion efficiency, and therefore economics, are improved by the co-location of both heat and electricity demand. The anaerobic digesters used to produce the biogas in all cases, except landfill gas, provide a demand for the heat to maintain optimum temperatures for the microorganisms that carry out the decomposition of the biomass. In addition, in most places the treatment of the waste is required by local ordinances for the purpose of maintaining the environmental health of the watersheds where these facilities are located.

Agricultural crop residues are not currently being collected on a large scale for use as bioenergy feedstock because it is not yet profitable for farmers. However, it is expected that biomass, including agricultural crop residues, will play a substantial role in the national effort to diversify the transportation fuel supply away from petroleum. As was mentioned in Section 3, a substantial research and development effort, led by the DOE Bioenergy Technologies Office has been under way since the early 2000s to build a national bioenergy industry. As a part of this effort in 2005 the USDA and DOE issued a joint report from a study investigating the viability of using energy from biomass to replace 30 percent of U.S. petroleum consumption by the year 2030, titled *Biomass Feedstock for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry: the Technical Feasibility of a Billion-Ton Annual Supply* [6], and in 2011 an update to that report and an associated online database of the results of the study, the *Bioenergy Knowledge Discovery Framework* (KDF) was released [7]. In the 2016 update to this *Billion-Ton* study the amount of crop residue that would be produced at various farm-gate prices was estimated using an agricultural sector model (POLYSYS). Residue production is estimated in conjunction with energy crop production and other cropland uses to account for the competition between uses for the available cropland. Figure 4-1 shows the supply curves of primary crop residues for select years under the 2016 *Billion-Ton* study base-case assumptions. The crop residues in Figure 4-1 include corn stover, cereal (wheat, oats, and barley) straws, and sorghum stubble. Table 4-1 shows the potential supply of secondary agricultural wastes at select prices and years.




Figure 4-1 Supply curves of potential production from primary crop residues for select years under 2016 *Billion-ton* study base-case assumptions¹⁰ (Source: DOE [8])

Waste type	Current supply*	2017			2022			2030			2040		
		\$40	\$50	\$60	\$40	\$50	\$60	\$40	\$50	\$60	\$40	\$50	\$60
		Million dry tons											
Animal manures	17.1	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.6	18.6	18.6	18.4	18.4	18.4
Cotton field residues	3.3	0.0	0.9	1.5	0.0	1.5	2.0	0.0	1.7	2.2	0.0	1.7	3.2
Cotton gin trash	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1
Grain dust and chaff	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orchard and vineyard prunings	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Rice straw	4.3	0.0	4.9	4.9	0.0	5.2	5.2	0.0	5.4	5.4	0.0	5.6	5.6
Rice hulls	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.6	1.6
Soybean hulls	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sugarcane field trash	1.1	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.6	1.1	1.1	0.6	1.1	1.1	0.6	1.1	1.1
Total	34.2	27.1	33.4	34.0	28.0	35.3	35.7	27.0	36.1	36.6	27.1	36.5	37.9

*Current supply without regard to price

Table 4-1: Summary of secondary agricultural wastes potential at select prices and years under 2016 *Billion-ton* study base-case assumptions (Source: DOE [8])

¹⁰ The backward sloping supply curves show that at high biomass prices it is more profitable for the farmer to grow energy crops than primary food crops.

In a USDA-funded study at Iowa State University published in 2012 [9], the U.S.-wide supply curve for corn stover was estimated. Unlike the USDA/DOE billion-ton study which estimated the stover price at the farm gate, the price in this study estimated the price at the bioenergy plant gate. That is, it includes the handling, storage and shipping costs associated with getting the stover to the bioenergy processing plant. According to this study the minimum price at which stover would be available for the bioenergy industry is \$37.5 per ton, which is lower than the \$40/ton minimum price modeled for corn stover in the *Billion-Ton* study. Figure 4-2 shows the U.S.-wide corn stover supply curve from the Iowa State University study.




Figure 4-2: U.S. corn stover supply curve (Source: USDA [9])

Although the concept of using algae for energy production has been proven at the laboratory level, no commercial scale sustainable production facility has been established yet. In 2009 DOE established the *National Alliance for Advanced Biofuels and Bioproducts* (NAABB), a consortium of industry, universities and national laboratories to advance research in various facets of the algal biofuels industry. According to the NAABB final report, the consortium developed and demonstrated, at a pilot level, technology improvements that, when combined, can reduce the cost of producing algal biodiesel from \$240/gallon to \$7.50/gallon. It still remains for this technology to be applied at a commercial scale [10].

4.3 State of organic waste biomass nationally

Historically organic waste biomass, and in particular residues from the wood products industry, has been one of the main sources of renewable energy in the U.S. As can be seen in Figure 4-3, wood and wood-derived fuels have been second only to hydroelectricity as a source of renewable

energy. Until the increase in wind and biofuels in the last decade, wood and wood-derived fuels comprised nearly half of the renewable energy consumed in the U.S. Recently wood was relegated to third place as wind has become the largest source of renewable energy nationally. In 2021 wood contributed 17 percent of the renewable energy consumed, behind wind energy's 27 percent and hydro's 19 percent.





Figure 4-3: U.S. renewable energy consumption 1949-2020 (Source: EIA [11])

Although not as large a source of energy as wood and wood-derived fuels, municipal solid waste has also been a significant contributor to the nation's renewable energy mix. According to the national association of the waste to energy industry (the Energy Recovery Council) there were 75 municipal solid waste to energy plants operating in 21 states in the U.S. Of these plants, 58 had electricity as their only energy product; fourteen generated both electricity and steam, while three plants produced only steam. The combined electricity generating capacity installed in these plants was 2,534 MW. If the steam generated from the eighteen steam-only and cogenerating plants were to be converted to electricity, the Energy Recovery Council estimated that the total electricity generating capacity would increase to 2,725 MW. Table 4-2 shows the locations of municipal solid waste energy conversion plants in the U.S. Details about Indiana's one MSW energy conversion facility are given in Section 4.4.

State	Number of facilities	State	Number of facilities	State	Number of facilities
Alabama	1	Maine	3	New York	10
California	2	Maryland	2	Oklahoma	1
Connecticut	5	Massachusetts	7	Oregon	1
Florida	11	Michigan	2	Pennsylvania	6
Hawaii	1	Minnesota	8	Virginia	4
Indiana	1	New Hampshire	1	Washington	1
Iowa	1	New Jersey	5	Wisconsin	2

Table 4-2: Location of the 75 municipal solid waste to energy plants in the U.S. (Data source: Energy Recovery Council [12])

Another organic waste stream in use as a source of energy is landfill gas. According to the EPA there were 541 landfills in the U.S. with operational energy conversion projects with a combined capacity of 1,471 MW electricity generation and 314 million standard cubic feet per day (mmscfd) of gas for thermal energy production. In addition, there were 474 candidate landfills that have the size and capacity necessary to support energy projects. These candidate landfills have the potential for 980 MW of electricity generation or 545 mmscfd of gas for thermal energy conversion. Figure 4-4 shows the location of operational and candidate landfill gas energy projects in the U.S. as of June 2022. Twenty-nine of the operational landfills and nine of the candidate landfills are in Indiana [13].



Legend

mmscfd – million standard cubic feet per day;

MMTCO₂e/yr – million metric ton of carbon dioxide-equivalent per year

Figure 4-4: Landfill gas projects (Source: EPA [13])

Livestock manure is currently in use as an energy source with 317 anaerobic digester biogas recovery systems in operation on livestock farms in the U.S. as of May 2022. The majority of these digesters (260) were on dairy farms, but there were also 38 on swine farms, seven on poultry farms, four on beef cattle farms, three on combined cattle/swine farms, three on combined dairy/swine farms and one on a mixed cattle/swine/poultry farm [14]. In the 2018 *Market Opportunities for Biogas Recovery Systems at U.S. Livestock Facilities* report, EPA estimated that there were 8,113 dairy and swine farms that could support biogas recovery systems with a combined potential electric generating capacity of 1,667 MW supplying approximately 16 million MWh of electricity per year. Table 4-3 shows the top states with the potential for electricity generation from livestock farms. Biogas is more readily recovered from swine and dairy farms because the manure in these types of farms is handled in a wet slurry state that is hospitable to the waste-digesting microorganisms [15].

State	Number of Candidate Farms	Methane Emissions Reductions (Thousand Tons)	Methane Production Potential (Billion ft ³ /year)	Energy Generation Potential	
				(1,000 MMBtu/Year)	(1,000 MWh/Year)
Swine Farms					
Iowa	2174	331	24.30	22,430	2,070
North Carolina	761	192	12.21	11,266	1,040
Minnesota	691	64	7.64	7,052	651
Illinois	345	47	5.45	5,030	464
Indiana	302	34	4.11	3,795	350
Missouri	129	31	3.45	3,183	294
Nebraska	154	27	3.33	3,077	284
Oklahoma	45	49	3.26	3,013	278
Kansas	58	24	2.50	2,311	213
Ohio	226	15	1.73	1,594	147
Remaining 40 states	525	102	9.46	8,733	806
Swine Total:	5,409	915	77	71,484	6,598
Dairy Farms					
California	799	431	32.64	30,125	2,780
Idaho	179	138	11.56	10,668	985
Wisconsin	358	88	9.02	8,323	768
Texas	126	102	7.10	6,553	605
New Mexico	88	83	6.26	5,780	533
Washington	122	54	4.80	4,428	409
Michigan	138	47	4.79	4,420	408
Arizona	56	59	3.84	3,544	327
New York	126	32	3.29	3,033	280
Colorado	58	31	2.72	2,514	232
Remaining 40 states	655	254	22.47	20,737	1,914
Dairy Total:	2,704	1,320	108	100,124	9,241
Overall:	8,113	2,234	185	171,608	15,838

Table 4-3: Top ten states for potential electricity generation from swine and dairy farms (Source: AgStar [15])

Municipal wastewater is yet another waste stream that is being used as a source of energy and that has potential for substantial expansion. According to the EPA 2011 study there were 104 waste treatment facilities that were capturing biogas and using it for electricity generation in combined heat and power (CHP) plants with a total 190 MW generating capacity. An additional 1,351 facilities had installed anaerobic digesters but not CHP plants. EPA estimated that if these facilities installed electricity generating equipment they could support a further 411 MW of electricity generation and 38,000 mmBtu per day of thermal energy [16]. In addition to the units listed in Table 4-4, SUFG is aware of an electricity generating plant at a second location in Indiana, giving the state a total capacity of 195 kW. More information about these plants is given in Section 4.4.

State	Number of Sites	Capacity (MW)
AR	1	1.73
AZ	1	0.29
CA	33	62.67
CO	2	7.07
CT	2	0.95
FL	3	13.50
IA	2	3.40
ID	2	0.45
IL	2	4.58
IN	1	0.13
MA	1	18.00
MD	2	3.33
MI	1	0.06
MN	4	7.19

State	Number of Sites	Capacity (MW)
MT	3	1.09
NE	3	5.40
NH	1	0.37
NJ	4	8.72
NY	6	3.01
OH	3	16.29
OR	10	6.42
PA	3	1.99
TX	1	4.20
UT	2	2.65
WA	5	14.18
WI	5	2.02
WY	1	0.03
Total	104	189.8

Table 4-4: Wastewater treatment combined heat and power systems in the U.S. (Data source: EPA [16])

Although crop residues are not in large scale use today as a source of energy, they are the most readily available biomass feedstock. According to the USDA/DOE *Billion-Ton* study referred to in Section 4.2, corn stover is the most abundant untapped source of biomass currently available from croplands. In the 2016 update of the *Billion-Ton* study, the total amount of agricultural residues projected to be produced in 2017 at a farm-gate price of \$60 per dry ton is estimated at 89 million tons of corn stover, 13 million tons of wheat straw and one million tons of other types of grain crop residues [17].

4.4 Organic waste biomass in Indiana

Organic waste biomass, in particular wood residue and byproducts, has historically been the main source of renewable energy consumed in Indiana contributing over 80 percent of the renewable energy up to the 1980s, and over 60 percent in the 1990s. It was not until the rapid growth in corn ethanol production in the 2000s that waste biomass was overtaken by ethanol as the leading source of renewable energy consumed in Indiana. Figure 4-5 shows the contribution of the various renewable resources to the total annual energy consumed in Indiana from 1960 to 2020. The types of industries using wood residue and byproducts include the paper and pulp industry that has traditionally used the paper-making byproducts for cogeneration of electricity and process heat. In 2020 waste biomass' contribution to Indiana's renewable energy mix, at 20 percent, fell to third place behind biofuels' 44 percent and wind energy's 30 percent.




Figure 4-5: Renewables share of Indiana total energy consumption (1960-2020) (Data source EIA [18])

Municipal solid waste is another major source of energy from waste biomass in Indiana, for example the Covanta Energy Corporation’s Indianapolis facility uses municipal solid waste to generate steam used for district heating in downtown Indianapolis. The plant processes annually 703,000 tons of solid waste to produce 3.2 billion pounds of steam that supplies half of the heat energy for the downtown Indianapolis heating loop [19].

The other organic waste biomass that is a significant source of energy in Indiana is landfill gas. According to the EPA Landfill Methane Outreach Program there are 18 operational landfill gas electricity generating projects in Indiana with a combined 65 MW installed generating capacity. Table 4-5 provides a list of operational landfill gas electricity generating plants in Indiana in the EPA database. WVPA, with 43.2 MW listed in the EPA database, is the most active user of landfill gas for electricity generation in Indiana. According to the WVPA website however WVPA owns and operates 14 landfill projects with a total of 49.6 MW and contracts for power from one 5.6 MW landfill project. The projects listed on the WVPA website are shown in Table 4-6 [20].

Project Developer	Landfill Name	County	Rated Capacity (MW)	End User
Not Available	National Serv-All LF	Allen	6.4	General Motors Company
Aria Energy	County Line LF	Fulton	1.6	WVPA
Aria Energy; Republic Services	County Line LF	Fulton	5.898	NIPSCO; WVPA
Energy Systems Group	Blackfoot Landfill	Pike	3.2	CenterPoint Energy
Energy Systems Group	Munster LF	Lake		NIPSCO
Granger Energy	South Side Landfill Inc.	Marion	5	Rolls-Royce
WVPA	Liberty Landfill	White	6.4	WVPA
WVPA	Liberty Landfill	White	3.2	WVPA
WVPA	Liberty Landfill	White	3.2	WVPA
WVPA	Deercroft RDF	LaPorte	4	WVPA
WVPA	Earthmovers LF	Elkhart	4.8	WVPA
WVPA	Jay County LF	Jay	2.4	WVPA
WVPA	Oak Ridge RDF	Cass	3.2	WVPA
WVPA	Prairie View RDF	St. Joseph	3.2	WVPA
WVPA	Prairie View RDF	St. Joseph	3.2	WVPA
WVPA	Twin Bridges RDF	Hendricks	3.2	WVPA
WVPA	Twin Bridges RDF	Hendricks	3.2	WVPA
WVPA; WM Renewable Energy	Twin Bridges RDF	Hendricks	3.2	WVPA

Table 4-5: Electricity generating plants at Indiana landfills (Data source: EPA [21])

Landfill Name	Capacity (MW)		Landfill Name	Capacity (MW)
Twin Bridges I	3.2		Liberty I	3.2
Twin Bridges II	3.2		Liberty II	3.2
Twin Bridges III	3.2		Liberty III	6.4
Twin Bridges IV	3.2		Jay County	3.2
Prairie View I	3.2		Oak Ridge	3.2
Prairie View II	3.2		Earthmovers	4.8
Deercroft II	3.2		Clinton	3.2
County Line*	5.6			

*County Line project is on a power purchase agreement

Table 4-6: Wabash Valley Power Association landfill electricity projects (Data source: WVPA [20])

Giraldo, in his 2013 Master's thesis [22], estimated that 10 other landfills in Indiana had the technical characteristics necessary to support an additional 16.9 MW of electricity generating capacity as shown in Table 4-7.

Facility Name	Amount of garbage disposed on landfill (tons)	Potential electricity generation capacity (kW)
Clinton County	1,170,254	560
New Paris Pike	1,900,000	870
Decatur Hills	1,363,442	900
Hoosier 2	2,143,024	1,030
Bartholomew County 2	1,468,927	1,170
Medora Sanitary	2,509,000	1,200
Wabash Valley	4,488,770	2,290
County Line	4,694,835	2,400
United Refuse	7,125,327	2,440
Sycamore Ridge	4,579,067	4,060

Table 4-7: Potential electricity generating capacity at Indiana landfills (Data source: Giraldo [22])

Another source of biomass fuel used for electricity generation in Indiana is the anaerobic digestion of animal manure. According to the EPA AgSTAR livestock digester database, there are ten such digesters in Indiana. Five of those digesters use the biogas to generate electricity, generating a combined average 111,000 MWh per year. In five of the farms the biogas is cleaned and pressurized into transportation fuel quality compressed natural gas (CNG) which can then be used as fuel for the milk transportation trucks. In addition to the digesters listed in the EPA AgSTAR database, SUFG is aware of digesters at the Culver Ducks Farm in Middlebury, Indiana that use the by-products from the duck processing plant to generate an average 9,960 MWh of electricity per year from three generators with a combined 1.2 MW generating capacity. Table 4-8 lists the location and some characteristics of these livestock-based digesters. The potential to expand biogas production from livestock farms in Indiana is substantial given that Indiana is ranked by the EPA among the top ten with an estimated potential for producing 3.5 billion cubic feet of biogas per year from livestock manure digesters in 296 farms [15].

Project Name	County	Animal Type and Population	Electricity Generated (MWh/yr)	Biogas Generation Estimate (ft³/day)
Bio Town Ag	White	Cattle (4500); Swine (800) Other Feedstocks	70,365	Cogeneration
Waste No Energy Digester (centralized/Regional)	White	Cattle (300); Swine (4,000) Agricultural Residues; Fats, Oils, Greases; Food Processing Wastes; Food Wastes	8,370	408,000 Cogeneration
Prairie's Edge Dairy Site 2 Digester 1	Jasper	Dairy (12,000)	7,818	1,200,000 Cogeneration; CNG
Prairie's Edge Dairy Site 2 Digester 2	Jasper	Dairy (4,300)	NA	CNG
Homestead Dairy	Marshall	Dairy (2,100) Fats, Oils, Greases	7,446	Electricity
Hidden View Dairy	Jasper	Dairy (3,500)	7,074	Cogeneration
Bos Dairy	Jasper	Dairy (3,600)	NA	CNG
Green Cow Power (Centralized/Regional)	Elkhart	Dairy (1,500) Food Processing Wastes	NA	907,200 Cogeneration
Herrema Dairy Digester	Jasper	Dairy (3,750)	NA	CNG
Windy Ridge Dairy	Jasper	Dairy (7,000)	NA	CNG
Culver Duck Farm (processing plant) @	Elkhart	Ducks 105,000 gallons processing byproducts per week	9,960	N/A

*Data from 2G Energy Corporation [23]

Table 4-8: Operational anaerobic digesters in Indiana (Data source EPA: [14])

It was estimated in 2013 that 144 concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) had the size and manure handling processes necessary to support an additional 20 MW of electricity generating capacity as shown in Table 4-9.

Operation type (size in head)	Number of candidate farms	Potential electrical generation capacity per farm (kW)	Potential electrical generation capacity per category (kW)
Dairy (500-999)	17	175	2,975
Dairy (1000-2499)	12	365	4,380
Dairy (2500 or more)	3	1,204	3,612
Hog farrow-to-wean (1000-1999)	4	22	88
Hog farrow-to-wean (2000-4999)	2	53	106
Hog farrow-to-wean (5000 or more)	2	184	368
Hog farrow-to-finish (1000-1999)	14	20	280
Hog farrow-to-finish (2000-4999)	14	43	602
Hog farrow-to-finish (5000 or more)	16	194	3,104
Hog finish only (1000-1999)	18	28	504
Hog finish only (2000-4999)	22	68	1,496
Hog finish only (5000 or more)	14	181	2,534
Hog nursery (1000-1999)	2	12	24
Hog nursery (2000-4999)	3	18	54
Hog nursery (5000 or more)	1	38	38
Total	144		20,165

Table 4-9: Potential electricity generating capacity at Indiana concentrated animal feeding operations (Data source: Giraldo [22])

Another biomass waste stream that is currently in use as a source of energy in Indiana is municipal wastewater. SUFG is aware of a total of 195 kW of electricity generating capacity in wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) in the cities of Jasper (65 kW) and West Lafayette (130 kW). The West Lafayette facility is also equipped to take in food related waste from Purdue University and other local businesses. The electricity produced at the West Lafayette plant supplies approximately 15 percent of the total electricity needs at the plant [24]. It was estimated in 2013 that wastewater treatment plants in 17 Indiana cities had the volume and processing infrastructure necessary to support an additional 10 MW of electricity generating capacity as shown in Table 4-10.

Facility name	Average flow (MGD)	Potential electricity generation capacity (kW)
Noblesville WWTP	5.0	130
Speedway WWTP	5.5	143
Shelbyville WWTP	6.8	177
Elkhart WWTP	8.3	216
J.B. Gifford WWTP	8.5	221
William Edwin Ross WWTP	9.0	234
Anderson WWTP	12.0	312
Mishawaka WWTP	12.0	312
Evansville Eastside WWTP	18.0	468
Muncie WWTP	19.0	494
Lafayette WWTP	20.7	537
Terre Haute WWTP	24.0	624
Hammond WWTP	27.0	702
City of South Bend WWTP	36.0	936
Gary Sanitary District	50.0	1,300
Fort Wayne WPCP	62.0	1,612
Carmel South WWTP	95.0	2,470
Total		10,888

Table 4-10: Potential electricity generating capacity at Indiana wastewater treatment plants (Data source: Giraldo [22])

Figure 4-6 shows the amount of agricultural and forest biomass residue potentially available for energy production in Indiana in 2030 at various bioenergy feedstock prices according to the 2016 *Billion-Ton* study KDF database referred to earlier in this section. As can be seen in the figure, the most abundant residue available in Indiana is corn stover; increasing from approximately 4.9 million dry tons per year at an offer price of \$50 per dry ton to 6.2 million dry tons per year at the higher price \$60 per dry ton.




Figure 4-6: Estimated biomass production potential in Indiana (Data source: DOE [17])

4.5 Incentives for organic waste biomass

Federal Incentives

- Renewable Electricity Production Tax Credit (PTC) provides 1.3 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) for open-loop biomass, landfill gas and municipal solid waste energy technologies. Organic waste biomass falls under the open-loop category. The PTC has been recently extended by the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (RA) to include projects beginning construction before the end of 2024. For projects to access the full credit they are required to meet the prevailing age and apprenticeship described in Section 1.4. Projects can also earn extra credit if they meet the domestic content condition or if they are located in an energy community or an environmental justice community as described in Section 1.4. The details of what qualifies as an energy community or an environmental justice community are also given in Section 1.4 of this report [25-27].
- Business Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC) credits up to 30 percent of expenditures on qualified renewable energy systems. Municipal solid waste is the only biomass that qualifies for the ITC. Like the PTC above the ITC has been extended by the IRA the end of 2024. And like the PTC projects are required to meet the prevailing wages and

apprenticeship conditions and projects can earn extra credit by having the specified amount of domestic content in their power plant or if they locate in an “energy community” as defined by the IRA or in an environmental justice community [25 – 27].

- Clean Energy Production Tax Credit (CEPTC) is similar to the PTC except it begins in 2025, after the PTC expires. The CEPTC expires at the end 2032 [26, 27].
- Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit (CEITC) is similar to the PTC, except it comes into effect at the beginning of 2025 and continues to include projects beginning construction at the end of 2032 [26, 27]
- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title IV of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [25].
- Modified Accelerated Cost-Recovery System (MACRS) allows businesses to recover investments in qualified renewable energy technologies through depreciation deductions. In its history, bonus first year depreciation has been made available sporadically. The latest of these is a 100 percent first year depreciation for projects placed in service between September 27, 2017 to December 31, 2023 provided for by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 [25].
- USDA Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) promotes energy efficiency and renewable energy for agricultural producers and rural small businesses through the use of grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy systems. The program covers up to 25 percent of costs [25, 28].
- High Energy Cost Grant Program administered by USDA is aimed at improving the electricity supply infrastructure in rural areas having extremely high per-household energy costs; that is, 275 percent of the national average and above. Eligible infrastructure includes renewable resources generation [29].
- USDA Biorefinery Assistance Program offers loan guarantees for the construction or development of commercial-sized biorefineries. The program finances 80 percent of the cost of the biorefinery up to a maximum of \$250 million [25].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [25].

Indiana Incentives

- Net Metering Rule allows utility customers with renewable resource facilities with a maximum capacity of 1 MW to receive a credit for net excess generation in the next billing cycle. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 of 2017 made changes to the net metering rule to modify the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 shall continue to receive full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until July 1, 2032 [25, 30].
- Community Conservation Challenge Grant provides \$20,000-\$80,000 in grants for community energy conservation projects that reduce energy consumption or displace the use of traditional energy sources [25].
- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Electrical Generating Equipment exempts transactions involving manufacturing machinery, tools, and equipment used for the production of tangible personal property, which includes electricity, from state gross retail tax. However, only wind energy has clearly specified rules from the Department of Revenue [25].
- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects [25].
- NIPSCO offers feed-in tariff incentive rates for electricity generated from renewable resources for up to 15 years. The payment for biomass projects is negotiated with maximum possible payment set at \$0.0918/kWh. The size of biomass projects eligible for the feed-in tariff is between 100 and 1,000 kW [31].

4.6 References

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Overview of Greenhouse Gases. <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/understanding-global-warming-potentials>
2. DOE Bioenergy Technology Office. National Algal Biofuels Technology Review. June 2016. <https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/downloads/2016-national-algal-biofuels-technology-review>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/06/f33/national_algal_biofuels_technology_review.pdf
3. DOE Bioenergy Technology Office. Algal Biofuels Advanced Algal Systems Fact Sheet. June 2019. <https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/algal-biofuels>

- <https://www.energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/related-links-0>
<https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2019/06/f63/Advanced%20Algal%20Systems%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>
4. Greentechmedia.
<http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/aps-gets-70.5m-to-feed-captured-carbon-to-algae>
 5. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Cost and Performance Characteristics of New Generating Technologies, 2019 Annual Energy 2019.
 6. DOE and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Biomass as feedstock for a bioenergy and bioproducts industry: the technical feasibility of a billion-ton annual supply. April 2005.
https://www1.eere.energy.gov/bioenergy/pdfs/final_billionton_vision_report2.pdf
 7. DOE. 2011 U.S. Billion-Ton Update: Biomass Supply for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry. R.D. Perlack and B.J. Stokes (Leads), ORNL/TM-2011/224. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. 448p. doi:10.2172/1271651.
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/01/f19/billion_ton_update_0.pdf
 8. DOE. 2016 Billion-Ton Report: Advancing Domestic Resources for a Thriving Bioeconomy, Volume 1: Economic Availability of Feedstocks. M. H. Langholtz, B. J. Stokes, and L. M. Eaton (Leads), ORNL/TM-2016/160. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. 448p.
<https://energy.gov/eere/bioenergy/downloads/2016-billion-ton-report-advancing-domestic-resources-thriving-bioeconomy>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/12/f34/2016_billion_ton_report_12.2.16_0.pdf
 9. USDA. Biomass supply from corn residues: estimates and critical review of procedures.
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/econ_reportspapers/21/
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1018&context=econ_reportspapers
 10. National Alliance for Advanced Biofuels and Bioproducts (NAABB). Synopsis.
 Final report. June 2014.
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/07/f18/naabb_synopsis_report_0.pdf
https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/07/f18/naabb_full_final_report_section_I.pdf
 11. EIA. April 2021 Monthly Energy Review Table 10.1
<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#renewable>
 12. Energy Recovery Council. 2018 directory of waste-to-energy facilities
<http://energyrecoverycouncil.org/>
<http://energyrecoverycouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/ERC-2018-directory.pdf>
 13. EPA. Landfill Methane Outreach Program.
<https://www.epa.gov/lmop/project-and-landfill-data-state>
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-02/lmopdatail.xlsx>
 14. EPA, AgStar. Livestock Anaerobic Digester Database. May 2022.
<https://www.epa.gov/agstar/livestock-anaerobic-digester-database>
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-10/agstar-livestock-ad-database.xlsx>
 15. AgStar. Market opportunities for biogas recovery systems at U.S. livestock facilities.
<https://www.epa.gov/agstar/agstar-market-opportunities-report>

- <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-06/documents/epa430r18006agstarmarketreport2018.pdf>
16. EPA Combined Heat and Power Partnership, Opportunities for combined heat and power at wastewater treatment facilities: market analysis and lessons learned from the field.
<https://www.epa.gov/anaerobic-digestion/opportunities-combined-heat-and-power-wastewater-treatment-facilities-market>
https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-07/documents/opportunities_for_combined_heat_and_power_at_wastewater_treatment_facilities_market_analysis_and_lessons_from_the_field.pdf
 17. DOE. Bioenergy Knowledge Discovery Framework, Billion-ton 2016 Data Explorer.
<https://bioenergykdf.net/>
<https://bioenergykdf.net/models-and-tools>
 18. EIA. State Energy Data System (SEDS): 1960-2020 (complete).
Table CT2. Primary Energy Consumption Estimates, 1960-2020, Indiana (Trillion Btu)
<https://www.eia.gov/state/seds/seds-data-complete.php?sid=IN>
https://www.eia.gov/state/seds/data.php?incfile=/state/seds/sep_sum/html/sum_btu_1.html&sid=IN
 19. Covanta Energy Corporation.
<https://www.covanta.com/Our-Facilities/Covanta-Indianapolis>
 20. Wabash Valley Power Association.
<https://www.wvpa.com/power-supply-diversity/renewable-energy/>
 21. EPA. Landfill Methane Outreach Program (LMOP).
<https://www.epa.gov/lmop/landfill-gas-energy-project-data>
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-03/opprjslmopdata-detailed.xlsx>
 22. Juan S. Giraldo. An economic analysis of electricity generation potential from biogas resources in the state of Indiana. Master of Science Thesis, Purdue University 2013.
<https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/dissertations/AAI1544326/>
https://www.purdue.edu/discoverypark/sufg/docs/publications/SUFG_Biogas.pdf
 23. 2G Energy. Culver Ducks Farm Project.
<https://www.2g-energy.com/projects/culver-duck-farms-inc>
https://9102466.fs1.hubspotusercontent-na1.net/hubfs/9102466/2GEnergy_March2022/PDFs/culver_duck_farms.pdf
 24. West Lafayette wastewater treatment plant.
<https://www.westlafayette.in.gov/wwtu/>
<https://www.purdue.edu/discoverypark/energy/assets/pdfs/energy-camp-presentations/West%20Lafayette%20Waste%20Water%20Treatment%20Plant.pdf>
 25. Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>

26. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
27. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
28. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development. Rural Energy for America Program Renewable Energy Systems & Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loans & Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/rural-energy-america-program-renewable-energy-systems-energy-efficiency>
29. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development. Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/high-energy-cost-grants>
30. Indiana General Assembly. Senate Bill 309 <https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>
31. NIPSCO <https://www.nipsco.com/services/renewable-energy-programs/feed-in-tariff>

5. Solar Energy

5.1 Introduction

Solar energy is captured and converted into various forms of energy in two main ways: directly to electricity using photovoltaic cells and indirectly using solar thermal conversion technologies. Solar thermal technologies use the energy from the sun to heat a fluid which can then be used to make hot water, heat a building or drive an electricity generator. The two solar energy conversion methods and their associated technologies are presented in this report, starting with solar thermal conversion in this section followed by photovoltaic cells in the Section 6.

Solar thermal energy is captured using solar collectors, of which there are two main types: concentrating and non-concentrating collectors. Concentrating collectors use mirrors of various configurations to focus the solar energy onto a receiver containing a working fluid that is used to transfer the heat to a conversion engine. Concentrating collectors are typically used for electricity generating projects while non-concentrating collectors are typically used for heating applications such as water and space heating.

The most commonly used non-concentrating collectors are flat-plate designs. Flat-plate collectors consist of a flat-plate absorber, a transparent cover that allows solar energy to pass through while reducing heat loss, a heat-transport fluid flowing through tubes, and a heat insulating backing. Figure 5-1 shows the basic components of a flat-plate collector. Other non-concentrating collectors include evacuated-tube collectors and integral collector-storage systems.




Figure 5-1: The layout of a flat-plate collector (Source: Penn State University [1])

The four main types of thermal concentrating solar power (CSP) systems are parabolic trough, linear Fresnel, solar power tower, and solar dish/engine system.

The parabolic trough CSP system is the most developed and widely used CSP technology. It has trough shaped collectors with a parabolic cross section and a receiver tube located at the focal line of the trough as shown in Figure 5-2. A working fluid is used to transport the heat from the receivers to heat exchangers. Trough CSP systems in use for utility scale electricity generation are typically coupled with a fossil-fuel fired boiler to supplement the supply of heat when the solar energy collected is not adequate. Trough systems can also be coupled with energy storage equipment to store the hot working fluid, thereby providing the ability for the plant to be dispatched to match system demand.




Figure 5-2: A parabolic trough CSP system (Source: IEA [2])

The linear Fresnel CSP system functions a lot like the parabolic trough system. The parabolic trough is replaced with a series of flat or slightly curved mirrors that focus the radiation onto a receiver tube as shown in Figure 5-3. The receiver tube contains a fluid that is used to carry the reflected sun's heat to the energy conversion equipment. SUFG is aware of one currently operational Fresnel project in the U.S., the 5 MW Tucson Electric Power Sundt Boost project in Tucson, Arizona [3].




Figure 5-3: A linear Fresnel CSP system (Source: IEA [2])

The power tower CSP system utilizes thousands of flat sun-tracking mirrors, that concentrate the solar energy on a tower-mounted heat exchanger as shown in Figure 5-4. This system avoids the heat loss during transportation of the working fluid to the central heat exchanger in a trough-based CSP system. Power tower CSP systems are typically equipped with molten salt energy storage tanks at the base of the towers that enable them to store energy for several hours. There are two operational power tower projects in the U.S.: the 377 MW Ivanpah project in the Mojave Desert in California and the 110 MW Crescent Dunes project in Tonopah, Nevada [4, 5].




Figure 5-4: A power tower CSP system (Source: IEA [2])

The dish/engine system utilizes a parabolic shaped dish that focuses the sun's rays to a receiver at the focal point of the dish as shown in Figure 5-5. An engine/generator located at the focal point of the dish converts the absorbed heat into electricity. Many of these dish systems may be combined to make a utility-scale power plant. The dish/engine system does not use any cooling water which puts it at an advantage over the other three systems. However, it is the least

developed of the three CSP technologies with several challenges to be overcome in the design of the reflectors and the solar collectors. The two dish/engine CSP plants installed in the U.S. are no longer operational. They are the 1.5 MW Maricopa project in Arizona and the 1.5 MW project at the Tooele Army Depot in Utah [5].




Figure 5-5: A dish/engine CSP system (Source: IEA [2])

5.2 Economics of solar technologies

Table 5-1 shows the overnight capital cost¹¹ estimates from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) for CSP power plants currently in operation in the U.S. The per kilowatt cost varies widely, ranging from a low of \$2,250/kW for the Colorado Integrated Solar Project in Palisades, Colorado to a high of \$8,000/kW for the Solana Station in Phoenix, Arizona.

¹¹ Overnight capital cost “is an estimate of the cost at which a plant could be constructed assuming that the entire process from planning through completion could be accomplished in a single day” [6]. The overnight cost concept is used to avoid the impact of the differences in financing methods chosen by project developers on the estimated costs.

Project Name	Developer, Owner	Location	Capacity (MW)	Technology	Online Date	Capital cost (\$/kW)	Thermal storage (hours)
Solana Generating Station	Abengoa	Phoenix, AZ	250	Parabolic Trough	2013	8,000	6
Mojave Solar Project	Abengoa	Harper Dry Lake, CA	250	Parabolic Trough	2014	6,400	None
Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center	Florida Power & Light	Indian Town, FL	75	Parabolic Trough	2010	6,351	None
Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System	BrightSource Energy	Primm, CA	377	Power Tower	2013	5,836	None
Saguaro Power Plant	Arizona Public Service	Red Rock, AZ	1.16	Parabolic Trough	2006	5,172	None
Nevada Solar One	Acciona	Boulder City, NV	72	Parabolic Trough	2007	3,694	0.5
Colorado Integrated Solar Project	Xcel Energy /Abengoa Solar	Palisades, CO	2	Parabolic Trough	2010	2,250	None

Table 5-1: Estimated capital cost of CSP plants in the U.S. (Data sources NREL [5])

Figure 5-6 shows the overnight capital cost estimates of utility scale electricity generating technologies given in the March 2022 EIA update of generating plant costs for the technologies modeled in the 2022 Annual Energy Outlook. The solar thermal technology's estimated capital cost of \$7,895 /kW is the most expensive of the generating technologies (renewable and non-renewable) modeled in by the EIA in the 2022 Annual Energy Outlook.

Overnight cost (2021\$/kW)




Figure 5-6: Estimated capital cost of generating technologies (Data source: EIA [6])

Figure 5-7 shows the estimate of the fixed and variable operating and maintenance (O&M) costs of the generating technologies modeled in the 2022 update of estimated generating technologies costs. As can be seen in Figure 5-7 solar thermal technology has moderate O&M cost, with almost no variable O&M cost and an estimated fixed annual O&M cost of \$89/kW. The fixed O&M cost

is higher than that of PV (\$16/kW) and land-based wind (\$28/kW) but lower than offshore wind, biomass and geothermal.




Figure 5-7: Operating and maintenance cost of generating technologies (Data source: EIA [6])

5.3 State of solar energy nationally

As can be seen in Figure 5-8, there are substantial solar resources available in the U.S., especially in the southwestern region.




Figure 5-8: Solar power resource in the U.S. (Source: NREL [7])

Between 1980 and 2016 there were two surges in the installation of CSP electricity generating plants. The first surge in the 1980s saw the installation of 354 MW of CSP capacity most of which was part of the multiphase, multilocation, Solar Energy Generating System (SEGS) CSP in California. The second surge of CSP capacity happened between 2007 and 2016 when a further 1404 MW of CSP capacity was installed. Figure 5-9 shows the annual and cumulative capacity additions in the U.S. Since 2016 SUFG is not aware of any new CSP systems coming online or under construction in the U.S. Instead a total of 288 MW of CSP capacity has been decommissioned, including all but 80 MW of the 354 MW SEGS system in California.




Figure 5-9: Solar thermal power capacity installed in the U.S. (Data sources: NREL [5, 8], SEIA [9], IREC [10])

Five of the largest operating projects, with a combined capacity of 1,282 MW, were completed in 2013 - 2015. The largest of these is the 377 MW Ivanpah power tower in the Mojave Desert in California. The other four are: the 250 MW Solana project near Gila Bend, Arizona; the 250 MW Genesis project in Riverside County, California; the 250 MW Mojave solar project also located in the Mojave Desert of California; and the 110 MW Crescent Dunes project in Tonopah, Nevada. Table 5-2 contains a list of CSP projects in operation in the U.S. as of the writing of this report while Table 5-3 is a list of installed CSP projects that are no longer operational.

Project Name	State	Generating Capacity (MW)	Technology	Production Start Year
Solar Electric Generating Station (SEGS) IX	CA	80	Parabolic trough	1991
Nevada Solar One	NV	72	Parabolic trough	2007
Martin Next Generation Solar	FL	75	Parabolic trough	2010
Solana Generating Station	AZ	250	Parabolic trough	2013
Genesis Solar Energy Project	CA	250	Parabolic trough	2014
Mojave Solar Project	CA	250	Parabolic trough	2014
Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System	CA	377	Power tower	2014
Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project	NV	110	Power tower	2015
Stillwater GeoSolar Hybrid Plant	NV	2	Parabolic trough	2015

Table 5-2: Operating concentrating solar power plants in the U.S. (Data source: NREL [5, 8])

Project Name	State	Generating Capacity (MW)	Technology	Production Start Year
SEGS I	CA	13.8	Parabolic trough	1984
SEGS II	CA	30	Parabolic trough	1985
SEGS III	CA	30	Parabolic trough	1987
SEGS IV	CA	30	Parabolic trough	1987
SEGS V	CA	30	Parabolic trough	1988
SEGS VI	CA	30	Parabolic trough	1989
SEGS VII	CA	30	Parabolic trough	1989
SEGS VIII	CA	80	Parabolic trough	1990
Saguaro Power Plant	AZ	1	Parabolic trough	2006
Kimberlina Solar Thermal	CA	5	Linear Fresnel reflector	2008
Sierra SunTower	CA	5	Power tower	2009
Holaniku at Keahole Point	HI	2	Parabolic trough	2009
Maricopa Solar Project	AZ	1.5	Dish/Engine	2010
Colorado Integrated Solar	CO	2	Parabolic trough	2010
Tooele Army Depot	UT	1.5	Dish/Engine	2013

Table 5-3: Concentrating solar power plants in the U.S. that are no longer operating (Data source: NREL [5, 8])

Although there have been no CSP projects developed in the U.S. in the last few years CSP development has continued in other areas of the world as shown in Figure 5-10.




Figure 5-10: Solar thermal power capacity installed worldwide (Source: U.S. DOE [11])

5.4 Solar energy in Indiana

As can be seen in the U.S. solar radiation map (Figure 5-8), Indiana is in a region of the country that has comparatively low annual average solar radiation. This combined with the very high capital cost for CSP power plants compared to other generating technologies makes Indiana a less than ideal location for multi-megawatt CSP plants compared to such states as California, Arizona, Nevada, and Florida. The 1,799 MW of solar thermal power plants in the U.S. are located in four states as follows: California – 1,256 MW, Arizona – 281 MW, Nevada – 187 MW and Florida – 75 MW. However, there is some potential for water heating applications of solar thermal technologies in Indiana.

Figure 5-11 shows the solar radiation available to a flat collector facing south in Indiana. Flat plate collectors are typically used for water heating applications. As can be seen in the figure, the southwestern portion of the state has the highest solar radiation available.




Figure 5-11: Direct normal solar radiation (flat-plate collector) in Indiana (Source: NREL [12])

5.5 Incentives for solar energy

The following incentives are available for solar thermal energy projects:

Federal Incentives

- Business Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC) is a corporate tax credit that credits up to 30 percent of expenditures on solar systems. The ITC has been extended by the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 to include projects which begin construction before the end of 2024. The full 30 percent credit is conditioned on the workers on the project being paid the prevailing wages at the project's locality and a specified proportion of the workforce being enrolled in the apprenticeship program as defined in the National Apprenticeship Act. A project that does not meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions qualifies for only 6 percent credit. A project can earn an extra 10 percent credit by using power plant equipment with a specified proportion of domestic content, by locating in an "energy community" or by locating in an "environmental justice community." The definition of an "energy community" and "environmental justice community" are given in Section 1.4 of this report. A project locating on low-income economic development project or residential building qualifies for an extra 20 percent tax credit [13, 14].
- Clean Electricity Investment Tax Credit (CEITC) credits 30 percent of construction cost to all electricity generating technologies which have zero greenhouse gas emissions. The credit comes to effect in 2025 and expires either at the end of 2032 or when greenhouse emissions from the electricity industry reduce by 25 percent below the 2022 level [13, 14].
- Residential Renewable Energy Tax Credit is a personal tax credit that credits up to 30 percent of expenditures, with no maximum credit, on solar systems, including solar water heaters, installed on residential properties. The tax credit scales down to 26 percent for projects placed in service in 2020 through 2022, 22 percent for projects placed in service in 2023. The credit does not apply to systems used to heat swimming pools and hot tubs [15].
- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title IV of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [15].
- Modified Accelerated Cost-Recovery System (MACRS) allows businesses to recover investments in qualified renewable energy technologies through depreciation deductions. In its history, bonus first year depreciation has been made available sporadically. The latest of these is a 100 percent first year depreciation for projects placed in service between

September 27, 2017 to December 31, 2023 provided for by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 [15].

- USDA Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) promotes energy efficiency and renewable energy for agricultural producers and rural small businesses through the use of grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy systems. The program covers up to 25 percent of costs [15, 16].
- USDA High Energy Cost Grant Program administered by USDA is aimed at improving the electricity supply infrastructure in rural areas having extremely high per-household energy costs; that is, 275 percent of the national average and above. Eligible infrastructure includes renewable resources generation [17].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [15].
- Energy Efficiency Mortgage can be used by homeowners to finance a variety of energy efficiency measures, including renewable energy technologies, in new or existing homes. The federal government subsidizes these mortgages by insuring them through the Federal Housing Authority or the Department of Veterans Affairs [15].

Indiana Incentives

- Net Metering Rule qualifies renewable resources with a maximum capacity of 1 MW for net metering in Indiana. The net excess generation is credited to the customer in the next billing cycle. The aggregate capacity limit is set at 1 percent of the utility's most recent summer peak. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 signed into law in May 2017 made changes to the net metering rule to modify the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 continue to receive the full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until June 30, 2032 [15, 18].
- Renewable Energy Property Tax Exemption provides property tax exemptions for solar thermal, PV, wind, hydroelectric and geothermal systems [15].
- Community Conservation Challenge Grant provides \$20,000-\$80,000 in grants for community energy conservation projects that reduce energy consumption or displace the use of traditional energy sources [15].

- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Electrical Generating Equipment exempts transactions involving manufacturing machinery, tools, and equipment used for the production of tangible personal property, which includes electricity, from state gross retail tax. However, only wind energy has clearly specified rules from the Department of Revenue [15].
- Solar Access Laws prevent planning and zoning authorities from prohibiting or unreasonably restricting the use of solar energy. Indiana's solar-easement provisions do not create an automatic right to sunlight, though they allow parties to voluntarily enter into solar-easement contracts which are enforceable by law [15].
- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects [15].
- NIPSCO offers feed-in tariff incentive rates for electricity generated from renewable resources for up to 15 years. The payment for solar systems from 5kW to under 10kW is \$0.1564/kW and \$0.138/kW for solar systems larger than 10kW up to 200kW [19].

5.6 References

1. Pennsylvania State University. Department of Energy and Mineral Engineering.
<https://www.e-education.psu.edu/eme811/node/685>
2. International Energy Agency (IEA). SolarPACES - solar thermal for dispatchable power and solar chemistry network. <http://www.solarpaces.org/how-csp-works/>
3. Tucson Electric Power. Sundt Augmentation (solar thermal).
<https://www.tep.com/sundt-augmentation/>
4. U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE), Solar Energy technologies Office. Multi-year program plan 2007 – 2011. January 2006.
https://www1.eere.energy.gov/solar/pdfs/set_myp_2007-2011_proof_1.pdf
5. National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). Concentrating solar projects.
<https://www.nrel.gov/csp/solarpaces/>
https://solarpaces.nrel.gov/download-project-all?_format=csv
6. U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Cost and Performance Characteristics of New Generating Technologies, Annual Energy Outlook 2022 Table 1. March 2022.
https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/assumptions/pdf/table_8.2.pdf
7. NREL. Solar maps
<https://www.nrel.gov/gis/solar.html#csp-radiation>
<https://www.nrel.gov/gis/assets/images/solar-annual-dni-2018-01.jpg>

8. U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Today in Energy September 20, 2021
<https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=49616>
9. Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), Major projects list.
August 19, 2014; February 23, 2015; May 28, 2015
<http://www.seia.org/research-resources/major-solar-projects-list>
10. Interstate Renewable Energy Council (IREC). 2013 U.S. solar market trends.
<https://irecusa.org/publications/annual-u-s-solar-market-trends-report/>
11. U.S. DOE, Solar Energy technologies Office. 2013 U.S. SETO CSP Program Summit 2019.
Concentrating Solar Thermal Power Technology Overview. Dr. Avi Shultz, Program
Manager. March 18, 2019
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/concentrating-solar-power>
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/downloads/seto-csp-program-summit-2019>
12. NREL. Direct Normal Solar Radiance of Indiana. NREL April 4, 2017
13. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry
- Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
14. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction
Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce
carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
15. Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>
16. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development. Rural Energy for America
Program Renewable Energy Systems & Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loans
& Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/rural-energy-america-program-renewable-energy-systems-energy-efficiency>
17. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Electric Programs.
<http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/high-energy-cost-grants>
18. Indiana General Assembly, 2017 Session. Senate Bill 309
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>
19. NIPSCO.
<https://www.nipsco.com/services/renewable-energy-programs/feed-in-tariff>

6. Photovoltaic Cells

6.1 Introduction

Unlike the solar thermal systems discussed in Section 5 of this report, photovoltaic (PV) cells convert solar energy directly into electricity without having to first convert it to heat. In addition, since PV cells use both direct and indirect sunlight, their use is more geographically widespread than solar thermal systems that require access to direct solar radiation. Figure 6-1 shows the layout and functioning of a PV cell. When the photons in sunlight strike the surface of a photovoltaic cell, some of them are absorbed. The absorbed photons cause free electrons to migrate in the cell, thus causing “holes.” The resulting imbalance of charge between the cell’s front and back surfaces creates a voltage potential. When these two surfaces are connected through an external load, electrical current flows [1].




Figure 6-1: Photovoltaic cell operation (Source: EIA [2])

The photovoltaic cell is the basic building block of a PV system. Individual cells range in surface from smaller than a postage stamp to several inches across with a power output of 1 to 2 watts (W). To increase the power output of the PV unit, the cells are interconnected into a packaged, weather-tight module, typically with a 50-100 W power output as shown in Figure 6-2. Several PV modules are then connected to form a panel. Many of these panels are connected to form the

large scale multi megawatt arrays in a modern solar farm. A complete PV system will include other components such as inverters¹² and mounting systems [1].




Figure 6-2: Illustration of a cell, module, panel and array of a PV power plant (Source: Florida Solar Energy Center [3])

There are currently three main types of PV cell technologies in commercial use: crystalline silicon, thin-film and concentrating PV cells. Other PV cells being developed use new materials instead of silicon, including solar dyes, solar inks and organic polymers. The crystalline silicon cell is the most common PV cell technology and was the first PV technology to be developed. It was developed in the 1950s and was initially used to power satellites and smaller items like watches and electronic calculators. As the prices of PV systems declined, their use spread to other areas such as highway signs and other facilities remote from the electricity grid. In more recent years PV power systems have gained more widespread application as grid-connected generating resources with nearly 96 gigawatts (GW) of installed PV capacity in the U.S at the end of March 2022 [4].

Unlike crystalline silicon cells, thin-film cells are made by depositing thin layers of non-crystalline (amorphous) silicon or other photovoltaic material on low-cost substrate material. As a result, thin-film PV cells have a lower cost per unit of area than crystalline silicon cells. However, since

¹² Inverters change the direct current (DC) produced by the PV array to alternating current (AC) for household or business use or for injection into the power grid.

they have a lower energy conversion efficiency, this cost advantage is reduced by the required larger surface area relative to a crystalline silicon PV system with the same power rating. One of the main advantages of thin-film PV cells is that they can be made into flexible panels that are easily fitted onto building structures such as roofing shingles, facades and glazing on sky lights.

The third category of photovoltaic cell technology in commercial use is the concentrating photovoltaic cell (CPV) technology. CPV systems use optical lenses to focus the sun's rays onto small, high efficiency PV cells, thus reducing the amount of photovoltaic material needed. Unlike the other photovoltaic technologies, CPV systems require direct sunlight and therefore their viability is restricted to sunny locations. According to a 2015 NREL report there were ten CPV systems operating in the U.S. in 2015. The largest of these was the 30 MW Alamosa Solar Generating Station in Alamosa, Colorado. CPV technology has not had as much commercial success as crystalline silicon PV due to its much higher capital cost, as much as 2.5 to 4 times as much as crystalline silicon PV technology [5, 6]. Figure 6-3 shows the layout of a CPV cell.




Figure 6-3: Illustration of concentrating photovoltaic cell (Source: Kuraray [7])

According to the U.S. DOE solar energy technology office, approximately ninety five percent of the photovoltaic systems sold today are crystalline silicon solar cells. They have advantages over other types of solar cells in conversion efficiency, low cost and long lifetimes. Although thin film cells have a lower manufacturing cost, their conversion efficiency is lower. Concentrating photovoltaic cells, although having a high conversion efficiency are constrained by their more expensive materials, manufacturing processes and tracking systems. Organic photovoltaic cells

are still in the research and development stage with limitations in their efficiency and long-term reliability being significant barriers to their commercial deployment [8, 9].

6.2 Economics of PV systems

Since 2008, the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) has issued an annual “*Tracking the Sun*” report that provides historical trends in the installed price of PV systems in the U.S. Starting in 2013 the report was split into two with one report dedicated to utility-scale systems (ground-mounted with capacity greater than 5 MW) and the other focused on distributed PV systems, which includes all roof-mounted systems and all ground mounted systems with an installed capacity up to 5 MW.

Figure 6-4 shows the trends in median installed prices for distributed PV systems in the Berkeley lab database divided into three sub-categories; residential PV systems, small non-residential systems (up to 500kW) and large non-residential systems (between 0.5 MW and 5 MW). The shaded areas around the solid median price line are the 20th and 80th percentile ranges. As can be seen in Figure 6-4, the installed prices for all three groups of distributed PV systems have fallen rapidly since 2000 with an interruption between 2005 and 2009 and a slowing down of the rate of decline starting in 2014. The median prices for residential systems have fallen from over \$12/W in 2002 to \$3.8/W in 2020, from over \$11/W to \$2.9/W for small non-residential systems and from over \$9/W in 2004 for large non-residential systems to \$2.2/W. The installed prices in Figure 6-4 is the upfront cost and does not include any financial incentives.



Figure 6-4: Installed price trends among grid-connected, distributed PV systems (Source: LBNL [10])

Figure 6-5 shows the installed cost in \$/W for the utility-scale PV projects in the Berkeley Labs database based on the year of the projects' commissioning. Utility-scale in the Berkeley Labs report includes ground-mounted PV projects larger than 5 MW in capacity. As can be seen in the figure, the median price for utility-scale PV projects in the Berkeley Lab database has dropped from \$5.38/W for the projects commissioned in 2010 to \$1.4/W for the projects commissioned in 2020.




Figure 6-5: Installed cost of utility-scale PV systems over time (Source: LBNL [11])

Figure 6-6 shows the average construction costs of some generators installed in the U.S. from 2013 to 2020 released by EIA in August 2022. As can be seen the construction cost of PV has dropped by 55 percent from 3,705/kW in 2013 to \$1,655/kW in 2020. The data included in the EIA report is for PV systems 1 MW or more installed on the utility side of the meter.




Figure 6-6: Average construction cost of generation installed in the U.S. (2013-2020)
(Data Source: EIA [12])

Figure 6-7 shows EIA’s estimates of the capital cost of utility-scale photovoltaic electricity generating plants alongside other utility-scale electricity generating technologies issued in March 2022 to populate the National Energy Modeling System for the 2022 EIA Annual Energy Outlook. The estimated cost of a standalone utility-scale PV plant, that is, one not coupled with battery storage was \$1,327/kW and \$1,748/kW for a PV plant coupled with battery storage.




Figure 6-7: Estimated generating technologies capital costs (Data source: EIA [13])

Figure 6-8 shows EIA’s estimated fixed and variable O&M cost for utility-scale photovoltaic electricity generating plants alongside other utility-scale electricity generating technologies. The fixed O&M costs of photovoltaics are among the lowest of the renewable energy technologies at \$16/kW-yr and there is virtually no variable O&M cost. A PV power plant coupled with battery storage has a higher combined fixed O&M at \$34/kW-yr.




Figure 6-8: Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs (Data source: EIA [13])

6.3 State of PV systems nationally

PV installed capacity in the U.S. has been increasing rapidly and steadily in the last twenty years, growing from a mere 12 MW in 2000 to nearly 97 GW at the end of March 2022. Figure 6-9 shows the annual and the cumulative installed capacity PV systems in the U.S.




Figure 6-9: Installed U.S. PV capacity (Data source: EIA [4, 14])

The main factors behind this rapid expansion have been state and federal financial incentives, state renewable portfolio standards (RPS) with specific provisions for solar technologies and the declining costs of PV panels. The decline in the cost of PV systems is described in Section 6.2 of this report. The thirty percent federal investment tax credit (ITC) is generally recognized as one of the most important drivers of the rapid expansion in installed PV capacity in the U.S. The ITC was first enacted into law in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. In 2008, the federal government eliminated the \$2,000 cap on residential installations and permitted utilities and companies the alternative to access the credit. Most recently the ITC was extended in August 2022 by the Inflation Reduction Act to include projects beginning construction before the end of 2032.

At the state level, 30 states and the District of Columbia have a RPS. PV systems are the most common renewable energy technologies in use for residential customer-side distributed generation. Figure 6-10 shows the states with renewable portfolio standards and goals.

September 2020




Figure 6-10: Renewable portfolio standards and goals (Source: DSIRE [15])

Although uncertainty surrounding the imposition of the Section 201¹³ tariffs on imported PV modules in the early part of 2018 caused disruption in the PV industry in 2018, the long-term effects have not been substantial. According the Solar Energy Industry Association (SEIA) the expected effect on project costs was muted by a faster than expected drop in global module prices. In addition, industry players pushed out project timelines to account for the tariff step down schedule. The four-year tariffs started at 30 percent in 2018 and were scheduled to drop by 5 percent per year until they expire in February 2022. In October 2020 the tariff rate applicable in 2021 and 2022 was increased from 15 to 18 percent and the exclusion for bifacial solar panels was removed. According to the SEIA the 3 percent year-to-year drop in utility-scale PV capacity installed from 2017 to 2018 can be attributed to the disruption in the industry associated with the Section 201 tariffs. In February 2022 the federal government substantially mitigated the effect of the tariffs going forward by doubling the annual import threshold below which the tariffs do not apply to 5.5 GW [16, 17, 18].

¹³ Section 201 is a commonly used shorthand for the trade remedies section of the Trade Act of 1974 that permits the president to raise tariffs and duties to provide temporary relief to domestic industries facing injury from imports.

For a few months in early 2022 an investigation launched by the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) had thrown a cloud of uncertainty over the PV installation industry. The investigation on whether Chinese manufacturers were circumventing the Section 201 tariffs by routing solar cells through the Southeast Asian nations of Cambodia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam was launched on April 1 by DOC after a February petition by a U.S. manufacturer, Auxin Solar. On June 6, the President announced an exemption to antidumping tariffs for solar panels originating from those nations for a period of 24 months. This served to lift the uncertainty around the investigation [19].

Table 6-1 lists PV projects in the U.S. having a capacity of 100 MW and above, all of which have been constructed since 2011.

Project Name	Capacity (MW)	City/County	State	Online Date
Copper Mountain (I - V) Solar Facility	802	Boulder City	NV	2010-2021
Mount Signal Solar	794	Calexico	CA	2014
Solar Star (I, II)	747	Rosamond	CA	2015
Desert Sunlight Solar Farm	550	Riverside County	CA	2015
Topaz Solar Farm	550	San Luis Obispo	CA	2011-2014
Blythe Solar Energy Center	485	Riverside County	CA	2020
Mesquite Solar	415	Maricopa County	AZ	2011-2016
Agua Caliente Solar Project	290	Yuma County	AZ	2012
Garland Solar	272	Kern County	CA	2016
Tranquility Solar	258	Fresno County	CA	2016
Moapa Southern Paiute Solar Project	250	Moapa River	NV	2017
McCoy Solar Energy Center	250	Riverside County	CA	2016
Silver State South Solar	250	Primm	NV	2016
California Valley Solar Ranch	250	San Luis Obispo	CA	2012-2013
Antelope Valley Solar	242	Lancaster	CA	2015
Astoria I, II	231	Kern County	CA	2016
Centinela Solar	200	El Centro	CA	2014
Springbok 2	191	Kern County	CA	2016
Comanche Solar	156	Pueblo	CO	2017
Tenaska Imperial Solar Energy West	150	El Centro	CA	2016
Catalina Solar Project	143	Kern County	CA	2013
Campo Verde Solar Project	139	El Centro	CA	2013
Springbok 1	137	Kern County	CA	2016
Mustang Solar	134	Kings County	CA	2016
Tenaska Imperial Solar Energy South	130	El Centro	CA	2013
Arlington Valley Solar Energy II	125	Maricopa County	AZ	2013
Solverde 1	107	Los Angeles	CA	2016
Utah Red Hills Renewable Park	104	Parowan	UT	2015
White Pine Solar Energy Center	101	Taylor County	CA	2016

Table 6-1: PV systems with capacity above 100 MW installed in the U.S. (Data sources: PVresources [20], Solapower Guide [21], California Energy Commission [22], PVmagazine [23], Con Edison [24])

6.4 PV systems in Indiana

Similar to the rest of the U.S., Indiana has seen a rapid growth in the amount of PV capacity installed in the last ten years. As of July 2022, SUFG was aware of at least 682 MW of PV capacity as shown in Table 6-2. This capacity does not include customer-side PV capacity that is not interconnected through net-metering or feed-in tariffs. Indiana's installed capacity was increased by 200 MW at the commissioning of the Riverstart Solar Park in Randolph County in January 2022. The output of the solar park has been contracted by a power purchase agreement to Hoosier Energy. This capacity is set to increase substantially when five large projects with a combined capacity of 1,034 MW are added between now and the end of 2023.

The five projects that were under construction as of the writing of this report are the 265 Dunn's Bridge I Solar project in Jasper County, the 200 MW Indiana Crossroads Solar project in White County, the 250 MW Fairbanks Solar Energy Center in Sullivan County, 199 MW Speedway Solar in Shelby County and the 120 MW Lone Oak project in White County.

	Feed-in Tariff (MW_{AC})	Net Metered PV (MW_{AC})	Utility Owned or Purchase Agreement (MW_{AC})	Total (MW_{AC})
I&M		26	230	256
AES	96*	9		105
Duke		54	44	98
NIPSCO	22	42	0	64
CenterPoint		18	54	72
IMPA			68	68
Hoosier			12	12
WVPA			7	7
Total	118	149	415	682

*Includes 1,858 kW whose feed-in tariff contracts have expired

Table 6-2: Total installed Indiana PV capacity (Data source: IURC [25], CenterPoint [26], I&M [27])

The currently installed PV capacity in Indiana connected to the grid is as follows: 61 percent (415 MW) through direct utility ownership or a power purchase agreement, 22 percent (149 MW) through net metering tariffs, and 17 percent (118 MW) through feed-in tariffs offered by two Indiana utilities. Table 6-3 lists the PV installations in Indiana with a capacity greater than two MW. The Riverstart Solar Park project with a capacity of 200 MW is by far the largest PV installation so far in Indiana. As of the writing of this section it comprised nearly 30 percent of the installed PV capacity in Indiana.

Project	Utility Interconnected	Location (County)	Capacity (MW _{AC})
Riverstart Solar Park	Hoosier	Randolph	200
Troy Solar Facility	CenterPoint	Spencer	50
St. Joseph Energy Center	I&M	St. Joseph	20
Crane Solar	Duke	Martin	17.25
Indy Solar No. 1 (Franklin Township)	AES	Marion	10
Indy Solar No. 2 (Franklin Township)	AES	Marion	10
Indianapolis Airport No. 1	AES	Marion	9.8
Indianapolis Motor Speedway	AES	Marion	9
Indy Solar No. 3 (Decatur Township)	AES	Marion	8.64
Anderson II Solar Park	IMPA	Madison	8
Vertellus	AES	Marion	8
Crawfordsville 2 Solar Park	IMPA	Montgomery	7.93
Indianapolis Airport Phase II A	AES	Marion	7.5
Richmond Solar Farm 2	IMPA	Wayne	7.4
McDonald Solar	Duke	Vigo	5
Pastime Farm	Duke	Clay	5
Geres Energy	Duke	Howard	5
Sullivan Solar	Duke	Sullivan	5
Camp Atterbury	Duke	Bartholomew	5
Anderson I Solar Park	IMPA	Madison	5
Olive Solar	I&M	St. Joseph	5
Tipton Solar Park	IMPA	Tipton	5.26
Crawfordsville 2 Solar Park	IMPA	Montgomery	4.76
Lifeline Data Centers	AES	Marion	4
Rensselaer Solar Farm 2	IMPA	Jasper	4
Washington Solar Park	IMPA	Daviess	4
CWA Authority	AES	Marion	3.83
Rensselaer 2 Solar Farm	IMPA	Jasper	3.8
Duke Realty #129	AES	Marion	3.4
Crawfordsville 1 Solar Park	IMPA	Montgomery	3
Peru Solar Park	IMPA	Miami	3
Greenfield Solar Park	IMPA	Madison	2.8
Rexnord Industries	AES	Marion	2.8
Equity Industrial	AES	Marion	2.73
Duke Realty #98	AES	Marion	2.72
Duke Realty #87	AES	Marion	2.72
Twin Branch	I&M	St. Joseph	2.6
Deer Creek	I&M	St. Joseph	2.5

Table 6-3: Operating PV systems in Indiana with capacity greater than 2 MW (Data sources: IURC [25], IMPA [28])

As mentioned earlier, Indiana's PV capacity is set to increase substantially if all the currently proposed solar projects are constructed. Table 6-4 is a list of large-scale proposed PV projects which were under construction at the writing of this report. Table 6-5 is a list of the 25 projects which had received approval but whose construction had not started as of the writing of this report while Table 6-6 are the projects that who have filed at the IURC but whose approval was pending as of the writing of this report. When the 7 projects that were under construction are completed Indiana's solar PV capacity will increase by 1,586 MW to a total of 2,241 MW. If all the 25 projects which have received approval but had not yet started and completed Indiana's PV capacity will increase by another 5,445 MW to make a total of 7,686 MW and if the five projects whose applications are pending at the commission are constructed Indiana's capacity will increase by a further 800 MW to 8,486 MW.

Project	County	Utility Owner or Buyer	Capacity (MW _{AC})	Planned In-service Date	IURC Cause Number
Dunn's Bridge I Solar	Jasper	NIPSCO	265	2022	45462
Indiana Crossroads Solar	White	NIPSCO	200	2022	45524
Fairbanks Solar Energy Center	Sullivan	NIPSCO	250	2023	45254
Speedway Solar	Shelby	Merchant	199	2023	45230
Lone Oak Solar Energy	Madison	Merchant	120	2023	45255

Total under construction **1,586**

Table 6-4: Utility-scale PV projects under construction in Indiana (Data source: IURC [25, 29])

Project	County	Utility Owner or Buyer	Capacity (MW _{AC})	In-service Date	IURC Cause Number
Dunn's Bridge II Solar	Jasper	NIPSCO	435	2023	45462
Gibson Solar	Gibson	NIPSCO	280	2023	45489
Calvary Solar	White	NIPSCO	200	2023	45462
Elliot Solar	Gibson	NIPSCO	200	2023	45529
Hardy Hills Solar	Clinton	AES	195	2023	45493
Posey County Solar	Posey	CenterPoint	300	2023	45501
Warrick County Solar	Warrick	CenterPoint	100	2023	45501
Petersburg Solar	Pike	AES	250	2024	45591
Ratts 1 Solar	Pike	Merchant	150	2024	45426
Brickyard Solar	Boone	NIPSCO	200	2023	45424
Wheatland Solar	Knox	Merchant	150	2023	45676
Honey Creek Solar	White	Merchant	400	2023	45704
Ratts 2 Solar	Knox	Merchant	150	2023	45615
Skycrest Solar Facility	Jay	Merchant	155	2024	45570
Mammoth Solar Phase 2	Pulaski	Merchant	300	2024	45586
Mammoth Solar Phase 3	Pulaski	Merchant	600	2024	45662
Sun Chief Solar Farm	Jay	Merchant	100	2025	45723
Greensboro Solar	Henry	NIPSCO	100	NA	45425
Trade Post Solar	Sullivan	Merchant	200	NA	45539
Crossroads Solar	Fountain	Merchant	200	NA	45681
Riverstart Solar Park III	Randolph	Merchant	100	NA	45682
Foundry Works Solar	Lake	Merchant	200	NA	45639
Crosstrack Solar	Pike	Merchant	130	NA	45652
Moss Creek Solar	Pulaski	Merchant	200	NA	45657
Rose Gold Solar	Jay	Merchant	150	NA	45672

Total approved but not started construction **5,625**

Table 6-5: Approved utility-scale PV projects in Indiana not yet under construction (Data source: IURC [25, 29])

Project	County	Utility Owner or Buyer	Capacity (MW _{AC})	In-service Date	IURC Cause Number
Rustic Hills Solar II	Warrick	Merchant	100 MW	NA	45716
Rustic Hills Solar	Warrick	Merchant	100 MW	NA	45718
Thalassa Solar	Dekalb	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45739
Twin Lakes Solar	White	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45741
Honeysuckle Solar	St. Joseph	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45742
Blackford Solar	Blackford	Merchant	150 MW	NA	45759

Total with approval pending at IURC **800**

Table 6-6: Utility-scale PV projects whose approval is pending at the IURC (Data source: IURC [25, 29])

As explained previously, the factors being credited with the rapid growth in the PV market in the last decade include federal, state and utility incentives. The federal incentives include the renewal and expansion of the investment tax credit to remove the \$2,000 cap on residential installations and to allow electric utilities access to the investment tax credit. In more recent years the desire to insulate from potential carbon regulation has caused utilities to focus more on low and no carbon resources to meet new capacity needs. The favorable factors in Indiana include the feed-in tariffs by IPL (now AES) and NIPSCO and the expansion of the Indiana net metering rule to include all customer classes and systems up to 1 MW.

The Indiana net metering rule was modified by the May 2017 Senate Enrolled Act 309 to reduce the compensation from net retail rate to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale rate beginning on July 1, 2022. Generators installed before the end of 2017 would continue to receive the full retail rate compensation until July 1, 2047 while those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will be compensated at the full retail rate until July 1, 2032 [15, 30].

The IPL feed-in tariff expired in 2013. While it was in place, it paid \$0.24/kWh for systems between 20 and 100 kW and \$0.20/kWh for systems greater than 100kW up to 10 MW.

NIPSCO's feed-in tariff was offered in two phases. Phase one, which expired in 2015, offered \$0.30/kWh for electricity and the associated renewable credits for units less than 10 kW and \$0.26 for solar facilities up to 2 MW. The purchase rates for the second phase of the NIPSCO feed-in tariff are arranged into two categories referred to as *allocation 1* and *allocation 2* as shown in Table 6-7.

Technology	Nameplate Capacity Range (kW)	Purchase Rate per kWh (Allocation 1)	Purchase Rate per kWh (Allocation 2)
Micro Solar	5 – 10	\$0.17	\$0.1564
Intermediate Solar	> 10 – 200	\$0.15	\$0.138
Micro Wind	3 – 10	\$0.25	\$0.23
Intermediate Wind	> 10 – 200	\$0.15	\$0.138
Biomass	100 – 1,000	\$0.0918	≤ \$0.0918

Table 6-7: Purchase rates under NIPSCO renewable feed-in tariff (Data source: NIPSCO [31])

As of the writing of this report the only rates being offered on the NIPSCO tariff are the *allocation II* rates shown in Table 6-7. In addition, the application for intermediate solar projects, that is, solar projects with a capacity greater than 10 kW and no more than 200 kW, has been closed.

6.5 Incentives for PV systems

Federal Incentives

- Business Renewable Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC) is a corporate tax credit that credits up to 30 percent of expenditures, with no maximum credit limit, on solar PV installations. The ITC has been extended by the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 to include projects which begin construction before the end of 2024. The full 30 percent credit is conditioned on the workers on the project being paid the prevailing wages at the project's locality and a specified proportion of the workforce being enrolled in the apprenticeship program as defined in the National Apprenticeship Act. A project that does not meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions qualifies for only 6 percent credit. A project can earn an extra 10 percent credit by using power plant equipment with a specified proportion of domestic content, by locating in an "energy community" or by locating in an "environmental justice community." The definition of an "energy community" and "environmental justice community" are given in Section 1.4 of this report. A project locating on low-income economic development project or residential building qualifies for an extra 20 percent tax credit [32, 33].
- Residential Renewable Energy Tax Credit is a personal tax credit that credits up to 30 percent of expenditures, with no maximum credit, on solar PV installations on residential properties. The tax credit has been extended by the IRA to include projects that start construction before the end of 2024 [32, 33].
- The Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit (CEITC) enacted for the first time by the Inflation Reduction Act 2022 is similar to the ITC above except it includes all zero carbon emitting technologies and does not come into effect until 2025. Projects qualify for the CEITC if they commence construction between January 1 2025 and the end of 2032. To qualify for the full 30 percent credit a project must meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions just as in the ITC above. Projects also can qualify for additional 10 credit is they meet the conditions specified for the ITC above [32, 33].
- Renewable Electricity Production Tax Credit (PTC). The Inflation Reduction Act 2022 has added photovoltaics to the list of technologies that qualify for the PTC. Projects can get as much 1.5 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) if they meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions specified above. Projects that don't the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions only qualify or 0.3 cents/kWh (1993 dollars) credit. Projects can earn 10 percent extra credit if they meet the domestic content condition, they locate in an energy community or a low-income community. The ten percent for the PTC is calculated on the

base 1.5 cents/kWh (1993) credit. Projects can earn 20 percent credit if they are located in a low-income residential development [32, 33].

- The Clean Energy Production Tax Credit (CEITC) enacted for the first time by the Inflation Reduction Act 2022 is similar to the PTC above except it includes all zero carbon emitting technologies and does not go into effect until 2025. Projects qualify for the CEPTC if they commence construction between January 1 2025 and the end of 2032. To qualify for the full credit projects must meet the prevailing wage and apprenticeship conditions just like for the PTC above. Projects can also draw an extra 10 or 20 percent credit if they meet the conditions specified for the PTC above [32, 33].
- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title XVII of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [15].
- Modified Accelerated Cost-Recovery System (MACRS) allows businesses to recover investments in qualified renewable energy technologies through depreciation deductions. In its history, bonus first year depreciation has been made available sporadically. The latest of these is a 100 percent first year depreciation for projects placed in service between September 27, 2017 to December 31, 2023 provided for by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 [15].
- USDA Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) promotes energy efficiency and renewable energy for agricultural producers and rural small businesses through the use of grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy systems. The program covers up to 25 percent of costs [15, 34].
- High Energy Cost Grant Program administered by USDA is aimed at improving the electricity supply infrastructure in rural areas having extremely high per-household energy costs; that is, 275 percent of the national average and above. Eligible infrastructure includes renewable resources generation [35].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [15].
- Energy Efficiency Mortgage can be used by homeowners to finance a variety of energy efficiency measures, including renewable energy technologies, in new or existing homes. The federal government subsidizes these mortgages by insuring them through the Federal Housing Authority or the Department of Veterans Affairs [15].

Indiana Incentives

- Net Metering Rule qualifies renewable resources with a maximum capacity of 1 MW for net metering in Indiana. The net excess generation is credited to the customer in the next billing cycle. The aggregate capacity limit is set at 1 percent of the utility's most recent summer peak. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 signed into law in May 2017 made changes to the net metering rule to modify the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 shall continue to receive full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until July 1, 2032 [15, 30].
- Renewable Energy Property Tax Exemption provides property tax exemptions for solar thermal, PV, wind, hydroelectric and geothermal systems [15].
- Community Conservation Challenge Grant provides \$25,000-\$100,000 in grants for community energy conservation projects that reduce energy consumption or displace the use of traditional energy sources [15].
- Solar Access Laws prevent planning and zoning authorities from prohibiting or unreasonably restricting the use of solar energy. Indiana's solar-easement provisions do not create an automatic right to sunlight; they allow parties to voluntarily enter into solar-easement contracts which are enforceable by law [15].
- Sales and Use Tax Exemption for Electrical Generating Equipment exempts transactions involving manufacturing machinery, tools, and equipment used for the production of tangible personal property, which includes electricity, from state gross retail tax. However, only wind energy has clearly specified rules from the Department of Revenue [15].
- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects [15].
- NIPSCO offers feed-in tariff incentive rates for electricity generated from renewable resources for up to 15 years. The payment for solar systems from 5kW to under 10kW is \$0.1564/kW and \$0.138/kW for solar systems larger than 10kW up to 200kW [31].

6.6 References

1. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), Solar Energy Technologies Office. Solar photovoltaic technology basics.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/articles/solar-photovoltaic-technology-basics>
2. PV Education.org Exchange.
<https://www.pveducation.org/pvcdrom/solar-cell-operation/solar-cell-structure>
3. Florida Solar Energy Center.
http://www.fsec.ucf.edu/en/consumer/solar_Electricity/basics/cells_modules_arrays.htm
4. U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Electric Power Monthly May 2022. Table 6.1.A Estimated Net Summer Solar Photovoltaic Capacity From Utility and Small Scale Facilities (Megawatts).
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/>
5. NREL. Current status of concentrator photovoltaic (CPV) technology. December 2015
<https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy16osti/65130.pdf>
6. ennomotive consulting. The Future of Solar Energy: High Concentrated Photovoltaic (CPV) Cells. <https://www.ennomotive.com/future-of-solar-energy/>
7. Kuraray Company. News release 2011
<https://www.kuraray.com/news/2011/110422>
8. EERE. Solar Photovoltaic Cell Basics.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/articles/solar-photovoltaic-cell-basics>
9. EERE. Organic Photovoltaics Research.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/organic-photovoltaics-research>
10. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). Tracking the Sun. Pricing and Design Trends for Distributed Photovoltaic Systems in the United States. 2021 Edition. September 2021
<https://emp.lbl.gov/tracking-the-sun/>
11. LBNL. Utility-Scale Solar, 2021 Edition. Edition. Empirical Trends in Deployment, Technology, Cost, Performance, PPA Pricing, and Value in the United States
<https://emp.lbl.gov/utility-scale-solar/>
12. EIA. Generator Construction cost data.
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/generatorcosts/>
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data.php>
13. EIA. Cost and Performance Characteristics of New Generating Technologies, Annual Energy Outlook 2022 Table 1. March 2022.
https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/assumptions/pdf/table_8.2.pdf
14. EIA. Electric Power Monthly August 2021. Table 6.1.A Estimated Net Summer Solar Photovoltaic Capacity from Utility and Small-Scale Facilities (Megawatts).
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/>
15. Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>

16. SEIA. U.S. solar market insight report, 2018 year-in-review, executive summary
<https://www.seia.org/research-resources/solar-market-insight-report-2018-year-review>
17. Solar Power World. The legal status of the Section 201 tariffs on solar panels, which expire in 2022. <https://www.solarpowerworldonline.com/2021/03/the-legal-status-of-the-section-201-tariffs-on-solar-panels-which-expire-in-2022/>
18. Reuter. February 4, 2022. Biden admin eases Trump-era solar tariffs but doesn't end them. <https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/biden-extends-modifies-trump-era-solar-tariffs-says-official-2022-02-04/>
19. White and Case Law Firm. June 8, 2022. President Biden Invokes Emergency Authority to Waive Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Solar Imports from Southeast Asia for Two Years.
<https://www.whitecase.com/publications/alert/president-biden-invokes-emergency-authority-waive-antidumping-and-countervailing>
20. pvresources.com
<http://www.pvresources.com/en/pvpowerplants/top50pv.php>
<http://www.pvresources.com/en/pvpowerplants/top100pv.php>
21. Solar Power Guide. Solar Energy Insights.
<https://solarpower.guide/solar-energy-insights/largest-solar-plants>
22. California Energy Commission
<https://www.energy.ca.gov/powerplant/pv/blythe-solar-power-project>
23. pv magazine
<https://pv-magazine-usa.com/2016/09/22/first-solar-tenaska-put-online-150-mw-solar-project-in-southern-california/>
24. Con Edison Development. Con Edison Development Asset Map and Gallery.
<https://www.coneddev.com/asset-map/>
25. Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC). July 2021, July 2022.
26. CenterPoint 2019/2020 Integrated Resource Plan, June 2020.
27. Indiana Michigan Power. St. Joseph Solar Farm Fact Sheet.
<https://www.indianamichiganpower.com/account/bills/programs/im-green/st-joseph-solar>
28. Indiana Municipal Power Agency
<https://www.impa.com/solar>
29. IURC Online Services Portal.
<https://iurc.portal.in.gov/advanced-search/>
30. Indiana General Assembly. Senate Enrolled Act 309
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>
31. NIPSCO. Feed-in Tariff
<https://www.nipsco.com/services/renewable-energy-programs/feed-in-tariff>
32. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>

33. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
34. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development. Rural Energy for America Program Renewable Energy Systems & Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loans & Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/rural-energy-america-program-renewable-energy-systems-energy-efficiency>
35. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Electric Programs. <http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/high-energy-cost-grants>

7. Hydropower

7.1 Introduction

Hydroelectric energy is produced by converting the kinetic energy of falling water into electrical energy. The moving water rotates a turbine, which in turn spins a generator to produce electricity. The harnessing of moving water to perform work has been in use for thousands of years with the Greeks having used it to grind wheat more than 2,000 years ago. The evolution of the hydropower turbine began in the mid-1700s in Europe with the published work of French Engineer Bernard Forest de Bélidor. The first use of a water driven dynamo in the U.S. was in 1880 in Grand Rapids, Michigan followed closely by Niagara Falls, New York, where hydropower was used to provide street lighting. Unlike modern hydropower plants, these two projects used direct current technology. The first modern alternating current hydropower plant in the world was installed in Appleton, Wisconsin in 1882. It generated enough electricity to light the inventor's home, the power plant and one neighboring building [1, 2].

From these beginnings hydroelectricity quickly rose to become one of the principal sources of electricity in the U.S. At the start of the 20th century hydropower provided over 40 percent of the electricity generated in the U.S. With the rise of other fuels, such as coal, nuclear, natural gas, wind and solar, the role of hydroelectricity has dropped steadily to the point that it supplied only 6 percent of the total electricity generated in 2021. For the first time hydroelectricity has been overtaken by wind as the main source of renewable electricity in the U.S. In 2021 electricity generated from wind constituted 46 percent of the renewable electricity generated in the U.S. while hydroelectricity contributed 31 percent [3, 4].

There are several different types of hydropower facilities today. They include impoundment hydropower, diversion, run-of-the-river, microhydro and pumped storage.

Impoundment hydropower is the most common hydropower facility. It involves storing water in a dam and then releasing this water as needed through the turbines to generate electricity. These dams also serve the purpose of flood control. Figure 7-1 shows the schematic of an impoundment hydropower plant [5].




Figure 7-1: Schematic of an impoundment hydropower facility (Source: DOE [6])

Diversion hydropower facilities channel some of the water from a river through a canal or a pipe. They may require a dam but they are less obtrusive than impoundment facilities. Figure 7-2 shows the schematic of a diversion hydropower plant.




Figure 7-2: Schematic of a diversion hydropower facility (Source: wordpress [7])

Run-of-river hydropower facilities utilize the natural flow of water of a river and require little to no impoundment. Examples of run-of-river hydropower plants are the NIPSCO-owned Norway and Oakdale hydropower plants on the twin lakes Shafer and Freeman near Monticello. Figure 7-3 is a photograph of the Oakdale run-of-river hydropower plant on Lake Freeman.



Figure 7-3: Oakdale run-of-river hydropower plant in Carroll County (Source: NIPSCO [8])

Microhydro power projects are small sized facilities (about 100 kW or less). They are typically used in remote locations to serve the power needs of a single home or business. Figure 7-4 shows a photograph of a microhydro power plant in Tamil Nadu, India.



Figure 7-4: Microhydro power facility (Source: Home Power [9])

Pumped storage hydropower plants are currently the most economic large-scale energy storage technology. When electricity demand is low and electricity prices low, electricity from the grid is used to pump water from a lower reservoir to an upper reservoir. The water is released through the turbines to generate electricity when electricity demand and prices are higher. Figure 7-5 is a schematic of a pumped storage power plant. A more detailed discussion of pumped storage hydropower plants is given in Section 8 of this report.




Figure 7-5: Schematic of a pumped hydro facility (Source: DC Thompson and Company [10])

In addition to the type of hydropower facility, there are a variety of turbine technologies that are utilized for hydropower production. The type of turbine is chosen based on its particular application and the height of standing water. There are two main groups of turbines used in hydro power projects –impulse and reaction turbine types. The impulse turbine type uses the velocity of the water while the reaction turbine uses both the velocity of the water and the pressure drop as the water passes through the turbine. The impulse turbine is more suited to a high head,¹⁴ low flow application while the reaction turbine is more suited to a lower head, faster flow situation [11].

7.2 Economics of hydropower

Hydropower projects are very capital intensive and the cost is very site specific. Figure 7-6 shows the capital cost ranges for U.S. hydropower projects from 1980 to 2020 expressed in 2019 dollars obtained from the 2021 DOE U.S. *Hydropower Market Report*. The projects are arranged in three

¹⁴ Head refers to the vertical distance from the reservoir to the turbine.

groups: canals/conduits, non-powered dams (NPD) and new stream-reach development (NSD). Canal/conduit hydropower projects are those constructed on water conveyance conduits put in place primarily for irrigation or water supply. Non-powered dams are hydropower projects added to dams already in place for other purposes, such as water storage, irrigation or navigation, while new stream-reach development projects are small capacity hydropower projects that can be built on streams with minimal environmental impact [12].




Figure 7-6: Capital cost of new U.S. hydropower plants constructed (1980-2020) (Source: DOE [12])

Table 7-1 shows capital costs estimates from various sources. The capital cost estimates range from as low as \$1,966/kW in 2005 dollars for the Hawaii Umauma project to \$9,417/kW cost in 2014 dollars estimate for the Susitna project in Alaska.

Project		Time*	Initial Capital Costs (\$/kW)**
EIA estimates		2018	2,898
Hawaii Pumped Storage Hydroelectric Project (Maui Electric Co.)	Umauma	2005	1,966
	East/West Wailuaiki		3,011
	Big Island		2,432-2,842
	Maui		3,477
Susitna-Watana Project (Alaska)		2014	9,417
American Municipal Power (AMP)	Belleville	1999	2,857
	Cannelton	2009	4,951
	Smithland	2010	6,226
	Meldahl	2010	4,504
	Willow Island	2011	7,889
	Robert C. Byrd	2015	6,250
	Pike Island	Not Available	7,414

* Time the project's cost estimate was made or the project's expected start date.

** The basis year for the capital cost estimates is 2018 for EIA and 2005 for the Hawaii pumped hydro project. The basis year for the AMP and the Alaska projects was not available. The document on which the AMP capital cost estimates were obtained was dated 2011, and the document from which Alaska project was obtained was dated 2014.

Table 7-1: Initial capital costs of hydropower projects (Data sources: EIA, Maui Electric Company, Susitna-Watana Project 2014 Annual Report, Alaska Energy Authority [13-17])

Once constructed, hydroelectric power plants have a major cost advantage since in addition to the free fuel they have moderately low O&M costs. According to the February 2022 EIA updated electricity generating technologies cost estimates, hydroelectric plants have one of the lowest O&M costs among electricity generating technologies. Figure 7-7 shows the fixed and variable O&M costs of various generating technologies. As can be seen in the Figure 7-7, hydroelectricity's variable O&M costs are estimated at \$1.5/MWh and the fixed O&M cost of \$44/kW-yr for a conventional hydroelectric plant. Impoundment hydro power plants, that is, those with dams that hold substantial amounts of water in a reservoir, have an added advantage over some of the other renewable resources (for example wind and solar) in that they are dispatchable. That is, the system operator can control the hydro power plant's output to match the system load. In addition, pumped hydro is the most economic energy storage technology among large scale storage technologies in use in the electricity industry today.




Figure 7-7: Estimated generating technologies fixed and variable O&M costs (Data source: EIA [13])

7.3 State of hydropower nationally

Hydropower has historically been the primary source of renewable energy in the U.S. Figure 7-8 shows the amount of electricity generated from renewable resources from 1949 to 2021. In the early parts of the 20th century, hydroelectricity accounted for virtually all the renewable electricity consumed in the U.S. with all other renewable resources combined contributing less than one percent up to 1974. Hydroelectricity’s dominance has reduced to where in 2019 it was overtaken by wind as the main source of renewable electricity; in 2021 wind contributed 46 percent of the renewable electricity while hydroelectricity contributed 31 percent.




Figure 7-8: Net renewable electricity generation in the U.S. (1949-2021) (Data source: EIA [4])

The total installed hydropower capacity in the U.S. is 102 gigawatts (GW) consisting of 80 gigawatts (GW) of conventional hydro and 22 GW of pumped hydro plants [12, 18]. Table 7-2 is a list of the ten largest hydropower plants in the U.S.

Hydropower Plant Name	River	State	Nameplate Capacity (MW)	Year of completion
Grand Coulee	Columbia	Washington	6,809	1941-1984
Bath County*	Little Back Creek	Virginia	2,862	1985
Chief Joseph	Columbia	Washington	2,456	1955-1979
Robert Moses - Niagara	Niagara	New York	2,429	1961-1962
John Day	Columbia	Oregon	2,160	1968-1971
Hoover	Colorado	Arizona/Nevada	2,079	1936-1961
Ludington*	Lake Michigan	Michigan	1,979	1973
The Dalles	Columbia	Oregon	1,820	1957-1973
Raccoon Mountain*	Tennessee River	Tennessee	1,714	1978-1979
Castaic*	California Aqueduct	California	1,675	1972-1978

*pumped hydropower stations

Table 7-2: Ten largest hydropower plants in the U.S. (Data sources: EIA [18])

Table 7-3 shows the top ten hydro states ranked by their hydroelectricity output in 2020 and Table 7-4 shows the top ten hydro states ranked by installed hydro capacity at the end of 2020. Almost sixty percent of the hydroelectricity generation in 2019 was from the top four states of Washington, California, New York, and Oregon and approximately half the nameplate hydroelectric capacity in the U.S. in 2019 was in the top three states of Washington, California and Oregon.

State	2020 Generation (GWh)	percent of U.S. generation	State	2020 Generation (GWh)	percent of U.S. generation
Washington	76,410	27%	Alabama	13,349	5%
Oregon	31,921	11%	Montana	10,748	4%
New York	29,550	10%	Idaho	9,508	3%
California	21,377	7%	North Carolina	7,957	3%
Tennessee	13,452	5%	Arizona	6,424	2%

Table 7-3: Top ten U.S. hydropower generating states in 2019 (GWh) (Data source: EIA [19])

State	2020 Summer Capacity (MW)	Percent of U.S. Hydro Capacity	State	2020 Summer Capacity (MW)	Percent of U.S. Hydro Capacity
Washington	21,299	27%	Arizona	2,718	3%
California	10,065	13%	Arizona	2,690	3%
Oregon	8,429	11%	Montana	2,649	3%
New York	4,692	6%	Tennessee	2,504	3%
Alabama	3,318	4%	Georgia	1,963	2%

Table 7-4: Top ten U.S. hydropower capacity states at the end 2020 (Data source: EIA [20])

In 2012 DOE released an assessment of the hydropower potential available at hydro sites that had dams already in place but no power generation equipment installed. According to DOE there were a total of 80,000 such non-powered dams providing services such as navigation, water supply and recreation. The combined electricity generating potential at these sites was assessed at 12 GW. Figure 7-9 shows the location of the non-powered dams with a hydropower potential greater than 1 MW. Table 7-5 shows the hydropower potential from non-powered dams for the states in the contiguous U.S.




Figure 7-9: Non-powered dams with potential capacity over 1 MW (Source: DOE [21])

State	Potential Capacity (MW)	State	Potential Capacity (MW)
Illinois	1269	Kansas	92
Kentucky	1253	Montana	88
Arkansas	1136	Washington	85
Alabama	922	Arizona	80
Louisiana	857	Connecticut	68
Pennsylvania	679	Massachusetts	67
Texas	658	New Hampshire	63
Missouri	489	Virginia	50
Indiana	454	Maryland	48
Iowa	427	Michigan	48
Oklahoma	339	Wyoming	45
New York	295	Tennessee	40
Ohio	288	Utah	40
Mississippi	271	South Carolina	38
Wisconsin	245	New jersey	33
West Virginia	210	North Dakota	31
California	195	Maine	19
Minnesota	186	Vermont	17
Florida	173	Nevada	16
Colorado	172	Rhode Island	13
North Carolina	167	Idaho	12
Georgia	144	South Dakota	12
Oregon	116	Nebraska	7
New Mexico	103	Delaware	3

Table 7-5: Hydropower potential from non-powered dams by state (Data source: DOE [21])

In April 2014 DOE released another assessment of hydropower potential, this time focused on undeveloped stream-reaches: that is, rivers and streams that do not have existing dams of any kind (either hydropower plants or non-powered dams). The total hydropower potential in these rivers and streams is estimated at 84.7 GW capable of producing 460,000 GWh of electrical energy per year [22].

7.4 Hydropower in Indiana

Until the commissioning of the first wind farm in Indiana in 2008, hydroelectricity was the main source of renewable electricity in Indiana as shown in Figure 7-10. With 3,468 MW of utility scale installed wind capacity at the end of 2021 compared to 61.9 MW of hydroelectricity, wind is now the dominant source of renewable electricity. Furthermore, the photovoltaic capacity has also been climbing rapidly to overtake hydropower with 655 MW of installed solar at the writing of this report.




Figure 7-10: Renewables share of Indiana net electricity generation (1990-2020) (Data source: EIA [23])

The 2012 DOE national assessment of hydropower potential from non-powered dams referred to in the preceding section of this report estimated that Indiana had a total potential of 454 MW hydropower capacity from already existing, non-powered dams. Table 7-6 lists the dams in Indiana with a potential greater than 1 MW. The capacity of the two dams on the Ohio River is assigned in equal proportions between Indiana and Kentucky.

The 2014 DOE assessment of hydropower potential in rivers and streams that do not have any dams today estimated that Indiana has the potential for 581 MW hydropower capacity capable of generating over 3,000 GWh of electricity per year. This is approximately 12 times the hydroelectricity generated in Indiana in 2019 and 3 percent of the total electricity generated in Indiana from all sources in 2019 [22].

Dam Name	County	City	River	Hydropower Potential (MW)
John T. Myers locks and dams	Posey	Mt. Vernon	Ohio River	395
Newburgh locks and dams	Henderson	Newburgh	Ohio River	319
Mississinewa Lake dam	Miami	Peru	Mississinewa River	14
J. Edward Roush Lake dam	Huntington	Huntington	Wabash River	9
Salamonie Lake dam	Wabash	Lagro	Salamonie River	9
Brookville Lake dam	Franklin	Brookville	White Water River (East fork)	8
Monroe Lake dam	Monroe	Guthrie	Salt Creek	8
White River dam	Marion	Indianapolis	White River	3
Patoka Lake dam	Dubois	Jasper	Patoka River	3
Cagles Mill Lake dam	Putman	Bowling Green	Mill Creek	2
Cecil M. Harden Lake dam	Parke	Mansfield	Raccoon Creek	2
Ball Band dam	St. Joseph	Mishawaka	St. Joseph River	2
Seymour Water Co. dam	Jackson	Seymour	White Water River (East fork)	2
Eagles Creek Reservoir dam	Marion	Clermont	Eagle Creek	2
West fork White River dam	Morgan	Martinsville	White River	2
Harding St. power plant dam	Marion	Indianapolis	White River	2
Versailles State Park dam	Ripley	Versailles	Laughery Creek	1.4
Emerichsville dam	Marion	Indianapolis	White River	1.3
Broad Ripple dam	Marion	Indianapolis	White River	1.3
Geist Reservoir dam	Marion	Indianapolis	Fall Creek	1.3
Cedarville dam	Allen	Cedarville	St. Joseph River	1.3
Hosey (Maumee River) dam	Allen	Fort Wayne	Maumee River	1.2

Table 7-6: Indiana non-powered dams with potential capacity over 1 MW (Data source: DOE [22])

American Municipal Power (AMP), a wholesale electricity supplier to municipal utilities in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Virginia, Kentucky and West Virginia has since 2016 been developing five run-of-the-river hydroelectric projects along the Ohio River. Three of the projects, the 105 MW Melhahl, the 44 MW Willow Island, and the 88 MW Cannelton projects were completed in 2016; while the 76 MW Smithland project was completed in 2017. One of the projects, the 50 MW Robert Byrd has since been abandoned with the city of Wadsworth, Ohio giving up its FERC construction license in 2019. The Cannelton project is located on the Indiana/Kentucky section of the river [24, 25].

In August 2019 the University of Notre Dame broke ground on a project to construct a 2.5 MW hydroelectric plant on the Saint Joseph River in South Bend. Notre Dame and the City of South Bend has had an agreement since 2016 for the University to construct the hydroelectric project as part of improvements planned for the Seitz park in downtown South Bend where the hydroelectric project is located. The hydroelectric project is expected to be completed in 2022 [26, 27].

7.5 Incentives for hydropower

Federal Incentives

- Clean Electricity Investment Tax Credit credits 30 percent of construction cost to all electricity generating technologies which have zero greenhouse gas emissions. The credit comes to effect in 2025 and expires either at the end of 2032 or whenever greenhouse emissions from the electricity industry reduces by 25 percent below the 2022 level [28, 29].
- Renewable Electricity Production Tax Credit (PTC) provides a 1.3 cents/kWh tax credit for small irrigation hydroelectric facilities for ten years of operation. The PTC expires at the end of 2021. That is, facilities must begin construction before December 31, 2021 to qualify [30].
- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title IV of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [30].
- USDA Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) promotes energy efficiency and renewable energy for agricultural producers and rural small businesses through the use of grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy systems. The program covers up to 25 percent of costs [30, 31].
- High Energy Cost Grant Program administered by USDA is aimed at improving the electricity supply infrastructure in rural areas having extremely high per-household energy costs; that is, 275 percent of the national average and above. Eligible infrastructure includes renewable resources generation [32].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [30].

Indiana Incentives

- Net Metering Rule qualifies renewable resource facilities with a maximum capacity of 1 MW for net metering. The net excess generation is credited to the customer in the next

billing cycle. Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 309 signed into law in May 2017 made changes to the net metering rule to modify the compensation after June 30, 2022 to 1.25 times the utility's average wholesale cost for the most recent year. Generators installed before the end of 2017 continue to receive the full retail credit until July 1, 2047 and those installed from 2018 until either 2022 or when the utility's total net metering load reaches 1.5 percent of their peak demand will receive full retail credit for their generation until June 30, 2032 [30, 33].

- Renewable Energy Property Tax Exemption provides property tax exemptions for solar, wind, hydroelectric and geothermal systems [30].
- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects. The deadline to apply for incentives in the 2013 to 2018 period has expired [30].

7.6 References

1. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE). History of hydropower. <http://energy.gov/eere/water/history-hydropower>
2. The Library of Congress. http://www.americalibrary.gov/jb/gilded/jb_gilded_hydro_1.html
3. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. The history of hydropower development in the United States. <http://www.usbr.gov/power/edu/history.html>
4. EIA. Electricity Net Generation. April 2022 Monthly Energy Review, Table 7.2a. <https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/#electricity>
5. EERE. Hydropower: Setting our course for our energy future. <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy04osti/34916.pdf>
6. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE). Types of hydropower plants. <https://www.energy.gov/eere/water/types-hydropower-plants>
7. WordPress.com <https://saharuljepara.wordpress.com/2009/02/14/skema-pltmh/>
8. NIPSCO. About NIPSCO's hydroelectric plants. <https://www.nipsco.com/our-company/about-us/hydro-power>
9. Tamil Nadu Energy Development Authority <https://teda.in/programes/small-hydro-micro-hydel-projects-watermills/>
10. DC Thompson and Company. <https://www.thecourier.co.uk/fp/business/business-news/320720/low-carbon-economy-worth-10-7-billion/>
11. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE). Types of hydropower turbines. <https://energy.gov/eere/water/types-hydropower-turbines>

12. EERE. 2021 U.S. Hydropower Market Report. January 2021.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/water/downloads/us-hydropower-market-report>
13. U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). Cost and Performance Characteristics of New Generating Technologies, Annual Energy Outlook 2022 Table 1. March 2022.
https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/assumptions/pdf/table_8.2.pdf
14. Maui Electric Company, Ltd. Hawaii pumped storage hydroelectric project: Advisory group meeting, November 1, 2005.
15. Susitna-Watana Hydro. http://www.susitna-watanahydro.org/?attachment_id=5018
16. Alaska Energy Authority. Susitna-Watana Hydro. Report to the Legislature, 2014.
http://www.susitna-watanahydro.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SWD110-Annual-Report-2014_FINAL3.pdf
17. AMP. Organization and generation project overview, June 2011.
18. EIA. Preliminary Monthly Electric Generator Inventory (based on Form EIA-860M as a supplement to Form EIA-860) - U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). February 2022. <https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/eia860m/>
https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/eia860m/xls/april_generator2021.xlsx
19. EIA. 1990-2020 Net Generation by State by Type of Producer by Energy Source (EIA-906, EIA-920, EIA-923) XLS file. <https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/>
https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/annual_generation_state.xls
20. EIA. Detailed State Data (eia.gov). Existing Nameplate and Net Summer Capacity by Energy Source, Producer Type and State, 1990-2020.
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/>
21. DOE. An Assessment of Energy Potential at Non-Powered Dams in the United States.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/water/downloads/assessment-energy-potential-non-powered-dams-united-states>
https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2013/12/f5/npd_report_0.pdf
22. DOE. Office of Scientific and Technical Information. New Stream-reach Development: A Comprehensive Assessment of Hydropower Energy Potential in the United States.
<https://hydrosourc.ornl.gov/dataset/hydropower-potential-new-stream-reach-development-conterminous-united-states>
<https://info.ornl.gov/sites/publications/Files/Pub46481.pdf>
23. EIA. 1990-2020 Net Generation by State by Type of Producer by Energy Source. Release date: April, 2022
<https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/>
https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/state/annual_generation_state.xls
24. Hydro Review.
<https://www.hydroreview.com/2019/10/28/city-files-ferc-notice-to-surrender-license-for-50-mw-robert-c-byrd-hydro-project/#gref>
25. American Municipal Power (AMP). Hydroelectric power
<http://www.amppartners.org/generation/hydro>

26. University of Notre Dame.
<https://facilities.nd.edu/projects/current-major-projects/hydroelectric-plant/>
27. South Bend Tribune, April 1, 2022.
Notre Dame's hydroelectric project wrapping up. Here's what it means for South Bend's Seitz Park.
<https://www.southbendtribune.com/story/news/local/2022/04/01/notre-dame-hydroelectric-project-seitz-park-south-bend-indiana-expected-return-public-use-2023/7190893001/>
28. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
29. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
30. Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency (DSIRE).
<http://www.dsireusa.org/>
31. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development. Rural Energy for America Program Renewable Energy Systems & Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loans & Grants. <https://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/rural-energy-america-program-renewable-energy-systems-energy-efficiency>
32. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Electric Programs.
<http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/high-energy-cost-grants>
33. Indiana General Assembly, 2017 Session. Senate Bill 309.
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2017/bills/senate/309#digest-heading>

8. Underground Pumped Storage Hydropower

8.1 Introduction

An underground pumped storage hydropower plant is a pumped storage hydropower plant where at least one of the reservoirs, usually the lower one, is located underground. This can be an artificially constructed cavern or an abandoned mine or any other underground chamber with the ability to hold water without losing it through leaks. In some designs it has been proposed to put both reservoirs underground to reduce the footprint of the power plant even further.

Although there have been several feasibility studies, a recent increase in interest, and a number of proposals to build underground pumped storage hydropower plants worldwide, SUFG is not aware of any underground pumped storage hydropower in operation anywhere in the world as of writing of this report. Alternatively, conventional surface level pumped storage hydropower plants have been in operation for decades in the U.S. and globally. They have been the dominant technology in use for utility-scale energy storage both in the U.S. and globally, constituting as much as 97 percent of the electrical energy storage capacity (MW) in the U.S. in 2019 [1]. The basic structure of a pumped storage hydropower plant consists of two water reservoirs at differing heights as shown in Figure 8-1. As mentioned earlier, the more common arrangement in existing pumped storage hydroelectric power plants is for both reservoirs to be surface level lakes at differing elevations.




Figure 8-1: Schematic of a pumped storage hydropower plant (Source: Alternative Energy Tutorials [2])

During periods of low electricity demand, electricity from the grid is used to pump water from the lower to the upper reservoir. Then during times of high electricity demand this water is released

through a turbine to the lower reservoir to generate electricity. An example of pumped storage power plant close to Indiana is the 1,872 MW Ludington Pumped Storage Hydropower plant in Ludington, Michigan. In this pumped storage plant Lake Michigan is used as the lower reservoir while the upper reservoir is a man-made lake at an elevated plateau above the lake shore [3].

The main driver behind the impetus to build underground pumped storage hydropower plants is that conventional pumped storage hydropower plants require the availability of topography with significant elevation differences. Sites with this type of topography have for the most part been exhausted and where they exist the proposal to flood large tracts of land to create the reservoirs faces fierce public resistance. Underground pumped storage hydropower technology overcomes this siting constraint by placing one, or even both of the reservoirs underground. Further, since the power rating of a hydropower plant is proportional to the height that the water falls before encountering the turbines for a given reservoir volume, one can reduce the size of the upper surface reservoir by increasing the depth at which the lower reservoir is excavated. This can be done at reasonable cost because the excavation cost of the reservoir does not increase proportionally with increasing depth [4].

Figure 8-2 is the schematic of a typical underground pumped storage hydropower plant where only one of the reservoirs, the lower one, is underground. The underground reservoir can be either in a specially constructed cavern or in an abandoned mine.




Figure 8-2: Schematic of an underground pumped storage hydropower plant (Source: ResearchGate [5])

In some conventional pumped storage hydropower plants, the power plant equipment (turbines and transformers, pressure pipes, etc.) are placed underground. This arrangement, however, does not constitute an underground pumped storage hydropower plant as discussed in this report; one of the

two reservoirs has to be placed underground for a pumped hydropower plant to be considered an underground pumped storage hydropower plant [4].

8.2 Economics of underground pumped storage hydropower

Many studies in the U.S. and elsewhere have been done establishing that underground pumped storage hydropower is both technically viable and, at least from modeling studies, an economic technology for large scale storage of energy for the electrical grid [4, 6]. Most of the feasibility studies done for underground pumped hydropower in the U.S. in the 1980s were focused on building the power plants with man-made underground reservoirs as close to the demand centers (cities) as possible, with the only limitation being the presence of the required hard impervious rock formations that could hold water without leaking. The use of abandoned mines for the lower reservoir has received more attention in recent years as more coal mines are made available by the move towards less carbon intense energy.

The cost of building underground pumped storage hydropower plants using abandoned mines is very site specific, and will depend on how well fitted the caverns in the abandoned mines are to hold the water and the power plant equipment. A few of those studies found in literature and their cost estimates are presented below.

Reinhard Madlener and Jan Martin Specht This paper, first published in 2013 and then revised in 2020 presents the results of an economic analysis done on the possibility of building pumped storage hydropower plants using the many abandoned deep coal mines in the Ruhr region of Germany. Although this study is cited in literature as one of the most rigorous techno-economic analysis of underground pumped storage hydropower plants using abandoned coal mines, the authors make a point to emphasize that there are numerous uncertainties in the data and assumptions made in the study and much more needs to be done to get a more accurate estimate of the costs and potential profitability of underground pumped storage hydropower plants in underground mines.

Figure 8-3 shows the capital cost of a 2,500 MWh underground pumped storage hydropower plant in Euros (€) per kW as function of the realized head¹⁵ of water. The realized head is determined by the depth of the mine at which the lower reservoir is constructed. For example, for a lower reservoir placement that results in a 1,000-meter head, the capital cost for a 5-hour discharge turbine is €1,265/kW and €2,024/kW for an 8-hour discharge turbine. At an exchange rate of 0.8 euros to a U.S. dollar this capital cost converts to \$1,580/kW for a 5-hour discharge power plant

¹⁵ The head (also known as the hydraulic head) is a measure of the energy available in a water column at the inlet to the turbine. In a pumped storage hydropower plant, it is proportional to the height difference between the upper and the lower reservoirs.

and \$2,530/kW for an 8-hour discharge power plant. The 0.8 euro to a dollar conversion rate was the exchange rate used in the paper.




Figure 8-3: Capital cost of underground pumped storage hydropower plant in an abandoned coal mine in Germany (Source: Madlener et al [4])

R Alvarado Montero, T. Wortberg, J. Binias and A Nieman (2016) While the Madlener and Specht study presented above was based on a generic mine in the Ruhr region of Germany, the study presented in the Montero et al paper presents a study that went a step further to do a technical and economic assessment of building an underground pumped storage power plant in a particular mine, the Prosper-Haniel mine in the same Ruhr region in Germany. This study brings to even clearer focus the wide range of the potential cost, that even when one narrows it down to one mine the cost will vary widely depending on how much of the mine infrastructure is usable and how much more work (excavation, etc.) needs to be done to house the reservoir, pump house, etc.

In the case of the Prosper-Haniel mine the capital cost of the power plant was estimated to range from a low of €760/kW to a high of €2,750/kW depending on how much of the mine tunnels system was usable for water storage. Using the 0.8 Euros to a dollar exchange rate explained earlier this translates to a low cost of \$950/kW and a high cost of \$3,480/kW. In the lowest cost option, the existing open tunnels in the mine are assumed usable while in the high cost case only the mine shafts are deemed usable and new tunnels have to be excavated to hold the water as the lower reservoir [7].

Peter Schubert, Afshin Izadian and JW Wheeler in a paper published in October 2019 is the one study found that is based on abandoned coal mines in Indiana. The study envisages a modular underground pumped storage hydropower plant design that can be scaled to fit different sizes of mines. The conceptual power plant used for cost estimates is a 200 MW, 1400 MWh (7-hour discharge) plant with the lower reservoir at a depth such as to have a 400 ft of water head.

A unique design feature in this power plant is the use of hydraulic wind turbines to supplement the pumping of the water from the lower reservoir to the upper reservoir. A hydraulic wind turbine differs from the more common electricity-generating wind turbines in that instead of a turbine-generator the rotors in a hydraulic turbine drive a hydraulic pump which can then be used to drive a water pump. The authors estimated the cost of this power plant at \$1,494/kW [8].

An important characteristic to note about underground pumped storage hydropower plants is that, unlike the more common surface level pumped storage hydropower plants in use today, they are not typically designed for long-term (seasonal) storage, but rather for daily arbitrage.

8.3 State of underground pumped storage hydropower nationally

Although several technical and feasibility studies have been done showing the technical viability of underground pumped storage hydropower plants, SUFG is not aware of any such power plant that has been constructed anywhere in the world so far. The cost and the uncertainty associated with a new technology has been too high a barrier to surmount thus far [9].

There was a flurry of activity in the 1970s and 1980s in the U.S. around the concept of building underground pumped hydropower plants including feasibility studies conducted by utilities such as Commonwealth Edison and Potomac Electric Company. The state of the research then is summarized in a 1984 U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) report [6]. During this period the focus was not using abandoned mines, but rather the excavation of underground reservoirs at locations close to cities where the load was located where they would serve to complement base-load nuclear generation and were considered more economic than running coal-fired power plants on cycling duty. Some of the more prominent studies in that period include

The Potomac Electric Power Study (1981). According to the 1984 DOE report this study was the most comprehensive and rigorous of the techno-economic and feasibility studies that had been carried out in that period. The design specification was for a 2,000 MW, (10-hour discharge) (20,000 MWh) underground pumped storage in close proximity to Washington D.C. with a 5,000 feet operating head. Seismologic studies were done and a site with the appropriate rock formation to host the underground reservoir was identified in Maryland 20 miles of Washington D.C. and 20 miles Southwest of Baltimore, Maryland. Like the other proposed underground projects in this period Potomac Electric Power did not proceed with the project.

Commonwealth Edison Study (1975-1981). This proposal and was for a 3,000 MW 10-hour discharge (30,000 MWh), underground pumped storage in close proximity to the city of Chicago to complement Commonwealth Edison's nuclear and coal power plants. Seismic studies were done and a site with the appropriate rock formation to host the lower reservoir was identified in Northwest Illinois, within the Commonwealth Edison service territory. This project was suspended when a revised load forecast set back substantially the date the capacity would be needed.

In more recent times the attention of the underground pumped storage industry globally has focused on the use of abandoned underground mines. Much more investigation has been going on in Europe than in the U.S. The major studies outside the U.S. encountered in literature include

- The 2013 (revised in 2020) Madlener et al techno-economic study of the potential for using underground coal mines in the Ruhr region of Germany
- The 2016 Alvarado et al of one of the mines, the Prosper-Haniel mine in the Ruhr region of Germany (200 MW)
- The 2017 Menendez et al study of the use of mines in the Asturian Central Coal Basin in northern Spain

In spite of this heightened interest and studies in the European Union none these of these projects has proceeded to making any substantial progress towards implementation.

In the U.S. most of the proposed underground pumped storage hydropower projects utilizing abandoned mines encountered in literature appear focused not on underground mines, but rather on abandoned open pit mines. In addition, none of these projects appear to have progressed beyond a preliminary FERC permit. Underground pumped storage hydropower projects found in literature in the U.S. include


The 1,000 MW Riverbank Wiscasset project in Wiscasset, Maine (2009) This project uses the site of a decommissioned nuclear power plant (the Maine Yankee Nuclear Power Plant) to minimize the impact of the construction work involved. The project proposes to use for its upper reservoir the tidal water at the mouth of the Black River and for its lower reservoir a man-made cavern excavated 2,200 feet below the surface. It was first proposed in 2008 and issued with a preliminary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) permit in 2009. The concept of using this site of a decommissioned nuclear power plant for large scale renewable energy project made it attractive to the local community. Like other proposed underground pumped storage powerplants this project has not progressed beyond permitting [10, 11].

The Elmhurst Quarry project in Elmhurst, Illinois project (2011) This project, proposed by the host county (Dupage County) in 2011, was to be located at a dolomite quarry and underground mine 20 miles west of downtown Chicago that had ceased to operate in 1980. The quarry is used for flood control storage, where flood water is stored during a flood events and then pumped out into the adjacent creek when the floods subside. This site is unique in that it consists of a surface quarry and an underground mine 300 feet below the quarry, such that very minimal excavation would be needed to construct the pumped hydropower plant. It was estimated to have the volume to host a pumped storage power plant with 709 MWh and between 50 to 250 MW generating capacity.

A preliminary permit for the proposed project was issued by FERC in 2011, but like other underground pumped storage projects, it has not progressed much beyond that [12, 13].

8.4 State of underground pumped storage hydropower in Indiana

Indiana has many surface and underground coal mines that are no longer active. According to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR) there are 701 underground and 388 surface mines in Indiana that are no longer active. Figure 8-4 shows the location of these mines as downloaded from the DNR Coal Mine System map geographic information system database on May 16, 2022.



Legend



Underground Mines



Surface Mines

Figure 8-4: Location of inactive mines in Indiana (Source: DNR [14])

Each of these mines have the potential to host an underground pumped storage hydropower plant. Further investigation would need to be done on the suitability of each individual mine, including the condition of the chambers, the depth, the location relative to transmission lines, etc.

Peter Schubert, Afshin Izadian and JW Wheeler in their paper referred to earlier in this section presents the cost estimate of a conceptual underground pumped storage hydropower plant that could be located in one of the many underground mines in Indiana. A modular power plant with the capacity to generate 200 MW for 7 hours (1,400 MWh) and a water head of 400 feet is modeled in the paper [8].

8.5 Incentives for underground pumped storage hydropower

No incentives or mandates specific to underground pumped storage hydropower plants exist currently in the U.S. or in Indiana but since pumped storage hydropower is a form of hydropower, incentives where hydropower qualifies may also be applicable for underground pumped storage hydropower.

Federal Incentives

- Clean Electricity Investment Tax Credit enacted in the Inflation Reduction Act 2022 credits 30 percent of construction cost to all electricity generating technologies which have zero greenhouse gas emissions. The credit comes to effect in 2025 and expires either at the end of 2032 or whenever greenhouse emissions from the electricity industry reduces by 25 percent below the 2022 level.

Also included in the Inflation Reduction Act 2022 is a provision that a power plant, such as an underground pumped storage hydropower plant, located in a retired coal mine would qualify for an extra 10 percent investment tax credit [15, 16].

- U.S. DOE Loan Guarantee Program (Section 1703, Title IV of Energy Policy Act of 2005) provides loan guarantees for large scale innovative, high technology risk renewable energy projects that reduce the emission of pollutants [17].
- Green Power Purchasing Goal requires that 7.5 percent of energy used by federal agencies must be obtained from renewable resources [17].

Indiana Incentives

- Renewable Energy Property Tax Exemption provides property tax exemptions for solar, wind, hydroelectric and geothermal systems [17].
- Clean Energy Portfolio Goal sets a voluntary goal of obtaining 4 percent between 2013 and 2018, 7 percent between 2019 and 2024, and 10 percent by 2025, of electricity from clean energy sources based on 2010 retail sales. Participation in the goal makes utilities eligible for incentives that can be used to pay for the compliance projects. The deadline to apply for incentives in the 2013 to 2018 period has expired [17].

8.6 References

1. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Water Power Technologies Office. 2021 U.S. Hydropower market report. January 2021.
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/water/downloads/us-hydropower-market-report>
<https://www.energy.gov/eere/water/downloads/us-hydropower-market-report>
<https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2021/01/f82/us-hydropower-market-report-2019.pdf>
3. Alternative Energy Tutorials
<https://www.alternative-energy-tutorials.com/hydro-energy/pumped-hydro-storage.html>
2. Consumer Energy. Ludington Relicensing.
<https://www.consumersenergy.com/company/electric-generation/renewables/hydroelectric/pumped-storage-hydro-electricity/ludington-relicensing>
<https://www.consumersenergy.com/-/media/CE/Documents/company/What%20We%20Do/Hydro/ludington-hydro-review.ashx>
4. Reinhard Madlener, Jan Martin Specht. An Exploratory Economic Analysis of Underground Pumped-Storage Hydro Power Plants in Abandoned Deep Coal Mines. MDPI Energies Journal. October 2020. <http://www.mdpi.com/journal/energies>
<https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/13/21/5634/>
5. James Saulsbury. ResearchGate
https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Conceptual-diagram-of-an-underground-pumped-storage-hydropower-project-Source-Based-on_fig5_340716067
6. R.D. Allen, T.J. Doherty, L.D. Kannberg. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Office of Scientific and Technical Information. Underground pumped hydroelectric storage. July 1994.
<https://www.osti.gov/biblio/6517343>
<https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/6517343>
7. R Alvarado Montero, T. Wortberg, J. Binias and A Nieman. Integrated Assessment of Underground Pumped-Storage Facilities using Existing Coal Mine Infrastructure.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305872758_Integrated_assessment_of_underground_pumped-storage_facilities_using_existing_coal_mine_infrastructure
8. Peter J Schubert, Afshin Izadian, JW Wheeler. Abandoned Mine Voids for Pumped Storage Hydro. Juniper Publishers. October 17, 2019.
<https://juniperpublishers.com/imst/IMST.MS.ID.555563.php>
9. Catalina R. Matos, Julio F. Carneiro, Patricia P. Silva. Overview of large-scale underground energy storage technologies for integration of renewable energies and criteria for reservoir identification. Elsevier Journal of Energy Storage. Volume 21, pages 241-258, February 2019. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2352152X18301919>
10. International Water Power and Dam Construction Magazine. Investigating Aquabank. January 2010. <https://www.waterpowermagazine.com/features/featureinvestigating-aquabank/>

11. Lincoln County News. January 31, 2009. Riverbank Power Receives Warm Local Reception. <https://lcnme.com/currentnews/riverbank-power-receives-warm-local-reception/>
12. Hydro Review. Pumped Storage: Investigating Development of the Elmhurst Quarry Project. January 2012. <https://www.hydroreview.com/environmental/pumped-storage-investigating-development-of-the-elmhurst-quarry-project/>
13. Anthony Charlton, Thomas Haag. Hydro Review. Pumped Storage: Investigating Development of the Elmhurst Quarry Project <https://www.hydroreview.com/environmental/pumped-storage-investigating-development-of-the-elmhurst-quarry-project/>
14. Indiana Department of Natural Resources. Coal Mine Information System. Pumped Storage: Investigating Development of the Elmhurst Quarry Project <https://www.in.gov/dnr/reclamation/abandoned-mines/coal-mine-information-system/>
15. The National Law Review. August 17, 2022. Relief Arrives for Renewable Energy Industry - Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/relief-arrives-renewable-energy-industry-inflation-reduction-act-2022>
16. DLA Piper Law Firm Publications. The clean energy provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 – a historic effort to encourage the development of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions. <https://www.dlapiper.com/en/us/insights/publications/2022/08/the-clean-energy-provisions-of-the-inflation-reduction-act-of-2022/>
17. Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency (DSIRE). <http://www.dsireusa.org/>