

HEAT PUMP WATER HEATERS IN EVERY HOME? FORECASTING THE COSTS AND EMISSIONS IMPACTS AND LONG-TERM RESOURCE PLANNING IMPACTS

Byron Boyle - DSM Technical Consultant KRO

Ashly McFarlane – Advanced Gird Principal Consultant

November 2022

**KR0** Was Ashly a co-author? She might appreciate having her name on here too. Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:25:05.225

## Introduction – Traditional DSM at a Crossroads The changing landscape





Source: Guidehouse analysis 2022

2022 Xcel Energy Colorado DSM Potential Study, Residential Lighting; 2021 Xcel Energy Sustainability Report © 2022 Xcel Energy



**KR0** I know the Guidehouse graphic is not part of your paper, but it doesn't ring true to me. We'll be at 88% efficiency saturation in 2 years?

Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:17:56.770

**BBT0 0** I definitely agree there's room to disagree on the actual saturation levels here, but don't really want to focus on specific details, rather I'm really just trying to convey in our service territories we're seeing a plateauing and even declines in EE achievement (and forecast further declines). Our most recent Potential study is saying that many of our highest achieving end-uses (e.g., Res Lighting) are getting closer and closer to saturation. It would be nice if I had another similar graphic readily available that maybe showed the portfolio trends, but this what I have. Boyle, Byron T, 2022-10-27T20:51:10.240

## Introduction – DSM and Beneficial Electrification Key Topics

Beneficial electrification<sup>1</sup> is coming, are we ready (and do we understand the impacts)? **KR2** This study aims to understar**KR1**the BE impacts from residential HPWH including:

- Utility Cost-to-Serve versus Retail Rate
- Carbon Emissions
- Customer Costs
- Resource Planning Impacts

<sup>1</sup>The use of term "beneficial electrification" in this presentation refers to natural gas to electric fuel switching that should reduce costs, emissions, and improve the efficiency of the electric grid.



- **KR0** I always struggle with this term. Would be better to say "electrification" and leave off beneficial, IMO. That's what your research is trying to find out. When/where/for who are the benefits. Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:20:57.856
- **BBT0 0** Adding the footnote addresses this to certain extent. Boyle, Byron T, 2022-10-28T05:22:41.477
- KR1 to... Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:38:24.388
- **KR2** I see you define the term BE in your notes. I would suggest putting that on the slide as a footnote. Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:42:35.549

## Methodology – Water Heating Assumptions Lots of Scenarios to Consider

| Technology Type                        | Water Heater<br>Location                       | Control<br>Strategy | Tank Size<br>(gallon) | Energy<br>Factor |  |
|--|--|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| Natural Gas<br>Federal Min. Efficiency | N/A  | None                | 66                    | 0.60             |  |
| Electric Resistance                    | N/A  | None                | 66                    | 0.95             |  |
| Electric Heat Pump                     | Unconditioned<br>Conditioned;<br>electric heat | None                | 66                    | 3.50             |  |
|  | Conditioned;<br>natural gas heat               |                     |                       |                  |  |
| Electric Heat Pump                     | Conditioned;<br>electric heat                  | Load<br>shifting    | 66                    | 3.50             |  |



#### Assumptions

13-year water heater lifetime

3-bedroom, single-family home in CO/MN

Non-load shifting tank temperature set to 120 F

Image Source: https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/styles/embed\_image\_large\_480px\_width\_/public/2021-11/heat\_pump\_water\_heat.gif?itok=0u2WxUGq © 2022 Xcel Energy



4

**KR0** I think table 2 in your paper is great. Listeners don't have to understand everything, but it's very insightful to appreciate all the different scenarios that need to be considered. For example, it's not obvious at all that space heating fuel type is a factor for HPWH costs and benefits modeling. Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:24:00.522

**BBT0 0** I pulled in the paper figure. Boyle, Byron T, 2022-10-28T05:01:30.868

## Methodology – Cost Considerations From the Utility and Customer Perspectives

Based on recently filed Xcel Energy DSM/Resource Plans in CO\*

## **Utility Costs**

Avoided Marginal Energy Avoided Generation Capacity Avoided T&D Capacity Natural Gas Commodity Cost

### **Customer Costs**

Retail Electric and Natural Gas Costs Equipment Costs

\*Paper covers impacts in Xcel's Colorado and Minnesota service territory. © 2022 Xcel Energy



## **Methodology – Control Strategy** Loadshapes and Load Shifting

Uncontrolled – load determined by usage

**Controlled** – load determined by usage, but can also respond to control signals to vary load

#### **Marginal Energy Price Load Shift**

Pre-heats tank during low-price energy Afternoon Peak Demand Load Shift

Curtails load during peak load events





## **Customer Equipment and Retail Costs**<sub>KR1</sub> Customer Baseline Equipment Makes a BIG Difference

#### **Electric Resistance Baseline**

Heat pumps provide cost savings compared to electric resistance water heater

#### **Natural Gas Water Heater Baseline**

Customers face substantial costs switching from natural gas to a heat pump



■ Heat Pump: No load shifting and electric space heat ■ Heat Pump: Load shifting and gas space heat

Dollar amounts represent lifetime NPV totals



- KR0 Very interesting results. I presume some customers don't have access to gas or they'd be using it. Do the ERWH customers generally have propane? Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:28:39.771
- **BBT0 0** For sure, some are stuck with propane, sometimes it's building owners installing a "cheaper" water heater, since they're not paying the utility bill. Sometimes it just a house with just electricity and that doubling of upfront equipment cost is enough to drive the choice to install the more inefficient option. Boyle, Byron T, 2022-10-28T05:43:07.431
- KR1 This slide seems to be more about incremental costs Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:39:38.885

## Utility Cost-to-Serve and Retail Costs Rate Structure Makes a BIG Difference

Differences in electric and natural gas retail rate structures are a key barrier

### **Retail Cost Divergence**

Heat pump retail costs are more than 300% higher than the utility cost-to-serve, while only about 40% for natural gas

#### Narrowing the Gap

Specifically designed rates Upfront and ongoing incentive



Heat Pump: No load shifting and electric space heat Heat Pump: Load shifting and gas space heat

Dollar amounts represent lifetime NPV totals

© 2022 Xcel Energy



8

**KR0** If I understand this correctly, the third chart on the right "cost-to-serve difference" is just the mathematical difference of the first too. It would be clearer if it was simply labeled "difference". Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:30:29.583

## **CO2 Emissions** Electric System Emissions Dictate Savings Potential

Heat pump water heaters have the  $\frac{kR2}{KR2}$  tential to generate substantial lifetime emissions reductions compared to natural gas water heaters

### **Heat Pump Savings**

50% fewer lifetime emissions compared to natural gas

#### Low Carbon Grid

Leads to large emissions savings even for inefficient technologies like electric resistance





- KR0 This needs a legend. Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:30:52.831
- KR1 I think this is a best practice for conference presentations: putting the key takeaway of each slide in the subtitle.
  (People get easily lost and distracted.) Some other slides would benefit from this practice.
  Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:32:05.974
- **BBT10** Thanks for the tip, I tried to update several that were missing or not very informative. Boyle, Byron T, 2022-10-28T05:32:33.556
- KR2 the

Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:40:07.626

## **Resource Planning Impacts** Annual Incremental Electrification Load - Inputs

What are the impacts to the electric system from large-scale growth in residential beneficial electric load?

## Low Electrification Scenario

20% of Xcel Energy served households haveelectric heat by 20454% of annual system load by 2045

### **High Electrification Scenario**

70% of Xcel Energy served households have electric heat by 2045 14% of annual system load by 2045





## **Resource Planning – Capacity Expansion Plan** Beneficial Electrification - Induces System Generation Change

| PSCo Base Case Exp (No BE)               | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025  | 2026  | 2027  | 2028  | 2029  | 2030  | 2031  | 2032 | Total |
|--|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Storage                                  | -    | -    | -    | 200   | -     | -     | -     | -     | 200   | 100   | -    | 500   |
| Wind                                     | -    | -    | -    | 1,000 | -     | 150   | 650   | 150   | 350   | 100   | 300  | 2,700 |
| Solar                                    | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | 600   | 100   | 0     | 850   | 0     | 0    | 1,550 |
| СТ                                       | -    | -    | -    | -     | 392   | 196   | 588   | -     | -     | -     | 392  | 1,568 |
| Recip (Internal Combustion)              | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | 100   | -     | -     | -    | 100   |
| сс                                       | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -    | -     |
| Distributed Solar                        | 126  | 792  | 232  | 899   | 342   | 1,012 | 475   | 1,163 | 643   | 1,302 | 785  | 7,771 |
| Total                                    | -    | -    | -    | 1,200 | 392   | 946   | 1,335 | 247   | 1,397 | 192   | 684  | 6,393 |
|  |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |       |
| PSCo BE Scenario 1 Expansion             | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025  | 2026  | 2027  | 2028  | 2029  | 2030  | 2031  | 2032 | Total |
| Storage                                  | -    | -    | -    | 300   | -     | -     | -     | -     | 50    | 100   | 50   | 500   |
| Wind                                     | -    | -    | -    | 1,000 | 200   | 100   | 700   | 200   | 400   | 100   | 300  | 3,000 |
| Solar                                    | -    | -    | -    | -     | 50    | 500   | 50    | 0     | 750   | (0)   | 0    | 1,350 |
| СТ                                       | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | 784   | 392   | 196   | -     | -     | 392  | 1,764 |
| Recip (Internal Combustion)              | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -    | -     |
| cc                                       | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -    | -     |
| Distributed Solar                        | 126  | 792  | 232  | 899   | 342   | 1,012 | 475   | 1,163 | 643   | 1,302 | 785  | 7,771 |
| Total                                    | -    | -    | -    | 1,300 | 250   | 1,384 | 1,139 | 393   | 1,197 | 193   | 735  | 6,592 |
|  |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |       |
| Delta Base Case and Scenario 1 Expansion | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025  | 2026  | 2027  | 2028  | 2029  | 2030  | 2031  | 2032 | Total |
| Storage                                  | -    | -    | -    | 100   | -     | -     | -     | -     | (150) | -     | 50   |       |
| Wind                                     | -    | -    | -    | -     | 200   | (50)  | 50    | 50    | 50    | -     | - /  | 300   |
| Solar                                    | -    | -    | -    | -     | 50    | (100) | (50)  | (0)   | (100) | (0)   | (C   | (200) |
| ст                                       | -    | -    | -    | -     | (392) | 588   | (196) | 196   | -     | -     | - \  | 196   |
| Recip (Internal Combustion)              | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | (100) | -     | -     | -    | (100) |
| cc                                       | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -    |       |
| Distributed Solar                        | -    | -    | -    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -    | -     |
| Total                                    | -    | -    | -    | 100   | (142) | 438   | (196) | 146   | (200) | 1     | 51   | 199   |

- **KR0** Not very clear to me what the takeaway is from this slide. Why would solar go down with electrification? Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:35:27.943
- **BBT0 0** The takeaway here is that these types of BE loads are different enough from the system load that they drive greater adoption of renewables (in this case it's wind) than if we were just looking at the typical capacity expansion plan based on the system resource plan. These results suggest that resource planning modeling to determine the change in generation assets built to serve BE loads should be considered when evaluating the impacts of BE technologies.

Acknowledging to a certain extent that these expansion plans are "black boxes" pinpointing why one resource is selected over another is not always easy to do, but I think here the results do seem logical.

Heat pump loads (both for space heat and water heat) don't align very well with solar, since most of the load is early morning or evening (warming up the house in the morning, the morning shower, evening space heat as the outdoor temps decline, etc.). Also, the heat pumps aren't driving an increase of load during hot midday hours, because air conditioners are already accounted for in the base case scenarios - the additional heat pump load is just replacing existing load (not adding more) so the cooling load is similar or slightly less (than the base case) assuming the HPs are a bit more efficient.

The HP load does align a lot better with our wind resources and the EnCompass results seem to indicate that building more wind capacity (at the expense of solar) is a better option. The CT is also growing since wind is not dispatchable and additional peaking capacity would be needed to deal with the additional BE load. Boyle, Byron T, 2022-10-27T21:48:20.829

## **Resource Planning - Results** Emissions and Cost-to-Serve Impacts

The results vary significantly from strongly supporting the expectation of renewable generation sources serving the increased load from electrification to not.

### Low BE Scenario

Increased renewable generation capacity that produce more energy than the increase in load – leading to negative incremental emissions

#### Marginal emissions Marginal cost-to-serve intensity (Tons/GWh) (\$/MWh) 2021-2032 2021-2032 2024 2024 Scenario Avg Avg Low BE Scenario -157 \$24.14 \$55.93 412 High BE Scenario \$21.86 447 216 \$28.61 Approved DSM Plan 443 364 \$23.78 \$27.44

### **High BE Scenario**

Similar to baseline results





# **FINAL COMMENTS**

Utilities can play a key role in raising customer interest and market adoption of heat pumps by understanding the barriers to adoption that are within their control. Through our study we identified barriers, benefits, and insights to electrifying natural gas end-uses including the following:

- Incremental customer cost can be a significant barrier to adoption for heat pumps
- New rate designs can better reflect the incremental utility cost-to-serve electric heat pump technologies
- Heat pump water heaters installed today can result in larg KRO missions savings over their lifetime compared to natural gas water heaters KR1
- Leveraging new BE load and programs may help shift system load enough to support greater renewable generation capacity across the country.



| KR0 | in                                      |
|-----|---|
|     | Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:43:44.770 |
|     |   |

#### KR1 pick singular or plural for this sentence Kasman, Robert, 2022-10-26T22:44:37.632

