



Floating Offshore Wind Costs in California: Study Results

Philipp Beiter, Walt Musial, Patrick Duffy, Aubryn Cooperman, Matt Shields, Donna Heimiller, and Mike Optis

CPUC IRP Modeling Advisory Group Webinar

August 27, 2020

**Update since Webinar:
Final Results, October 30, 2020**

Overview

1 Background

2 Method

3 Results

4 Q&A

1. Background

Background

- This study estimates the cost of floating offshore wind for technically viable sites on the outer continental shelf off California
- This cost study was funded by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM); the associated National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) Technical Report was published in October 2020 and is accessible here: <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/77384.pdf>
- This study is not a stakeholder engagement or a marine spatial planning effort to create wind energy areas under BOEM's leasing process and the study areas have not been vetted by ocean user communities
- Feedback on IRP data and modeling needs were discussed informally during monthly California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)/NREL/BOEM Working Group Meetings and a consultation meeting with CAISO
- The analysis domain is bound by the 1,300-m and the 40-m isobaths, includes sites with an average wind speed of greater than 7 meters per second (m/s) and is limited to sites south of the Oregon border and the confines of available wind resource data sets from Optis et al. (2020)
- Within this analysis domain, five study areas were chosen for cost modeling analysis. The Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE) of these study areas is calculated between 2019-2032 for consideration of offshore wind in California's long-term energy planning (including the Integrated Resource Planning [IRP] process coordinated by the CPUC)

Background

- This study builds on an earlier NREL cost assessment for California (Musial et al. 2016)
- Compared to earlier studies (e.g., Musial et al. 2016, NREL 2019/CPUC 2019), this study reflects updated technology and infrastructure assumptions, cost and resource data, and modeling capabilities. Key updates include (but are not limited to):
 - Wind speed data and representation of wake losses
 - Plant size of 1,000 MW
 - Turbine growth trajectory of up to 15 MW
 - Revised set of port and interconnection assumptions
 - Learning curve approach for projected capital expenditures (CapEx) through 2032
- This presentation was first made on August 27, 2020 to the CPUC Modeling Advisory Group (MAG); It has since been updated to include extensive feedback received from the MAG and the peer reviewers of the report

Sources:

Musial, W., P. Beiter, S. Tegen, and A. Smith. "Potential Offshore Wind Energy Areas in California: An Assessment of Locations, Technology, and Costs." National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 2016. <https://www.boem.gov/sites/default/files/environmental-stewardship/Environmental-Studies/Pacific-Region/Studies/BOEM-2016-074.pdf>.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). 2019. "2018 Annual Technology Baseline." Golden, CO: National Energy Technology Laboratory (NREL). <https://atb.nrel.gov/electricity/2018/index.html>

CPUC. 2019. Inputs and Assumptions: 2019-2020 Integrated Resource Planning.


https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUCWebsite/Content/UtilitiesIndustries/Energy/EnergyPrograms/ElectPowerProcurementGeneration/irp/2018/Inputs%20%20Assumptions%202019-2020%20CPUC%20IRP_20191106.pdf

Analysis Domain of this Study


Analysis domain

- Outer Continental Shelf Offshore California
- Between a water depth of 40 m (light blue) and 1,300 m (dark blue)
- > 7 m/s average wind speeds
- Sites south of the Oregon border and north of the extent of the available wind speed resource data set (Optis et al. 2020)

Note: The “State Offshore Boundary” designates the analysis boundary between California and Oregon.



Study Areas




- Within the analysis domain, five study areas were chosen
- The LCOE calculated for these five study areas is intended to be “typical” for offshore wind energy development in CA
- Study areas were chosen from 2018 BOEM Call areas and prior studies (Collier et al. 2019 and Musial et al. 2016)

Five study areas (in green)


- Humboldt (Call Area)
- Morro Bay (Call Area)
- Diablo Canyon (Call Area)
- Del Norte
- Cape Mendocino

Analysis Sites

- 759 individual wind sites (blue boundary lines) are scattered in a grid layout across the analysis domain. Each site represents a 1,000 MW offshore wind plant
- Costs and wind plant performance are calculated at each site to obtain LCOE
- Results for the Study Areas represent the mean of all analysis sites contained within the Study Area boundaries



State of the Floating Wind Industry



Three Basic Archetypes of Floating Wind Platforms Derived from Oil and Gas Experience

- 84 MW of installed floating wind capacity globally
- 7,663 MW of floating wind in the pipeline
- Industry is transitioning from pilot scale projects (10 MW – 50 MW) to commercial scale projects > 500 MW
- Commercial scale projects are needed to be competitive
- Floating in California – What are key challenges?
 - Grid and transmission
 - Ports and Harbors
 - Deep water
 - Co-existence with military and other stakeholders
- Opportunities – Jobs, energy independence/diversity
- 10 GW of Offshore Wind in California can supply over 15% of current electricity demand (EIA 2020)

2. Method

Levelized Cost of Energy (1/2)

$$LCOE = \frac{(FCR * CapEx) + OpEx}{AEP_{net}}$$

where:

LCOE = levelized cost of energy (\$/MWh)

FCR = fixed charge rate (%/year)

CapEx = capital expenditures (\$/kW)

OpEx = average annual operational expenditures (\$/kW/year)

AEP_{net} = net average annual energy production (MWh/year)

LCOE is helpful to compare projects/technologies with different cash flow profiles and over time
LCOE does not capture the locational and time value of the generated energy and other services

Levelized Cost of Energy (2/2)

Definitions used in this study and for IRP/RESOLVE¹ modeling purposes

Item	Definition
CapEx (total)	Total capital expenditures of the offshore wind system up to the land-based grid feature (e.g., onshore substation), including expenses for turbine, development, engineering & management, substructure and foundation, port and staging, array cables, interconnection (<i>as defined below</i>), assembly and installation, and plant decommissioning.
Interconnection costs	<p>Interconnection costs are a part of CapEx (total). They include expenses related to interconnecting a wind farm to a land-based grid feature (e.g., onshore substation, transmission line), including expenditures for offshore export cable(s), offshore substation(s), and spur line(s) from cable landfall to an inland grid feature (e.g., onshore substation, transmission line). Expenditures for array cables are not included in interconnection costs but are captured separately in CapEx (total).</p> <p>Expenditures for onshore substation upgrades or any (high-voltage) onshore bulk transmission are <u>not</u> included. Further, note that the RESOLVE model used for the IRP process typically considers capital costs and interconnection costs separately.</p>
OpEx	Average annual expenditures to operate and maintain the offshore wind system's equipment.
Gross capacity factor	Ratio of the system's predicted or actual gross electrical output to the nameplate output.
Net capacity factor	Ratio of the system's predicted or actual net (i.e., after accounting for losses) electrical output to the nameplate output.
Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) (after tax)	The average return required by equity and debt investors. Does not include any impact from tax credit schemes.
FCR (after tax)	Factor to annualize the initial CapEx over the financial lifetime of the project accounting for a return to debt and equity sponsors.
LCOE	Total project cost expressed in \$ per megawatt-hour of electricity generated by the system over its life

¹ RESOLVE is the capacity expansion model used in the CPUC's IRP process, available at: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=6442464143>

Cost Modeling Approach (1/2)

LCOE is calculated as a function of:

Floating technology and plant characteristics

Turbine and substructure characteristics (e.g., turbine rating, power curve)
Plant size and turbine spacing

Location

Wind speed, water depth, wave height, distance to port and grid infrastructure
Technology limitations (e.g., water depth limits)


Time

Anticipated learning in supply chain, growth in turbine rating and technology innovation

Cost Modeling Approach (2/2)

LCOE is calculated using NREL's Offshore Regional Cost Analyzer (ORCA)

- Deterministic cost model that estimates the LCOE (and its constituent cost and performance components) of a commercial-scale offshore wind power plant
- Used in Prior Regional Costs Analyses (e.g., for the U.S. Department of Energy and BOEM)



Floating Offshore Wind Costs

Estimating Floating Offshore Wind Costs (1/2)

- Floating costs are calculated for a commercial-scale floating offshore wind plant (1,000 MW) using semi-submersible substructure technology.
- Cost data were obtained from floating offshore wind developers and industry literature to calibrate the costs of the floating substructure, array, and export system costs (including an offshore substation). These build on an earlier NREL study conducted for Oregon (Musial et al. 2019a).
- Because of the pre-commercial stage of the floating industry, input for expenditures other than substructure, array and export system costs were derived from fixed-bottom project data and literature, where applicable.

Estimating Floating Offshore Wind Costs (2/2)

Key expenditure items	Primary Source	Fixed-bottom spill-over assumed
Turbine	Literature review	Yes
Balance-of-Station (BOS)		
Development and project management	Fraction of BOS & turbine expense	Yes
Substructure	Industry consultation	No
Turbine and substructure installation	Bottom-up modeling	No
Export cable	Bottom-up modeling and literature	No
Onshore grid connection	Literature	Yes
Soft Costs	Fraction of BOS & turbine expense	Yes
O&M		
Operations	Literature review	Yes
Maintenance	Bottom-up modeling and industry consultation	No
AEP		
Gross energy production	Bottom-up modeling	Yes
Wake losses and availability	Bottom-up modeling	Yes
Financing	Literature review	Yes

Spatial Variation in Costs

Estimating the Spatial Variation in Costs (1/3)

- The variation of costs as a function of key spatial parameters was determined by running a set of scenarios in higher-fidelity cost models
- For instance, maintenance costs were determined using the Energy Center of the Netherlands (ECN) O&M tool. This tool was calibrated to several scenarios with varying distances between an offshore wind site and its O&M base (holding all else constant) to obtain a spatially-dependent cost estimate
- Data on distance parameters, metocean conditions and wind speed was derived by combining different spatial data sets and bottom-up modeling


Key Spatial Parameters for Cost Modeling

	Water Depth	Distance to Shore	Distance to Port
Morro Bay	1,013 m	44 km	318 km
Diablo Canyon	640 m	49 km	248 km
Humboldt	832 m	42 km	56 km
Cape Mendocino	835 m	30 km	122 km
Del Norte	807 m	43 km	122 km

Bottom-up engineering tools that inform the spatial cost relationships in ORCA

Cost Component	Model	Source
BOS	NREL Balance of Station	Maness et al. (2017)
Substructure and tower	<u>TowerSE</u> tool	Damiani (2016)
Export system cable	PSCAD	Manitoba Hydro International (2020)
O&M	Energy Center of the Netherlands (ECN) O&M tool	Pietermen et al. (2011)
AEP	FLORIS	NREL (2019b)

Spatial Variation in Costs (2/3)



Subsea Cables

- Array cable costs increase with water depth
- Export cable costs depend on distance to shore

Grid Connection

- Candidate substations within 10 km of coast
 - ≥ 100 kV north of San Francisco
 - ≥ 200 kV in SF and south
- Transmission infrastructure is limited in region of 3 northern study areas
- Point of interconnection selection:
- Modeling generic distance of 5 km from cable landing to interconnection

Spatial Variation in Costs (3/3)

Candidate OSW Ports in California

Humboldt Bay

Port Hueneme

Los Angeles

Long Beach

San Diego

All candidate ports in California will require upgrades to enable offshore wind

Construction and O&M Ports

- Candidate construction ports must support turbine and substructure assembly at quayside
- Candidate O&M ports must support major component repairs
 - Heavy lift vessel for repairs at sea
 - Turbine tow-to-port
- Port selection criteria
 - Sufficient navigation channel depth and width for wind turbine installation vessels
 - Berth facilities for wind turbine installation vessels
 - Unrestricted air draft

Projecting Floating Offshore Wind Costs

Projecting Floating Offshore Wind Costs

- LCOE is assessed for three modeling years: 2019 (baseline), 2022, 2027 and 2032 (Commercial Operation Date [COD])
- Future costs are estimated from the combined effects of learning in the supply chain (e.g., economies of scale in production, standardization), technology innovation and turbine upsizing
 - Learning effects are estimated through a learning curve assessment using empirical data from fixed-bottom offshore wind projects; these are imposed on the baseline (2019) CapEx estimates
 - Turbine size is assumed to increase from 8 MW (2019) to 15 MW (2032)
 - Technology innovation is considered implicitly in the estimated learning effects and derived from literature (Hundleby et al. 2017) for O&M costs and energy production losses
- Plant size and turbine spacing is held constant at 1,000 MW and 7 rotor diameters between 2019-2032

Technology Assumptions over Time

	Unit	2019	2022	2027	2032
Turbine Rated Power	MW	8	10	12	15
Turbine Rotor Diameter	m	175	196	215	240
Turbine Hub Height	m	118	128	138	150
Turbine Specific Power	W/m ²	332	332	332	332
Waterline Clearance	m	30	30	30	30
Substructure Type	Name	Semisubmersible			
Minimum Water Depth	m	40			
Maximum Water Depth	m	1,300			
Wind Plant Rating	MW	1,000			
Turbine Spacing	Rotor diameters	7D x 7D			

Financing Assumptions over Time

- Finance terms were calibrated to align with those of today's commercial-scale fixed-bottom projects. A Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) (nominal) of 5.4% and FCR (nominal) of 7.2% were derived from literature and validated through industry consultation
- Financing terms are assumed constant for model years 2019-2032 (COD)

Finance	FCR (nominal) (after tax)	%	7.2%
	FCR (real) (after tax)	%	5.3%
	WACC (nominal) (after tax)	%	5.4%
	WACC (real) (after tax)	%	2.9%
	Capital Recovery Period	yr	30
	Share of debt	%	75%
	Debt rate (nominal)	%	4.4%
	Equity Return (nominal)	%	12.0%
	Tax rate	%	26%
	Inflation	%	2.5%
	CRF (nominal) (after tax)	%	6.8%
	CRF (real) (after tax)	%	5.0%
	Project Finance Factor	%	105%
	Depreciation Basis	%	100%
	Depreciation Schedule		5-year MACRS
Present Value of Depreciation	%	86%	

Annual Energy Production


Annual Energy Production Methodology (1/3)

- Annual Energy Production (AEP) is calculated at 759 sites comprising the analysis space of this study

3-step approach


1. Define reference wind farm:
 - Site specific wind resource
 - Turbine model for each reference year (2019, 2022, 2027, 2032)
 - Wind farm layout
2. Use NREL wake loss model FLORIS¹ to compute gross capacity factor (GCF) and wake losses
3. Apply losses in ORCA (wake, environmental, electrical, availability) and obtain net capacity factors (NCF)

Annual Energy Production Methodology (2/3)



100m mean wind speed map based on data from previous BOEM-funded study [1]

- Wind resource: New Offshore Dataset (CA20) produced for BOEM¹ includes new data and modeling capabilities compared with WIND Toolkit²
 - CA20 100-m mean wind speeds increased in many locations compared with WIND Toolkit (up to 20%). Morro Bay 9.7%. Diablo Canyon 17.4%. Humboldt 19.7%.
 - Optis et al. attributes this to different planetary boundary layer scheme and updated mesoscale model version




Humboldt Call Area centroid 150m wind rose

Sources


- 1 Optis et al. 2020
- 2 Draxl et al. 2015

Annual Energy Production Methodology (3/3)

- Turbine: NREL 15-MW Reference¹
- Plant: Nominally 1,000 MW square grid (7 rotor diameter spacing)



Turbine power and thrust curves from 15MW Reference¹




Reference plant layout for 2022 (10-MW turbine). Dot size = 1D

Results

CapEx – California Study Sites


- CapEx differences between study areas is driven primarily by the variation in export cable length and distance to construction port:



Study Area	Distance to Construction Port	Export Cable Length
Morro Bay	318 km	44 km
Diablo Canyon	248 km	49 km
Humboldt	56 km	42 km
Cape Mendocino	122 km	30 km
Del Norte	122 km	44 km

- Trajectory is estimated from:
 - Turbine upsizing (8 MW [2019 COD] to 15 MW [2032 COD])
 - Industry growth (50 MW [2019 COD] to 8,000 MW [2032 COD]) and technology innovation


Operating and Maintenance Expenses – California Study Sites



- Difference in OpEx driven by distance from site to O&M port and wave regime


Study Area	Distance to O&M Port	Mean Significant Wave Height
Morro Bay	318 km	2.47 m
Diablo Canyon	248 km	2.47 m
Humboldt	56 km	2.61 m
Cape Mendocino	122 km	2.60 m
Del Norte	122 km	2.61 m

Net Capacity Factor (NCF) – California Study Sites



- Estimated mean wind speeds @150m:
 - Morro Bay: 9.8 m/s
 - Diablo: 9.4 m/s
 - Humboldt: 10.8 m/s
 - Cape Mendocino: 11.6 m/s
 - Del Norte: 12.0 m/s
- Del Norte spends more time below the wind speed cut-in and above cut-out than Cape Mendocino
- Increase driven by vertical wind shear and assumed innovations in controls, conditions-based maintenance, improved weather forecasting, etc.

Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE) – California Study Sites




- LCOE differences driven primarily by variation in CapEx and AEP
- O&M costs relatively similar across sites
- Same financing, turbine technology and plant size assumptions made for the five study areas


Note: Mid-case CapEx scenario depicted.

LCOE in the California Analysis Domain

2019 COD



2032 COD



Note: Mid-case CapEx scenario depicted.


Capital Expenditures (CapEx) Scenarios

CapEx Scenario Definition

- CapEx scenarios reflect different levels of globally installed floating capacity by 2032
- Methodologically, these differences in the installed capacity levels by 2032 are captured through a CapEx learning curve that is derived from global fixed-bottom project data

Assumed Global Floating Capacity By 2032 (COD)


	Capacity (MW)			Source
4C Offshore	8,000			4COffshore 2020
University of Strathclyde/DNV GL	4,300			Hannon et al. 2019
Equinor	13,000			Buchsbaum 2018
WoodMacKenzie	4,200			Shreve and Kragelund 2020
NREL assumption for this study	LOW 4,000	MID 8,000	HIGH 13,000	




Note: Learning curve shown for illustration only

Cost Trajectories to 2032

CapEx – Diablo Canyon



LCOE – Diablo Canyon



2032 Floating Capacity Deployment Assumptions

Low = 4 GW
Mid = 8 GW
High = 13 GW

Comparison to Prior Studies

Key Differences to Prior Floating Cost Analyses for California

- In the 2019–2020 IRP process, floating cost estimates from NREL’s 2018 Annual Technology Baseline (NREL 2019a) were used
- These assessments, all published in different years, reflect varying sets of assumptions
- The floating (and fixed-bottom) offshore wind industry has progressed rapidly over the last few years in terms of commercial and technological status
- In this current study, modeling assumptions are updated to reflect these advances


	This Study	Musial et al. 2016	NREL 2019a ¹
Turbine size, 2019/2032 (MW)	8–15	6–10	3.4–10
Plant size (MW)	1,000	600	600
Fixed charge rate (%)	7.2%	10.5%	9.5%
Wind speed data	CA20 resource data set	17-yr AWS Truepower / MERRA ¹ data set	Wind Toolkit data ³
Aggregation	Site-specific	Site-specific	Average (TRG)

Key Differences to Prior Floating Cost Analyses for California

Results of this Study in Comparison with Earlier Assessment All Values in 2019\$ for 2030 COD


	Capacity Factor		CapEx (\$/kW)		OpEx (\$/kW-yr)		LCOE (\$/MWh)	
	2019-2020 IRP	NREL 2020 (current)						
Morro Bay	55%	49%	3,791	3,139	71	64	76	67
Diablo Canyon	46%	48%	4,042	3,128	71	63	96	68
Humboldt	52%	53%	3,791	3,064	71	62	81	61
Cape Mendocino	53%	55%	3,791	2,976	71	64	79	57
Del Norte	52%	55%	3,791	3,076	71	64	81	59

Capital Expenditures



Note: Differences illustrated for the Diablo Canyon Study Area

Operating and Maintenance Expenditures



Note: Differences illustrated for the Diablo Canyon Study Area

Timeline and Peer Review

Timeline

- August 28 – September 16
- Late October 2020
- Q4 2020 – Q4 2021

Peer review

Publication of report

Integration with IRP process

Peer Reviewers

Invited Peer Reviewers

Avangrid
AWEA
BOEM
CAISO
California Coastal Commission
California Energy Commission
California Ocean Protection Council
California Public Utilities Commission
CalWEA
Castle Wind
Department of Energy
E3 - Energy and Environmental Economics
EDPR
Equinor
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
Humboldt State University

Magellan Wind
Mainstream Renewable Power
Monterey Bay Community Power
North Coast Tribe
Offshore Wind Association
Orsted
Pacific Ocean Energy Trust
PG&E
Principle Power
Redwood Coast Energy Authority
RWE
Shell
Southern California Edison
State Lands Commission Executive Office
UC Berkeley Labor Center

Q&A

www.nrel.gov

Philipp Beiter
Philipp.Beiter@nrel.gov

Walt Musial
Walter.Musial@nrel.gov



References

Key References

4COffshore. “4COffshore Monthly Reports (Accessed through Subscription Services),” 2020.

<https://www.4coffshore.com/>.

Beiter, Philipp, Walter Musial, Aaron Smith, Levi Kilcher, Rick Damiani, Michael Maness, Senu Sirnivas, et al. “A Spatial-Economic Cost-Reduction Pathway Analysis for U.S. Offshore Wind Energy Development from 2015-2030.” Technical Report. Golden, CO: National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1324526>.

Buchsbaum, L. “Floating Offshore Wind Farms Exploit a Great Energy Resource.” Floating Offshore Wind Farms Exploit a Great Energy Resource, July 31, 2018. <https://www.powermag.com/floating-offshore-wind-farms-exploit-a-great-energy-resource/>.

California Public Utilities Commission, 2019. Inputs & Assumptions 2019-2020 Integrated Resource Planning. https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUCWebsite/Content/UtilitiesIndustries/Energy/EnergyPrograms/ElectPowerProcurementGeneration/irp/2018/Inputs%20%20Assumptions%202019-2020%20CPUC%20IRP_20191106.pdf

Collier, R., S. Hull, S. Li, M. Mogadali, D. Mullen, and A. Olson. “California Offshore Wind: Workforce Impacts and Grid Integration.” UC Berkeley Labor Center, September 2019.

<http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/pdf/2019/CA-Offshore-Wind-Workforce-Impacts-and-Grid-Integration.pdf>.

Key References

- Damiani, R. “JacketSE: An Offshore Wind Turbine Jacket Sizing Tool.” National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 2016. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy16osti/65417.pdf>
- Draxl, Caroline, Andrew Clifton, Bri-Mathias Hodge, and Jim McCaa. “The Wind Integration National Dataset (WIND) Toolkit.” *Applied Energy* 151, no. 1 August 2015 (August 2015): 355–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.03.121>.
- Feldman, D., M. Bolinger, and P. Schwabe. 2020. “Current and Future Costs of Renewable Energy Project Finance Across Technologies.” Technical Report NREL/TP-6A20-76881. Golden, CO: National Energy Technology Laboratory (NREL). <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy20osti/76881.pdf>.
- Gaertner, Evan, Jennifer Rinker, Latha Sethuraman, Frederik Zahle, Benjamin Anderson, Garrett Barter, Nikhar Abbas, et al. “Definition of the IEA 15 MW Offshore Reference Wind Turbine.” International Energy Agency, 2020. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy20osti/75698.pdf>.
- Guillet, Jerome. “Who Will Fund U.S. OSW - and on What Terms?” Teaneck, New Jersey (U.S.), September 7, 2018. <https://green-giraffe.eu/presentations/who-will-fund-us-offshore-wind-%E2%80%93-and-what-terms>.
- Hannon, M., E. Topham, J. Dixon, D. McMillan, and M. Collu. “Offshore Wind, Ready to Float? Global and UK Trends in the Floating Offshore Wind Market.” University of Strathclyde and DNV GL, 2019. https://brandcentral.dnvgl.com/fr/gallery/10651/others/694b3feb674e460198df6db6ba003861/694b3feb674e460198df6db6ba003861_low.pdf?utm_campaign=EN_Publication_Autoresponder_V2_PDF&utm_medium=email&utm_source=Eloqua

Key References

Hundleby, Giles, Kate Freeman, Andy Logan, and Ciaran Frost. “Floating Offshore: 55 Technology Innovations That Will Have Greater Impact on Reducing the Cost of Electricity from European Floating Offshore Wind Farms.” KiC InnoEnergy and BVG Associates, 2017. <http://www.innoenergy.com/new-floating-offshore-wind-report-55-technology-innovations-that-will-impact-the-lcoe-in-floating-offshore-wind-farms/>.

Junginger, Martin, Atse Louwen, Nilo Gomez Tuya, David de Jager, Ernst van Zuijlen, and Michael Taylor. “Offshore Wind Energy.” In *Technological Learning in the Transition to a Low-Carbon Energy System*, 1st ed., 103–17. Academic Press, 2019.

Louwen, Atse, and Juliana Subtil Lacerda. “The Experience Curve: Concept, History, Methods, and Issues.” In *Technological Learning in the Transition to a Low-Carbon Energy System*, 1st ed., 9–31. Academic Press, 2019.

Maness, M., B. Maples, and A. Smith. “NREL Offshore Balance-of-System Model.” National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 2017. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy17osti/66874.pdf>.

Manitoba Hydro International. “PSCAD (TM).” PSCAD (TM), 2020. <https://www.pscad.com/software/pscad/overview>.

Musial, W., P. Beiter, J. Nunemaker, D. Heimiller, J. Ahmann, and J. Busch. “Oregon Offshore Wind Site Feasibility and Cost Study.” National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 2019. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy20osti/74597.pdf>.

Key References

- Musial, W., P. Beiter, S. Tegen, and A. Smith. 2016. “Potential Offshore Wind Energy Areas in California: An Assessment of Locations, Technology, and Costs.” National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). <https://www.boem.gov/sites/default/files/environmental-stewardship/Environmental-Studies/Pacific-Region/Studies/BOEM-2016-074.pdf>.
- Musial, Walter, Philipp Beiter, Paul Spitsen, Jake Nunemaker, Vahan Gevorgian, Aubryn Cooperman, Rob Hammond, and Matt Shields. 2020. “2019 Offshore Wind Technology Data Update.” NREL/TP-5000-77411. Golden, CO: National Renewable Energy Laboratory. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/77411.pdf>.
- National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). “2018 Annual Technology Baseline.” Golden, CO: National Energy Technology Laboratory (NREL), 2019a. <https://atb.nrel.gov/electricity/2018/index.html>.
- . “FLORIS. Version 1.1.7,” 2019b. <https://github.com/wisdem/floris>.
- . “Wind Integration National Dataset Toolkit,” 2020 . <https://www.nrel.gov/grid/wind-toolkit.html>.
- NREL. *Offshore Renewable Balance-of-System Installation Tool (ORBIT)* (version 0.5.0). National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 2020. <https://github.com/WISDEM/ORBIT>.
- Nunemaker, Jake, Matt Shields, Robert Hammond, and Patrick Duffy. “ORBIT: Offshore Renewables Balance-of-System and Installation Tool.” National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2020.

Key References

Optis, M., A. Rybchuk, N. Bodini, M. Rossol, and W. Musial. 2020. 2020 Offshore Wind Resource Assessment for the California Pacific Outer Continental Shelf (Technical Report). National Renewable Energy Laboratory. NREL/TP-5000-77642. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy21osti/77642.pdf>.

Pietermen, R., H. Braam, T. Obdam, L. Rademakers, and T. van der Zee. “Optimization of Maintenance Strategies for Offshore Wind Farms.” Energy Center of the Netherlands (ECN), 2011. <http://www.ecn.nl/docs/library/report/2011/m11103.pdf>.

Short, W., D. Packey, and T. Holt. “A Manual for the Economic Evaluation of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Technologies.” National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), 1995. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/legosti/old/5173.pdf>.

Shreve, D., and R. Kragelund. “Foresight 20/20: Onshore & Offshore Wind,” January 2020. https://www.woodmac.com/our-expertise/focus/Power--Renewables/wind-foresight-2020/?utm_source=gtm&utm_medium=article&utm_campaign=wmpr_fs2020wind.