

EarthArXiv Coversheet

Title: Meteorological Drivers of Resource Adequacy Failures in Current and High Renewable Western U.S. Power Systems

Authors:

Srihari Sundar

sriharis@umich.edu, Twitter: @srisun14

Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Michael T. Craig

mtcraig@umich.edu, Twitter: @TheEnergyCraig

School for Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Ashley Payne

Tomorrow.io, Boston, MA, USA

David J. Brayshaw

Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK

Flavio Lehner

Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Climate and Global Dynamics Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA

This preprint is under review at *Nature Communications* and is not peer reviewed.

Meteorological Drivers of Resource Adequacy Failures in Current and High Renewable Western U.S. Power Systems

Srihari Sundar^{1*}, Michael T. Craig^{2*}, Ashley Payne³, David J. Brayshaw⁴ and Flavio Lehner^{5,6}

^{1,*}Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

^{2,*}School for Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

³Tomorrow.io, Boston, MA, USA.

⁴Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK.

⁵Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA.

⁶Climate and Global Dynamics Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): sriharis@umich.edu; mtcraig@umich.edu;

Abstract

Power system resource adequacy (RA), or its ability to continually balance supply and demand, underpins human and economic health. How meteorology affects RA, particularly with increasing penetrations of renewables, is poorly understood. We characterize large-scale circulation patterns that drive RA failures at increasing wind and solar penetrations by integrating power system and synoptic meteorology methods. At up to 60% renewable penetration and across analyzed weather years, three high pressure patterns drive nearly all RA failures. The highest pressure anomaly is the dominant driver, accounting for 46-100% of risk hours and 57-100% of cumulative risk. The three high pressure patterns exhibit positive surface temperature anomalies, mixed surface solar radiation anomalies, and negative wind speed anomalies across our region, which collectively increase demand and decrease supply.

Our characterized meteorological drivers align with meteorology during the California 2020 rolling blackouts, indicating continued vulnerability of power systems to high pressure anomalies as renewables grow.

Keywords: power system resource adequacy, power system reliability, large-scale circulation patterns, meteorological drivers, Western Electricity Coordinating Council, capacity expansion, self-organizing maps

Access to reliable, or uninterrupted, and low-cost electricity underpins human health, and well-being [1]. Designing a reliable system while minimizing costs is the central objective of power system planning [2]. Reliability partly depends on maintaining resource adequacy (RA), which is the ability to continually balance electricity supply (or generation) and demand despite the occurrence of unexpected events [3]. RA failures are often responsible for large-scale outages (or blackouts), e.g. in California in 2020 [4] and Texas [5] in 2021.

Meteorology affects RA through effects on electricity supply and demand. In bulk power systems dominated by thermal electricity generators, surface air temperature is the main meteorological driver of supply and demand. Low and high surface air temperatures affect demand through increased use of building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) for heating and cooling, respectively [6, 7]. Surface air temperature also affects supply. Specifically, extreme heat increases deratings of thermal power plants [8, 9] and solar photovoltaics, while extreme cold and heat increases forced outage rates of thermal and hydroelectric power plants [10].

Two trends complicate the link between meteorology and RA: (1) increasing penetrations of wind and solar power, and (2) non-stationary meteorology driven by natural variability and anthropogenic climate change. Since wind and solar power are a function of wind speeds and solar irradiance, increasing wind and solar power penetrations will increasingly link electricity supply to these meteorological variables. Wind speeds and solar irradiance exhibit significant spatio-temporal variability [11, 12] and forecast and projection uncertainty [13, 14], complicating RA assessment. Non-stationary meteorology driven by intensifying climate change further complicates RA assessment. As historical meteorology becomes increasingly non-representative of future meteorology, RA assessment will need to increasingly rely on projected future meteorological timeseries to account for the transient nature of the current climate state. However, generating high-quality meteorological projections that account for climate change remains an active area of research limited by methodological uncertainties, and computational power [15]. Generating high-quality future meteorological timeseries is especially challenging at the high spatio-temporal resolution (e.g., hourly) typically required for RA analyses [16].

In response to these challenges, this paper aims to better understand the meteorological drivers of RA and how investment decisions in renewable energy affect those drivers. Better understanding these relationships is crucial for

several reasons. First, the meteorology that drives (and co-occurs with) RA failures will determine human health impacts, which can be highly heterogeneous across space and socioeconomic groups [17]. Better understanding the link between decarbonization and drivers of failures can shed light on investment needs in bulk power systems and communities to mitigate possible health impacts and achieve more equitable outcomes. Second, characterization of historic meteorological drivers can guide in evaluating, selecting, and downscaling general circulation models, which is essential for making informed adaptation investments in the power sector [18, 19]. Third, once meteorological drivers of RA failures are characterized, long-range probabilistic forecasting at the sub-seasonal to seasonal scale can act as a more informed early warning system for system operators and emergency preparedness organizations [20].

We characterize meteorological drivers of RA failures using weather regimes. Weather regimes represent atmospheric circulation as belonging to a finite number of states or patterns [21, 22]. These states are constructed by applying clustering techniques to variables representing large-scale atmospheric flows, e.g., geopotential height. The resulting large-scale patterns have strong associations with surface-level meteorological variables that directly affect the power system, including extreme surface air temperatures [23–25]. The patterns persist over large spatial and temporal scales, and unlike the high-frequency variations exhibited by surface meteorology, the patterns’ spatio-temporal variations are better captured by GCMs. Previous research has sought to link the changes in frequency and return periods of these large-scale patterns with the occurrence of extreme events under a changing climate using data from GCMs [26–29].

Our research contributes to two literatures. The first literature analyzes meteorological drivers in the power system, but does not consider RA, a gap that we fill. Within this set, a few studies examine meteorological drivers of periods of low renewable generation or high net demand (demand minus renewable generation) [30–33]. Meteorological drivers in these papers include surface meteorology and atmospheric circulation during these periods. Further, other studies describe weather regimes as drivers of renewable generation, variability, and net demand in the European power system [34–36]. The second literature analyzes RA, but does not consider meteorological drivers, a gap that we also fill. In this broad RA umbrella, studies quantify the effect of using different RA metrics on reserve procurement decisions [37] and capacity values [38]. Other studies quantify the contribution of generators [39, 40] and transmission [41] to RA. A final group of studies quantify system RA under changing generator and/or weather. For instance, Turner et. al. [42] quantify RA changes (in probability and magnitude) driven by decarbonization decisions and climate change impacts on electricity demand and hydropower generation in the Pacific Northwest.

To address these gaps, we answer the following research questions: What large-scale circulation patterns drive regional resource adequacy? And how do these drivers change with increasing wind and solar penetrations? We conduct

our study for the U.S. Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) footprint given its rapid growth in wind and solar penetrations, aggressive wind and solar targets, and recent resource adequacy failure [43].

Our analytical pipeline uses methods from power system and synoptic meteorology domains [Figure 1]. We first construct fleets that generate increasing levels of wind and solar electricity (hereafter "renewable electricity" or RE) using a capacity expansion model (CEM) (see Methods.3.2). The CEM is a deterministic linear program that minimizes fixed plus variable costs by determining capacity investments in and/or operations of wind, solar, hydropower, natural gas combined cycle (NGCC), and electricity storage facilities. Investment and operational decisions are subject to numerous constraints, including hourly balance of supply and demand. To capture co-variability and extremes in electricity demand and wind and solar generation, we use observed hourly electricity demand for WECC [44] and coincident RE capacity factors (see Methods.3.5.3). We then quantify a RA profile for each fleet from the CEM using a resource adequacy model (RAM), which simulates stochastic forced outages of generators using a non-sequential Monte Carlo sampling procedure with 10000 samples and finds hours (see Methods.3.3). We use empirically-derived temperature-dependent forced outage rates for NGCC and hydropower facilities and constant outage rates for other generators [10, 45]. The reliability profile output by the RAM identifies hours with a loss of load probability (LOLP) greater than 0.005, which we refer to as "risk hours". Finally, to characterize the meteorological drivers of RA failure, we map the 500hPa geopotential height (Z500) anomalies in these risk hours to the western US extended summer weather regimes. These regimes are constructed based on May - September daily Z500 anomalies from a 40 year period using self organizing maps (SOM), and each regime is represented by a characteristic weather pattern (WP) (see Methods.3.4.1). The characteristic WPs show regimes with varying Z500 anomalies over the region, ranging from positive anomalies (high pressure systems) to negative anomalies (low pressure systems) [Figure 1 "Weather Regimes" panel]. The WPs corresponding to regimes identified based on the risk hours characterize the large-scale patterns contributing to RA failures. By running this integrated modeling framework for four weather years (2016 through 2019) and RE penetrations (13%, 20%, 40%, and 60%), we quantify the effect of increasing renewables on meteorological drivers of RA and the robustness of this effect across weather years. While using four weather years does not necessarily sample the full distribution of possible weather events and associated impacts on RA, it does cover over 35,000 hours and permits us to use observed hourly electricity demand with coincidental wind and solar generation.

1 Results

We divide our results into two sections. First, we quantify the effect of increasing renewable penetrations on meteorological drivers of risk hours for a single




Fig. 1: Our analytical pipeline uses a capacity expansion model (CEM) to construct generator fleets with increasing renewable penetrations and different weather years. Maps show the sizes and locations of facilities for 13% renewables penetration and 2019 weather. These fleets are input into a resource adequacy model (RAM) to quantify hourly loss of load profiles (LOLPs), yielding a resource adequacy (RA) profile. We then map the hours in the RA profile to weather regimes, which we identify with self-organizing maps (SOMs) applied to 500hPa geopotential height (Z500) anomalies. Depicted weather regimes are the SOM outputs for extended summer months, with positive anomalies (high pressure systems) in the bottom-left and negative anomalies (low pressure systems) in the top-right. By varying renewable penetrations and weather years, we characterize meteorological drivers of risk hours (or periods of low RA). Red arrows depicting attribution of risk hours to weather regimes is for illustrative purposes only.

weather year (2019). Second, we repeat this analysis to characterize meteorological drivers of risk hours across multiple weather years at increasing renewable penetrations.

1.1 Meteorological drivers under increasing renewable penetrations for the 2019 weather year

Using our CEM, we construct generator fleets in which RE generation accounts for increasing percentages of annual demand. As renewable penetrations increase from 13% (or current levels) to 60% of annual demand, wind and solar capacities increase from 28 GW to 141 GW and from 22 GW to 112 GW, respectively, while NGCC capacities decrease from 107 GW to 75 GW [Figure 2(A)]. Figure 2(B) depicts each system's RA profile by showing the magnitude of hourly LOLP and timing of risk hours. Across renewable penetrations, all risk hours occur in summer and early fall months (i.e., June through September). Most risk hours occur between 3 and 6 PM Pacific Standard Time (PST), but occur as early and late as 12 and 7 PM PST (UTC-08:00). As renewable

penetrations increase from 13% to 60%, the number of risk hours decrease from 68 and 50 and increasingly concentrate into the period between 4 and 6 PM PST. The decrease in risk hours is driven by increasing available generation in many hours of the year, including in hours that previously had low LOLPs. In these hours, increasing available generation results from wind and solar capacity increases exceeding NGCC capacity decreases. As risk hours decrease, hourly LOLPs increase. For instance, as renewable penetrations increase from 13% to 60%, maximum LOLPs increase from 0.17 to 0.26 [Figure SI.8].




Fig. 2: For the 2019 weather year this Figure SI.hows: (A) Installed capacities of technologies with increasing renewable penetrations. (B) For each renewable penetration, (i) hourly LOLPs across the entire year (i.e., the RA profile) and (ii) the date and hour of day (in PST) when RA failures occur, where the size of star is proportional to the LOLP and the legend shows marker size for LOLP=1. An LOLP of 0.1 indicates demand exceeds available capacity in 10% of the 10,000 simulated hours in the RA model. (C) For each renewable penetration, number of risk hours (blue lines) and cumulative LOLP (orange lines) attributed to each weather regime, where WPs correspond to figure 1.

To attribute RA failures to WPs, we map each risk hour to the prevailing weather regime, then quantify the number of risk hours and cumulative LOLP in each regime [Figure 2(C)]. The cumulative LOLP equals the sum of LOLPs across hours mapped to a given weather regime, so is a function of the number of risk hours in a given weather regime and the LOLP in each of those hours. The cumulative LOLP also equals the expected loss of load hours (LOLH) attributed to each regime. Using either number of risk hours or cumulative LOLP metrics, WPs 8,9, and 10 predominantly drive RA failures across renewable penetrations [Figure 2(C)]. These WPs correspond to high pressure anomalies that cover the entire Western US (as shown in Figure 1). Of those WPs, WP 9 accounts for most RA failures, e.g. 45-56% of risk hours and 57-65% of cumulative LOLP across renewable penetrations. Apart from WPs 8-10, only WPs 7 and 11 account for any RA failures, but these WPs

account for less than 3% of risk hours and 1.5% of cumulative LOLP across renewable penetrations.

The relative importance of WPs in driving RA failures is robust across increasing renewable penetrations for the 2019 weather year. As renewable penetrations increase from 13% to 60%, the number of risk hours driven by WP 8 consistently decrease from 20 to 11, respectively, while the numbers of risk hours driven by WPs 9 and 10 exhibit an overall decrease, from 31 to 28 and from 14 to 9, respectively. Increasing renewable penetrations have the opposite effect on cumulative LOLP driven by WPs 9 and 10, indicating increasing LOLPs in risk hours attributed to each WP. As renewable penetrations increase from 13% to 60%, the cumulative LOLPs driven by WPs 9 and 10 increase slightly from 1.3 to 1.5 and from 0.5 to 0.6, respectively [Figure 2(C)]. Conversely, cumulative LOLPs driven by WP 8 decrease from 0.5 to 0.2.

Mechanistically, surface meteorology, not high-pressure anomalies in the middle atmosphere, impact power system RA. To understand how the high pressure anomalies in WPs 8, 9, and 10 drive RA failures, we analyze surface meteorology corresponding to each weather regime [ref. methods 3.4.2]. We find that these WPs correspond to positive surface temperature anomalies, mixed surface solar radiation anomalies, and negative wind speed anomalies across WECC [Figure 3]. Positive temperature anomalies lead to higher generator forced outages and demand. Concurrently, negative solar radiation anomalies lead to lower solar generation. While surface solar radiation anomalies are not negative across WECC, they are largely negative in the Southwest where large amounts of solar capacity are installed [Figure 1]. WPs 8, 9, and 10 also exhibit WECC-wide negative wind speed anomalies, which drive negative anomalies in wind generation. Notably, each of these WPs include surface meteorology anomalies that reduce RA at low and high renewable penetrations, explaining the robustness of these three WPs in driving most RA failures at renewable penetrations ranging from 13% to 60%. Of these three WPs, WP 9 is the largest driver of RA failures across renewable penetrations because it has the largest positive temperature anomaly, largest negative solar anomaly over the Southwest, and largest negative wind speed anomaly over the entire region. Other WPs (i.e., WPs 1-7 and 11-12) do not exhibit the same combination of surface temperature, wind speed, and solar radiation anomalies that WPs 8-10 do, explaining their relative unimportance in driving RA failures.

1.2 Meteorological drivers across different weather years

The above discussion examines drivers of RA failures across renewable penetrations for a single weather year, 2019. Given significant inter-annual variability in meteorology and climate, we repeat our above analysis across four weather years (2016 through 2019) or the duration of our combined data timeseries. This approach treats each meteorological year as an independent observation, allowing us to quantify the robustness of our results to different weather years.

Across weather years and renewable penetrations, solar and wind capacities output by the CEM do not significantly differ across years. For instance,




Fig. 3: Composites of surface temperature (A), surface solar radiation (B), and 100 m wind speeds (C) anomalies. The composites are constructed based on the hours from the 2019 extended summer belonging to each weather regime.

at 60% renewable penetration, solar capacities range from 107 to 113 GW, and wind capacities range from 134 to 140 GW across weather years [Figure SI.9(a)]. NGCC capacities exhibit a similar range across weather years, e.g., ranging from 107 to 119 GW at 60% renewable penetration [Figure SI.9(a)]. Our results regarding the number of risk hours and maximum LOLPs are also largely insensitive to different weather years. Specifically, across weather years, risk hours decrease and maximum LOLPs increase with increasing renewable penetrations [Figure SI.9(b)]. For instance, in 2017, risk hours decrease from 47 to 13 and maximum LOLPs decrease from 23% to 62% when renewable penetrations increase from 13% to 60%.

Meteorological drivers of RA failures are also robust to weather years [Figure 4]. WPs 8, 9, and 10, which are all high pressure anomalies, drive most RA failures across all weather years. Collectively, these WPs drive 92% to 100% of all risk hours and 98% to 98% of cumulative LOLP across weather years. Furthermore, WP9 emerges as an even more dominant driver of RA failures in 2016 through 2018 than in 2019. In weather years 2016 through 2018, WP9 accounts for cumulative LOLPs of 2.2 to 2.3 for renewable penetrations of 13% to 40%, relative to 1.3 to 1.5 in 2019 [Figure 4B]. At 60% RE penetrations, WP9 is still the largest driver in all weather years, accounting for 1.5 to 2.35 cumulative LOLP or 64% to 100% of total cumulative LOLP. WP9 occurs more frequently in 2016-2018 than in 2019 [Figure SI.12], which could explain its larger role in driving RA failures than WPs 8 and 10 in 2016-2018 relative to in 2019. The surface meteorology associated with WPs 8-10 in

weather years 2016-2018 show similar trends of positive temperature anomalies, negative wind speed anomalies, and negative solar radiation anomalies in the Southwest as in 2019 [see Figures S10-12].




Fig. 4: A - Number of risk hours attributed to each weather regime across the weather years with increasing RE generation levels; B - Cumulative LOLP attributed to each weather regime across the weather years with increasing RE generation levels.

2 Discussion

Maintaining power system RA, and reliability more broadly, faces challenges from evolving supply- and demand-side technologies and non-stationary meteorology. In response to these challenges, this paper characterized meteorological drivers of RA failures by integrating power system and meteorological methods. We found that RA failures in WECC are driven by WPs corresponding to high pressure anomalies (WPs 8,9, and 10 in Figure 1) over the region. These WPs led to high surface air temperatures and low wind speeds across WECC and with low solar irradiance in areas with solar PV facilities. These meteorological conditions caused compounding impacts on electricity supply and demand, ultimately resulting in risk of resource inadequacy (i.e., RA failures). As renewable penetrations increase, the risk of RA failures increasingly concentrates within the WP with the highest pressure anomaly (WP9). Our findings are robust across analyzed weather years (2016 - 2019).

Rolling blackouts in California in the summer of 2020 support our results. On August 14 and 15, the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) instituted rotating electricity outages during an "extreme heat storm" covering much of the WECC system [4]. These rotating outages were necessitated by higher-than-predicted demand and supply shortages. While we are not able to include 2020 in our analysis due to data limitations, we can analyze atmospheric circulation prevailing during August 14 and 15 using our reanalysis data [Methods 3.5]. We find that the atmospheric circulation on these two days exhibits a high pressure anomaly over the Pacific northwest [Figure SI.13]. This

pattern resembles the high pressure WP in our analysis - WP9 - that accounts for most RA failures. Moreover, our SOM identifies the circulation pattern on August 14 and 15 as belonging to WP9. Thus, the California rotating outages provide real-world evidence for the meteorological drivers of RA failures that we identify in our analysis.

While outages threaten human health and well-being regardless of prevailing meteorology, outages during extreme heat can be particularly life threatening [17]. The robustness of high pressure anomalies driving RA failures at renewable penetrations up to 60% suggests that high temperature anomalies will continue to accompany RA failures. Consequences of outages could have disproportionate impacts on vulnerable populations [46], particularly when they align with extreme heat events [47]. Any disparities in outcomes during outages between income groups could widen as upper income individuals increasingly procure distributed energy systems. Our results indicate a long-term need to ensure vulnerable communities have access to potentially lifesaving cooling during outages, e.g., through investing in community hubs at public buildings [48].

Anthropogenic climate change is already affecting weather and climate, including by increasing surface air temperatures across the Western United States [49]. Using the ERA5 reanalysis dataset, we find some evidence for an increase in the frequency of weather regimes with high pressure anomalies from 1981 through 2020 in the extended summer months [Figure SI.14]. During this period, WPs 8, 9, and 10 (high pressure anomalies) occur more frequently, while WPs 1 and 4 (low pressure anomalies) occur less frequently. Increasing and decreasing trends of WPs 4 and 9, respectively, over the last 40 years are statistically significant (p-values less than 0.05) based on a simple linear regression with year as the independent variable and percent of days with the WP as the dependent variable. Specifically, WP9 shows an increase of 0.3 extended summer days per year while WP4 shows a decrease of 0.2 days per year. Given that we found high pressure anomalies, particularly WP9, drive RA failures, their increasingly frequent occurrence might result in more frequent challenges to maintaining RA. More rigorous analyses are needed to discern and attribute WP trends to aspects of the earth system dynamics, including natural variability versus anthropogenic changes. Better understanding how these WPs will evolve under a changing climate [26] would better inform the risk that climate change poses to RA.

Our research offers several opportunities for extensions. First, to capture co-variability between supply and demand, our analysis is limited to four weather years. To capture long-term climate variability, future research could extend our analysis to multi-decadal timespans using historic data from reanalyses or future data from climate models. This expansion faces several challenges, though, including estimating electricity demand and obtaining high resolution climate model outputs. Second, given data and computational tractability limits, our power system models do not capture the role of transmission infrastructure in driving resource adequacy. Accounting for transmission would

reveal regional heterogeneity in resource adequacy and meteorological drivers. In neglecting transmission, we also miss the effect of weather patterns on transmission infrastructure, although transmission systems are also vulnerable to high temperature anomalies [50]. Third, in linking specific weather patterns to resource adequacy failures, our research suggests climate downscaling methods designed, trained, and/or validated on these types of weather patterns could be highly valuable in bridging the disconnect between climate and energy system modelling [16]. Additionally, our results suggest RA analyses using future climate data could focus on weather regimes documented here, which could enable a greater computational focus on climate-related uncertainty.

3 Methods

3.1 Area of study

Our area of study is the Western Interconnection, which is the region within the continental United States overseen by the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC). We choose the WECC system for its high existing wind and solar installed capacities, its strong wind and solar resources, its large geographic area which makes it susceptible to large scale meteorology, and its vulnerability to climate change in the near-term. Climate change has already reduced system reliability in WECC, with extreme heat and drought exacerbated by climate change driving outages in California in 2020 [4]. In 2020, WECC demand totaled 724 TWh, with solar and wind generation meeting roughly 6% and 7%, respectively, of demand [51]. We ignore the transmission system within WECC, a common simplification in macro-scale energy system modeling [52, 53], to maintain computational tractability while capturing a full year of hourly meteorology in our CEM.

3.2 Capacity expansion

We use a capacity expansion model (CEM) to project capacity investments across WECC that are needed to meet increasing renewable generation requirements. The CEM is a deterministic linear program that minimizes fixed plus variable costs by deciding investments in and operations of generators while meeting numerous constraints. More specifically, the model decides investment in combined cycle natural gas (NGCC), wind, solar, and storage capacity; hourly generation from NGCC, wind, solar, and hydropower plants; and hourly charging and discharging from storage. Wind and solar capacity investment decisions occur at specific coordinates throughout WECC (see 3.5.3), while natural gas and battery storage capacity investment decisions occur at the interconnection level. We assume that existing hydroelectric capacity remains constant through all the scenarios, no new investment in hydroelectric capacity occurs, and generation decisions occur at the WECC level. We restrict electricity generation to this simplified set of technologies for three reasons. First, coal and other aging generators are rapidly retiring and being replaced by

wind, solar, and NGCC [54]. Second, while other types of generating facilities might persist for reasons other than electricity generation, these other types of facilities, e.g. combustion turbines, have similar underlying drivers of outages as NGCCs. Thus, we do not expect substitutions to substantially affect our results. Third, simplifying including generator types allows us to maintain computational tractability while running our CEM across WECC and all hours in a given year.

The CEM includes several system- and generator-level constraints. At the system level, the CEM requires total generation to meet demand in each hour. To approximate system reliability standards, the CEM includes a 15% planning reserve margin, which requires derated capacity to exceed peak demand by at least 15%. Derated capacity accounts for hourly wind and solar generation potential during the peak demand hour, and for scheduled maintenance and unscheduled outages at NGCC and hydropower generators. At the generator level, generation can vary between zero and maximum capacities output by the CEM. Wind and solar generation is also limited by hourly, spatially-specific wind and solar capacity factors (see 3.5.3) while total monthly hydropower generation is limited to historic monthly generation for the modeled weather years (see 3.5). The CEM also includes operational constraints on electricity storage units. These constraints limit each unit's generation to its state of charge in each hour, and track the state of charge over time given charging and discharging decisions. To examine generator fleets with increasing RE penetrations, the CEM requires total RE generation to meet a percent of total annual demand (see section 3.6 for specification of target levels).

In the real-world, wind and solar is deployed as a function of geography, economics, policy, institutions, transmission access, and other factors, some of which are not quantifiable or publicly available. To capture these factors, we constrain our model's installed RE generation sites to current RE locations. Specifically, the CEM's decision variables related to wind and solar capacity investment are two scaling factors. Location-specific wind and solar capacities output from the CEM equal the relevant scaling factor times existing installed wind or solar capacities in each location. This approach maintains the relative distribution of capacity across locations, enhancing real-world insights that can be drawn from our research. In our analyzed scenarios, the CEM also includes a constraint that sets the wind and solar scaling factors to be equal, thereby maintaining the existing ratio between total installed wind and solar capacity. Without this constraint, we find that the CEM indicates only solar investments and no wind investments upto RE penetrations of 40% across all the weather years. Since the CEM optimizes for WECC-wide capacity of NGCC and storage and generation from hydropower, we do not include any location-specific constraints for these assets.

CEM inputs are historical hourly WECC-wide demand data; historical hourly spatially-explicit wind and solar capacity factors; locations and installed capacities for existing solar and wind plants; monthly WECC-wide hydropower generation and installed capacity for existing hydropower plants;

and technology-specific capital and operational costs over our study horizon. We formulate the CEM using the Pyomo optimization package [55, 56] and solve it using CPLEX version 12.6.2. CEM formulation and parameters are detailed in SI.2

After running our CEM across our analyzed renewable penetrations and weather years (see section 3.6), the CEM only invests in storage at a 60% renewable penetration for 2019. This is likely driven by two factors. First, existing hydropower and NGCC investments provide significant flexibility for integrating variable wind and solar, reducing the value of storage. Second, we use 2021 capital costs for 4-hour utility-scale battery storage. Given the lack of investment in storage from our CEM and to facilitate comparison across scenarios, we rerun 2019 at a 60% renewable penetration without storage as an investment option. In future work, we plan to explore how grid-scale storage affects meteorological drivers of RA.

3.3 Resource Adequacy Model

To quantify resource adequacy on an hourly and annual basis, we combine a Monte-Carlo-based non-sequential state sampling procedure with an optimization-based sequential dispatch procedure. The state sampling procedure randomly samples forced outages at each generator in each hour of the year 10,000 times via Monte Carlo simulation (see SI.3.1 for justification of sample size). This results in 10,000 independent capacity curves for the year, each of which are paired with observed hourly demand for the year. Forced outages are a function of location-specific ambient air temperatures for NGCCs and hydropower plants [10], are a constant rate of (0.05) for solar and wind plants [45], and are assumed to be zero for storage (see SI.3.2 for forced outage rates used).

For each capacity curve after storage dispatch occurs, we identify a loss of load event as an hour in which hourly demand exceeds available capacity. The hourly loss of load probability (LOLP) equals the probability that demand exceeds available capacity in that hour across all simulations. We refer to any hour with a $LOLP > 0.005$ to be a "risk hour".

Unlike our RAM, our CEM does not account for stochastic outages. Instead, the CEM aims to produce a resource adequate system by enforcing a planning reserve margin. To facilitate resource adequacy comparisons across future systems output by our CEM, our RAM adjusts each generator fleet until its annual resource adequacy achieves a target value. Specifically, the RAM iteratively adds or removes NGCC capacity then calculates annual resource adequacy until the annual loss of load hours ($LOLH = \sum(LOLP)$) is 2.4. This target value reflects the real-world 1-in-10 reliability standard widely adopted by utilities. After each generator fleet is adjusted, the RAM estimates the fleet's hourly and annual resource adequacy.

Inputs to the RAM include installed capacities of solar, wind, hydropower, and NGCC plants from the CEM; hourly hydropower generation from the CEM; hourly surface air temperatures; and forced outage rates. The CEM

provides location-specific installed capacities for solar and wind power; WECC-wide installed capacities for NGCCs and storage; and WECC-wide hourly generation from hydropower consistent with each RE penetration level. We do not re-dispatch hydropower in our RAM for two reasons: (1) doing so is computationally intractable and (2) CEM captures the changes in hydropower dispatch which can be expected within each month from the increased wind and solar generation, albeit it does not capture the changes for the whole year [see SI.3.3]. To sample outages from realistically-sized power plants, we disaggregate installed capacities and (in the case of hydropower) generation from the CEM into realistic power plant capacities [see SI.3.4].

3.4 Meteorological analysis

3.4.1 Weather regimes

To characterize meteorological drivers of risk hours, we begin by identifying the weather regimes and corresponding circulation patterns that coincide with risk hours. To identify weather regimes in our study region (WECC), we use self-organizing maps (SOMs), which is an unsupervised neural-network-based clustering technique. Unlike other hierarchical and non-hierarchical clustering techniques, SOMs cluster input data into nodes that form a topological representation in which node proximity indicates their similarity. Previous studies have identified weather regimes with SOMs in other contexts, e.g. to quantify the frequency and persistence of weather regimes associated with heat waves [57] and extreme precipitation events [58] in a warming climate.

We create our SOMs using seasonal anomalies of the daily average 500 hPa geopotential height (Z500) for the extended summer season (May through September, or "MJJAS") from 1981-2020. We analyze an extended summer season because our risk hours occur in June through September, so we focus on the warmest months of the year without narrowly constraining our SOMs to a small subset of months. We use Z500 because it captures synoptic-scale atmospheric processes and their relationship with surface meteorology, is persistent over multiple days, and is widely used for weather typing in the US and Europe [25, 32, 59, 60]. To produce the SOM, we use the MiniSom Python package [61] with the following parameterization: grid shape of 3 rows and 4 columns, a *gaussian* neighborhood function, sigma (i.e., spread of neighborhood function) value of 2, learning rate of 0.1, and 5,000 training iterations. These parameter values provide a concise weather regime representation that balances quantization and topographic error [see SI.4].

3.4.2 Surface meteorology

While daily Z500 anomalies are a meaningful variable for weather regime identification via SOMs, the power system is directly affected not by Z500 but rather by surface meteorological variables. Thus, for each weather regime identified by our SOM, we make composite maps of hourly anomalies in surface

temperature, surface solar radiation, and near surface wind speed. To calculate these hourly anomalies, we calculate the MJJAS seasonal hour-of-day mean over the 40 years of surface weather data (yielding 24 mean values), then subtract this seasonal hour-of-day mean from each hourly data point. Using these hourly anomalies, we construct composite maps for every weather year analyzed (2016-2019) in a two step process. First, we map each day from the extended summer months to a weather regime by passing daily Z500 anomaly into the SOM. Second, for every hour of each day that belong to each weather regime, we average the hourly surface meteorology anomalies to get the composite surface meteorological anomalies under each weather regime. For solar radiation anomaly composites, we choose only the daylight hours region wide (6AM to 8PM PST) to avoid biasing the composites towards the hours with very low solar radiation.

3.5 Data Description

3.5.1 Demand data

We get hourly WECC electricity demand from a database of screened and imputed data based on observed demand [44]. Due to limited availability of observed hourly electricity demand, the database provides four full years of WECC demand from 2016 through 2019. Though there are techniques to back-cast electricity demand based on meteorological and societal factors, these methods exhibit large errors, particularly in predicting extreme demand values [7, 62]. Since demand extremes are a major factor in RA, we opt for observational rather than backcasted demand values.

3.5.2 ERA5 Reanalysis Data

Given that identification of weather regimes requires long-term (multi-decadal) weather data, we use reanalysis weather data for our analysis. Specifically, we obtain weather data from the ERA5 reanalysis dataset [63]. We choose ERA5 because it provides wind speeds at 100 m above surface at hourly resolution, unlike other reanalyses products [64]. ERA5 is also widely used in power systems and synoptic meteorology research [24, 34, 35]. From ERA5, we specifically obtain near-surface air temperature (t2m); dewpoint temperature (tdps); air pressure (sp); zonal and meridional surface wind speeds (u10 & v10); downward shortwave solar radiation at the surface (ssrd); and zonal and meridional wind speeds at 100m level (u100 & v100). We obtain each data field at hourly temporal resolution and 30 km spatial resolution. See SI for more details.

3.5.3 Capacity Factors

We derive solar capacity factors directly from the surface downwelling short-wave radiation data for a EFG-Polycrystalline silicon photovoltaic module using the formulation described by Jerez et. al. [65] [See SI 1.1]. We calculate

wind capacity factors using the formulation described by Karnauskas et. al. [66] and the composite 1.5 MW IEC class III turbine from the System Advisor Model [67] [See SI 1.2]. For more details, see the SI.

3.5.4 Technology and Costs

We obtain 2021 technology-specific capital costs and operational parameters for the CEM from the NREL Annual Technology Baseline (ATB) (SI Table 1)[68]. For NGCC operational costs, which equal fuel costs times heat rate [68] plus variable O&M costs [68], we use 2021 natural gas prices of 3.133 \$/MMBtu and heat rate of 8888.75 Btu/kWh from the U.S. EIA [69]. We use a capital recovery period of 30 years for all technologies with a discount rate of 7%. For grid-scale storage, we model 4-hour battery storage with a round trip efficiency (RTE) of 0.8 and decay rate (DR) of 1.5% per month.

3.6 Scenarios

To capture the effect of increasing renewable penetrations on meteorological drivers of reliability, we run four scenarios of increasing wind plus solar penetrations: 13% (current penetration [51]), 20%, 40%, and 60%. These scenarios are enforced in the CEM by constraining annual wind plus solar generation to equal to a percentage of annual electricity demand. Given significant inter-annual variability in meteorology and climate, we run our modeling framework for each renewable scenario for each year of available electricity demand data (2016 through 2019). This approach treats each meteorological year as an independent observation, allowing us to quantify the robustness of our results to different weather years.

Declarations

The authors have no competing interests to declare. Code and data produced for this analysis will be available at a public repository.

Acknowledgments. The results contain modified Copernicus Climate Change Service information 2020. Neither the European Commission nor ECMWF is responsible for any use that may be made of the Copernicus information or data it contains. SS would like to thank the open source knowledge contributors that furthered this research.

References

- [1] Desa, U.N.: Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development (2016)
- [2] Pérez-Arriaga, I.J.: Regulation of the Power Sector. Springer, ??? (2014)

- [3] North American Electric Reliability Corporation: 2021 Long-Term Reliability Assessment (2021). <https://www.nerc.com/pa/RAPA/ra/Pages/default.aspx>
- [4] CPUC, CAISO, CEC: Root Cause Analysis: Mid-August 2020 Extreme Heat Wave (2021). <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Final-Root-Cause-Analysis-Mid-August-2020-Extreme-Heat-Wave.pdf>
- [5] Mays, J., Craig, M.T., Kiesling, L., Macey, J.C., Shaffer, B., Shu, H.: Private risk and social resilience in liberalized electricity markets. *Joule* (2022)
- [6] Auffhammer, M., Baylis, P., Hausman, C.H.: Climate change is projected to have severe impacts on the frequency and intensity of peak electricity demand across the united states. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**(8), 1886–1891 (2017)
- [7] Ralston Fonseca, F., Jaramillo, P., Bergés, M., Severnini, E.: Seasonal effects of climate change on intra-day electricity demand patterns. *Climatic Change* **154**(3), 435–451 (2019)
- [8] Zhai, H., Rubin, E.S., Versteeg, P.L.: Water use at pulverized coal power plants with postcombustion carbon capture and storage. *Environmental science & technology* **45**(6), 2479–2485 (2011)
- [9] Loew, A., Jaramillo, P., Zhai, H., Ali, R., Nijssen, B., Cheng, Y., Klima, K.: Fossil fuel-fired power plant operations under a changing climate. *Climatic Change* **163**(1), 619–632 (2020)
- [10] Murphy, S., Sowell, F., Apt, J.: A time-dependent model of generator failures and recoveries captures correlated events and quantifies temperature dependence. *Applied Energy* **253**, 113513 (2019)
- [11] Kumler, A., Carreño, I.L., Craig, M.T., Hodge, B.M., Cole, W., Brancucci, C.: Inter-annual variability of wind and solar electricity generation and capacity values in Texas. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **14**(4) (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaf935>
- [12] Haupt, S.E., Copeland, J., Cheng, W.Y.Y., Zhang, Y., Ammann, C., Sullivan, P.: A method to assess the wind and solar resource and to quantify interannual variability over the United States under current and projected future climate. *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* **55**(2), 345–363 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-15-0011.1>
- [13] Jia, B., Xie, Z., Dai, A., Shi, C., Chen, F.: Evaluation of satellite and reanalysis products of downward surface solar radiation over east asia: Spatial and seasonal variations. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*

- Atmospheres **118**(9), 3431–3446 (2013)
- [14] Zhang, J., Hodge, B.-M., Gomez-Lazaro, E., Lovholm, A.L., Berge, E., Miettinen, J., Holttinen, H., Cutululis, N., Litong-Palima, M., Sorensen, P., et al.: Analysis of variability and uncertainty in wind power forecasting: an international comparison. Technical report, National Renewable Energy Lab.(NREL), Golden, CO (United States) (2013)
- [15] Kotamarthi, R., Hayhoe, K., Mearns, L.O., Wuebbles, D., Jacobs, J., Jurado, J.: Downscaling Techniques for High-Resolution Climate Projections: From Global Change to Local Impacts. Cambridge University Press, ??? (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108601269>
- [16] Craig, M.T., Wohland, J., Stoop, L.P., Kies, A., Pickering, B., Bloomfield, H.C., Browell, J., De Felice, M., Dent, C.J., Deroubaix, A., et al.: Overcoming the disconnect between energy system and climate modeling. *Joule* (2022)
- [17] Stone Jr, B., Mallen, E., Rajput, M., Gronlund, C.J., Broadbent, A.M., Krayenhoff, E.S., Augenbroe, G., O’Neill, M.S., Georgescu, M.: Compound climate and infrastructure events: how electrical grid failure alters heat wave risk. *Environmental Science & Technology* **55**(10), 6957–6964 (2021)
- [18] Goodess, C.M., Palutikof, J.P.: Development of daily rainfall scenarios for southeast Spain using a circulation-type approach to downscaling. *International Journal of Climatology: A Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **18**(10), 1051–1083 (1998)
- [19] Soares, P.M., Maraun, D., Brands, S., Jury, M., Gutiérrez, J.M., San-Martín, D., Hertig, E., Huth, R., Belušić Vozila, A., Cardoso, R.M., et al.: Process-based evaluation of the value perfect predictor experiment of statistical downscaling methods. *International Journal of Climatology* **39**(9), 3868–3893 (2019)
- [20] White, C.J., Domeisen, D.I., Acharya, N., Adefisan, E.A., Anderson, M.L., Aura, S., Balogun, A.A., Bertram, D., Bluhm, S., Brayshaw, D.J., et al.: Advances in the application and utility of subseasonal-to-seasonal predictions. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 1–57 (2021)
- [21] Michelangeli, P.-A., Vautard, R., Legras, B.: Weather regimes: Recurrence and quasi stationarity. *Journal of the atmospheric sciences* **52**(8), 1237–1256 (1995)
- [22] Casola, J.H., Wallace, J.M.: Identifying weather regimes in the winter-time 500-hpa geopotential height field for the Pacific–North American sector using a limited-contour clustering technique. *Journal of Applied*

- meteorology and climatology **46**(10), 1619–1630 (2007)
- [23] Adams, R.E., Lee, C.C., Smith, E.T., Sheridan, S.C.: The relationship between atmospheric circulation patterns and extreme temperature events in north america. *International Journal of Climatology* **41**(1), 92–103 (2021)
- [24] Rogers, C.D., Kornhuber, K., Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S.E., Loikith, P.C., Singh, D.: Sixfold increase in historical northern hemisphere concurrent large heatwaves driven by warming and changing atmospheric circulations. *Journal of Climate* **35**(3), 1063–1078 (2022)
- [25] Agel, L., Barlow, M., Skinner, C., Colby, F., Cohen, J.: Four distinct northeast us heat wave circulation patterns and associated mechanisms, trends, and electric usage. *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* **4**(1), 1–11 (2021)
- [26] Fabiano, F., Meccia, V.L., Davini, P., Ghinassi, P., Corti, S.: A regime view of future atmospheric circulation changes in northern mid-latitudes. *Weather and Climate Dynamics* **2**(1), 163–180 (2021)
- [27] Faranda, D., Vrac, M., Yiou, P., Jézéquel, A., Thao, S.: Changes in Future Synoptic Circulation Patterns: Consequences for Extreme Event Attribution. *Geophysical Research Letters* **47**(15), 1–9 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL088002>
- [28] Palipane, E., Grotjahn, R.: Future projections of the large-scale meteorology associated with california heat waves in cmip5 models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **123**(16), 8500–8517 (2018)
- [29] Francis, J.A., Skific, N., Vavrus, S.J.: North American Weather Regimes Are Becoming More Persistent: Is Arctic Amplification a Factor? *Geophysical Research Letters* **45**(20), 11414–11422 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080252>
- [30] Bloomfield, H., Sutters, C., Drew, D.: Meteorological drivers of european power system stress. *Journal of Renewable Energy* **2020** (2020)
- [31] Brown, P.T., Farnham, D.J., Caldeira, K.: Meteorology and climatology of historical weekly wind and solar power resource droughts over western north america in era5. *SN Applied Sciences* **3**(10), 1–12 (2021)
- [32] van der Wiel, K., Stoop, L.P., Van Zuijlen, B., Blackport, R., Van den Broek, M., Selten, F.: Meteorological conditions leading to extreme low variable renewable energy production and extreme high energy shortfall. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **111**, 261–275 (2019)

- [33] Brayshaw, D.J., Dent, C., Zachary, S.: Wind generation's contribution to supporting peak electricity demand—meteorological insights. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part O: Journal of Risk and Reliability* **226**(1), 44–50 (2012)
- [34] van der Wiel, K., Bloomfield, H.C., Lee, R.W., Stoop, L.P., Blackport, R., Screen, J.A., Selten, F.M.: The influence of weather regimes on european renewable energy production and demand. *Environmental Research Letters* **14**(9), 094010 (2019)
- [35] Bloomfield, H.C., Brayshaw, D.J., Charlton-Perez, A.J.: Characterizing the winter meteorological drivers of the european electricity system using targeted circulation types. *Meteorological Applications* **27**(1), 1858 (2020)
- [36] Pickering, B., Grams, C.M., Pfenninger, S.: Sub-national variability of wind power generation in complex terrain and its correlation with large-scale meteorology. *Environmental Research Letters* **15**(4) (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab70bd>
- [37] Lueken, R., Apt, J., Sowell, F.: Robust resource adequacy planning in the face of coal retirements. *Energy Policy* **88**, 371–388 (2016)
- [38] Ibanez, E., Milligan, M.: Comparing resource adequacy metrics and their influence on capacity value. In: *2014 International Conference on Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems (PMAPS)*, pp. 1–6 (2014). IEEE
- [39] Bromley-Dulfano, I., Florez, J., Craig, M.T.: Reliability benefits of wide-area renewable energy planning across the western united states. *Renewable Energy* **179**, 1487–1499 (2021)
- [40] Pickering, S., Rostkowski, I., Foley, S., Huebsch, M., Claes, Z., Ticknor, D., McCalley, J., Okullo, J., Heath, B., Figueroa-Acevedo, A.: Power system resource adequacy evaluation under increasing renewables for the midwestern us. In: *2019 North American Power Symposium (NAPS)*, pp. 1–6 (2019). IEEE
- [41] Ibanez, E., Milligan, M.: Impact of transmission on resource adequacy in systems with wind and solar power. In: *2012 IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting*, pp. 1–5 (2012). IEEE
- [42] Turner, S.W.D., Voisin, N., Fazio, J., Hua, D., Jourabchi, M.: Compound climate events transform electrical power shortfall risk in the Pacific Northwest. *Nat. Commun.* **10**(1) (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07894-4>

- [43] WECC: August 2020 Heatwave Event Analysis Report (2021). <https://www.wecc.org/Reliability/August%202020%20Heatwave%20Event%20Report.pdf>
- [44] Ruggles, T.H., Farnham, D.J., Tong, D., Caldeira, K.: Developing reliable hourly electricity demand data through screening and imputation. *Scientific data* **7**(1), 1–14 (2020)
- [45] Kashefi Kaviani, A., Riahy, G.H., Kouhsari, S.M.: Optimal design of a reliable hydrogen-based stand-alone wind/pv generating system, considering component outages. *Renewable Energy* **34**(11), 2380–2390 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2009.03.020>
- [46] Busby, J.W., Baker, K., Bazilian, M.D., Gilbert, A.Q., Grubert, E., Rai, V., Rhodes, J.D., Shidore, S., Smith, C.A., Webber, M.E.: Cascading risks: Understanding the 2021 winter blackout in texas. *Energy Research & Social Science* **77**, 102106 (2021)
- [47] Klinenberg, E.: *Heat Wave: A Social Autopsy of Disaster in Chicago*. University of Chicago press, ??? (2015)
- [48] Farthing, A., Craig, M., Reames, T.: Optimizing solar-plus-storage deployment on public buildings for climate, health, resilience, and energy bill benefits. *Environmental Science & Technology* **55**(18), 12528–12538 (2021)
- [49] Vose, R., Easterling, D.R., Kunkel, K., LeGrande, A., Wehner, M.: Temperature changes in the united states. *Climate science special report: fourth national climate assessment* **1**(GSFC-E-DAA-TN49028) (2017)
- [50] Bartos, M., Chester, M., Johnson, N., Gorman, B., Eisenberg, D., Linkov, I., Bates, M.: Impacts of rising air temperatures on electric transmission ampacity and peak electricity load in the united states. *Environmental Research Letters* **11**(11), 114008 (2016)
- [51] WECC: State of the Interconnection (2021). <https://www.wecc.org/epubs/StateOfTheInterconnection/Pages/State-of-the-Interconnection.aspx>
- [52] Deshmukh, R., Phadke, A., Callaway, D.S.: Least-cost targets and avoided fossil fuel capacity in india’s pursuit of renewable energy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**(13) (2021)
- [53] Shaner, M.R., Davis, S.J., Lewis, N.S., Caldeira, K.: Geophysical constraints on the reliability of solar and wind power in the united states. *Energy & Environmental Science* **11**(4), 914–925 (2018)

- [54] Storrow, B.: And now the really big coal plants begin to close. *SCI. AM.*(Aug. 16, 2019), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/and-now-the-really-big-coal-plants-beginto-close> (2019)
- [55] Hart, W.E., Watson, J.-P., Woodruff, D.L.: Pyomo: modeling and solving mathematical programs in python. *Mathematical Programming Computation* **3**(3), 219–260 (2011)
- [56] Bynum, M.L., Hackebeil, G.A., Hart, W.E., Laird, C.D., Nicholson, B.L., Sirola, J.D., Watson, J.-P., Woodruff, D.L.: *Pyomo—optimization Modeling in Python* vol. 67, 3rd edn. Springer, ??? (2021)
- [57] Horton, D.E., Johnson, N.C., Singh, D., Swain, D.L., Rajaratnam, B., Diffenbaugh, N.S.: Contribution of changes in atmospheric circulation patterns to extreme temperature trends. *Nature* **522**(7557), 465–469 (2015)
- [58] Loikith, P.C., Lintner, B.R., Sweeney, A.: Characterizing large-scale meteorological patterns and associated temperature and precipitation extremes over the northwestern United States using self-organizing maps. *Journal of Climate* **30**(8), 2829–2847 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0670.1>
- [59] Loikith, P.C., Broccoli, A.J.: Characteristics of observed atmospheric circulation patterns associated with temperature extremes over north america. *Journal of Climate* **25**(20), 7266–7281 (2012)
- [60] Cassou, C.: Intraseasonal interaction between the madden–julian oscillation and the north atlantic oscillation. *Nature* **455**(7212), 523–527 (2008)
- [61] Vettigli, G.: MiniSom: minimalistic and NumPy-based implementation of the Self Organizing Map (2018). <https://github.com/JustGlowing/minisom/>
- [62] Ghosh, R.: Data-driven stochastic reliability assessment of the us electricity grid under large penetration of variable renewable energy resources. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University (January 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1184/R1/17939732.v1>. https://kilthub.cmu.edu/articles/thesis/Data-driven_stochastic_reliability_assessment_of_the_US_electricity_grid_under_large_penetration_of_variable_renewable_energy_resources/17939732
- [63] Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Biavati, G., Horányi, A., Muñoz Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Rozum, I., et al.: Era5 hourly data on single levels from 1979 to present. Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) Climate Data Store (CDS) **10** (2018)

- [64] Olauson, J.: Era5: The new champion of wind power modelling? *Renewable energy* **126**, 322–331 (2018)
- [65] Jerez, S., Tobin, I., Vautard, R., Montávez, J.P., López-Romero, J.M., Thais, F., Bartok, B., Christensen, O.B., Colette, A., Déqué, M., *et al.*: The impact of climate change on photovoltaic power generation in europe. *Nature communications* **6**(1), 1–8 (2015)
- [66] Karauskas, K.B., Lundquist, J.K., Zhang, L.: Southward shift of the global wind energy resource under high carbon dioxide emissions. *Nature Geoscience* **11**(1), 38–43 (2018)
- [67] Blair, N., Diorio, N., Freeman, J., Gilman, P., Janzou, S., Neises, T., Wagner, M.: System advisor model (sam) general description (version 2017.9.5). National Renewable Energy Laboratory Technical Report (2018)
- [68] Vimmerstedt, L., Akar, S., Mirletz, B., Stright, D., Augustine, C., Beiter, P., Cohen, S., Cole, W., Duffy, P., Feldman, D., *et al.*: Annual technology baseline: The 2021 electricity update. Technical report, National Renewable Energy Lab.(NREL), Golden, CO (United States) (2021)
- [69] Center, B.P.: Annual energy outlook 2021. Energy Information Administration, Washington, DC (2021)