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Abstract

Projections indicate that solar energy will constitute 55\% of total electricity capacity by 2050 in the US. Despite solar energy’s growing importance, few studies have analyzed the risks of country-wide deployments of solar infrastructure due to extreme weather events such as hurricanes. This paper presents a probabilistic framework to evaluate the performance of solar infrastructure to generate energy during hurricanes, which often cause significant outages in the US. Our novel framework integrates recent data-driven models that capture two critical and compounding factors: transient cloud conditions that decrease irradiance and high winds that can cause permanent panel damage. We apply the framework to the 2694 counties in the 38 Central and Eastern US states to elucidate the risk landscape of solar generation during hurricanes. Our results show that hurricane impacts are significant, compounding, and strikingly disproportional in the US. We show that in Florida and Louisiana, clouds rapidly reduce solar generation to 32\% and 65\%, respectively, of their normal levels with a return period of 100 years. Our results also show that damage to panels can induce more acute and permanent energy losses a few days after landfall, especially in rarer storms, e.g., causing 80\% more losses than hurricane clouds two days after landfall for 200-year events.

Synopsis: A new methodology to model solar generation during hurricanes shows substantial regional variability in the environmental risk landscape of solar infrastructure in the US.
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Introduction

Ensuring continuous electricity delivery is key to supporting communities in responding and recovering from extreme natural events. Nevertheless, the grid is far from resilient. Hurricane Maria in 2017, for example, caused one of the longest and largest power outages in modern United States (US), which left half of Puerto Rico without power for at least four months.1 Last year, Hurricane Ida damaged 30,000 utility poles, leaving 1.2 million customers without power across eight states2, ranking as the costliest disaster in the world in 2021.3 Governments are investing aggressively in upgrading the grid to enhance resilience. Through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the US Department of Energy (DOE) will provide USD 2.3 billion over the next five years to strengthen US power systems against extreme weather.4 Furthermore, through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the 2022 Energy Act, the US will invest even more ambitiously (USD 62 billion) in accelerating renewable adoption, including solar energy, to achieve net-zero electricity by 2035 and become a net-zero economy by 2050.5 Motivated by the need to plan for these large-scale investments holistically, this paper studies the large-scale risk landscape of solar generation to hurricanes across the entire Central and Eastern US.

We focus on solar panels because the US Energy Information Administration (EIA) projects them to constitute 55% of total electricity capacity by 20506 and also because they have a high potential to increase resilience when deployed as a distributed energy resource. In fact, the USD 2.3-billion investments to modernize the grid include utilizing distributed energy resources as a key pillar to enhance resilience7. For example, rooftop solar panels and behind-the-meter batteries together can provide continuous energy to communities in an outage in the main grid.7,8 Despite these opportunities, little is known about the ability of panels to generate electricity during hurricanes.

Extensive energy system models can assess disruptions in power systems,9–11 enabling the design of strategies for risk mitigation (e.g., grid hardening) or emergency response (e.g., grid operations and repairs).12–19 Nevertheless, these studies build on critical assumptions about electricity generation during extreme weather events, especially for solar energy during hurricanes. Many studies focus on damage to the distribution lines, not considering that extreme weather events also damage infrastructure for energy generation.15,17–19 Recent observations have shown extensive wind-induced failures in rooftop and ground-mounted panels after Hurricane Irma, Maria, and Dorian in 2017 and 2019.20–22 Other system models assume that energy sources remain constant during extreme weather events, neglecting transient environmental effects.12–14,16,23 Yet, hurricanes bring optically-thick clouds that can absorb and reflect light and thus decrease generation drastically, e.g., to a fifth,24 during a hurricane emergency.25

Current system models cannot capture these effects because no existing quantitative methods take them into account. These effects are complex as they are compounding and dynamic, i.e., they co-occur with conditions that vary rapidly over a storm’s lifespans. DOE, energy regulators, and utility companies must account for these acute effects to assess the risk of solar generation losses and strategize a risk-informed response to outages and an effective deployment of solar energy for grid resilience.

To address this research gap, we present a probabilistic framework to quantify solar generation during hurricanes. This framework integrates recently developed data-driven models to capture the stochasticity in panels’ structural performance and the intermittency of solar generation during hurricanes. We first apply the framework to study Miami-Dade, Florida, which faces high hurricane hazards26,27 and large-scale hurricane-triggered outages28. Then, we extend the study to the 38 Central and Eastern US states at the county level to elucidate the risk landscape of solar generation. We reveal considerable variability in solar generation risks, highlighting where and when wind-induced panel failures and cloud-driven irradiance reduction are critical. Performing energy system studies to assess the implications of these energy losses on power delivery falls outside this paper’s scope. Instead, we apply the proposed methodology to the US to create risk
maps of solar generation to help inform the response of utility operators during hurricanes and long-term investments in solar panels for grid resilience.

Materials and Methods

Compounding solar energy losses due to storms. We assess the time series of solar generation during hurricanes (Figure 1). Consider that $P$ is the solar power generated during a storm and $E$ is the total harvested energy until time $t_f$ in the hurricane emergency. Thus,

$$E = \int_{0}^{t_f} P dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

If $\overline{E}$ is the counterfactual energy, i.e., the harvested energy that would have been collected at the same site and time in the absence of the hurricane, then

$$\overline{E} = E + \Delta E_c + \Delta E_d$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

where $\Delta E_c$ and $\Delta E_d$ are the energy losses due to cloud conditions and damage to the panels, respectively. Power generation is first affected by the cloud conditions brought by hurricanes, reducing the irradiance that reaches the panel according to hurricane intensity and proximity. When the hurricane leaves and it is at a sufficient distance away from the site, $P$ will bounce back to normal levels. Thus, $\Delta E_c$ is transient. In contrast, if wind conditions are high enough, the panel will be damaged and remain unfunctional, driving power generation $P$ to be permanently 0, starting at $t = t_d$, until the panel is repaired or replaced. Thus, $\Delta E_d$ grows indefinitely, and the cumulative electricity generation $E$ will become flat at $t = t_d$ until the panel is functional again. If there is no failure, $\Delta E_d$ will always be 0.

![Figure 1. Conceptual illustration of solar generation losses during hurricanes. Left: Instantaneous solar power generation. Right: Cumulative solar energy. The dashed blue line shows solar power and accumulated energy in a non-damaged solar panel during five days, i.e., from $t = 0$ to $t = t_f$. The dotted black lines show the counterfactual scenario, energy in the absence of the hurricane, highlighting the reduction in losses from hurricane cloud conditions $\Delta E_c$ – area in black in left figure and difference between ordinates in right figure. The solid blue line shows the generation and power for a panel the is damaged at $t = t_d$ due to high hurricane winds. The panel is unable to generate energy after $t = t_d$, generating additional energy losses $\Delta E_d$ – area in blue in left figure and difference between ordinates in right figure. Notice that generation will bounce back to normal levels as soon as the hurricane leaves if the panel is undamaged. If the panel is damaged, generation will be 0 after $t = t_d$ until it is repaired or replaced. Notice this conceptualization is valid for either small residential rooftop panel arrays or large ground-mounted arrays for utility companies.](image)

To assess the relative effect of these two factors on the total solar generation, we use two multiplicative factors to characterize solar generation during hurricanes

$$E = \frac{\overline{E}}{A_cA_d}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

where $A_c$ is a reduction factor that accounts for the energy losses due to the optically thick clouds reducing irradiance and is given by

$$A_c = \frac{E}{\overline{E} - \Delta E_c}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)$$
and $A_d$ is the reduction factor that accounts for the energy losses due to failures in the solar panel structural system and is given by

$$A_d = \frac{E - \Delta E_c}{E}$$ (5)

Framework for simulating time-series of solar generation during storms. To evaluate these compounding effects, we model solar generation during storms in four stages (Figure 2). We based our assessment on ~50,000 Monte Carlo simulations to capture the spatiotemporal complexities in the factors affecting generation. We first used simulations of landfalling synthetic hurricanes representative of the current climate in the Atlantic Basin. These simulations of synthetic hurricanes track the maximum wind (and thus category $C$), storm size, and location of the hurricane’s center, which enables the computation of its distance $d$ to any site. This information is modeled at a fine temporal resolution of 2 hours, critical to capture intra-day variations of solar irradiance and rapid wind intensifications that can damage panels. In the second stage, we assess solar irradiance during hurricanes ($I^h$) using a recently developed mixed-regression model. To capture the physics of irradiance decay with hurricanes, this model estimates irradiance decay as a function of hurricane category $C$ and distance $d$ normalized by storm size. In the third stage, solar panel functionality $F$ (1 if there is no structural damage and 0 otherwise) and time-to-damage $t_d$ are estimated stochastically. To account for these impacts on the panels’ structural system, we use a study that linked the likelihood of panel damage to varying winds ($W$) in hurricanes. We further detail stage 1, 2, and 3’s models in the following subsections. In the fourth stage, we use $I^h$, $F$, and $t_d$ to compute the synthetic time-series of instantaneous solar generation $P$ and cumulative energy $E$.

---

**Figure 2.** Overview of proposed probabilistic framework to estimate the times series of solar generation during hurricanes. The analysis builds on the probabilistic modeling of hurricane hazards, solar damage due to high winds, and irradiance decays under hurricane cloud conditions to estimate the resulting solar generation.

For a panel, with efficiency $\eta$ (the ratio of energy that is converted into electricity from the solar energy reaching the panel) and area $a$, the instantaneous solar generation is
\( P = F I_h a \eta \) \hspace{1cm} (6)

If we isolate the effect of hurricane clouds (not considering panel failure), then \( F = 1 \) and

\( P = I_h a \eta \) \hspace{1cm} (7)

Additionally, in regular conditions,

\( \bar{P} = I a \eta \) \hspace{1cm} (8)

where \( I \) is irradiance in the absence of a hurricane. Thus,

\( \Delta E_c = a \eta \int_0^t (l - I_h) dt \) \hspace{1cm} (9)

We then estimate our metrics for compounding effects reducing solar generation through the factors \( A_c \) and \( A_d \). From Equation (4),

\[ A_c = \frac{a \eta \int_0^t l dt}{a \eta \int_0^t l dt - a \eta \int_0^t (I - I_h) dt} \left[ \frac{\int_0^t l dt}{\int_0^t F I_h dt} \right] \] \hspace{1cm} (10)

Similarly, from Equation (5),

\[ A_d = \frac{a \eta \int_0^t l dt - a \eta \int_0^t (I - I_h) dt}{a \eta \int_0^t F I_h dt} \left[ \frac{\int_0^t l_h dt}{\int_0^{\min(t_d, t_f)} F I_h dt} \right] \] \hspace{1cm} (11)

**Limiting behavior of compounding factors.** Using L’Hospital’s rule for the limiting behavior of \( A_c \),

\[ \lim_{t_f \to \infty} A_c = \frac{\int_0^t l dt}{\int_0^t F I_h dt} = \lim_{t_f \to \infty} \frac{l}{l_h} \] \hspace{1cm} (12)

Because the hurricane eventually leaves or gets dissipated,

\[ \lim_{t_f \to \infty} I_h = \lim_{t_f \to \infty} I \] \hspace{1cm} (13)

Thus,

\[ \lim_{t_f \to \infty} A_c = 1 \] \hspace{1cm} (14)

In the case of \( A_d \), if the panel does not fail, then \( F = 1 \), and \( t_d = \infty \). Thus,

\[ A_d = \frac{\int_0^t l_h dt}{\int_0^t l_h dt} = 1 \] \hspace{1cm} (15)

If the panel fails, \( t_d < \infty \) and
Solar Irradiance during storms. $I^h$ is the irradiance, e.g., Global Horizontal Irradiance, during hurricane conditions and can be estimated as

$$I^h = I e^{f(R,C)}$$

(17)

where $I$ is irradiance under normal conditions, i.e., without a hurricane, at the time and location of interest. $f(R,C)$ is an irradiance decay equation as a function of the normalized proximity from the site to the hurricane center $R$ and hurricane intensity $C$. This irradiance model was recently calibrated to ~0.75 M data points and high-resolution spatiotemporal dataset of Global Horizontal Irradiance (GHI) from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). Notice that $R$ and $C$ are highly variable in time, thus $I^h$ is highly dynamic. Furthermore, $I^h$ is stochastic as $I$ is also random. Equation (17) implies that if $I$ is modeled with a lognormal distribution, $I^h$ is also lognormally distributed, with a logarithmic mean that is reduced by the factor $f(R,C)$. Empirically, this factor can be assessed as

$$f = \begin{cases} 
(0.0965C + 1.97) \ln \left( \frac{R + (-0.126C + 1.15)}{2.48 - 0.139C} \right) & R + (1.15 - 0.126C) < 1 \\
1 & R + (1.15 - 0.126C) \geq 1 
\end{cases}$$

(18)

where $C$ is the hurricane intensity in the Saffir-Simpson wind scale and $R$ is the distance from the site of interest to the hurricane center, normalized by the hurricane’s radius of the outermost closed isobar (ROCI). ROCI is estimated from the synthetic storms’ size using an empirical equation. Supplementary Figure 1 shows $f$ for multiple values of $C$ and $R$. Following the procedure in Ceferino et al., 2022, irradiance at the site is sampled using a lognormal distribution fitted to each county’s 20-year history of irradiance, for every two hours during the lifespan of each synthetic hurricane.

Damage to panels during storms. High hurricane winds increase the likelihood of panels’ structural failure and loss of functionality. The functional form of damage likelihood, i.e., fragility function, is typically defined as a cumulative density function of the logarithm, and it uses natural hazards’ intensities as input, like maximum wind for hurricanes or spectral acceleration for earthquakes. Accordingly, we utilized the following fragility function recently calibrated with a ground-truth data on panel structural performance after Hurricane Irma and Maria in 2017 and Dorian in 2019.

$$q = \phi \left( \frac{\ln(W) - \ln(80)}{0.32} \right)$$

(19)

where $W$ (m/s) is 3-second gusts at a site. Supplementary Figure 2 shows $q$ for multiple values of $W$. Damage is only caused by high-intensity hurricanes. For hurricanes reaching a category of 1, $W$ is 42 m/s (after transforming 1-m sustained winds to 3-second gusts with an empirical formula), and $q$ is only 0.02. It takes an intensity of 4 ($W = 74$ m/s) to increase the probability of failure to 0.4. In our model $F$ equal 1 until $t_q$ and 0 after. If the panel is undamaged, then the time to failure $t_d = \infty$. Thus, $t = \infty$ with probability of $1 - q_{max}$, where $q_{max}$ is the maximum $q$ induced at the site of interest during the lifespan of the hurricane. Otherwise, if $t_d < \infty$, i.e., there is a failure.
We modeled the time to failure stochastically, with probability of failure at time \( t \) proportional to the varying values of \( q \) during the hurricane’s lifespan. While high-resolution and high-fidelity structural analysis models may better capture \( t_d \), this simplified approach accounts for the fact that it is more likely to have failures during the highest wind conditions imposed by hurricanes.

**Hurricane Simulation.** We used a synthetic hurricane database with 5018 landfalling storms in the United States’ Atlantic Coast, and simulated 10 time series of solar generation for each storm, reaching to \( \sim 50,000 \) simulations. The synthetic hurricanes were generated in a previous study\(^{30} \) using a statistical-deterministic tropical cyclone model. These synthetic hurricanes account for current climate conditions, representative of hurricane activity from 1980 to 2005 according to the National Center for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) reanalysis. The model that generates these storms consists of three stages: a probabilistic genesis model; a probabilistic beta-advection motion model; and a deterministic model that captures how environmental factors influence storm development and intensity.\(^{34} \) The model solves the synthetic storms’ tracks, maximum sustained winds, and radii of maximum winds, and we use its results at 2-hour intervals. We estimated the total wind fields with a complete wind profile model\(^{35} \) and background winds.\(^{36} \) According to the current hurricane occurrence rate, the total \( \sim 50,000 \) simulations are representative of \( \sim 15,000 \) years of simulation of solar generation during storms.

**Results and Discussion**

We studied the impact of a large number of synthetic storms\(^{30} \) making landfall on the US Atlantic Coast. The storm simulations account for current climate conditions and include the assessment of the synthetic storms’ tracks, sizes, and wind fields at 2-hour intervals. We determined \( A_c \) and \( A_d \) at this high temporal resolution to capture intermittency of solar generation within a day and its seasonal variability during storms, which occur at different monthly rates.\(^{37} \)

To capture different risk levels, we use our probabilistic approach to estimate the return periods (\( RPs \)) for the total reduction factor, \( A_cA_d \), as the inverse of the annual exceedance rates \( \lambda \). Using the \( n \) Monte Carlo simulations, we computed the empirical estimate of this rate as

\[
\hat{\lambda}(A_cA_d > x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} 1\{A'_cA'_d > x\}}{T}
\]

where \( x \) is the threshold of interest. The summation computes the number of simulations (with index \( i \)) that exceed the threshold, and \( T \) is the equivalent number of years of simulation. We followed a similar procedure to calculate the \( RPs \) for \( A_c \) and \( A_d \).

**Risk of Solar Generation in Miami-Dade.** We utilized our proposed framework to first generate \( \sim 50,000 \) Monte Carlo simulations of the time series of \( P \) and \( E \) in Miami-Dade, Florida (Supplementary Figure 3). We characterized the occurrence of energy losses probabilistically, estimating different levels of total reduction factor, i.e., \( A_cA_d \) (Equation (3)), and their associated return periods \( RP \) (Equation (20)). The total reduction factor was assessed for the total harvested solar energy starting the day before hurricane landfall, i.e., \( t = 0 \), because important energy losses also occur when the hurricane’s center is still on the ocean but nearing the coastline.\(^{25,38} \)

Our simulations capture how more extreme events (longer \( RP \)) trigger larger solar energy losses, i.e., large total reduction factors \( A_cA_d \), across the wide range of return periods at landfall, and one (\( t_f = 24h \)), two (\( t_f = 48h \)) and three (\( t_f = 96h \)) days after (Figure 3a). We show that frequent events will induce large energy generation losses, with total reduction factors increasing sharply in the initial return period range. Miami-Dade will lose 70, 63, 52, and 40% of its solar generation, i.e., \( A_cA_d \) of 3.3, 2.7, 2.1, and 1.67, at landfall, and one, two and three days after, respectively, for hurricane emergencies happening on average every 50 years (\( RP = 50 \) years).
Figure 3. Return periods for different levels of relative energy loss due to hurricanes for Miami-Dade, Florida. **Left:** The relative energy loss is depicted through total reduction factors, $A_c \times A_d$, equal to the cumulative energy harvested by the panel until landfall and one, two and three days after ($t_f = 24, 48, 72, 96h$) compared to the counterfactual event, i.e., generation in the absence of a hurricane. 95% Confidence are estimated using $\chi^2$ distributions for Poisson rate estimates and are shown as shaded areas. **Right:** The total reduction factor is decomposed in its two factors, $A_c$ and $A_d$, for cumulative energy until 72 hours after landfall ($t_f = 96h$) to highlight the contributions of cloud conditions and panel damage in the energy losses for different return periods.

**Time-variant contributions of reduction factors.** We observe that the total reduction factor is bigger at landfall than three days after for the “frequent” events (Figure 3a). However, they reach similar values, $A_cA_d$ of ~3.4 for hurricanes with $RP$ of ~90 years. For rarer events, the order flips, and energy losses increase over time after landfall in Miami-Dade, due to the varying contributions of the factors $A_c$ and $A_d$ through the wide range of return periods (Figure 3b). $A_c$ is initially bigger than $A_d$ until they reach a similar value of 1.7 for a $RP$ of ~90 years for $t_f = 96h$. This $RP$ threshold coincides with the transition from increasing to decreasing values of $A_cA_d$ as a function of $t_f$. Empirically, we demonstrate that this transition is dominated by the change in the energy loss mode, from predominantly transient and cloud-induced to permanent and damage-induced losses.

We also observe transient but strong cloud-induced energy losses especially for small $t_f$. For example, at $t_f = 6h$, i.e., 18 hours before landfall, hurricanes with $RP$ of 200 years will trigger losses of 68% (Figure 4a), almost entirely due to the hurricane clouds ($A_c = 3.1$ and $A_d = ~1$). Cloud-induced losses will reach their maximum values of 77% ($A_c = 4.4$) for $24 < t_f < 36h$ (between landfall and the 12 hours after). This observation is consistent with presence of optically thick cloud structures (with high moisture levels and vertical depths) in the hurricane eyewalls that will cover Miami-Dade after landfall. More frequent events can also induce large energy losses. Clouds from storms with $RP$ of only 9 years will induce losses of 50% ($A_c = 2$) at $t_f = 6h$. These strong cloud effects are transient. Thirteen days after landfall, $A_c$ is only 1.19, which is a modest energy loss of 11% for an extreme event with return period of 200 years (Figure 4a). Notice that in the limit, cloud-induced losses will be negligible, i.e., $A_c = 1$ (Equation (14)).
Figure 4. Time-varying behavior of compounding factors $A_c$ and $A_d$ across different return periods. **Left:** Reduction factor due to cloud conditions ($A_c$). **Right:** Reduction factor due to solar panel damage ($A_d$). The reduction factors are estimated for cumulative energy losses starting at 24 hours after landfall until different $t_f$ values, i.e., the values of $A_c$ and $A_d$ for $t_f = 6h$ correspond to cumulative since 24 hours before landfall until 18 hours before landfall.

Less frequent events ($RP > ~90$ years) can have permanent effects on energy (Figure 4b). $A_d$ is close to 1 for $RP < ~90$ years for all values of $t_f$, and then, it grows steadily as a function of the return period given that these extreme events will induce higher solar panel damage likelihoods (Supplementary Figure 2). In contrast to $A_c$, $A_d$ is close to 1 (below 1.03), i.e., no effects, until $t_f = 36h$ (12 hours after landfall) even for very extreme events with $RP$ of 1,000 years, demonstrating that storms require additional time to be near the site and damage panels. If the panel is damaged, then energy losses will grow to infinite unless the panel is repaired or replaced (Equation (16)). Accordingly, the factor $A_d$ becomes rapidly dominant for damaged panels. For storms with $RP$ of 200 years, the ratio between $A_d$ and $A_c$ is 0.4 at $t_f = 48h$, but it increases to 1.8 only 48$h$ after (Figure 4). These results demonstrate that structural reliability is critical for generation reliability during a hurricane emergency.

**Storms’ features driving bigger energy losses:** We de-aggregated the storm simulations to assess the storm features driving large energy losses quantitatively. We analyzed the joint probability distribution of category $C$ and distance to the site $d$, empirically, utilizing 500,000 Monte Carlo simulations instead of 50,000 to estimate these joint distributions more smoothly. We analyzed the drivers for energy losses of 33% and 50%, i.e., $A_cA_d$ of 1.3 ($RP$ of 12 years) and 2 ($RP$ of 58 years), at $t_f = 96h$ (Figure 5). The average hurricane categories that caused these losses were 3.1 and 3.6, and the average closest distances are 66 and 33 km, respectively. Hurricane cloud conditions rather than high winds drove the reduction factor of 1.3 as 88% of the events did not cause panel failure. 33% of these synthetic storms did not reach hurricane categories beyond two, and 44% were more than 50 km away, indicating that the 1.3 reduction factor can be caused by events distant from the site. For the reduction factor of 2, panels experienced failures in 69% of the simulations, indicating that significant panel damage can occur even at return periods lower than 90 years, as discussed above. Moreover, 72% of the simulations had storms with categories above three, and 90% had distances from the track to the site of 50 km or less. These results are consistent with frequent observations of hurricane’s maximum winds at radii between 20 and 80 km.41
Figure 5. Analysis of the drivers of energy capacity loss through de-aggregation of the simulations for Miami-Dade, Florida. **Left:** $A_1A_2 = 1.3$ ($A_c = 1.29, A_d = 1.01, RP = 12$ years). **Right:** $A_1A_2 = 2$ ($A_c = 1.59, A_d = 1.26, RP = 58$ years). The plots show histograms of the storms’ features that triggered generation losses of 33 and 50%, respectively, or lower. The black portion of the plot represents losses associated to structural failures and the white ones represent losses due to hurricane clouds. The plots highlight that larger capacity losses are driven by structural failures rather than hurricane cloud conditions.

**Annual rates of panel failure in Central and Eastern United States:** We extended the analysis to the entire Central and Eastern United States and generated 50,000 Monte Carlo simulations for their 2694 counties in 38 states. We first focused on simulations of structural damage to assess the spatial distribution of $RP$ and reliability indexes of panel failures. As defined in the ASCE7-16\textsuperscript{42}, the structural index $\beta$ is estimated as the cumulative distribution function for a standard normal random variable evaluated on the probability of infrastructure survival (the complementary of failure) in 50 years. Thus,

$$\beta = \Phi^{-1}(\exp(-50 \lambda_f))$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

where $\lambda_f$ is the annual probability of panel failure, equal to the inverse of $RP$. We estimated $\lambda_f$ empirically from the 50,000 Monte Carlo simulations in the 38 states, as in a Maximum Likelihood Estimation of a Poisson distribution's rate, and then computed $RP$ (Figure 6a) and $\beta$ (Figure 6b). We show that Florida and Louisiana face the highest failure risks due to hurricanes, with average $RP$ of 174 years and 265 years across all their counties. 55% and 41% of the counties in Florida and Louisiana have $RP$ of panel failure below 200 years. Our results also show that Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Southern and Northern Carolina also have high risks, where installed solar panels will experience failures with $RP$ below 600 years in 19%, 22%, 19%, 26%, 24%, and 12% of their counties, respectively.
Using results from a recent reliability study that assessed wind loads and capacities according to ASCE7-16\(^4\), we estimated that a structure well designed for Risk Category II (winds with a 700-year return period) should have a $\beta$ at or above 2.3.$^{42}$ For the Risk category I (winds with a 300-year return period), the lowest design standard in ASCE7-16, a well-designed structure should achieve a $\beta$ value at or above 1.9.$^{29,42,43}$ Our results indicate that the panel installations in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Southern and Northern Carolina have $\beta$ values below 1.9 in 62% of their counties. Thus, these results reveal extensive structural vulnerabilities and highlight that panels are below all ASCE7-16 standards for resilience in large regions in Southern US (Figure 6b).

**Spatial Distribution of Solar Generation Losses in Central and Eastern United States:** Next, we assessed generation during storms in Central and Eastern US. We generated 50,000 Monte Carlo Simulations of the time series of $P$ and $E$ for panels in the 2694 counties’ centroids (see example in Texas and North Carolina in Supplementary Figure 4). Similar to the analysis in Miami-Dade, we determined the reduction factors $A_c$ and $A_d$ at different return periods. We focused on cumulative energy at $t_f = 24 \text{ h}$ (Figure 7), 48 h (Supplementary Figure 5), 72 h (Figure 8) and 96 h (Supplementary Figure 6).
Figure 7. Spatial distribution of energy generation losses for uniform risk targets (associated to return periods) in Central and Eastern United States and the compounding factors for energy losses at landfall ($t_f = 24h$). **Upper Left:** $A_c$ for events with 100-years of return period. **Upper Right:** $A_cA_d$ for events with 100-years of return period. **Middle Left:** $A_c$ for events with 300-years of return period. **Middle Right:** $A_cA_d$ for events with 300-years of return period. **Lower Left:** $A_c$ for events with 700-years of return period. **Lower Right:** $A_cA_d$ for events with 700-years of return period.

The spatial distribution of $A_c$ at $t_f = 24h$ reveals that hurricane clouds will induce significant energy losses at landfall even at tens of kilometers away from the Southern and Eastern coastline (Figure 7). For $RP$ of 100 years, Florida and Louisiana will only harvest 32% ($A_c = 3.13$) and 65% ($A_c = 1.54$) of their regular solar energy on average across all their counties, with hardest-hit counties generating only at 23% ($A_c = 4.27$) and 27% ($A_c = 3.65$), respectively. More extreme events will increase the intensity and the spatial extent of high energy losses. For $RP$ of 300 years, Florida and Louisiana will only harvest 21% ($A_c = 4.80$) and 50% ($A_c = 2.01$) on average across all their counties. For $RP$ of 700 years, they will only harvest 25% ($A_c = 4$) and 54% ($A_c = 1.84$), with hardest-hit counties generating only at 17% ($A_c = 5.83$) and 18% ($A_c = 5.46$) of regular capacity, respectively. All Southern and Central counties near the coastline up to the ones in Virginia, Maryland and Delaware will have reduced generation equal or below 33% due to the storm clouds ($A_c > ~3$).

Our results show that compounding effects will be critical only after $t_f = 24h$, i.e., at landfall. Before, $A_cA_d$ is almost equivalent to $A_c$ across the different levels of storms’ return periods for all counties (Figure 7). However, at $t_f = 72h$ (two days after landfall), we start observing important contributions of solar damage to the energy losses (Figure 8). At this time, Florida and Louisiana already experience 26% and 15% less energy losses than at landfall, thanks to the recovery of regular...
irradiance levels after the hurricane leaves, and damage-induced losses will start dominating the total energy losses. In counties in the coastline, this transition can happen as early as 24 hours after landfall (Supplementary Figure 4). For $RP$ of 300 years, $A_d$ across all of Florida and Louisiana’s counties are 2.03 and 1.13 at $t_f = 72$ h (two days after landfall), inducing energy losses that are 25% and 9% higher than those when panels do not fail, respectively. For $RP$ of 700 years, the compounding effect of damage becomes stronger since $A_d$ increases to 3.48 and 1.39 for Florida and Louisiana, respectively, inducing 38 and 25% higher losses, which will become even stronger for longer $t_f$ (Supplementary Figure 5).

![Spatial distribution of energy generation losses for uniform risk targets (associated to return periods) in Central and Eastern United States and the compounding factors for energy losses.](image)

**Figure 8.** Spatial distribution of energy generation losses for uniform risk targets (associated to return periods) in Central and Eastern United States and the compounding factors for energy losses 48 hours after landfall ($t_f = 72$ h). **Upper Left:** $A_c$ for events with 100-years of return period. **Upper Right:** $A_cA_d$ for events with 100-years of return period. **Middle Left:** $A_c$ for events with 300-years of return period. **Middle Right:** $A_cA_d$ for events with 300-years of return period. **Lower Left:** $A_c$ for events with 700-years of return period. **Lower Right:** $A_cA_d$ for events with 700-years of return period.

**Discussion.** In sum, our results show that hurricane’s impacts on solar generation are significant, compounding and strikingly disproportional in the United States. Clouds can induce losses above 66% in extensive regions in Southern and Eastern United States (see $RP$ of 100 years in Figure 7), but fortunately, these effects are only transient. In contrast, damage to solar panels will induce more acute and permanent energy losses but fortunately in smaller extents (see counties with highest risk of panel failure in Figure 6). When these two effects are compounded, solar generation risk will induce large energy losses throughout the entire hurricane emergency.
A direct implication of this study is that the naïve adoption of panels in the current conditions will create electricity generating infrastructure with high risks, especially in Louisiana and Florida, which have experienced massive hurricane outages in the last few years.\textsuperscript{2,44,45} Building stronger panels can help prevent panel damage, i.e., making $A_d = 1$. Thus, this paper advocates installing stronger panels, at least up to the ASCE-7 standards for infrastructure with risk category I. Existing studies point out that cheap solutions can increase the performance of solar installation’s structural system, e.g., torque check on bolts.\textsuperscript{20,22} If panels do not fail, all solar energy reductions ($A_c$) will be driven by hurricane clouds only, making solar energy losses only transient.

These results underscore that massive investments in resilience and clean energy in power infrastructure will pay off if their deployment is risk-informed. Placing panels on coastlines in the Southern or Eastern US can make the grid lose (sometimes permanently) solar generation during hurricane emergencies (Figure 7 and Figure 8). Power system models can optimize the deployment of new solar farms, maximizing profits for regulators, power utility companies, and consumers. But they should also assess resilience to consider the trade-off between costs and risks, especially in Florida and Louisiana, where generation potential is high, but risks are also high.

Additionally, for communities exposed to high risks, like those in Miami-Dade or New Orleans (Louisiana) installing decentralized resources, such as rooftop panels and behind-the-meter batteries must account for the potential high reduction in energy generation. Even if they have continuous power supply even in case of a main grid’s outage, they should still plan for only using necessary building functions in a hurricane emergency, e.g., refrigeration for food or even cooling especially if heatwaves follow storms.\textsuperscript{46}

This paper also advocates risk-informed utility companies’ contingency planning during extreme events. We provide a framework to account for these losses quantitatively so that utility companies can plan for offsetting the large losses in solar generation from other sources. In the context of disaster, additional difficulties might arise from failures in transmission lines that prevent the use of other functional electricity sources. Thus, it is critical for utility companies to install robust generating infrastructure to ensure the resilience of our future grids, especially since global warming is projected to intensify hurricanes in the future climate.\textsuperscript{47}
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