

# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## LBL Publications

### Title

Patience is a virtue: A data-driven analysis of rooftop solar PV permitting timelines in the United States

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5tj8n83c>

### Authors

O'Shaughnessy, Eric  
Barbose, Galen  
Wiser, Ryan

### Publication Date

2020-09-01

### DOI

10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111615

Peer reviewed

## **Patience is a Virtue: A Data-Driven Analysis of Rooftop Solar PV Permitting Timelines in the United States**

Eric O'Shaughnessy<sup>1</sup>, Galen Barbose<sup>2</sup>, Ryan Wiser<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Clean Kilowatts, LLC, U.S.A.

<sup>2</sup> Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, U.S.A.

### **Abstract**

Local permitting can ensure the safe installation and operation of rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems. At the same time, burdensome local permitting processes and local variation in requirements may pose challenges to PV deployment. In this article, we explore new data on the durations between key steps in the PV permitting process in the United States. The data suggest that a typical customer can expect to wait around 25 to 100 days from permit application until an installed system passes inspection. Permit durations vary significantly across jurisdictions, due in part to differences in local permitting policies. However, permit durations vary as significantly within jurisdictions as across them, in part due to significant variation across installers, suggesting that installer strategies and practices play an important role in permitting timelines. Permit durations have declined over time, reflecting progress from permit streamlining policies and jurisdiction learning-by-doing, though durations have stabilized in recent years. The data suggest that typical PV customers still face long and uncertain permitting timelines in the United States.

### **Keywords**

solar; permitting; streamlining; timelines; deployment barriers

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Keywords

solar; permitting; streamlining; timelines; deployment barriers

## 1. Introduction

In the United States, rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems generally require a permit from a local building, electrical, or other permitting authority (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013). Local permitting requirements may ensure safe PV system installation and operation given local contexts (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013, CA OPR 2019). At the same time, local PV permitting processes can pose challenges to PV deployment. Onerous local permit requirements can increase the amount of customer and PV system installer time required to navigate the permitting process. Further, variations in local permitting processes can force installers to invest time and effort to learn the nuances of numerous local policies (Argetsinger and Inskeep 2017, Strupeit 2017). These permitting burdens may affect customer experiences (Sinitskaya, Gomez et al. 2019), translate to higher system prices (Dong and Wiser 2013, Burkhardt, Wiser et al. 2015), and ultimately result in lower PV adoption rates (Hsu 2018, White 2018).

1  
2  
3  
4 Several state, regional (e.g., county level), and local (e.g., city level) initiatives are  
5  
6  
7 underway to reduce PV permitting burdens in the United States, generally  
8  
9  
10 through streamlining permitting processes (e.g., online applications, virtual  
11  
12 inspections) and increasing standardization across jurisdictions (Stanfield,  
13  
14 Schroeder et al. 2012, Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013, Taylor 2019). At the national  
15  
16 level, the U.S. Department of Energy-funded SolSmart program recognizes solar-  
17  
18 friendly jurisdictions and provides technical assistance to jurisdictions seeking to  
19  
20 reduce permitting timelines. Further, The Solar Foundation, the Solar Energy  
21  
22 Industries Association, and the U.S. National Renewable Energy Laboratory are  
23  
24 developing the Solar Automated Permit Processing Campaign to create free  
25  
26 online permitting tools and other assistance to streamline local permitting  
27  
28 processes. However, no data-driven studies are available that quantify PV  
29  
30 permitting burdens in terms of the durations of permitting processes. Without  
31  
32 such research, it is difficult to discern the historic or potential future impacts of  
33  
34 these initiatives to reduce PV permitting burdens.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 In this article, we fill this research gap with data-driven analysis of PV permit  
51  
52 durations from a new data set of PV permits in the United States. Our article is  
53  
54 motivated by four research questions: 1) How long is a typical PV permit process  
55  
56 from application to completion? 2) How much do these durations vary?  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 3) What are the key trends in PV permit durations over space and time? and 4)  
5  
6  
7 What factors can explain variation in permit durations? By answering these  
8  
9  
10 questions, our article can inform future research to identify policy and market  
11  
12  
13 measures to reduce permit durations.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 The U.S. provides a particularly rich research context for these questions. The  
19  
20  
21 U.S. has no national-level standardization of PV permitting requirements (Seel,  
22  
23  
24 Barbose et al. 2014). Most states set minimum permitting requirements and  
25  
26  
27 delegate authority to sub-state jurisdictions to implement permitting processes  
28  
29  
30 and to develop stricter requirements as needed. As a result, the U.S. PV  
31  
32  
33 permitting landscape is a patchwork of locally developed and implemented  
34  
35  
36 processes (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013). While the United States provides a rich  
37  
38  
39 context for research purposes, we note that permitting timelines in the United  
40  
41  
42 States may not be representative of timelines in other contexts, particularly in  
43  
44  
45 countries with more national-level standardization or permitting requirements  
46  
47  
48 (e.g., Germany).  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 The remainder of the article is organized as follows. First, we provide a review of  
54  
55  
56 the relevant literature in Section 2. We describe our data and methods in Section  
57  
58  
59 3. In Section 4, we present descriptive trends in PV permit durations. In Section 5,  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4 we present the results of a duration analysis model to explore how various  
5  
6  
7 factors affect PV permit durations. We discuss the implications of key results in  
8  
9  
10 Section 6.

## 11 12 13 14 15 **2. Literature Review** 16 17 18 19 20

21 Several studies document the PV permitting practices of local authorities having  
22  
23 jurisdiction (AHJs) (Stanfield, Schroeder et al. 2012, Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013,  
24  
25 Cook, Aznar et al. 2016, Argetsinger and Inskeep 2017, Taylor 2019). This  
26  
27 literature elucidates three findings relevant to our article: 1) AHJs have generally  
28  
29 integrated PV installations into existing permitting processes — particularly  
30  
31 building and electrical permitting; 2) these permitting process vary across AHJs;  
32  
33 and 3) some AHJs have implemented measures to expedite permitting for small-  
34  
35 scale (e.g., <10 kW) PV systems or to otherwise facilitate PV permitting. Cruz  
36  
37 (2018) finds that various political factors explain why some AHJs adopt measures  
38  
39 to facilitate PV permitting while others do not, such as AHJ membership in  
40  
41 climate change networks and whether AHJs have dedicated sustainability staff.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Several studies have quantified PV permit process durations. Ardani et al. (2015)  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 use residential PV installation data to estimate that an average rooftop PV system  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 takes 6 days to pass permitting inspections. That study as well as Barnes (2015)  
5  
6  
7 quantify durations for processes to interconnect PV systems to the grid—though  
8  
9  
10 those processes are outside the scope of our article. Three studies have explored  
11  
12  
13 PV permit durations qualitatively through surveys. Using survey data from the  
14  
15  
16 U.S. Department of Energy’s Rooftop Solar Challenge, Taylor (2019) finds that  
17  
18  
19 more than half of AHJs issue a permit within 3 days from application, on  
20  
21  
22 average. Based on a survey of California AHJs, Salmon et al. (2014) find that  
23  
24  
25 AHJs implemented measures to reduce permit durations from 2007 to 2009, but  
26  
27  
28 that durations stabilized after those initial efforts. The authors posit two  
29  
30  
31 explanations for the stabilization of permit durations: 1) Increasing application  
32  
33  
34 volumes met or exceeded AHJ capacity to process those applications; and 2)  
35  
36  
37 AHJs learn to permit PV more efficiently through experience, but average permit  
38  
39  
40 processing times can still remain relatively high as long as some AHJs remain  
41  
42  
43 inexperienced. Stanfield et al. (2013) describe permit durations based on several  
44  
45  
46 AHJ-level case studies. The authors find significant variation across and within  
47  
48  
49 AHJs in terms of permit durations. For instance, the authors find that permit  
50  
51  
52 application reviews can take between 1.5 and 30 days.  
53  
54  
55

56 Several studies explore the effects of PV permitting on system prices. Burkhardt  
57  
58  
59 et al. (2015) find that PV customers in jurisdictions with the most onerous  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 permitting processes pay \$0.18 per watt (\$/W) more than PV customers in  
5  
6  
7 jurisdictions with the least onerous permitting, roughly a 3% difference based on  
8  
9  
10 prices during the study period. Dong and Wiser (2013) show that differences in  
11  
12 city-level permitting processes are associated with price impacts ranging from  
13  
14 \$0.27/W to \$0.77/W. In a meta-analysis, Beck and Rai (2020) find that permitting-  
15  
16 related costs account for 3-7% of all non-hardware PV installation costs in the  
17  
18 United States. Seel et al. (2014) find that permitting costs are about \$0.21/W  
19  
20 higher in the United States than in Germany. In Germany, many permitting  
21  
22 requirements are set at the national level, reducing jurisdiction-level  
23  
24 inconsistency. Further, many German jurisdictions have chosen to exempt small-  
25  
26 scale PV systems from building permitting requirements, further reducing  
27  
28 permitting costs in Germany relative to the United States (Strupeit 2017).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Research on the links between local permitting and PV deployment has yielded  
42  
43 mixed results. White (2018) compares the number of new PV systems installed  
44  
45 annually in AHJs with and without streamlined permitting provisions and finds  
46  
47 no statistically significant relationship. Hsu (2018) compares cumulative PV  
48  
49 deployment in California AHJs that had adopted a state-mandated PV approval  
50  
51 procedure with AHJs that had yet to adopt the procedure. The study produces  
52  
53 mixed results based on different model specifications, but the author concludes  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 that cumulative PV deployment in AHJs with the PV approval procedures was  
5  
6  
7 22% higher than in AHJs without the procedures while controlling for other  
8  
9 factors.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Sinitskaya et al. (2019) explore how various components of the PV adoption  
16  
17 process affect the subjective experiences of PV adopters and installers. The study  
18  
19 identifies permit applications and inspection requests as specific “pain points”  
20  
21 for PV installers. The authors posit that these pain points may delay adoption.  
22  
23  
24 However, the study does not attempt to quantify the magnitude of the impacts of  
25  
26 permitting processes on PV adoption durations.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Our article builds on this literature in two ways. First, we build on previous  
37  
38 descriptions of permit process durations (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013, Salmon,  
39  
40 Russell et al. 2014, Ardani, Davidson et al. 2015, Taylor 2019) using a significantly  
41  
42 larger and more geographically-comprehensive system-level data set. Second, we  
43  
44 build on the survey-based results of Sinitskaya et al. (2019) with a data-driven  
45  
46 analysis of the factors that determine PV permit durations.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

### 56 **3. Data and Methods**


57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 PV permitting records were obtained from BuildZoom, an online marketplace  
5  
6  
7 that connects home and business owners to service contractors including PV  
8  
9  
10 installers. The BuildZoom data include dates for three key events in the  
11  
12  
13 permitting process: the date the permit application was submitted, the date the  
14  
15  
16 permit was issued, and the date the installed system passed the permitting  
17  
18  
19 inspection (Figure 1). BuildZoom provided over 1.4 million records of permits  
20  
21  
22 for rooftop PV systems, though only about one third of those records include  
23  
24  
25 valid application dates, permit issuance dates, and passed-inspection dates.<sup>1</sup> The  
26  
27  
28 raw data included records with application dates spanning more than two  
29  
30  
31 decades. However, the sample sizes in the early years of the data are relatively  
32  
33  
34 small, and observations in the early years of the data are likely not representative  
35  
36  
37 of current permitting processes. We therefore focus on a subset of the data with  
38  
39  
40 an application date in 2010 or later — though we include older records in certain  
41  
42  
43 analyses of time trends, where noted. Observations of permit durations are  
44  
45  
46 truncated in that passed-inspection dates are unavailable for permits that had yet  
47  
48  
49 to pass inspection when the data were generated. To prevent data truncation  
50  
51  
52 from introducing bias into the analysis of temporal trends, we limit the data to  
53  
54  
55 permits that lasted no more than 1 year from application to passed inspection

---

56  
57 <sup>1</sup> PV systems have a variety of applications. Our scope is limited to rooftop PV systems. We  
58  
59 dropped records where the record description indicated that the permit represented a ground-  
60  
61 mounted PV system, solar water heating system, PV-powered attic fan, PV-powered pool heater,  
62  
63 and/or PV-powered billboard.  
64  
65

and dropped records with an application date before March 6, 2018, representing the date 1 year before the most recent application date reported in the data. We assume that multiple records filed on behalf of the same property within the same month represent duplicative records and drop those records. We dropped records with implausible recorded dates where the permit was issued before the application date or the permit passed inspection before the permit was issued. Finally, we dropped records associated with PV systems installed as part of a new home construction, given that numerous extraneous factors associated with the home construction process affect permit durations for those records.




**Figure 1. The PV permitting and interconnection process**

These data cleaning processes yield a final data set of 203,590 records on 178,393 unique properties in 368 AHJs<sup>2</sup> with application dates from 2010 to 2018. The key

<sup>2</sup> For most records, the AHJ was identified as the authority that reported the permit to BuildZoom. Where the permit was reported by another party (e.g., installer), we assigned the records to AHJs according to the AHJ that reported other permits from the same city as the

1  
2  
3  
4 metrics in our analysis are the durations between permit application, permit  
5  
6  
7 issuance, and a passed inspection. We refer to these durations as apply-issue,  
8  
9  
10 issue-pass, and apply-pass (Figure 2). We report central tendencies for the  
11  
12  
13 durations in terms of medians rather than means because the permit duration  
14  
15  
16 distributions are highly right-skewed. We report variation in permit durations in  
17  
18  
19 terms of inter-quartile ranges.



23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 **Figure 2. Permit durations**

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Our methodological approach is framed around our four research questions: 1)  
39  
40  
41 How long is a typical PV permit process from application to completion? 2) How  
42  
43  
44 much do these durations vary? 3) What are the key trends in PV permit  
45  
46  
47 durations over space and time? and 4) What factors can explain variation in  
48  
49  
50 permit durations? We answer the first three research questions through multiple  
51  
52  
53 descriptive analyses presented in Section 4. To answer the fourth research  
54  
55  
56 question, we develop a duration analysis model to test the effects of different

---

57  
58  
59 record. Where this matching was not possible, the city associated with the record was used as the  
60  
61  
62 AHJ.

factors on permit durations:

$$\log t_{ij} = \alpha + AHJ_j\beta_1 + job_{ij}\beta_2 + AHJ + INST + QTR + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

Where  $t_{ij}$  is the duration of one of the three permitting phases for record  $i$  located in AHJ  $j$ ,  $\alpha$  is a constant,  $AHJ_j$  is a vector of AHJ-level variables,  $job_{ij}$  is a vector of job-level variables,  $AHJ$  is an AHJ-level fixed effect,  $INST$  is an installer-level fixed effect,<sup>3</sup> and  $QTR$  is quarter fixed effect. The AHJ- and job-level variables are defined in Table 1. The model represented by Equation (1) is an accelerated failure time (AFT) model, a specific model in the broader class of duration analysis models (Van den Berg 2001). Amongst duration analysis models, the AFT model is relatively simple in that it does not require any assumptions on the baseline probability that a process ends in any given time period. Because this baseline probability is unspecified, the coefficients may be biased by unobserved variables that influence the process duration. However, it can be shown that AFT models provide robust evidence of the sign and significance of the effects of the observed factors (Van den Berg 2001). Hence, we proceed with the AFT model as a means of understanding the direction and significance of the effects of various factors on permit durations, while noting

---

<sup>3</sup> Each installer with at least 1,000 records in the data was assigned a separate effect.

1  
2  
3  
4 that the magnitudes of the estimated coefficients should be treated with caution.  
5  
6  
7 We use robust AHJ-clustered standard errors in all models to control for the fact  
8  
9  
10 that the BuildZoom data were generated through a non-random sample of AHJs  
11  
12  
13 (Abadie, Athey et al. 2017).<sup>4</sup>  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 **Table 1. Duration Analysis Model Variables**

20 Variable	21 Definition	22 Rationale
23 <i>AHJ Level</i>		
24 Experience	25 The cumulative number of permit 26 applications received by the AHJ 27 associated with the record. Note: The 28 experience variable is based on the 29 cumulative number of applications 30 received from 2000. The variable 31 includes 10,901 records that were 32 dropped from the descriptive 33 analyses. 34	35 Negative coefficients would 36 suggest of AHJ-level learning-by- 37 doing.
38 Volume	39 The number of permit applications 40 received by the AHJ associated with 41 the record in the same quarter in 42 which the record’s application was 43 submitted relative to the same quarter 44 in the prior year.	45 Positive coefficients would suggest 46 that large application volumes— 47 relative to the same volumes in the 48 prior year—increase permit 49 durations.
50 Installer 51 cumulative 52 experience	53 The cumulative number of permits 54 associated with the system’s installer 55 <i>within</i> the AHJ.	56 Negative coefficients would 57 suggest that installers learn to 58 reduce permit durations through 59 experience with a specific AHJ’s 60 processes.
61 SolSmart	62 Dummy variable for whether the AHJ 63 is SolSmart designated (SolSmart=1) or 64 not (SolSmart=0)	65 Negative coefficients would 66 suggest that best-practice AHJ- 67 level policies are associated with 68 shorter permit durations.
69 <i>Job Level</i>		
70 Electrical	71 Dummy variable for whether the	72 Tests whether electrical permits—

73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79 <sup>4</sup> The AFT models were estimated using the streg package for parametric survival models in  
80 Stata.  
81  
82

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

	record includes an electrical permit	and the additional job requirements they may reflect— affect permit durations.
Roofing	Dummy variable for whether the record includes a roofing permit	Tests whether roofing permits— and the additional job requirements they may reflect— affect permit durations.
Other	Dummy variable for whether the record includes an additional permit other than electrical or roofing	Tests whether non-related jobs (e.g., home remodel) implemented in tandem with PV installation affects permit durations.
Housing Age	Percentage of the housing stock that was built before 2000, based on zip code-level data from the U.S. Census	Tests whether the age of the housing stock affects permit durations.

---

The model includes two variables to test the hypotheses posed by Salmon et al. (2014) to explain temporal trends in permit durations (see Section 2). First, the *experience* variable refers to the cumulative number of applications received by the AHJ associated with each record. This variable uses all records with application dates going back to 2000, otherwise following the same data cleaning protocol described in Section 3. The hypothesis is that AHJs “learn” to process permits more efficiently through experience. Process learning-by-doing is supported by a rich literature (Arrow 1962), including in the PV context (Nemet 2006, Bollinger and Gillingham 2019). The learning hypothesis would be supported by a negative coefficient on the experience variable, suggesting that durations decline as AHJs accumulate more experience. Second, the *volume* variable refers to the number of applications received by the AHJ in the quarter

1  
2  
3  
4 associated with each record relative to the same quarter in the prior year. The  
5  
6  
7 hypothesis is that large application volumes can strain AHJ capacity to process  
8  
9  
10 those applications. That hypothesis would be supported by a positive coefficient  
11  
12  
13 on the volume variable, indicating that durations increase as AHJs face higher  
14  
15  
16 application volumes.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 There are three limitations to note with the permitting data in this study. First,  
22  
23  
24 the data are not geographically representative of the U.S. PV market. The data  
25  
26  
27 have strong coverage in key markets like California and Hawaii but relatively  
28  
29  
30 weak coverage in other key markets such as Massachusetts, New Jersey, and  
31  
32  
33 New York. Second, the data's geographic composition has changed over time. In  
34  
35  
36 particular, Hawaii's share of the data declined significantly from 62% of records  
37  
38  
39 in 2012 to about 2% of records in 2018. The changing geographic composition of  
40  
41  
42 the data introduces additional data noise that affects the interpretation of  
43  
44  
45 temporal trends. We discuss these issues with our presentation of temporal  
46  
47  
48 results. Third, the data are generated through AHJ reporting processes. These  
49  
50  
51 reporting processes are not necessarily standardized. For instance, it is possible  
52  
53  
54 that AHJs with digital processes record and report the date of the application  
55  
56  
57 submission, while AHJs with analog processes record and report the date that  
58  
59  
60 the application was entered into a permit tracking system. Further, BuildZoom  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 tends to collect data from AHJs with digital processes that facilitate data  
5  
6  
7 collection. As a result, the BuildZoom data may be biased toward AHJs with  
8  
9 digital processes. A comparison of the BuildZoom data with permit duration  
10  
11 data compiled by installers suggests that apply-issue durations may generally be  
12  
13 downward biased in the BuildZoom data, while issue-pass durations are in line  
14  
15 with the durations compiled by the installers. This comparison suggests that  
16  
17 differences in AHJ reporting processes or biases in BuildZoom data collection  
18  
19 may affect the representativeness of the data sample. We place several caveats on  
20  
21 analyses concerning apply-issue durations throughout the article.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

#### 33 **4. Descriptive Statistics**

34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 At the median, the data suggest that a typical customer receives her permit on  
40  
41 the same day as the application then waits 42 days until the installed system  
42  
43 passes inspection (Table 2).<sup>5</sup> However, the data also suggest significant variation  
44  
45 in permit durations. A typical customer can expect to receive her permit between  
46  
47 0 and 9 days from the permit application date, and then can expect to wait  
48  
49  
50 between 20 and 85 days for the system to pass inspection, based on 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup>  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

58  
59 <sup>5</sup> Same-day permits (e.g., permits with 0 days from apply-issue) may be overrepresented in the  
60 data, as noted in our discussion of data limitations in Section 3.  
61  
62

percentiles for those durations. In terms of the entire process, a typical customer can expect to wait 26 to 97 days from permit application to a passed inspection.

Table 2. Permit Duration Quantiles (Days)

	Apply- Issue	Issue- Pass	Apply- Pass
Minimum	0	0	0
P25	0	20	26
Median	0	42	50
P75	9	85	97
Maximum*	357	364	364

\* Recall that records with durations over 365 days were dropped from the analysis


#### 4.1 Durations Across States and AHJs

Median state-level apply-pass durations in the data range from 33 days in Washington to 135 days in New York (Figure 3).<sup>6</sup> California and Hawaii, which together account for about 74% of the dataset, drive durations in the dataset more than the remaining states. At the median, a typical permit in California takes 41 days from application to passed inspection while a typical permit in Hawaii takes 60 days. The relatively low permit durations in California may reflect state-level policies designed to streamline permitting processes (Salmon, Russell et al. 2014). California limits the ability of local AHJs to implement local

---

<sup>6</sup> It is worth recalling that the data are not necessarily geographically representative and the sample sizes from most states are relatively small. We therefore urge caution in the state-level comparison of permit durations.


1  
2  
3  
4 solar ordinances. Further, since 2012, many California AHJs have adopted best  
5  
6  
7 practices developed by the California Governor’s Office of Planning and  
8  
9  
10 Research. Finally, in 2014, California passed a state law requiring AHJs to adopt  
11  
12 ordinances for streamlined permitting for small-scale PV systems (<10 kW) by  
13  
14  
15  
16 September 30, 2015 (CA OPR 2019). Other factors that could explain short  
17  
18 durations in California include a relatively experienced installer base and a  
19  
20  
21 relatively stable climate that results in fewer weather-related installation delays  
22  
23  
24 than in states with more seasonal climates.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29



30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 **Figure 3. Apply-pass median and inter-quartile ranges by state. Figure limited to states with at**  
50 **least 1,000 records in data. The size of each point represents the state’s share of the data.**  
51  
52

53 Permit durations vary significantly within states, in part because of variation  
54  
55 across AHJs (Figure 4). The observed AHJ-level variation is consistent with  
56  
57  
58  
59 suppositions from the literature that inconsistent permitting requirements across  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65


1  
2  
3  
4 AHJs could pose a barrier to PV deployment (Argetsinger and Inskeep 2017,  
5  
6  
7 Strupeit 2017). Even within California, the median AHJ-level apply-pass  
8  
9  
10 duration varies from 28 days to 80 days. However, apply-pass durations vary as  
11  
12 significantly *within* as across AHJs. The AHJ-level interquartile range spans 63  
13  
14 days, on average, across the 100 AHJs depicted in Figure 4. Put another way, a  
15  
16 typical customer in any given AHJ faces an uncertain window of more than two  
17  
18 months from permit application to a passed inspection. This within-AHJ  
19  
20 months from permit application to a passed inspection. This within-AHJ  
21  
22 variation is particularly remarkable given that all systems within an AHJ are, in  
23  
24 theory, subject to the same permitting requirements. As highlighted later,  
25  
26 variations in installation and permit timelines among PV installers represents  
27  
28 one core driver for this within-AHJ variation.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35



55 **Figure 4. AHJ-level median and inter-quartile ranges for apply-pass durations. Size of the**  
56 **points corresponds to the number of records from the AHJ. Limited to the 100 AHJs with the**  
57 **most records in the data and sorted along the x-axis based on median apply-pass duration**  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Differences in local permitting policies could explain some of the variation across  
5  
6  
7 AHJs. To explore this hypothesis, we augmented the BuildZoom data set with  
8  
9  
10 additional data to test the effects of AHJ policies on permit durations. Our first  
11  
12  
13 additional data source is the list of AHJs recognized for their PV permitting best  
14  
15  
16 practices by the U.S. Department of Energy SolSmart program. By program  
17  
18  
19 design, AHJs apply for and—if meeting certain criteria—are recognized as gold,  
20  
21  
22 silver, or bronze, depending on their implementation of PV permitting best  
23  
24  
25 practices. The SolSmart program also recruits AHJs through conferences and  
26  
27  
28 various energy policy networks. A SolSmart designation provides evidence of  
29  
30  
31 AHJ implementation of best practices insofar as AHJs with such practices self-  
32  
33  
34 select into the program or SolSmart prioritizes recruitment of AHJs with such  
35  
36  
37 practices. However, it is possible that some AHJs in the data with similar best  
38  
39  
40 practices have not received a SolSmart designation. There are 81 SolSmart-  
41  
42  
43 designated AHJs represented in the BuildZoom data: 29 bronze-designated; 14  
44  
45  
46 silver-designated; and 38 gold-designated AHJs. SolSmart designations are  
47  
48  
49 found to have no descriptive impact on apply-issue durations. However, the data  
50  
51  
52 suggest that SolSmart-designated AHJs process permits more quickly during the  
53  
54  
55 issue-pass phase (Figure 5). In particular, the median issue-pass duration is about  
56  
57  
58 7 days shorter in gold-designated AHJs than in undesignated AHJs.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Figure 5. Median issue-pass durations with interquartile ranges by SolSmart designation**

Our second additional data source is a set of AHJ policy databases compiled by several large-scale PV installers. The information in these databases represents AHJ permitting policies as observed and recorded by installers who operate in those AHJs. As a result, there are three caveats to these installer-generated databases. First, the information is based on installer observations that may or may not accurately reflect AHJ permitting policies. Second, the geographic coverage of the databases is limited to the AHJs where the installers operate. Third, the information represents installer observations at a specific point in time, generally in 2018 to 2019, such that the AHJ policies recorded in these databases may or may not reflect the prevailing AHJ policies at the time when BuildZoom records were generated. For this reason, we restrict this particular


1  
2  
3  
4 analysis to 17,173 records with an application date in 2017 or later in 123 AHJs  
5  
6  
7 that were matched with the installer data.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Notwithstanding these caveats, the installer data provide more nuanced insights  
13  
14 into differences in AHJ-level permitting policies and their potential effects on  
15  
16 permit durations. The installer data suggest that:  
17  
18  
19

- 20  
21 • *Durations are shorter in AHJs that involve fewer departments in approvals.* The  
22 installer data suggest that 4% of AHJs in the data do not require permit  
23  
24 approvals from any permitting departments after the permit has been  
25  
26 issued, 55% require approvals from 1 department, 31% require approvals  
27  
28 from 2 departments, and 10% require approvals from 3 departments. The  
29  
30 data indicate that durations increase with the number of required  
31  
32 approvals (Figure 6, left). The median apply-pass duration increases from  
33  
34 30 days in AHJs that do not require any approvals to 47 days in AHJs that  
35  
36 require 2 approvals.  
37  
38
- 39 • *Apply-issue durations are shorter in AHJs with online permitting processes,*  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
*outside California.* The installer data suggest that about 37% of AHJs in the  
data allow or require online permit applications. Outside California, the  
median apply-issue duration is 0 days and the inter-quartile range is 3  
days in AHJs that allow online permitting compared to a median of 1 day

and inter-quartile range of 9 days in AHJs that do not. However, in California, apply-issue durations are actually 2 days longer at the median in AHJs that allow online permitting. As a result, median apply-pass durations in the data are 1 day longer in AHJs that allow online permitting (Figure 6, center).

- *Durations are longer in AHJs that require onsite inspections.* The installer data suggest that about 80% of AHJs in the data require an onsite system inspection for permit approval. Median apply-pass durations are 8 days longer and apply-pass interquartile ranges are 22 days longer in AHJs that require onsite inspections than in AHJs that do not (Figure 6, right). This result suggests that policies that obviate the need for onsite inspections, such as through virtual inspections, could significantly reduce permit durations and increase duration certainty.



**Figure 6. Apply-pass duration distributions by: left - number of departments requiring an approval; center - whether AHJs allow online applications; right - whether AHJs require onsite inspections.**



## 4.2 Durations Across Installers

PV installers play a key role in the PV permitting process, and differences in installer strategies may affect permit durations. PV installers may play a particularly important role during the issue-pass phase in at least three ways. First, differences in installer scheduling and installation crew availability could drive variations in delays from permit issuance to installation. Second, some installers may navigate inspections more efficiently than others, or may navigate inspections more efficiently in certain AHJs than in others. For instance, installers may be more likely to pass inspections with local inspectors with whom they have experience. Third, installers may have different strategies around when to submit the permit application. For instance, some installers may choose to submit permit applications well in advance of the scheduled installation date, while others may choose to submit the application only when they are ready to install the system. All else equal, records associated with early permit application submitters will be associated with longer issue-pass durations, even if the overall installation timeline is the same.

1  
2  
3  
4 Most PV installers are local companies, operating in one or a small number of  
5  
6  
7 AHJs. As a result, some observed variation in permit durations across installers  
8  
9  
10 may actually be attributable to variation in durations in the different markets in  
11  
12  
13 which installers operate. To isolate installer-level variation, we analyze installer-  
14  
15  
16 level permit durations within three illustrative AHJs with large numbers of  
17  
18  
19 records in the data: Boulder, CO (N=3,334), Honolulu, HI (N=42,107), and Los  
20  
21  
22 Angeles, CA (N=5,085).<sup>7</sup> We identified the 10 installers with the largest number  
23  
24  
25 of records in each of the three AHJs. Apply-issue durations vary across these  
26  
27  
28 installers within each AHJ (Figure 7). In Los Angeles, the median installer-level  
29  
30  
31 apply-issue duration varies from 0.5 days to 12 days. Issue-pass durations vary  
32  
33  
34 more significantly across installers within the AHJs (Figure 8). In each case,  
35  
36  
37 installer-level median issue-pass durations vary by at least 39 days from the  
38  
39  
40 shortest-duration installer to the longest-duration installer. These results suggest  
41  
42  
43 that permit durations vary across installers even when those installers are—in  
44  
45  
46 theory—subject to the same permitting requirements.<sup>8</sup>  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

---

55 <sup>7</sup> Sample sizes based on number of records with valid installer names.

56 <sup>8</sup> Requirements within each AHJ may have changed over time, such that installers with more  
57 records early on were subject to different requirements than installers with more records later in  
58 the data. However, similar installer-level variation remains evident within each AHJ for specific  
59 years.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 7. Installer-level median apply-issue durations in three illustrative AHJs. Based on 10 installers with the most records in each AHJ.




Figure 8. Installer-level median issue-pass durations in three illustrative AHJs. Based on 10 installers with the most records in each AHJ.

1  
2  
3  
4 The prior results suggest that permit durations vary across installers within  
5  
6  
7 AHJs. This result could be explained in two ways: 1) Some installers are  
8  
9  
10 consistently associated with shorter/longer durations regardless of the AHJ; or 2)  
11  
12  
13 Installers navigate different AHJ permitting processes in different ways. The data  
14  
15  
16 support both explanations, but particularly the former. Figure 9 depicts installer-  
17  
18  
19 level variation across 20 California AHJs for the group of 5 installers with the  
20  
21  
22 most records in those AHJs. In this example, some installers are consistently  
23  
24  
25 associated with longer issue-pass durations (e.g., the upward red triangles) than  
26  
27  
28 other installers (e.g., the downward blue triangles). This result suggests that  
29  
30  
31 variation from installer-level factors can—to some extent—dominate variation  
32  
33  
34 from AHJ-level factors. However, the figure also supports the second  
35  
36  
37 explanation. The installers represented by red triangles appear to navigate the  
38  
39  
40 permitting processes in different ways across the AHJs, while the remaining  
41  
42  
43 installers exhibit relatively constant issue-pass durations across the AHJs.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65





Figure 9. Installer-level median issue-pass durations by AHJ. Each shape/color represents a different installer (names not included for proprietary data reasons). Based on 20 AHJs in California with the most records in the data and the 5 installers with the most records in those AHJs.


### 4.3 Durations Over Time

Permit durations within the BuildZoom dataset steadily declined from a median of 68 days in 2012 to 43 days in 2018 (Figure 10). Additionally, the distributions of durations have narrowed over time, with the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile duration falling from 126 days in 2012 to 79 days in 2018. This result is primarily attributable to two trends driven by Hawaii (Figure 11). First, apply-pass durations declined in Hawaii from a median of 80 days in 2012 to 54 days in 2018, due primarily to declining durations in Honolulu. Second, Hawaii’s share of the data declined over the same time period, from about 62% of the data in 2012 to just 2% in 2018. Given that Hawaii is a relatively long-duration state, Hawaii’s declining share of

1  
2  
3  
4 the data has shifted the statistical center of the data toward the lower durations  
5  
6  
7 of other states, particularly California. The first trend represents a true reduction  
8  
9  
10 in permit durations, while the second trend is simply due to changes in the  
11  
12  
13 underlying composition of the data. In California, median apply-pass durations  
14  
15  
16 fell just 3 days over the same timeframe, from 43 days in 2012 to 40 days in 2018.  
17  
18  
19 Permit durations in the remaining states declined from 85 days in 2013 to 49 days  
20  
21  
22 in 2018, largely due to duration reductions in Florida (169 days to 55 days) and  
23  
24  
25 New York (162 days to 91 days).  
26  
27  
28  
29



48  
49 **Figure 10. Apply-pass median and inter-quartile ranges by year. Point sizes represent sample**  
50 **size.**  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Figure 11. Median apply-pass durations in California, Hawaii, and other states over time. Point sizes represent sample size.**

The temporal trends depicted in Figure 11 are consistent with the finding from Salmon et al. (2014) that permit durations in California stabilized after a period of initial reductions due to the state’s permit streamlining policies (see Section 4.1). Similar trends are evident in Hawaii and other states, where permit durations appear to fall from 2012 to 2016 but then stabilize around the same median levels observed in California. As noted in Section 2, Salmon et al. (2014) posit two explanations for the stabilization of permit durations: 1) Increasing application volumes offset any permit duration reductions achieved through streamlining policies; and 2) AHJs “learn” over time to process permits more efficiently, but longer durations in inexperienced AHJs can still weigh down overall permit durations. Descriptive analyses of these hypotheses yielded inconclusive results,

1  
2  
3  
4 in part because it is difficult to isolate the effects of streamlining policies,  
5  
6  
7 application volumes, and AHJ learning on permit durations. Another hypothesis  
8  
9  
10 is that AHJ policies can only reduce permit durations by so much. After the  
11  
12  
13 implementation of best-practice AHJ policies, further reductions may  
14  
15  
16 increasingly rely on other factors, such as installation timelines. We return to  
17  
18  
19 these hypotheses in Section 5.  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **5. Duration Analysis Model**

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 The duration analysis model results counter the learning and volume hypotheses  
31  
32  
33 during the apply-issue phase, as indicated by the positive coefficient on the AHJ  
34  
35  
36 experience variable and the insignificant negative coefficient on volume in the  
37  
38  
39 apply-issue model (Table 3). However, the model supports these hypotheses in  
40  
41  
42 the issue-pass phase, as indicated by the negative coefficient on AHJ experience  
43  
44  
45 and the positive—though still insignificant—coefficient on volume in the issue-  
46  
47  
48 pass model. One potential explanation for the inverse effect of application  
49  
50  
51 volumes on apply-issue durations is that AHJs expedite application reviews  
52  
53  
54 when they face large application volumes in order to avoid large application  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 backlogs.<sup>9</sup> The issue-pass model suggests that issue-pass durations decline by  
5  
6  
7 about 2% for every additional 1,000 applications of cumulative experience,  
8  
9  
10 consistent with the learning-by-doing hypothesis. Because issue-pass durations  
11  
12  
13 contribute more to overall durations than do apply-issue durations, the apply-  
14  
15  
16 pass model likewise suggests that AHJ experience results in shorter apply-pass  
17  
18  
19 durations. The positive coefficient on the volume variable indicates that these  
20  
21  
22 gains from AHJ experience may be partially offset in the issue-pass phase by  
23  
24  
25 increasing permit application volumes. The negative coefficient on the installer  
26  
27  
28 experience variable for the apply-pass model provides some evidence of installer  
29  
30 learning during the permit application process.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

---

57  
58 <sup>9</sup> Also, as noted in Section 2, we have less confidence in the apply-issue estimates than in the  
59 issue-pass estimates. It is possible that underlying biases in the data are obscuring the effects of  
60 learning and application volumes.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Table 3. Duration Analysis Model Results**

	Y=log(apply-issue)	Y=log(issue-pass)	Y=log(apply-pass)
AHJ experience (x1000)	0.04* (4.1)	-0.02* (6.9)	-0.02* (7.2)
Volume (x1000)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.02 (1.7)	0.007 (0.6)
Installer experience (x100)	-0.02* (3.9)	0.003 (0.8)	0.001 (0.3)
SolSmart	-0.29* (2.7)	0.04 (0.4)	-0.008 (0.1)
Electrical	-0.06 (0.5)	-0.02 (0.6)	-0.01 (0.3)
Roofing	-0.02 (0.1)	-0.09* (2.2)	-0.06 (1.7)
Other permits	0.13 (1.3)	-0.04 (1.0)	-0.02 (0.4)
Housing age	0.002* (2.0)	-0.002 (1.4)	-0.002* (2.4)
AHJ FE	X	X	X
Installer FE	X	X	X
Quarter FE	X	X	X

Robust z-statistics in parentheses; \* p<0.05

The apply-issue model suggests that apply-issue durations are about 25% shorter in SolSmart-designated AHJs than in undesignated AHJs.<sup>10</sup> That result suggests that AHJ best-practice policies can reduce permit application review times, though the model suggests that SolSmart designation has no impact on issue-pass durations. Further, the apply-issue model suggests that apply-issue durations are slightly longer in AHJs with older housing stocks (housing age), suggesting that permit applications for older homes with older roofs and electrical systems are subject to additional scrutiny during the permit application

<sup>10</sup>  $-0.29^e=0.748$ , i.e., a roughly 25% reduction.

1  
2  
3  
4 review period. The data suggest that older electrical systems, in particular, may  
5  
6  
7 draw additional permitting scrutiny: an electrical permit was required for about  
8  
9  
10 53% of records in AHJs where more than 90% of homes were built before 2000  
11  
12  
13 compared to about 24% of records in AHJs where fewer than half of homes were  
14  
15  
16 built before 2000. At the same time, the model suggests that issue-pass durations  
17  
18  
19 are *shorter* in AHJs with older housing stocks. There may be some confounding  
20  
21  
22 factor to explain this outcome, but one hypothesis is that contractors are more  
23  
24  
25 familiar with roofing structures and electrical systems in older homes, which  
26  
27  
28 may save time and effort during the installation and inspection processes.

29  
30 Finally, the issue-pass model suggests that records with roofing permits are  
31  
32  
33 associated with shorter issue-pass durations than records without such permits,  
34  
35  
36 consistent with the descriptive results. This result is particularly striking in that it  
37  
38  
39 counters expectations: one would assume that records with roofing permits  
40  
41  
42 represent more complex jobs (e.g., roof replacement) and would therefore be  
43  
44  
45 associated with longer rather than shorter durations. One potential explanation is  
46  
47  
48 that PV systems installed on new rooftops are less likely to experience inspection  
49  
50  
51 delays due to structural issues associated with the roof.

52  
53  
54  
55  
56 The fixed effect results provide further evidence that nuanced AHJ- and installer-  
57  
58  
59 level factors can explain variation in permit durations. 193 of the 275 AHJ-level  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4 apply-pass fixed effects are statistically significant, while 15 of the 18 installer-  
5  
6  
7 level apply-pass fixed effects are statistically significant. The quarter fixed effects  
8  
9  
10 are mostly insignificant, indicating that temporal trends in permit durations can  
11  
12  
13 be largely explained by other time-varying factors such as AHJ experience and  
14  
15  
16 application volumes.  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **6. Conclusion and Policy Implications**

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 In this article, we build on previous descriptions of PV adoption processes and  
28  
29  
30 durations (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013, Salmon, Russell et al. 2014, Ardani,  
31  
32  
33 Davidson et al. 2015, Sinitskaya, Gomez et al. 2019) through a data-driven  
34  
35  
36 analysis of trends in durations and the factors that explain differences in  
37  
38  
39 durations across AHJs. We build on the existing literature with data-driven  
40  
41  
42 insights into PV permit durations, key trends across space and time, and the  
43  
44  
45 factors that drive permit durations (Table 4).  
46

47 **Table 4. Summary of Key Findings in the Context of Previous Research**

49 <b>Research Question</b>	50 <b>Previous Research</b>	51 <b>Findings</b>
52 What is the duration of a typical PV permit?	53 No previous work, to our knowledge, has comprehensively estimated durations for the full permitting process.	54 At the median, a typical PV installation takes about 50 days from permit application to pass inspection.
55 How do these durations vary?	56 Permit application review times can vary from 1.5 to 30 days (Stanfield, Kapla et al.	57 Permit durations vary from 26 to 97 days at the 25 <sup>th</sup> and 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

	2013).	
What are the key trends in permit durations across space and time?	Permit application review periods vary significantly across AHJs (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013). PV permit durations declined in California from 2007 to 2009 but stabilized from 2009 to 2013 (Salmon, Russell et al. 2014).	Permit durations vary significantly across states and AHJs. Durations declined in some key markets (e.g., Hawaii) but remained relatively stable in others (e.g., California).
What factors explain variations in permit durations?	Installers identify permit applications and inspections as key “pain points” in the permitting process (Sinitskaya, Gomez et al. 2019).	The data suggest that permit durations decline as AHJs and installers accumulate more PV permitting experience. There is also evidence that AHJ policies to expedite PV permitting can shorten permit durations.

---

The results suggest that permit streamlining policies and AHJ experience have reduced PV permit durations over time. Nonetheless, permit durations have appeared to stabilize in recent years in most AHJs and have remained stable in California for nearly a decade. Whether further reductions in permit durations are desirable is a normative question beyond the scope of this article. However, the data show that some AHJs and installers are able to navigate the PV permitting processes faster than others, suggesting that further reductions in permit durations are possible. For instance, in 2017, the median apply-pass duration was 44 days, yet 10% of AHJs had a median apply-pass duration of 27 days or less, and 10% of installers had a median apply-pass duration of 19 days

1  
2  
3  
4 or less.<sup>11</sup> Put another way, considering the AHJ- and installer-level 10<sup>th</sup>  
5  
6  
7 percentiles as reasonable measures of aspirational yet attainable low-bound  
8  
9 permit durations, AHJ- and installer-level efforts could reduce most permit  
10  
11 durations by around 17 to 25 days. Further reductions in permit durations may  
12  
13 require additional state, AHJ, and installer efforts to streamline permitting and  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 installation processes.  
20

21  
22  
23  
24 The results give additional weight to arguments that inconsistent PV permitting  
25  
26 requirements pose a barrier to PV deployment (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013,  
27  
28 Argetsinger and Inskeep 2017), providing further rationale for permitting  
29  
30 standardization at the state or national level. However, the data show that permit  
31  
32 durations vary as significantly *within* as across AHJs (see Figure 4). We have  
33  
34 presented several analyses to explore this within-AHJ variation, with one clear  
35  
36 driver being differences across installers. Regardless of the explanation for this  
37  
38 variation, one implication is clear: PV customers face highly uncertain timelines  
39  
40 during the PV permitting and installation process. In any given AHJ, a typical  
41  
42 customer faces a window of more than two months for the expected timeline  
43  
44 between permit application and a passed inspection (see Section 3.1). The  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

---

<sup>11</sup> Statistics are based on AHJs and installers with at least 10 records in 2017.

1  
2  
3  
4 considering that most PV installations only require one or two days of onsite  
5  
6  
7 labor. Uncertain permitting and installation timelines may deter risk-averse  
8  
9  
10 customers from entering the permitting process. These results suggest that at  
11  
12  
13 least some policy focus may need to shift from reducing average permit  
14  
15  
16 durations to reducing the variation in those durations.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Finally, and related, while the PV permitting literature has generally focused on  
22  
23  
24 the role of AHJs, the data suggest that installers play an important role in  
25  
26  
27 determining PV permit durations. Even highly streamlined PV permitting  
28  
29  
30 policies may have little impact on durations if installers implement strategies  
31  
32  
33 that result in long lags between permit issuance, installation, and inspection.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 We conclude by suggesting several areas for future research building on these  
39  
40  
41 results. First, future research could explore the effects of AHJ-level policies more  
42  
43  
44 directly by compiling a database of AHJ-level PV permitting policies over time.  
45  
46  
47 Second, and related, future research could explore what explains differences in  
48  
49  
50 AHJ-level permitting policies through studying factors such as AHJ-level  
51  
52  
53 resources and culture. Third, future research could explore the potentially  
54  
55  
56 detrimental effects of PV permit duration uncertainty on PV deployment. One  
57  
58  
59 possibility is that lengthy and uncertain durations can generate negative peer  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 effects when neighbors share their negative adoption experiences and deter other  
5  
6  
7 neighbors from adoption. Lengthy and uncertain durations may also increase the  
8  
9 chances that a customer cancels their contract before the system is installed.  
10  
11  
12 Fourth, future research could further explore the effects of demographic and  
13  
14 other factors that appear to affect PV permit durations, such as housing age. Last,  
15  
16 future research could explore potential policy levers that could optimize the role  
17  
18 of installers in the PV permitting process, such as policies that discourage  
19  
20 installers from submitting permit applications long before the expected  
21  
22 installation date.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **Acknowledgments**

33  
34 This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)'s Office of  
35 Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) under Solar Energy  
36 Technologies Office (SETO) Agreement Number 34158 and Contract No. DE-  
37 AC02-05CH11231. We would like to especially thank Ammar Qusaibaty (DOE)  
38 for his contributions to this paper, and Garrett Nilsen and Becca Jones-Albertus  
39 (DOE) for their support. For data, input, and comments, we also thank two  
40 anonymous referees, as well as Stephen Kline (BuildZoom), Michele Boyd  
41 (DOE), Alex Aznar, Jeff Cook, Megan Day, and Robert Margolis (National  
42 Renewable Energy Laboratory), Ed Gilliland, Mary Van Leuven, Richard  
43 Lawrence, Andrea Luecke, and Theresa Perry (The Solar Foundation), Justin  
44 Baca (Solar Energy Industries Association), Brian Fitzsimons (Grid Unity), Karyn  
45 Boenker (Sunrun), Sarah Van Cleve (Tesla), and Ben Hoen and Peter Cappers  
46 (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory). The views expressed in the article do  
47 not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government. The U.S.  
48 Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication,  
49 acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up,  
50 irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of  
51 this work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 **References**  
5  
6

7 Abadie, A., S. Athey, G. Imbens and J. Wooldridge (2017). When Should You Adjust  
8 Standard Errors for Clustering? Cambridge, MA, National Bureau of Economic  
9 Research.  
10

11 Ardani, K., C. Davidson, R. Margolis and E. Nobler (2015). A State-Level Comparison  
12 of Processes and Timelines for Distributed Photovoltaic Interconnection in the United  
13 States. Golden, CO, NREL.  
14  
15

16 Argetsinger, B. and B. Inskeep (2017). Standards and Requirements for Solar Equipment,  
17 Installation, and Licensing and Certification, Clean Energy States Alliance.  
18  
19

20 Arrow, K. J. (1962). "The economic implications of learning by doing." Review of  
21 Economic Studies **29**(80): 155-173.  
22

23 Barnes, C. (2015). Comparing Utility Interconnection Timelines for Small-Scale Solar  
24 PV, EQ Research.  
25  
26

27 Beck, A. L. and V. Rai (2020). "Solar soft cost ontology: A review of solar soft costs."  
28 Progress in Energy **2**.  
29

30 Bollinger, B. and K. Gillingham (2019). Learning-by-Doing in Solar Photovoltaic  
31 Installations, Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies.  
32  
33

34 Burkhardt, J., R. Wisner, N. Darghouth, C. G. Dong and J. Huneycutt (2015). "Exploring  
35 the impact of permitting and local regulatory processes on residential solar prices in the  
36 United States." Energy Policy **78**: 102-112.  
37  
38

39 CA OPR (2019). California Solar Permitting Guidebook, California Governor's Office of  
40 Planning and Research.  
41

42 Cook, J., A. Aznar, A. Dane, M. Day, S. Mathur and E. Doris (2016). Clean Energy in  
43 City Codes: A Baseline Analysis of Municipal Codification across the United States.  
44 Golden, CO, National Renewable Energy Laboratory.  
45  
46

47 Cruz, R. (2018). "The Politics of Land Use for Distributed Renewable Energy  
48 Generation." Urban Affairs Review **54**(3): 524-559.  
49

50 Dong, C. and R. Wisner (2013). "The impact of city-level permitting processes on  
51 residential photovoltaic installation prices and development times: An empirical analysis  
52 of solar systems in California cities." Energy Policy **63**: 531-542.  
53  
54

55 Hsu, J. H.-Y. (2018). "Predictors for adoption of local solar approval processes and  
56 impact on residential solar installations in California cities." Energy Policy **117**: 463-472.  
57  
58

59 Nemet, G. F. (2006). "Beyond the learning curve: factors influencing cost reductions in  
60 photovoltaics." Energy Policy **34**(17): 3218-3232.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Salmon, J. P., R. Russell, J. Hummer, C. Bloch, B. Davis, A. Meyer, K. Corfee, S.  
5 Graham, B. Gibson, N. Fry, S. Goffri and S. Piell (2014). California Solar Initiative  
6 Market Transformation Study (Task 2), Navigant.  
7

8  
9 Seel, J., G. L. Barbose and R. H. Wiser (2014). "An analysis of residential PV system  
10 price differences between the United States and Germany." Energy Policy **69**: 216-226.  
11

12 Sinitskaya, E., K. Gomez, Q. Bao, M. Yang and E. MacDonald (2019). "Designing linked  
13 journey maps to understand the complexities of the residential solar energy market."  
14 Renewable Energy **145**: 1910-1922.  
15

16  
17 Stanfield, S., K. Kapla, E. Schroeder McConnell, R. Haynes and K. Kooles (2013).  
18 Minimizing Overlap in PV System Approval Processes, Interstate Renewable Energy  
19 Council.  
20

21  
22 Stanfield, S., E. Schroeder and T. Culley (2012). Sharing Success: Emerging Approaches  
23 to Efficient Rooftop Solar Permitting, Interstate Renewable Energy Council.  
24

25 Strupeit, L. (2017). "An innovation system perspective on the drivers of soft cost  
26 reduction for photovoltaic deployment: The case of Germany." Renewable and  
27 Sustainable Energy Reviews **77**: 273-286.  
28

29  
30 Taylor, M. (2019). Understanding streamlined solar permitting practices: A primer.  
31 Berkeley, CA, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.  
32

33  
34 Van den Berg, G. (2001). Duration models: Specification, identification, and multiple  
35 durations. Handbook of Econometrics. J. J. H. a. E. E. Learner. **5**: 3381-3460.  
36

37 White, L. (2018). "Increasing residential solar installations in California: Have local  
38 permitting processes historically driven differences between cities?" Energy Policy **124**:  
39 46-53.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Declaration of interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

**Eric O'Shaughnessy:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Writing - Original Draft, Visualization

**Galen Barbose:** Validation, Investigation, Writing - Review & Editing

**Ryan Wiser:** Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition

## **Patience is a Virtue: A Data-Driven Analysis of Rooftop Solar PV Permitting Timelines in the United States**

### **Highlights**

- Analysis of new data set of solar photovoltaic permit durations
- Solar permit process durations are highly variable
- Permitting authorities and solar installers influence permit process durations
- Solar permit process durations have declined but further reductions are possible
- Permitting authority policies and experience may reduce solar permit durations

## Patience is a Virtue: A Data-Driven Analysis of Rooftop Solar PV Permitting Timelines in the United States

Our response to document uses the following conventions to distinguish reviewer comments and author responses:

- Reviewer comments are in plain text
- Author responses are in blue text
- *Verbatim extracts from the revised manuscript are in blue italics, changes are underlined*

### Reviewer 1

The authors have addressed all comments with a nice level of detail, I have no further requests for revision.

Please note that we have made some structural changes to the manuscript in response to Reviewer 2's comments, but the manuscript retains the same content and findings as the previous revision. In particular, please note that we shifted much of the introductory content for the duration analysis model into Section 3, though this content is the same. Please see our response to Reviewer 2 as a guide for these changes.

The anecdotal insights provided within the reviewer document suggest some interesting additional directions for future research into cancellations of underway projects, and the authors may consider adding this to the discussion in a brief sentence, for the curious.

This is a good suggestion. We avoid relying on anecdotal insights, but we added a note to the concluding paragraph that future research could explore the effects of uncertain durations on customer cancelations:

*"Third, future research could explore the potentially detrimental effects of PV permit duration uncertainty on PV deployment. One possibility is that lengthy and uncertain durations can generate negative peer effects when neighbors share their negative adoption experiences and deter other neighbors from adoption. Lengthy and uncertain durations may also increase the chances that a customer cancels their contract before the system is installed."*

### Reviewer 2

There is no clear liaison between the reason to pursue the research, the methodology,

the results, the policy implications, and/or any other relevant factor. There is no review of similar published or unpublished analyses to support the work. The methodology description lacks liaison with the goal of the work. Current state of the work is far behind possible + outcomes. At least the following elements should be considered: a liaison between the reason to pursue the research, the methodology, the results, the policy implications... As well as a decent review of similar published or unpublished analyses to support the work.

We very much appreciate the review and constructive criticism of the structure of the paper. We have done our best to restructure and revise accordingly and believe the new structure and content is an improvement.

We made three primary structural changes to the manuscript to address these comments:

1. We converted the "Background" section into a more formal literature review. We further searched the literature and added citations to five additional studies. We expanded our discussion of comparable work. However, we note that no previous study attempts to answer the research question posed in our study. Specifically, no previous study attempts to quantify the effects of different factors on permit durations as we have done. We attempt to make this as clear as possible in a new concluding paragraph to the literature review:

*"Our article builds on this literature in two ways. First, we build on previous descriptions of permit process durations (Stanfield, Kapla et al. 2013, Salmon, Russell et al. 2014, Ardani, Davidson et al. 2015, Taylor 2019) using a significantly larger and more geographically comprehensive system-level data set. Second, we build on the survey-based results of Sinitskaya et al. (2019) with a data-driven analysis of the factors that determine PV permit durations."*

2. In order to clearly establish the links between the methods and the results, we restructured the Data section into a Data and Methods section comprising all relevant methods used in the study. We explicitly link these methods to the research objective and the results:

*"Our methodological approach is framed around our four research questions: 1) How long is a typical PV permit process from application to completion? 2) How much do these durations vary? 3) What are the key trends in PV permit durations over space and time? and 4) What factors can explain variation in permit durations? We answer the first three research questions through multiple descriptive analyses presented in Section*

*4. To answer the fourth research question, we develop a duration analysis model to test the effects of different factors on permit durations."*

3. We edited the manuscript to explicitly link the conclusions to the research objectives and how these conclusions relate to and build on the existing literature. See Table 4 in the revised manuscript.