ONE ENERGY
WIND FOR INDUSTRY®

ONE ENERGY ENTERPRISES LLC

UNITED STATES MARKET ANALYSIS

SEPTEMBER 2020

LEADING THE ON-SITE ENERGY REVOLUTION FOR C&I CUSTOMERS

This page intentionally left blank

DISCLOSURES AND DISCLAIMERS

This document is provided by One Energy Enterprises LLC, for itself and its affiliates (collectively referred to in this document as "One Energy" or the "Company"). This document is not, and nothing in it should be construed as, an offer, or solicitation of an offer, to buy or invest in any of the Company's credit facilities or securities in any jurisdiction. Neither this document nor anything in it shall form the basis of any contract or commitment. This document is not intended to be relied upon as advice to investors or potential investors and does not take into account the investment objectives, financial situation, or needs of any investor. All investors should consider such factors in consultation with a professional investment and/or tax advisor of their choosing when deciding if an investment is appropriate.

The Company has prepared this document based on the information available, including information derived from public sources that have not been independently verified. No representation or warranty, express or implied, is provided in relation to the fairness, accuracy, correctness, completeness or reliability of the information, opinions, or conclusions expressed herein. The financial models and projections contained in this document should not be considered a comprehensive representation of the Company's performance.

All forward–looking statements attributable to the Company or persons acting on its behalf apply only as of the date of this document and are expressly qualified in their entirety by the cautionary statements included elsewhere in this document. The financial projections and models are preliminary and are subject to change; the Company undertakes no obligation to update or revise these forward–looking statements to reflect events or circumstances that arise after the date made, or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events. Inevitably, some assumptions will not materialize, and unanticipated events and circumstances may affect the ultimate financial results. Projections are inherently subject to substantial and numerous uncertainties and to a wide variety of significant business, economic and competitive risks, and the assumptions underlying the projections may be inaccurate in any material respect. Therefore, the actual results achieved may vary significantly from the forecasts, and the variations may be material.

This is NOT an offering document.

<u>Forward-Looking Statement Disclaimers</u>

This document, along with any supplement to this document, include ''forward-looking statements.'' To the extent that the information presented in this document discusses financial projections, information, or expectations about business plans, results of operations, products, or markets, or otherwise makes statements about future events, such statements are forward-looking. Such forward-looking statements can be identified by words such as "should," "may," "intends," "anticipates," "believes," "estimates," "projects," "forecasts," "expects," "plans," and "proposes." Although the Company believes the expectations reflected in these forward-looking statements are based on reasonable assumptions, there are several risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from such forward-looking statements.

"Wind for Industry," "Wind Campus," and "Continuum" are registered trademarks of One Energy Enterprises LLC.

One Energy Enterprises LLC is headquartered in Findlay, Ohio.
One Energy Enterprises LLC is a Delaware Limited Liability Company.
One Energy Capital Corporation is an Ohio Corporation.

CORPORATE ADDRESS
North Findlay Wind Campus
12385 Township Road 215
Findlay, OH 45840
877.298.5853

CEO
Jereme Kent
jeremekent@oneenergyllc.com
419.905.5274
Assistant: Brandy Rea
brandy@oneenergyllc.com

CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

This page intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One Energy's market analysis quantifies *Wind for Industry*'s market in the continental U.S. One Energy, headquartered in Findlay, Ohio, is the largest installer of on-site wind energy in North America. Since 2009, One Energy has installed 40.5 MW of *Wind for Industry* projects for world-class companies. *Wind for Industry* is One Energy's flagship energy solution of installing utility-scale distributed wind projects for commercial and industrial (C&I) customers. This market analysis is made up of four components: the Total Addressable Market (TAM), the Serviceable Market (SM), Serviceable Market Growth, and *Wind for Industry's* Expansion Strategy.

The TAM identifies customer facilities that are technically viable based on the unique requirements of utility-scale wind turbine projects. One Energy performed site-specific screenings for 822 facilities across four Energy Intensive Sectors and a representative General Industry Sampling. The total number of technically viable locations within the General Industry Sampling was used to extrapolate to all C&I facilities in the continental U.S., creating the General Industry Market Extrapolation. Using the results from the Energy Intensive Sectors and General Industry Market Extrapolation, along with estimated project sizing and cost, One Energy estimated the total deployable capital of the TAM.

One Energy's Serviceable Market (SM) is the segment of the TAM where *Wind for Industry* projects are economically viable. To determine economic viability, One Energy compared the current grid rate to the estimated *Wind for Industry* PPA rate for each U.S. county. Using locations that are both technically and economically viable, One Energy was able to calculate the total deployable capital of the Serviceable Market.

The Serviceable Market Growth analysis explores areas of business-model improvement including higher turbine efficiency, greater project cost efficiency, and higher grid rates. Scenarios are modeled to see how these improvements, as well as a phase-out of the Investment Tax Credit will impact the Serviceable Market.

The Expansion Strategy analysis creates a State Value Score to explore where One Energy should focus its sales strategy. The states were ranked based on their customer concentration, economic viability, and manufacturing output. The highest ranked states closest to One Energy's current project footprint will guide *Wind for Industry's* Expansion Strategy.

The key takeaways from the analysis include:

1. The *Wind for Industry* Serviceable Market in the continental U.S. is estimated at $66 billion in deployable capital based on a 0% Investment Tax Credit under current business model conditions (35,825 MW).

2. With a 30% Investment Tax Credit, the Serviceable Market nearly doubles to $120 billion (65,345 MW).

3. The Energy Intensive Sectors including Biodiesel, Cement Production, Ethanol Production, and Refining represent a $3.4 billion market for deployable capital without any Investment Tax Credit (1,865 MW).

4. As economies of scale and known technology improvements become fully effective, the *Wind for Industry* Serviceable Market will increase to $95 billion in deployable capital without any Investment Tax Credit (57,185 MW).

5. Approximately 20% of large C&I facilities will be able to have a technically viable and financially attractive *Wind for Industry* project as the industry reaches maturity.

6. The Investment Tax Credit is not critical to the success of the *Wind for Industry* market.

7. *Wind for Industry's* potential has a sizeable concentration in the Midwest states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. These states are known for having a large manufacturing presence and good wind resource.

TOTAL ADDRESSABLE MARKET
All technically viable *Wind for Industry* projects in the continental U.S, expressed as deployable capital.

SERVICEABLE MARKET
The subset of the TAM where *Wind for Industry* projects are economically viable, expressed as deployable capital.

8. Texas and California markets each represent a substantial standalone opportunity.

As of January 2020, there are approximately 105,000 MW of wind energy in the U.S. The *Wind for Industry* market represents a substantial growth opportunity for wind energy expansion in the U.S. Due to several barriers to entry (the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this report), less than 200 MW of distributed on-site wind have been deployed to date in the continental U.S. As a result, nearly the entire $66 billion market is available to be captured by companies equipped to overcome these barriers.

INTRODUCTION

This market analysis was performed to quantify One Energy's *Wind for Industry* market in the continental U.S. One Energy, headquartered in Findlay, Ohio, is the largest installer of on-site wind energy in North America. Since 2009, One Energy has installed 40.5 MW of *Wind for Industry* projects for world-class companies. *Wind for Industry* is One Energy's flagship energy solution of installing utility-scale distributed wind projects for commercial and industrial (C&I) customers. This market analysis consists of the Total Addressable Market (TAM), the Serviceable Market (SM), Serviceable Market growth, and One Energy's Expansion Strategy. The analysis of the TAM and SM is limited to the continental United States. The results of this report indicate there is a significant nationwide market for *Wind for Industry*, given One Energy's current business model.

Wind for Industry's market is made up of the nation's large energy users, which are typically C&I customers. The TAM identifies customer facilities that are technically viable based on the unique requirements of utility-scale wind turbine projects. One Energy performed site-specific screenings to estimate the ratio of C&I facilities that are technically viable in the U.S. Using this viability ratio, estimated project sizing, and cost, One Energy was able to estimate the total deployable capital of the TAM.

One Energy's SM is the segment of the TAM where *Wind for Industry* projects are economically viable. The SM identifies the locations where One Energy could offer the customer a lower PPA rate than the average industrial grid rate, making *Wind for Industry* a more attractive energy alternative. One Energy believes cost is the single biggest driver of customer decisions; thus, price is the distinguishing factor for the SM. Using locations that are both technically and economically viable, One Energy was able to calculate the total deployable capital of the SM.

> **TOTAL ADDRESSABLE MARKET**
>
> All technically viable *Wind for Industry* projects in the continental U.S, expressed as deployable capital.
>
> **SERVICEABLE MARKET**
>
> The subset of the TAM where *Wind for Industry* projects are economically viable, expressed as deployable capital.

After identifying the TAM and SM, the Serviceable Market Growth analysis explores how the SM could be impacted by the phase-out of the Investment Tax Credit (ITC), and how One Energy will adapt and improve its business model. There are three areas of business-model improvement One Energy expects to see: higher turbine efficiency, greater project cost efficiency, and higher grid rates. Based on these improvements, One Energy modeled two scenarios to determine the potential to expand the SM.

To capture the market identified, the Expansion Strategy analysis explores where One Energy should focus its sales strategy as it moves out of Ohio. One Energy created the *Wind for Industry* State Value Score to rank states based on their customer concentration, economic viability, and manufacturing output. The highest ranked states closest to One Energy's current project footprint will guide *Wind for Industry's* Expansion Strategy.

One Energy has identified the current and future market potential of *Wind for Industry* by analyzing technical and economic viability data. The results of this market analysis demonstrate that a significant nationwide market exists for *Wind for Industry* projects. This document is a collection of several maps, graphs, and evaluations used to support this conclusion.

REFERENCE MAPS

The following two pages include a series of Reference Maps. These maps provide a high-level view of several metrics used throughout the U.S. Market Analysis, including wind speed, manufacturing concentration, electricity rates, and the location of power generation facilities. Larger versions of these maps are also provided at the end of this document.

TOTAL ADDRESSABLE MARKET
TECHNICAL VIABILITY

SERVICEABLE MARKET
ECONOMIC VIABILITY

Map 1:
U.S. Average Wind Speeds at 80 meters

The black outline is representative of states with generally enough wind for wind energy development.

Map 2:
Manufacturing Concentration by County, 2019

There are **3,142** counties in the continental U.S.

Map 3:
Average Commercial
Electricity Rates
(cents/kWh), 2018

Map 4:
Average Industrial
Electricity Rates
(cents//kWh), 2018

Map 5:
U.S. Power Generation
Facilities, 2020

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

This page intentionally left blank

TOTAL ADDRESSABLE MARKET

All technically viable *Wind for Industry* projects in the continental U.S., expressed as deployable capital.

Method

One Energy investigated the *Wind for Industry* technical viability of potential customers across the U.S. One Energy analyzed the TAM by breaking it down into two components: Energy Intensive Sectors, and General Industry Market Extrapolation. The Energy Intensive Sectors are specific industries where One Energy has decided to strategically focus business efforts. The General Industry Market Extrapolation is meant to represent all other large C&I sectors. The combination of the Energy Intensive Sectors and General Industry Market Extrapolation comprises *Wind for Industry's* TAM.

The Energy Intensive Sectors include biodiesel, cement manufacturing, ethanol production, and petroleum refining. One Energy performed site-specific screenings to determine the technical viability of facilities in these sectors. One Energy chose these sectors in part because they tend to be in remote locations and therefore typically have a higher rate of technical viability. The screenings were based on publicly available sector location data. The Energy Intensive Sector analysis uses all known facilities and does not use a representative set.

For the General Industry Sampling, a representative population of facilities was used that included facilities belonging to seven companies from a range of industries. One Energy has a location list for each of the facilities used, either from an existing relationship or from publicly available data. The General Industry Sampling covers a wide variety of industries and geographic areas and is a reasonable representation of all large C&I facilities. This analysis assumes that the General Industry Sampling results are representative of the entire C&I market (excluding the Energy Intensive Sectors) and can be applied to all other large C&I facilities in the U.S. The results are referred to as "General Industry Market Extrapolation" in this report.

The combined results of the Energy Intensive Sector analysis and the General Industry Market Extrapolation provides the total deployable megawatts and deployable capital of *Wind for Industry's* TAM. The companies whose facilities were used in the General Industry Sampling and the Energy Intensive Sectors screened are listed below:

GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING		ENERGY-INTENSIVE SECTORS
COMPANY	**INDUSTRY**	
Ball Corporation	Metal Packaging	Biodiesel
Ford Motor Company	Automotive Manufacturing	Cement
International Paper	Paper Processing	Ethanol
Procter & Gamble	Consumer Goods	Refining
Valfilm	Plastic Fabrication	
Veoneer	Automotive Technology	
Whirlpool	Home Appliance Manufacturing	

For both the General Industry Sampling and the Energy Intensive Sectors, the deployable megawatts and deployable capital of the technically viable locations were estimated using an appropriate average project size and cost for each industry type. The average project size and cost were based on One Energy's experience with development of actual projects within each sector.

Screening Methodology

Below are the three main factors One Energy considers when screening for technical viability for a *Wind for Industry* project:

1. Wind resource
2. Land availability
3. Proximity to airports

The wind resource is evaluated on a county by county basis, while land availability and proximity to airports are site specific evaluations.

Wind Resource

Wind resource is evaluated using National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) wind speed data, converted into a turbine Capacity Factor (CF)[a,b]. A minimum turbine CF of 20% is generally used when assessing viability. A single wind speed and CF is used for each county based on the average wind speed in the county.

Land Availability

Land availability is determined visually by using satellite imagery. If the facility is surrounded by development with no land for turbine siting, it is considered nonviable. One Energy has extensive experience with turbine siting and can reliably judge land availability based on prudent setbacks. One Energy looked at each individual facility in the General Industry Sampling and each facility in the Energy Intensive Sectors to evaluate land availability. Typically, each wind turbine needs a minimum of an 800' diameter circle around the turbine and a total setback of 1000' from a residence. This standard may vary depending on the unique details of each facility.

Proximity to Airports

Based on regulation and prudent practices, a wind turbine cannot be built in a location where it interferes with an airport's operations. The Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) online "Notice Criteria Tool" is used to determine if the proposed project will have any impact on air navigation. If a potential site exceeds an airport's critical area according to the "Notice Criteria Tool," the site is determined to be nonviable. There may be instances where a location is within the critical area but would be deemed "No Hazard" by the FAA, but because accurately identifying these exceptions would require filing with the FAA, One Energy listed any site in the critical area as nonviable. All the facilities screened in the TAM analyses for General Industry Sampling and the Energy Intensive Sectors were entered into the Notice Criteria Tool.

General Industry Market Extrapolation Methodology

To determine the total number of C&I facilities in the U.S. that are large enough for a *Wind for Industry* project, One Energy used facility data from the U.S. Census Bureau[c], and filtered for manufacturing facilities that have greater than 100 employees[1]. In the U.S. there are 54,296 large C&I facilities with more than 100 employees. The facilities included in the General Industry Sampling were examined in detail, as described in the screening methodology. This report assumes that the results of that examination are representative of all large C&I facilities in the U.S. (excluding those in the Energy Intensive Sectors) and can be used to extrapolate the total number of technically viable facilities in the U.S.

Since the Energy Intensive Sector facilities are included in the number of large C&I facilities, the number of facilities used in the General Industry Market Extrapolation has been reduced to 53,743 to avoid counting any facilities twice. Throughout the rest of this report, One Energy assumes there are 53,743 large general industry facilities in the continental U.S.[2] Applying the General Industry Sampling results to the number of large C&I facilities gives the total number of viable facilities that make up the General Industry Market Extrapolation.[3]

The deployable megawatts and deployable capital of the General Industry Market Extrapolation were calculated using an average project size of 5 MW. This presents a conservative estimate, as many facilities could utilize a larger project size. An installed cost of $1.85MM/MW was used to determine capital requirements. This cost is generally consistent with One Energy's historical

---

[1] The census data is grouped by facilities with less than 5, 10, 20, 100, and 500 employees and facilities with over 500 employees. One Energy's consideration of the number of employees is intended to capture only facilities that consume enough electricity to warrant the installation of a utility-scale wind project. Based on One Energy's experience, this is the simplest way to distinguish "large" C&I facilities. This assumption does not capture energy intensive facilities with low employment.

[2] The analysis excluded facilities located in Alaska and Hawaii.

[3] The examined sample size for general industry facilities was 269 facilities which exceeds the square root of the 53,743 large general industry facilities and thus the sample size is considered large enough to be representative of the total population.

installed costs. While each location will have specific factors that increase or decrease the installed cost, One Energy believes this cost is generally representative of *Wind for Industry* projects in the U.S.

One Energy's operating projects are included in the number of viable facilities to account for sites that are already benefitting from *Wind for Industry.* These sites are not included in the deployable megawatts or capital.

Results

Market Potential: General Industry Sampling

One Energy screened 269 facilities across the U.S. for the 7 companies in the General Industry Sampling. From this technical screening, One Energy has identified a total of 76 technically viable *Wind for Industry* project locations for a total of 345 deployable megawatts. Applying this to the 53,743 large C&I facilities in the U.S., the General Industry Market Extrapolation predicts 15,183 viable facilities and 75,915 deployable megawatts.

Map 6: General Industry Sampling Locations

GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	
FACILITIES SCREENED:	269
VIABLE FACILITIES:	76
% OF FACILITIES VIABLE:	28%
AVG. PROJECT SIZE (MW):	5
DEPLOYABLE MW:	345
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$638
MARKET EXTRAPOLATION	
DEPLOYABLE MW:	75,915
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$140,443

Market Potential: Biodiesel Sector

One Energy screened 97 biodiesel facilities across the U.S. From this technical screening, One Energy has identified a total of 28 viable *Wind for Industry* project locations for a total of 280 deployable megawatts based on an average project size of 10 MW per project.

Map 7: Biodiesel Sector Locations

FACILITIES SCREENED:	97
VIABLE FACILITIES:	28
% OF FACILITIES VIABLE:	29%
AVG. PROJECT SIZE (MW):	10
DEPLOYABLE MW:	280
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$518

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Market Potential: Cement Sector

One Energy screened 103 cement facilities across the U.S. From this technical screening, One Energy has identified a total of 51 viable *Wind for Industry* project locations for a total of 250 deployable megawatts based on an average project size of 5 MW per project.

Map 8: Cement Sector Locations

FACILITIES SCREENED:	103
VIABLE FACILITIES:	51
% OF FACILITIES VIABLE:	50%
AVG. PROJECT SIZE (MW):	5
DEPLOYABLE MW:	250
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$463

■ Not Viable
■ Viable

Market Potential: Ethanol Sector

One Energy screened 200 ethanol facilities across the U.S. From this technical screening, One Energy has identified a total of 114 viable *Wind for Industry* project locations for a total of 1,140 deployable megawatts based on an average project size of 10 MW per project.

### *Map 9: Ethanol Sector Locations*

| FACILITIES SCREENED:	200
VIABLE FACILITIES:	114
% OF FACILITIES VIABLE:	57%
AVG. PROJECT SIZE (MW):	10
DEPLOYABLE MW:	1,140
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$2,109

■ Not Viable
■ Viable

Market Potential: Refining Sector

One Energy screened 153 refining facilities across the U.S. From this technical screening, One Energy has identified a total of 55 viable *Wind for Industry* project locations for a total of 1,100 deployable megawatts based on an average project size of 20 MW per project.

Not Viable
Viable

Map 10: Refining Sector Locations

FACILITIES SCREENED:	153
VIABLE FACILITIES:	55
% OF FACILITIES VIABLE:	35.9%
AVG. PROJECT SIZE (MW):	20
DEPLOYABLE MW:	1,100
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$2,035

For Reference: All Screened Facilities

For general geographic prioritizing, all site-specific screenings One Energy completed are shown on one map. One Energy screened 822 facilities across the U.S. from seven companies and four key sectors. This viability data is shown for reference and not used in later extrapolation. From this technical screening, One Energy has identified a total of 324 viable *Wind for Industry* project locations for a total of 3,115 deployable megawatts based on an average project size of 5 MW per project.

Not Viable
Viable

Map 11: All Facility Locations

FACILITIES SCREENED:	822
VIABLE FACILITIES:	324
% OF FACILITIES VIABLE:	39%
AVG. PROJECT SIZE (MW):	5
DEPLOYABLE MW:	3,115
DEPLOYABLE CAPITAL (MM):	$5,763

TAM SUMMARY *General C&I*	COMPANY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Number of Facilities Screened	269	53,743
% of Facilities Technically Viable	28%	28%
Average Project Size (MW)	5	5
Total Deployable MW	345	75,915
Deployable Capital (MM)	$638	$140,443

TAM SUMMARY *Energy Intensive Sectors*	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
Number of Facilities Screened	97	103	200	153	553
% of Facilities Technically Viable	29%	50%	57%	36%	45%
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	11
Total Deployable MW	280	250	1,140	1,100	2,770
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$463	$2,109	$2,035	$5,125

Takeaway

One Energy determined that 28% of the General Industry Sampling facilities are technically viable. When the General Industry Sampling factor is applied to the 53,743 large C&I facilities in the US, there are an estimated 15,183 total viable facilities.

This General Industry Market Extrapolation results in 75,915 MW and $140 billion of deployable capital of the TAM.

The Energy Intensive Sector analysis contains 28 biodiesel locations, 51 cement locations, 114 ethanol locations, and 55 refining locations that are all technically viable for *Wind for Industry* projects. This results in 280 MW from biodiesel locations, 250 MW from cement locations, 1,140 MW from ethanol locations, and 1,100 MW from refining locations.

The Energy Intensive Sectors make up 2,770 MW and $5,125 million of deployable capital of the TAM.

Combining the General Industry Market Extrapolation and the Energy Intensive Sectors, the TAM has 78,685 MW and $146 billion dollars of deployable capital. This provides a substantial market for *Wind for Industry* projects.

Energy Intensive Sector Deployable Capital Breakout

SERVICEABLE MARKET

The subset of the TAM where *Wind for Industry* projects are economically viable, expressed as deployable capital.

Method

While wind projects help customers meet sustainability goals, One Energy believes the main driver for any large energy user's decision to move forward with a *Wind for Industry* project is a financial incentive. With *Wind for Industry,* the financial incentive is a cost for energy that is less than the cost they are paying to the grid[4]. Based on One Energy's experience with past sales, if the electricity rate offered to a *Wind for Industry* customer is lower than their current grid price, the customer is highly likely to move forward with the project. An energy project that offers certainty for 20 years, lowers Scope 2 emissions, provides green marketing material, and saves money immediately is an attractive project for any customer.

The rate competitiveness of *Wind for Industry* projects across the U.S. was determined by analyzing the available wind resource and current industrial grid rates[d]. For this study, the wind resource was evaluated for each county across the U.S. and translated into a capacity factor (CF). The CF was then utilized with *Wind for Industry*'s project cost model to determine an estimated 20-year PPA rate. The 20-year PPA rate was compared to the industrial grid rate in that area. If the One Energy 20-year fixed PPA rate was lower than the average current grid rate, the county was identified as economically viable. For example, if the current grid rate in a county is $0.060/kWh, and One Energy expects to be able to offer a $0.058/kWh rate based on the wind resource of the area, then that county is deemed economically viable.

Economic viability is analyzed at 30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0% ITC rates, which reflect all ITC rate possibilities.

To determine the SM's deployable capital potential, One Energy assessed the economic viability of the facilities screened in the TAM. Similar to the TAM, the project size and cost were applied to the technically and economically viable locations to obtain the total deployable megawatts and deployable capital. If a facility was not located in an economically viable county, it was not included in that sector's deployable capital potential.

The Energy Intensive Sector deployable capital for the SM was determined by calculating the number of technically viable facilities that were in economically viable counties. The deployable capital for each sector was adjusted based on percentage of facilities located in economically viable counties. The General Industry Market Extrapolation deployable capital potential for the SM was determined by applying the percentage of U.S. counties that are economically viable to the TAM results[5]. The total SM deployable capital was calculated by combining the deployable capital of the Energy Intensive Sector and the General Industry Market Extrapolation[6].

---

[4] One Energy typically delivers projects through a Renewable Energy Agreement (REA) which sets a fixed energy price ($/kWh) for the customer for 20 years. Projects can also be delivered as a capital expenditure (CAPEX), where the customer pays for and owns the project, but this choice is uncommon.

[5] One Energy's operating projects are included in the number of economically viable facilities to account for sites that are already benefitting from *Wind for Industry.* These sites are not included in the deployable megawatts or capital.

[6] This assumes even distribution of manufacturing across the U.S.

ONE ENERGY

Results

*Map 12: Economically
Viable Counties at 30% ITC*

Legend	
■ 20% to 100%	
■ 10% to 20%	
■ 5% to 10%	
■ 0% to 5%	
■ 0%	
■ 0% to -5%	
■ -5% to -10%	
■ -10% to -20%	
■ -20% to -100%	

*Map 13: Economically
Viable Counties at 24% ITC*

Legend	
■ 20% to 100%	
■ 10% to 20%	
■ 5% to 10%	
■ 0% to 5%	
■ 0%	
■ 0% to -5%	
■ -5% to -10%	
■ -10% to -20%	
■ -20% to -100%	

Understanding the Analysis

% difference from rate break-even

Color	Range	Description
■	20% to 100%	
■	10% to 20%	*PPA rate < grid rate*
■	5% to 10%	
■	0% to 5%	
■	0%	*PPA rate = grid rate*
■	0% to -5%	
■	-5% to -10%	
■	-10% to -20%	*PPA rate > grid rate*
■	-20% to -100%	

ONE ENERGY

Map 14: Economically Viable Counties at 18% ITC

Map 15: Economically Viable Counties at 12% ITC

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Map 16: Economically Viable Counties at 0% ITC

SM RESULTS BY COUNTY	30% ITC		24% ITC		18% ITC		12% ITC		0% ITC	
	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%
Total U.S. Counties	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-
Economically Viable Counties	2,040	65%	1,855	59%	1,699	54%	1,559	50%	1,254	40%

Map 17: Economically Viable Screened Facilities at 30%

	VIABLE FACILITIES:	286
	NOT VIABLE FACILITIES:	38

Map 18: Economically Viable Screened Facilities at 24%

VIABLE FACILITIES:	268
NOT VIABLE FACILITIES:	56

Not Viable
Viable

Map 19: Economically Viable Screened Facilities at 18%

VIABLE FACILITIES:	253
NOT VIABLE FACILITIES:	71

Not Viable
Viable

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Map 20: Economically Viable Screened Facilities at 12%

	VIABLE FACILITIES:	238
	NOT VIABLE FACILITIES:	86

Map 21: Economically Viable Screened Facilities at 0%

	VIABLE FACILITIES:	208
	NOT VIABLE FACILITIES:	116

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Takeaway

One Energy determined that, at 0% ITC, 1,254 of the 3,142 counties within the U.S. have grid rates that are higher than the PPA rate One Energy is likely able to offer in that county. All results are shown at 0% ITC[7]. For additional ITC rate results, see Appendix D.

Of the facilities deemed technically viable in the General Industry Sampling, 45% were determined to be economically viable. Applying this factor to the General Industry Market Extrapolation results in 33,960 MWs and $62 billion of deployable capital.

Of the facilities deemed technically viable in the Energy Intensive Sector analysis, 70% were determined to be economically viable. This results in the Energy Intensive Sectors totaling 1,865 MW and $3 billion of deployable capital.

Combining the General Industry Market Extrapolation and the Energy Intensive Sectors results in a Serviceable Market of 35,825 MW and $66 billion in deployable capital.

Given current grid prices, there is a $66 billion market today for *Wind for Industry*.

SM GENERAL C&I 0% ITC Rate	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Number of Facilities Screened	269	53,743
TAM		
# of Viable TAM Facilities	76	15,183
Average Project Size (MW)	5	5
Total Deployable MW	345	75,915
Deployable Capital (MM)	$638	$140,443
SM		
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	45%	45%
# of Viable SM Facilities	34	6,792
Total Deployable MW	135	33,960
Deployable Capital (MM)	$250	$62,826

SM ENERGY INTENSIVE SECTORS 0% ITC Rate	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
Number of Facilities Screened	97	103	200	153	553
TAM					
# of Viable TAM Facilities	28	51	114	55	134
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	5
Total Deployable MW	280	250	1,140	1,100	2,775
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$463	$2,109	$2,035	$5,134
SM					
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	86%	39%	94%	42%	70%
# of Viable SM Facilities	24	20	107	23	174
Total Deployable MW	240	95	1,070	460	1,865
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$176	$1,980	$851	$3,450

SM SUMMARY Deployable Capital	GENERAL INDUSTRY MARKET EXTRAPOLATION		ENERGY INTENSIVE SECTORS		TOTAL	
ITC RATE	MW	(MM)	MW	(MM)	MW	(MM)
30%	62,925	$116,411	2,420	$4,477	65,345	$120,888
24%	57,935	$107,180	2,295	$4,246	60,230	$111,426
18%	52,940	$97,939	2,150	$3,978	55,090	$101,917
12%	49,940	$92,389	1,985	$3,672	51,925	$96,061
0%	33,960	$62,826	1,865	$3,450	35,825	$66,276

---

[7] Throughout this document, 0% ITC was chosen to present the most conservative results and for the sake of brevity.

SERVICEABLE MARKET GROWTH

One Energy must consider a range of possible scenarios when determining the future potential of the serviceable market. With the phase-out of the ITC[8], One Energy, along with the rest of the wind industry, will need to make improvements to maintain its current SM and create future market expansion. Future grid prices, turbine efficiency, and improved project costs could benefit *Wind for Industry*'s potential moving forward. The future growth scenarios explore the impact on the economic viability of *Wind for Industry* projects as the industry reaches maturity. The deployable megawatts and deployable capital for each scenario show how the SM can be expanded, even with a declining ITC.

One Energy analyzed the General Industry Market Extrapolation, as well as the Energy Intensive Sectors to determine the Serviceable Market Growth. The analysis included 30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0% ITC to illustrate the increase in market potential if the ITC is reinstated to a past percentage.

Scenario 1: Cost and Turbine Efficiency

Considering the ITC phase-out, how will decreased cost and increased turbine efficiencies impact the SM over the next 10 years?

Method

For Scenario 1, One Energy assumes the project installation costs will decrease through increased efficiencies and the turbines' technology will improve, increasing the CF. Improved cost efficiencies could be possible through economies of scale, greater construction efficiency, and more competitive turbine supplier pricing. A higher CF is possible due to taller towers and longer blades, allowing turbines to capture more wind.

In this scenario, the CF calculated for the SM was increased by 10% for each county[9]. The installed project costs calculated for the SM were decreased by 10%. These new metrics were used to determine the Scenario 1 20-year PPA rate using five different ITC rates (30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0%). As with the SM calculation, the new 20-year PPA rate was then compared to the grid rate in that area. If the Scenario 1 20-year fixed PPA rate was lower than the average current grid rate, the county was identified as economically viable[10].

ITC RATES	
2016	30%
2017	24%
2018	18%
2019	12%
2020	18%

---

[8] Wind energy projects qualify for either a Section 48 Investment Tax Credit (ITC) or a Section 45 Production Tax Credit (PTC). *Wind for Industry* projects typically elect the ITC. The ITC rate was originally set at 30% of the project cost and has been decreasing annually until fully phased out in 2021. Projects that begin construction in calendar year 2020 are eligible for a 12% ITC rate. The ITC rate eligibility is determined based on the year a project "begins construction." Projects have various ways to meet the "begin construction" test and typically must be placed in service within 4 years from when construction began. Because of the rules governing this credit, the practical phase-out lags the legal phase-out. The steps used previously for the phase-out were 30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0%. Based on past deviations from the original legislation, future ITC phase-out rates may vary.

[9] A 30% CF is assumed in this scenario to now be 33%, a 10% increase in annual energy production. This increased the number of facilities that were considered technically viable from a wind resource standpoint.

[10] The individual sector deployable capital total may be reduced due to the decrease in project cost. This does not capture the margin expansion or EBITDA of the projects. See Appendix E for revenue information.

Results

Map 22: Scenario 1 Economically Viable Counties at 30% ITC

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 84%

Map 23: Scenario 1 Economically Viable Counties at 24% ITC

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 78%

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

*Map 24: Scenario 1
Economically Viable
Counties at 18% ITC*

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 72%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

*Map 25: Scenario 1
Economically Viable
Counties at 12% ITC*

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 65%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Map 26: Scenario 1 Economically Viable Counties at 0% ITC

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 56%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

FUTURE MARKET POTENTIAL: SCENARIO 1	30% ITC		24% ITC		18% ITC		12% ITC		0% ITC	
	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%
Total U.S. Counties	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-
Economically Viable Counties	2,654	84%	2,441	78%	2,251	72%	2,048	65%	1,760	56%

Takeaway

This analysis reveals that Scenario 1 expands the SM in the U.S. At a 0% ITC rate, One Energy expects to be able to offer a PPA rate that is lower than the current grid rate in 1,760 counties (56% of all U.S. counties).

By decreasing projects costs by 10% and increasing project efficiencies by 10%, Scenario 1 increased the deployable capital potential of the General Industry Market Extrapolation from $62 billion to $91 billion. A matured industry has a positive impact on *Wind for Industry's* deployable capital.

SCENARIO 1 0% ITC Rate	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
SM		
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	45%	45%
Total Deployable MW	135	33,960
Deployable Capital (MM)	$250	$62,826
SCENARIO 1		
% of Facilities Economically Viable	72%	72%
# of Viable Scenario 1 Facilities	55	10,987
Total Deployable MW	240	54,935
Deployable Capital (MM)	$400	$91,467
Increase in Deployable Capital (MM)	$150	$28,641
% Change in Deployable Capital	60%	46%

SCENARIO 1 0% ITC Rate	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
SM					
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	86%	39%	94%	42%	70%
Total Deployable MW	240	95	1,070	460	1,865
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$176	$1,980	$851	$3,450
SCENARIO 1					
% of Facilities Economically Viable	86%	64%	97%	61%	80%
# of Viable Scenario 1 Facilities	25	35	111	36	207
Total Deployable MW	250	170	1,110	720	2,250
Deployable Capital (MM)	$416	$283	$1,848	$1,199	$3,746
Increase in Deployable Capital (MM)	($28)	$107	($131)	$348	$296
% Change in Deployable Capital	-6%	61%	-7%	41%	9%

SCENARIO 1 SUMMARY Deployable Capital ITC RATE	GENERAL INDUSTRY MARKET EXTRAPOLATION MW	(MM)	ENERGY INTENSIVE SECTORS MW	(MM)	TOTAL MW	(MM)
30%	66,925	$111,430	2,715	$4,520	69,640	$115,951
24%	66,925	$111,430	2,665	$4,437	69,590	$115,867
18%	64,925	$108,100	2,620	$4,362	67,545	$112,462
12%	62,925	$104,770	2,470	$4,113	65,395	$108,883
0%	54,935	$91,467	2,250	$3,746	57,185	$95,213

Scenario 2: Grid Rate Inflation

Considering the ITC phase-out, how will increased cost efficiencies, turbine efficiencies, and grid rates impact the SM over the next 10 years?

Method

For Scenario 2, One Energy included the same assumptions and calculations as in Scenario 1, with the additional assumption that the grid rate of each county increased by 5%. Historically, grid prices have trended up over a significant period[11]. One Energy believes a 5% increase is a conservative metric to use for potential future grid rates.

The CF calculated for the SM was increased by 10% for each county. The installed project costs calculated for the SM were decreased by 10% and the grid rate was increased by 5%. These new metrics were used to determine the Scenario 2 20-year PPA rate using five different ITC rates (30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0%). As with the SM calculation, the new 20-year PPA rate was then compared to the grid rate in that area. If the Scenario 2 20-year fixed PPA rate was lower than the average current grid rate, the county was identified as economically viable.

Results

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

Map 27: Scenario 2 Economically Viable Counties at 30% ITC

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 89%

---

[11] According to the 2018 U.S. Energy Information Administration's annual report (EIA-861), the industrial user grid rate in the U.S. has increased 7.2% over the last 10 years, and 56% over the last 20 years.[e]

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Map 28: Scenario 2 Economically Viable Counties at 24% ITC

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 82%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

Map 29: Scenario 2 Economically Viable Counties at 18% ITC

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 76%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

Map 30: Scenario 2 Economically Viable Counties at 12% ITC

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 71%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

Map 31: Scenario 2 Economically Viable Counties at 0% ITC

% OF COUNTIES VIABLE: 60%

20% to 100%
10% to 20%
5% to 10%
0% to 5%

FUTURE MARKET POTENTIAL: SCENARIO 2	30% ITC		24% ITC		18% ITC		12% ITC		0% ITC	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total U.S. Counties	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-
Economically Viable Counties	2,784	89%	2,576	82%	2,399	76%	2,233	71%	1,890	60%

Takeaway

This analysis reveals that Scenario 2 expands the SM in the U.S. at a 0% ITC rate. One Energy expects to be able to offer a PPA rate that is lower than the current grid rate in 1,890 counties (60% of all U.S. counties).

Scenario 2 increased the deployable capital potential of the General Industry Market Extrapolation from $62 billion to $101 billion. Increased grid rates have a positive impact on *Wind for Industry's* deployable capital.

SCENARIO 2 0% ITC Rate	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
SM		
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	45%	45%
Total Deployable MW	135	33,960
Deployable Capital (MM)	$250	$62,826
SCENARIO 2		
% of Facilities Economically Viable	80%	80%
# of Viable Scenario 2 Facilities	61	12,186
Total Deployable MW	270	60,930
Deployable Capital (MM)	$450	$101,448
Increase in Deployable Capital (MM)	$200	$38,622
% Change in Deployable Capital	80%	61%

SCENARIO 2 0% ITC Rate	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
SM					
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	86%	39%	94%	42%	70%
Total Deployable MW	240	95	1,070	460	1865
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$176	$1,980	$851	$3,450
SCENARIO 2					
% of Facilities Economically Viable	86%	75%	97%	64%	83%
# of Viable Scenario 2 Facilities	25	41	111	38	215
Total Deployable MW	250	200	1,110	760	2,320
Deployable Capital (MM)	$416	$333	$1,848	$1,265	$3,863
Increase in Deployable Capital (MM)	($28)	$157	($131)	$414	$413
% Change in Deployable Capital	-6%	89%	-7%	49%	12%

SCENARIO 2 SUMMARY Deployable Capital ITC RATE	GENERAL INDUSTRY MARKET EXTRAPOLATION MW	(MM)	ENERGY INTENSIVE SECTORS MW	(MM)	TOTAL MW	(MM)
30%	70,920	$118,082	2,755	$4,587	73,675	$122,669
24%	66,925	$111,430	2,690	$4,479	69,615	$115,909
18%	66,925	$111,430	2,645	$4,404	69,570	$115,834
12%	64,925	$108,100	2,620	$4,362	67,545	$112,462
0%	60,930	$101,448	2,320	$3,863	63,250	$105,311

Serviceable Market Growth Takeaway

The *Wind for Industry* Serviceable Market Growth analysis is defined by two scenarios. Scenario 1 projects a 10% increase in CF from expected improvements in turbine technology, and a 10% decrease in project costs as One Energy becomes increasingly efficient in project installation. Scenario 2 uses the same assumptions as Scenario 1 and projects a 5% increase in grid rates, a conservative increase from historical grid-rate trends.

As these two scenarios illustrate, One Energy expects the market for *Wind for Industry* to expand regardless of the future of the ITC rate.

EXPANSION STRATEGY

One Energy's expansion strategy ranks the states with the greatest potential for *Wind for Industry*.

Method

The final step in the market analysis is to determine the logical progression of *Wind for Industry*'s expansion. One Energy's expansion strategy will focus on the locations with the greatest potential for *Wind for Industry*. One Energy is a vertically integrated company that develops, engineers, procures, constructs, and operates *Wind for Industry* projects. When determining an expansion strategy, One Energy must consider the logistics and cost of self-performed construction and O&M. By layering a geographic analysis on the results of the technical and economic analysis of the TAM and Serviceable Market, One Energy identified the states and regions most suitable for expansion.

Moving *Wind for Industry* into a new state requires considerable upfront work from a legal, regulatory, logistic, and permitting perspective. The decision to move into a new state and complete the required upfront work needs to consider the market potential of that state. If a state has significant market potential (many potential customers, attractive project pricing, high manufacturing output), then it is deemed a preferred state for expansion.

Each state's serviceability is explored by assigning it a *Wind for Industry* State Value Score. The county component of the *Wind for Industry* State Value Score is comprised of two equally weighted factors: potential customers and project pricing. The state component includes an additional factor: manufacturing output. These three are considered most vital to the success of One Energy's expansion.

To calculate each state's *Wind for Industry* State Value Score, One Energy first identified the counties within each state that had high concentrations of potential C&I customers. High concentration is defined as a county that has >75% of the nation's average manufacturing employment quotient or has a known facility in one of the TAM screened sectors[e]. This threshold is considered *high manufacturing concentration* for this analysis. Counties with high manufacturing concentration can be seen in Map 28 in orange (those with low concentration are colored in blue).

One Energy then combined the counties with high manufacturing concentration with the economic viability results of the SM. Map 29 shows only counties that have high manufacturing concentration and were economically viable. To determine the County Score, the two components were assessed for each county. Both components were scaled to a value between 1 and 5 and then summed. Values that did not meet One Energy's threshold for high manufacturing concentration and economic viability received a score of zero. A theoretically perfect county would receive a score of 10. The County Values were averaged for each state.

The final component of the State Value Score is the normalized manufacturing output[12,f]. States with higher manufacturing output make the upfront cost to move into that state more worthwhile. Each state's average score was weighted by the state's manufacturing output. The weighted scores were normalized to a maximum value of 100, comprising the final *Wind for Industry* State Value Score.

---

[12] The normalized manufacturing output was determined by dividing a state's manufacturing output in billions of dollars by the largest manufacturing output of an individual state. The state with the highest manufacturing output thus had a weight of one and all other states had a weight of less than one.[f]

COUNTY SCORE PROCESS

Manufacturing Concentration Score
0 1 — 5

Economic Viability Score
0 1 — 5

County Score
0 1 — 10

↓

Repeat for all Counties in State

Average all Counties in State

STATE SCORE PROCESS

State Score
0 — 10

Manufacturing Output Weighting

Preliminary *Wind for Industry* State Value Score

Normalize to 100

Final *Wind for Industry* State Value Score
0 — 100

↓

Repeat for all States

COUNTY SCORE EXAMPLE

Manufacturing Concentration Score **2.1**

Economic Viability Score **1.8**

County Score **3.9**

↓

All Ohio Counties

| Average of all Counties in State | = | State Score |

STATE SCORE EXAMPLE

State Score **2.4**

↓

Prelim Score **0.9**

↓

State Value Score **49.4**

↓

All States

ONE ENERGY

Results

Map 32: U.S. Manufacturing Concentration by County, 2019

Map 33: Economically Viable Counties Filtered for Manufacturing at 0%

There are **860** economically viable counties with manufacturing in the continental U.S.

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which PPA rate < grid rate

20% to 100%

10% to 20%

5% to 10%

0% to 5%

| ONE ENERGY EXPANSION STRATEGY RESULTS			
	STATE	STATE VALUE SCORE	CUMULATIVE SCORE	% OF TOTAL
1	California	100.0	100.0	12%
2	Indiana	60.4	160.4	20%
3	Michigan	53.9	214.3	26%
4	Ohio	49.4	263.7	33%
5	Massachusetts	45.7	309.5	38%
6	Texas	38.4	347.9	43%
7	Illinois	38.2	386.1	48%
8	Wisconsin	36.7	422.8	52%
9	Minnesota	33.6	456.4	56%
10	New Jersey	28.9	485.3	60%
11	Pennsylvania	28.2	513.5	63%
12	Connecticut	26.7	540.2	67%
13	North Carolina	25.0	565.2	70%
14	Iowa	20.7	585.9	72%
15	Missouri	17.9	603.8	74%
16	Kansas	17.9	621.7	77%
17	Tennessee	16.7	638.4	79%
18	New York	13.5	651.9	80%
19	Georgia	13.3	665.1	82%
20	Alabama	11.9	677.1	84%
21	South Carolina	11.1	688.2	85%
22	Virginia	10.1	698.3	86%
23	Washington	9.7	708.0	87%
24	Maryland	9.5	717.6	89%
25	Nebraska	9.2	726.8	90%
26	Kentucky	8.8	735.6	91%
27	New Hampshire	8.3	743.9	92%
28	Louisiana	7.6	751.5	93%
29	Oregon	6.8	758.3	94%
30	Colorado	6.7	765.0	94%
31	Arkansas	5.1	770.2	95%
32	Rhode Island	5.0	775.2	96%
33	Mississippi	4.5	779.6	96%
34	Oklahoma	4.1	783.8	97%
35	Maine	3.8	787.6	97%
36	Florida	3.6	791.2	98%
37	South Dakota	3.3	794.5	98%
38	Delaware	2.6	797.1	98%
39	North Dakota	2.4	799.4	99%
40	Vermont	2.3	801.7	99%
41	Utah	2.0	803.7	99%
42	Arizona	1.6	805.3	99%
43	Idaho	1.5	806.8	100%
44	West Virginia	1.3	808.1	100%
45	Nevada	1.0	809.1	100%
46	Wyoming	0.7	809.8	100%
47	New Mexico	0.5	810.3	100%
48	Montana	0.3	810.6	100%

Takeaway

As can be seen in Map 30, six of the top ten states (Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota) are located in the Midwest, making capturing this market One Energy's ideal expansion strategy. While California has the highest State Value Score, approximately one third of the U.S.'s total score value can be obtained in the Midwest. This concentration of value is ideal from an expansion perspective. Focusing the expansion strategy in one region will make One Energy's self-perform business model more feasible to execute; construction and O&M costs will be minimized by growing the business within one geographic area. Expanding *Wind for Industry* to the top ten scoring states would capture 60% of the total value in the U.S. The Midwest states indicated capture over 30% of the total value in the U.S., making them a viable strategy for initial expansion.

KEY RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

One Energy's market analysis quantified *Wind for Industry*'s potential in the continental U.S. One Energy identified the Total Addressable Market (technically viable), the Serviceable Market (economically viable), Serviceable Market Growth, and *Wind for Industry's* Expansion Strategy. The key takeaways from this analysis include:

1. The *Wind for Industry* Serviceable Market in the continental U.S. is estimated at $66 billion in deployable capital based on a 0% Investment Tax Credit under current business model conditions (35,825 MW).

2. With a 30% Investment Tax Credit the Serviceable Market nearly doubles to $120 billion (65,345 MW).

3. The Energy Intensive Sectors including Biodiesel, Cement Production, Ethanol Production, and Refining represent a $3.4 billion market for deployable capital without any Investment Tax Credit (1,865 MW).

4. As economies of scale and known technology improvements become fully effective, the *Wind for Industry* Serviceable Market will increase to $95 billion in deployable capital without any Investment Tax Credit (57,185 MW).

5. Approximately 20% of large commercial and industrial facilities will be able to have a technically viable and financially attractive *Wind for Industry* project as the industry reaches maturity.

6. The Investment Tax Credit is not critical to the success of the *Wind for Industry* market.

7. *Wind for Industry's* potential has a sizeable concentration in the Midwest states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. These states are known for having a large manufacturing presence and good wind resource.

8. Texas and California markets each represent a substantial standalone opportunity.

As of January 2020, there are approximately 105,000 MW of wind energy in the U.S. The *Wind for Industry* market represents a substantial growth opportunity for wind energy expansion in the U.S. Due to several barriers to entry (the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this report), less than 200 MW of distributed on-site wind have been deployed to date in the continental U.S. As a result, nearly the entire $66 billion market is available to be captured by companies equipped to overcome these barriers.

REFERENCES

[a] National Renewable Energy Lab, Geospatial Data Science. Wind Integration National Dataset (WIND) Toolkit. https://www.nrel.gov/gis/wind.html. Accessed May 11, 2020.

[b] National Aeronautics and Space Administration EarthData. Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications version 2. https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/SSW/. Accessed May 11, 2020.

[c] U.S. Census Bureau. 2017 SUSB Annual Data by Establishment Industry. https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2017/econ/susb/2017-susb-annual.html. Accessed July 24, 2020.

[d] U.S. Energy Information Administration. Electricity: sales (consumption), revenue, prices & customers (EIA-861M). https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data.php#sales. Published October 18, 2019. Accessed February 7, 2020.

[e] Bureau of Labor Statistics. Quarterly census of employment and wages. United States Department of Labor. https://www.bls.gov/cew/datatoc.htm. Last Modified June 3, 2020. Accessed June 3, 2020.

[f] National Association of Manufacturers. 2019 United States Manufacturing Facts. https://www.nam.org/state-manufacturing-data/2019-united-states-manufacturing-facts/. Accessed July 28, 2020.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDICES

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A
KEY TERMS

APPENDIX A

KEY TERMS

Capacity factor (CF): the ratio of the actual power output over a period of time to the theoretical maximum output if generation was at rated capacity continuously for the same time period.

Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC): a federal financial incentive that is a one-for-one credit against a net tax liability.

Grid rate: electricity costs to a consumer purchasing power from the national electric grid. The 2018 average industrial rate per state was used as the grid rate throughout this analysis.

Kilowatt hour (kWh): 1,000 watts of electricity used for one hour.

Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS): a standard implemented by California to incentivize cleaner fuel. The standard sets performance metrics on cleaner hydrocarbon fuels and assigns a monetary value to the carbon used to create the fuel.

Megawatt (MW): a unit of power equivalent to 1,000,000 watts.

Power Purchase Agreement (PPA): a contract between an energy provider and a customer who wishes to purchase energy at a predetermined rate for an extended period of time.

Renewable Energy Agreement (REA): One Energy's version of PPA.

Serviceable Market (SM): The segment of the TAM where *Wind for Industry* projects are economically viable.

Total Addressable Market (TAM): the available revenue opportunity for a product or service. One Energy's TAM is defined as the percentage of C&I facilities that could support a *Wind for Industry* project based on technical factors. The TAM is comprised of the General Industry Market Extrapolation and the Energy Intensive Sectors.

Wind for Industry: a wind energy project designed to achieve a significant reduction of a C&I facility's electrical consumptions from the grid. These projects involve installing one or more utility-scale turbines and interconnecting them on the facility's side of their utility meter.

APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL DATA
INFORMATION

APPENDIX B

ADDITIIONAL DATA INFORMATION

Wind-Resource Data

Data from two sources was used in the analysis: 50-meter long-term wind speed data from NASA's Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications version 2 (MERRA2) and 80-meter average wind speed data from NREL's WIND Toolkit. 30 years of data from 81 MERRA2 nodes over nine states were utilized in the analysis. The WIND Toolkit data provided an average wind speed on a county level.

Each MERRA2 node was used to calculate an Annual Energy Production (AEP) value using the turbine power curve. A linear relationship was formed between the 30-year average wind speed and AEP. To calculate the capacity factor for each county, the linear relationship generated using MERRA2 was applied to the WIND Toolkit county average wind speed data.

The One Energy Project Finance Model was used to establish a baseline PPA rate for project CFs ranging from 16% – 70% based on the assumptions of a 4.7 MW project and no wake loss. PPA rates in correlation to CFs were established for five different ITC levels (30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0%). Each county was then assigned an expected PPA rate for each ITC rate based on the county's previously calculated CF.[a,b]

Average Electricity-Rate Data

The 2018 average industrial grid rate data was downloaded from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). From the original data, the 2018/State/All Utilities/Industrial End Users information was extracted. The average industrial electricity rate in each state was then applied to each county in the state. Although the average commercial grid rate was also considered for analysis, the average industrial grid rate was utilized to remain conservative.[d]

Manufacturing Concentration by County Data

The concentration of manufacturing by county was obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. The 1975 – 2019 Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) data at the county level was utilized. The data was provided on a per-county basis. For this analysis, the Employment Location Quotient Relative to the U.S. was used for the manufacturing industry. A quotient cutoff of 0.75 was used to generate the manufacturing-filtered maps; this criterion was selected because this is sufficiently representative of a high concentration of manufacturing employers in an area.[e]

APPENDIX C
PPA RATES

APPENDIX C

PPA RATES

The following PPA rates were determined using One Energy's financial model and were used when calculating the current SM. The rates cited are constant un-escalated 20-year rates that match One Energy's typical PPA-rate structure and yield an acceptable project internal rate of return (IRR). Given the rates are constant, these figures also represent average rates.

		ITC RATE				
		30%	24%	18%	12%	0%
	16%	0.1130	0.1199	0.1275	0.1350	0.1500
	17%	0.1059	0.1130	0.1200	0.1270	0.1411
	18%	0.0998	0.1064	0.1131	0.1197	0.1330
	19%	0.0943	0.1006	0.1069	0.1132	0.1258
	20%	0.0888	0.0952	0.1013	0.1073	0.1192
	21%	0.0846	0.0903	0.0960	0.1017	0.1131
	22%	0.0806	0.0860	0.0914	0.0969	0.1078
	23%	0.0769	0.0821	0.0873	0.0925	0.1029
	24%	0.0735	0.0785	0.0834	0.0884	0.0984
	25%	0.0704	0.0751	0.0799	0.0847	0.0943
	26%	0.0675	0.0721	0.0767	0.0813	0.0905
	27%	0.0648	0.0692	0.0737	0.0781	0.0870
	28%	0.0623	0.0666	0.0709	0.0751	0.0837
	29%	0.0600	0.0641	0.0682	0.0724	0.0806
	30%	0.0578	0.0618	0.0658	0.0698	0.0778
	31%	0.0558	0.0597	0.0635	0.0674	0.0751
	32%	0.0539	0.0577	0.0614	0.0651	0.0726
	33%	0.0521	0.0558	0.0594	0.0630	0.0703
	34%	0.0505	0.0540	0.0575	0.0610	0.0681
	35%	0.0489	0.0523	0.0557	0.0591	0.0660
	36%	0.0474	0.0507	0.0540	0.0574	0.0640
	37%	0.0460	0.0492	0.0524	0.0557	0.0621
	38%	0.0446	0.0478	0.0509	0.0541	0.0604
	39%	0.0434	0.0464	0.0495	0.0526	0.0587
CAPACITY	40%	0.0421	0.0451	0.0481	0.0511	0.0571
FACTOR	41%	0.0410	0.0439	0.0468	0.0498	0.0556
	42%	0.0399	0.0428	0.0456	0.0485	0.0542
	43%	0.0389	0.0416	0.0444	0.0472	0.0528
	44%	0.0379	0.0406	0.0433	0.0460	0.0515
	45%	0.0369	0.0396	0.0422	0.0449	0.0502
	46%	0.0360	0.0386	0.0412	0.0438	0.0490
	47%	0.0351	0.0377	0.0402	0.0428	0.0479
	48%	0.0343	0.0368	0.0393	0.0418	0.0468
	49%	0.0335	0.0359	0.0384	0.0408	0.0457
	50%	0.0327	0.0351	0.0375	0.0399	0.0447
	51%	0.0320	0.0343	0.0367	0.0390	0.0437
	52%	0.0313	0.0336	0.0359	0.0382	0.0428
	53%	0.0306	0.0329	0.0351	0.0374	0.0419
	54%	0.0299	0.0322	0.0344	0.0366	0.0410
	55%	0.0293	0.0315	0.0337	0.0358	0.0402
	56%	0.0287	0.0308	0.0330	0.0351	0.0394
	57%	0.0281	0.0302	0.0323	0.0344	0.0386
	58%	0.0275	0.0296	0.0317	0.0337	0.0379
	59%	0.0270	0.0290	0.0310	0.0331	0.0371
	60%	0.0264	0.0284	0.0304	0.0324	0.0364
	61%	0.0259	0.0279	0.0299	0.0318	0.0357
	62%	0.0254	0.0274	0.0293	0.0312	0.0351
	63%	0.0249	0.0269	0.0288	0.0307	0.0345
	64%	0.0245	0.0264	0.0282	0.0301	0.0338
	65%	0.0240	0.0259	0.0277	0.0296	0.0332

ONE ENERGY

The following PPA rates were determined using One Energy's standard financial model, assuming a 10% decrease in installed project costs. These rates were used when calculating the Future Market Potential in Scenarios 1 and 2.

		ITC RATE				
		30%	24%	18%	12%	0%
	16%	0.1042	0.1106	0.1174	0.1238	0.1378
	17%	0.0975	0.1039	0.1102	0.1166	0.1292
	18%	0.0919	0.0978	0.1038	0.1098	0.1218
	19%	0.0868	0.0924	0.0981	0.1038	0.1151
	20%	0.0822	0.0875	0.0929	0.0983	0.1090
	21%	0.0779	0.0830	0.0881	0.0932	0.1035
	22%	0.0741	0.0790	0.0839	0.0888	0.0986
	23%	0.0707	0.0754	0.0801	0.0847	0.0941
	24%	0.0676	0.0720	0.0765	0.0810	0.0900
	25%	0.0647	0.0690	0.0733	0.0776	0.0862
	26%	0.0620	0.0661	0.0703	0.0744	0.0827
	27%	0.0595	0.0635	0.0675	0.0715	0.0795
	28%	0.0572	0.0611	0.0649	0.0688	0.0765
	29%	0.0551	0.0588	0.0625	0.0662	0.0737
	30%	0.0531	0.0567	0.0603	0.0639	0.0710
	31%	0.0512	0.0547	0.0582	0.0616	0.0686
	32%	0.0495	0.0528	0.0562	0.0596	0.0663
	33%	0.0478	0.0511	0.0544	0.0576	0.0641
	34%	0.0463	0.0494	0.0526	0.0558	0.0621
	35%	0.0448	0.0479	0.0510	0.0540	0.0602
	36%	0.0434	0.0464	0.0494	0.0524	0.0584
	37%	0.0421	0.0450	0.0479	0.0509	0.0567
	38%	0.0409	0.0437	0.0466	0.0494	0.0551
	39%	0.0397	0.0425	0.0452	0.0480	0.0535
	40%	0.0386	0.0413	0.0440	0.0467	0.0521
	41%	0.0375	0.0402	0.0428	0.0454	0.0507
	42%	0.0365	0.0391	0.0417	0.0442	0.0494
CAPACITY FACTOR	43%	0.0356	0.0381	0.0406	0.0431	0.0481
	44%	0.0346	0.0371	0.0395	0.0420	0.0469
	45%	0.0338	0.0362	0.0385	0.0409	0.0457
	46%	0.0329	0.0353	0.0376	0.0399	0.0446
	47%	0.0321	0.0344	0.0367	0.0390	0.0436
	48%	0.0313	0.0336	0.0358	0.0381	0.0426
	49%	0.0306	0.0328	0.0350	0.0372	0.0416
	50%	0.0299	0.0320	0.0342	0.0364	0.0407
	51%	0.0292	0.0313	0.0334	0.0355	0.0398
	52%	0.0285	0.0306	0.0327	0.0348	0.0389
	53%	0.0279	0.0299	0.0320	0.0340	0.0381
	54%	0.0273	0.0293	0.0313	0.0333	0.0373
	55%	0.0267	0.0287	0.0306	0.0326	0.0365
	56%	0.0261	0.0281	0.0300	0.0319	0.0358
	57%	0.0256	0.0275	0.0294	0.0313	0.0351
	58%	0.0251	0.0269	0.0288	0.0307	0.0344
	59%	0.0246	0.0264	0.0282	0.0300	0.0337
	60%	0.0241	0.0259	0.0277	0.0295	0.0331
	61%	0.0236	0.0254	0.0271	0.0289	0.0324
	62%	0.0231	0.0249	0.0266	0.0284	0.0318
	63%	0.0227	0.0244	0.0261	0.0278	0.0312
	64%	0.0223	0.0239	0.0256	0.0273	0.0307
	65%	0.0218	0.0235	0.0252	0.0268	0.0301
	66%	0.0214	0.0231	0.0247	0.0263	0.0296
	67%	0.0210	0.0226	0.0243	0.0259	0.0291
	68%	0.0207	0.0222	0.0238	0.0254	0.0286
	69%	0.0203	0.0218	0.0234	0.0250	0.0281
	70%	0.0199	0.0215	0.0230	0.0245	0.0276

ONE ENERGY

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX D
ADDITIONAL 5M ITC RESULTS

APPENDIX D

ADDITIONAL SM ITC RESULTS

SM GENERAL C&I 12% ITC Rate	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Number of Facilities Screened	269	53,743
TAM		
# of Viable Facilities	76	15,183
Average Project Size (MW)	5	5
Total Deployable MW	345	75,915
Deployable Capital (MM)	$638	$140,443
SM		
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	66%	66%
# of Viable SM Facilities	50	9,988
Total Deployable MW	215	49,940
Deployable Capital (MM)	$398	$92,389

SM ENERGY INTENSIVE SECTORS 12% ITC Rate	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
Number of Facilities Screened	97	103	200	153	553
TAM					
# of Viable TAM Facilities	28	51	114	55	248
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	5
Total Deployable MW	280	250	1,140	1,100	2,775
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$463	$2,109	$2,035	$5,134
SM					
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	89%	55%	96%	45%	76%
# of Viable SM Facilities	25	28	110	25	188
Total Deployable MW	250	135	1,100	500	1,985
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$250	$2,035	$925	$3,654

SM GENERAL C&I 18% ITC Rate	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Number of Facilities Screened	269	53,743
TAM		
# of Viable TAM Facilities	76	15,183
Average Project Size (MW)	5	5
Total Deployable MW	345	75,915
Deployable Capital (MM)	$638	$140,443
SM		
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	70%	70%
# of Viable SM Facilities	53	10,588
Total Deployable MW	230	52,940
Deployable Capital (MM)	$426	$97,939

SM ENERGY INTENSIVE SECTORS 18% ITC Rate	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
Number of Facilities Screened	97	103	200	153	553
TAM					
# of Viable TAM Facilities	28	51	114	55	248
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	5
Total Deployable MW	280	250	1,140	1,100	2,775
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$463	$2,109	$2,035	$5,134
SM					
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	89%	65%	96%	58%	81%
# of Viable SM Facilities	25	33	110	32	200
Total Deployable MW	250	160	1,100	640	2,150
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$296	$2,035	$1,184	$3,959

ONE ENERGY

APPENDIX E
REVENUE

APPENDIX E

REVENUE

The balance of this report was based on deployable capital. This appendix provides an approximation of annual revenue instead of deployable capital.

One Energy calculated the revenue of the SM at 0% ITC. The revenue was calculated at 30%, 35%, and 40% CF at $0.06/kWh to remain conservative in revenue estimates. One Energy's operating projects were not included in the calculation of deployable megawatts, production, or revenue.

SM TOTAL REVENUE 0% ITC RATE, 30% CF	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Total Viable Facilities	24	20	107	23	34	6,792
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	5	5
Total Deployable MW	240	95	1,070	460	135	33,960
Production (kWh)	630,720,000	249,660,000	2,811,960,000	1,208,880,000	354,780,000	89,246,880,000
Revenue ($0.06/kWh)	$37,843,200	$14,979,600	$168,717,600	$72,532,800	$21,286,800	$5,354,812,800

SM TOTAL REVENUE 0% ITC RATE, 35% CF	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Total Viable Facilities	24	20	107	23	34	6,792
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	5	5
Total Deployable MW	240	95	1,070	460	135	33,960
Production (kWh)	630,720,000	249,660,000	2,811,960,000	1,208,880,000	354,780,000	89,246,880,000
Revenue ($0.06/kWh)	$37,843,200	$14,979,600	$168,717,600	$72,532,800	$21,286,800	$5,354,812,800

SM TOTAL REVENUE 0% ITC RATE, 40% CF	BIODIESEL	CEMENT	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING	MARKET EXTRAPOLATION
Total Viable Facilities	24	20	107	23	34	6,792
Average Project Size (MW)	10	5	10	20	5	5
Total Deployable MW	240	95	1,070	460	135	33,960
Production (kWh)	840,960,000	332,880,000	3,749,280,000	1,611,840,000	473,040,000	118,995,840,000
Revenue ($0.06/kWh)	$50,457,600	$19,972,800	$224,956,800	$96,710,400	$28,382,400	$7,139,750,400

APPENDIX F
ADDITIONAL MARKET OPPORTUNITY

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL MARKET OPPORTUNITY

LOW CARBON FUEL STANDARD (LCFS)

One Energy identified a market opportunity within the C&I sectors that could improve the economic viability at many facilities across the US. This opportunity is the Low Carbon Fuel Standard imposed by the state of California on all transportation fuels being sold within the state. This section discusses the opportunity in further detail and explores the financial impact on the Serviceable Market.

Method

In recent years, there has been increased scrutiny on C&I facilities' carbon emissions and a push towards more sustainable business practices. While *Wind for Industry* projects benefit companies trying to meet sustainability goals, the customer's primary driver for on-site wind is (and will continue to be) the financial bottom line. One Energy has identified a financial incentive market that puts monetary value on a customer's ability to lower their carbon emissions. This market makes *Wind for Industry* projects more financially attractive and expands the SM to new customers not previously considered.

California has implemented a Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) to incentivize cleaner fuel. The standard sets performance metrics on cleaner hydrocarbon fuels and assigns a monetary value to the carbon used to create the fuel. Transportation fuels with a lower carbon intensity (CI) score receive a higher dollar-per-gallon credit, which creates a quantifiable incentive for suppliers to reduce CI.

One Energy has identified that *Wind for Industry* projects can significantly reduce the CI of transportation fuels by directly powering facilities behind the meter, or, according to LCFS language, "inside the fence." CI is calculated by assessing the emissions in the complete lifecycle of a fuel and is expressed in CO_2 equivalent per unit of energy (gCO_2e/MJ). If a fuel uses less carbon during any part of its lifecycle, including electricity consumed during processing, its CI goes down. Renewable energy must be utilized in a behind-the-meter application to directly offset energy consumption from the grid. This is exactly what One Energy offers with *Wind for Industry*. One Energy has identified numerous oil, biodiesel, and ethanol facilities that could utilize on-site wind energy to reduce their CI (for example, the sectors highlighted in the TAM).

CI reduction holds a quantifiable monetary value for qualifying facilities that would increase the financial attractiveness of a *Wind for Industry* project in a way that is unique to the transportation fuels industry. In some cases, the CI improvement value is higher than the actual cost of the energy. This results in *Wind for Industry* projects that are particularly financially attractive for both One Energy and the customer.

In the analysis, One Energy assumed the LCFS monetary value to the customer to be $0.03/kWh, $0.05/kWh, and $0.07/kWh. These assumptions are based on values that One Energy has obtained from an existing relationship with a major LCFS producer. The value varies with location, so these values were chosen to show a conservative range. The analysis does not include the assumptions from Scenarios 1 and 2. The LCFS value was added into the 20-year PPA rate using five different ITC rates (30%, 24%, 18%, 12%, and 0%). As with the SM calculation, the new 20-year PPA rate was then compared to the grid rate in that area. If the 20-year fixed PPA rate was lower than the average current grid rate, the county was identified as Economically Viable.

The economically viable counties were compared to the areas of high manufacturing concentration. The results below show the economically viable counties with high manufacturing concentration (green), and the economically viable counties without high manufacturing concentration (gray).

While the LCFS value currently only applies when selling into the California market, other states are exploring similar standards.

Results

LCFS MARKET POTENTIAL *3 Cents*	30% ITC		24% ITC		18% ITC		12% ITC		0% ITC	
	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%
Total U.S. Counties	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-
Economically Viable Counties	3,022	96.2%	2,973	94.6%	2,883	91.8%	2,796	89.0%	2,410	76.7%
Economically Viable Counties with High Manufacturing Concentration	2,020	64.3%	1,982	63.1%	1,914	60.9%	1,852	58.9%	1,594	50.7%

ONE ENERGY

LCFS MARKET POTENTIAL	30% ITC		24% ITC		18% ITC		12% ITC		0% ITC	
5 Cents	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%
Total U.S. Counties	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-
Economically Viable Counties	3,092	98.4%	3,076	97.9%	3,061	97.4%	3,036	96.6%	2,954	94.0%
Economically Viable Counties with High Manufacturing Concentration	2,072	65.9%	2,059	65.5%	2,049	65.2%	2,030	64.6%	1,970	62.7%

LCFS MARKET POTENTIAL	30% ITC		24% ITC		18% ITC		12% ITC		0% ITC	
7 Cents	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%	COUNT	%
Total U.S. Counties	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-	3,142	-
Economically Viable Counties	3,100	98.7%	3,099	98.6%	3,092	98.4%	3,086	98.2%	3,086	98.2%
Economically Viable Counties with High Manufacturing Concentration	2,080	66.2%	2,080	66.2%	2,072	65.9%	2,067	65.8%	2,053	65.3%

3 Cent LCFS Market at 0% ITC

5 Cent LCFS Market at 0% ITC

7 Cent LCFS Market at 0% ITC

Takeaway

This analysis reveals that LCFS expands the SM in the U.S. at a 0% ITC rate. With a 3 cent LCFS incentive, One Energy expects to be economically attractive to facilities in 2,410 counties (76.7%) and in 1,594 counties with customer potential (50.7%). With a 5 cent LCFS incentive, One Energy expects to be economically attractive to facilities in 2,954 counties (94.0%) and in 1,970 counties with customer potential (62.7%). With a 7 cent LCFS incentive, One Energy expects to be economically attractive to facilities in 3,086 counties (98.2%) and in 2,053 counties with customer potential (65.3%).

The LCFS allows One Energy to reach more customers and to be more financially attractive to those customers. With an LCFS credit of 3 cents, the market increased the overlap of economically viable counties and high manufacturing concentration by 85.3%. The LCFS potential essentially opens the door for economically viable *Wind for Industry* projects at qualifying facilities across the U.S.

ONE ENERGY

www.oneenergy.com

The LCFS has a positive impact on *Wind for Industry*'s deployable capital in the applicable sectors. Since LCFS potential only applies to transportation fuels at this time, the deployable capital potential only increased in those sectors.

LCFS MARKET POTENTIAL *3 CENTS, 0% ITC*	BIODIESEL	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
SM				
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	86%	94%	42%	74%
Total Deployable MW	240	1,070	460	1,770
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$1,980	$851	$3,275
LCFS – 3 CENTS				
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	100%	100%	89%	96%
Total Deployable MW	280	1,140	980	2,400
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$2,109	$1,813	$4,440

LCFS MARKET POTENTIAL *5 CENTS, 0% ITC*	BIODIESEL	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
SM				
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	86%	94%	42%	74%
Total Deployable MW	240	1,070	460	1,770
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$1,980	$851	$3,275
LCFS – 5 CENTS				
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	100%	100%	96%	99%
Total Deployable MW	280	1,140	1,060	2,480
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$2,109	$1,961	$4,588

LCFS MARKET POTENTIAL *7 CENTS, 0% ITC*	BIODIESEL	ETHANOL	REFINERIES	TOTAL
SM				
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	86%	94%	42%	74%
Total Deployable MW	240	1,070	460	1,770
Deployable Capital (MM)	$444	$1,980	$851	$3,275
LCFS – 7 CENTS				
% of TAM Facilities Economically Viable	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Deployable MW	280	1,140	1,100	2,520
Deployable Capital (MM)	$518	$2,109	$2,035	$4,662

ONE ENERGY

APPENDIX G
FULL-PAGE MAPS

MAP 1: U.S. AVERAGE WIND SPEEDS AT 80 METERS

Wind Speed m/s

- >10.5
- 10.0
- 9.5
- 9.0
- 8.5
- 8.0
- 7.5
- 7.0
- 6.5
- 6.0
- 5.5
- 5.0
- 4.5
- 4.0
- < 4.0

Manufacturing Employment Concentration

0.00 ◼◼◼◼◼◼◼◼◼◼◼◼ 5.00

▬▬▬▬ IDEAL WIND RESOURCE STATES

MAP 2: MANUFACTURING CONCENTRATION BY COUNTY, 2019

**MAP 3: AVERAGE COMMERCIAL ELECTRICITY RATES ($/kWh), 2018**

Average Industrial Rates (cents)

3.00 — 15.00

━━━━━ IDEAL WIND RESOURCE STATES

MAP 4: AVERAGE INDUSTRIAL ELECTRICITY RATES ($/kWh), 2018

Primary Source
- Batteries
- Biomass
- Coal
- Geothermal
- Hydroelectric
- Natural Gas
- Nuclear
- Other
- Petroleum
- Pumped Storage
- Solar
- Wind

Total MW
- 0
- 2,000
- 4,000
- 6,000
- 7,079

IDEAL WIND RESOURCE STATES

MAP 5: U.S. POWER GENERATION FACILITIES, 2020

MAP 6: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAMPLING LOCATIONS

MAP 7: BIODIESEL SECTOR LOCATIONS

Legend:
- Not Viable
- Viable

MAP 8: CEMENT SECTOR LOCATIONS

Not Viable

Viable

MAP 9: ETHANOL SECTOR LOCATIONS

Not Viable

Viable

MAP 10: REFINING SECTOR LOCATIONS

Not Viable
Viable

MAP 11: ALL FACILITY LOCATIONS

Not Viable
Viable

Understanding the Analysis

% difference from rate break-even

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%   PPA rate < grid rate
- 0%   PPA rate = grid rate
- 0% to -5%
- -5% to -10%   PPA rate > grid rate
- -10% to -20%
- -20% to -100%

MAP 12: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 30% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

% difference from rate break-even

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%   PPA rate < grid rate
- 0% to 5%
- 0%   PPA rate = grid rate
- 0% to -5%
- -5% to -10% PPA rate > grid rate
- -10% to -20%
- -20% to -100%

MAP 13: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 24% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

% difference from rate break-even

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%   *PPA rate < grid rate*
- 0% to 5%
- 0%   *PPA rate = grid rate*
- 0% to -5%
- -5% to -10%   *PPA rate > grid rate*
- -10% to -20%
- -20% to -100%

MAP 14: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 18% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

% difference from rate break-even

■ 20% to 100%	
■ 10% to 20%	
■ 5% to 10%	PPA rate < grid rate
■ 0% to 5%	
■ 0%	PPA rate = grid rate
■ 0% to -5%	
■ -5% to -10%	
■ -10% to -20%	PPA rate > grid rate
■ -20% to -100%	

MAP 15: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 12% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

% difference from rate break-even

■ 20% to 100%	
■ 10% to 20%	PPA rate < grid rate
■ 5% to 10%	
■ 0% to 5%	
□ 0%	PPA rate = grid rate
■ 0% to -5%	
■ -5% to -10%	PPA rate > grid rate
■ -10% to -20%	
■ -20% to -100%	

MAP 16: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 0% ITC

MAP 17: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE SCREENED FACILITIES AT 30%

**MAP 18: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE SCREENED FACILITIES AT 24%**

Legend:
- Not Viable (red)
- Viable (green)

MAP 19: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE SCREENED FACILITIES AT 18%

Legend:
- Not Viable (red)
- Viable (green)

MAP 20: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE SCREENED FACILITIES AT 12%

Legend:
- Not Viable (red)
- Viable (green)

Not Viable

Viable

MAP 21: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE SCREENED FACILITIES AT 0%

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 22: SCENARIO 1 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 30% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 23: SCENARIO 1 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 24% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 24: SCENARIO 1 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 18% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

*Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate*

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 25: SCENARIO 1 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 12% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 26: SCENARIO 1 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 0% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 27: SCENARIO 2 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 30% ITC

**MAP 28: SCENARIO 2 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 24% ITC**

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 29: SCENARIO 2 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 18% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

*Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate*

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 30: SCENARIO 2 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 12% ITC

Understanding the Analysis

Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 31: SCENARIO 2 ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES AT 0% ITC

Manufacturing Employment Concentration

0.00 ████████████████████ 5.00

▬▬▬▬▬ IDEAL WIND RESOURCE STATES

MAP 32: MANUFACTURING CONCENTRATION BY COUNTY, 2019

Understanding the Analysis

*Percent by which
PPA rate < grid rate*

- 20% to 100%
- 10% to 20%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%

MAP 33: ECONOMICALLY VIABLE COUNTIES FILTERED FOR MANUFACTURING AT 0%

MAP 34: Wind for Industry STATE VALUE SCORE RANKINGS

Understanding the Analysis
State Ranking

- 1 - 10
- 11 - 20
- 21 - 30
- 31 - 40
- 41 - 48