## **New Tools for Coordination of Gas and Electric System Planning**

**Utility Variability Integration Group 2018 Spring Technical Workshop** 



#### **Anatoly Zlotnik**

(with Alexandr Rudkevich, Richard Tabors, Michael Caramanis, Pablo Ruiz, Russell Philbrick, Scott Backhaus, Richard Hornby)

March, 14 2018

LA-UR-17-22938

Operated by Los Alamos National Security, LLC for the U.S. Department of Energy's NNS/

# Outline

- Vision for gas-electric system coordination
  - Enabled by new concept for transient pipeline optimization
  - Integration of markets, flow scheduling, and gas control
- Locational Trade Values (LTVs) for natural gas
  - Obtained by single price two-sided auction mechanism
  - Account for pipeline structure, physics and engineering

## Gas Balancing Market

- Voluntary intra-day auction mechanism
- Fits within existing practices and regulations

## **Gas-Electric Challenges**

#### Operational Challenges:

- Flexible gas-fired generation lacks fuel supply flexibility
- <u>Flexibility is crucial in power systems</u>: supply must match demand continuously and instantaneously (there is no equivalent to line pack)
- Variability and unpredictability of gas-fired generation challenges pipeline operations
- Anticipated continued growth of the gas-fired generating fleet

#### Planning/Long-Term Challenges:

- Gas-fired power plants tend to not procure firm gas transportation
- Under extreme conditions, there have been severe gas pipeline constraints that limited supply to gas-fired generation

#### Addressing continued growth of gas-fired generation

- New optimization and control technology
- Engineering economic methods

# **ARPA-e GECO Goals**

- Radically improve coordination of natural gas and electric operations
  - *Price formation:* for power systems, now done by optimization, every 10 minutes
  - for gas pipelines: by bilateral trades  $\rightarrow$  hubbased, 5 times per week. GOAL: HOURLY
- Develop Physics- & engineering-based models, market-based optimal control formulations, & optimization algorithms for economically optimal scheduling of intra-day pipeline flows
  - Similar to day-ahead unit commitment and economic dispatch for power systems
  - Hourly, locational pricing of gas accounts for value to power system & pipeline capacity



• Quantify advantages of market-based gas-electric coordination

# **Today's Key Gas-Electric Coordination Deficiency**

#### Gas-fired power generators...

- Tend to be flexible units capable of generating upon relatively short notice
- Active in the 5-minute real-time power markets, change their outputs frequently
- Provide the bulk of operating reserves in some regions
- require ability to change output immediately, as directed by the power system operator
- It is difficult to forecast burn rates for these units on a day-ahead basis
- There are no liquid and transparent intra-day gas markets
  - Gas-fired generators cannot procure gas as needed under relatively short notice
  - Most flexible gas-fired power plants purchase gas bilaterally from marketers who manage a portfolio of gas resources
  - Purchasing gas from a supplier and transportation rights from a shipper is time consuming, multi-party process in an illiquid market
- R. D. Tabors and S. Adamson, "Measurement of energy market inefficiencies in the coordination of natural gas & power," in 47th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS). IEEE, 2014, pp. 2335–2343.

# **Traditional Transient Pipeline Optimization Goals**

#### Intra-day operations are done without real-time optimization/analytics

- Optimization and simulation is traditionally used for capacity planning
- Does not take advantage of full pipeline capacity

### Given expected/forecasted natural gas load profiles

- Determine flow schedule and compute compressor controls

### Previously suggested approaches

- Simulation-based, complex "full-physics" modeling
- High performance computing

#### Possible issues

- Load profiles are uncertain and may change intra-day
- Computing solutions is costly for large-scale systems

#### <u>Reactive to decisions made by market actors</u>

• H. H. Rachford Jr, R. G. Carter, and T. F. Dupont. "Using optimization in transient gas transmission." PSIG Annual Meeting. Pipeline Simulation Interest Group, 2009.

# **New Transient Pipeline Optimization Concept**

- Responsive intra-day gas pipeline flow scheduling using optimization
- Given bids by market participants (shippers)
  - Allocate deliveries according to bids and capacity
  - Compute compressor controls and flow schedule

## Our approach

- Optimization-based, simplified "reduced" modeling
- Fast computation on commodity platform (e.g. a laptop)

### Advantages

- Integration of market and physical operations
- Fast compute to enable intra-day shipping requests
- Voluntary balancing market over current daily nominations

• A. Zlotnik, M. Chertkov, and S. Backhaus, "Optimal control of transient flow in natural gas networks," in 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Osaka, Japan, 2015, pp. 4563–4570.

# **Economic Optimization of Intra-day Pipeline Operation**

#### • A "two-sided auction" for buyers and sellers on entire pipeline network

- Network nodes: custodial meters & compressor stations
- Network edges: pipes that physically connect nodes

### Subject to engineering constraints

- Pipeline flow equations, limitations on the capability of compressors
- Maximum Allowed Operational Pressure, Minimum pressure contractual requirements

### Market Bids by Suppliers and Offtakers:

- Submitting Price/Quantity (P/Q) offers to sell/buy gas
- Offers and bids submitted with hourly time step for optimization horizon (e.g., 36 hours)

#### Auctioneer's objective function

- To maximize <u>market surplus</u> over the optimization horizon (accounting for accepted bids and offers less compressor costs of running the pipeline)
- Maximize payments for delivery minus costs of supply
- A. Rudkevich, and A. Zlotnik. "Locational Marginal Pricing of Natural Gas subject to Engineering Constraints." Proceedings of the 50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, pp. 3092-3101, 2017.

# Locational Trade Values (LTVs) of Natural Gas

#### Mathematical formulation of the optimization problem

- A two-sided auction over pipeline network
- Uses non-linear dynamic PDEs of gas flow in the pipeline
- Equation of state for compressible flow

### Shadow prices (dual variables)

- For mass flow withdrawal at nodes (congestion price)
- For pressure and compressor limits (capacity price)
- Proved that there is revenue adequacy for the Auctioneer

### Transient LTVs

- reflect increase in system-wide costs of serving incremental locational demand incurred over entire optimization horizon, may not coincide with demand increase
- depend on the timing, location and cost of marginal resources used to serve incremental demand <u>subject to all engineering constraints</u>
- reflect current and anticipated conditions of pipeline during the optimization horizon

# Mathematics of Gas Balancing Market



$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		
$ \overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{i} \frac{p}{j} k $ $ \overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{i} \frac{p}{j} k $ $ \overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{i} \frac{p}{i} k $ $ \overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{i} \frac{p}{i} k $ $ \overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{i} \frac{p}{i} k $ $ \overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{i} k $ $ \overline{\alpha}_{i} $	its (SI)	
$\overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{l}_{jk} $ $[0,T] \qquad kg\cdot s^{-1} \qquad kg\cdot s^{-1} \qquad p_j(t) \qquad j \in \nabla_F \qquad [0,T] \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad p_j(t) \qquad j \in \nabla_F \qquad [0,T] \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad p_j(t,x) \qquad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0,T] \times [0,L_{ij}] \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad p_j(t,x) \qquad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0,T] \times [0,L_{ij}] \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad p_j(t,x) \qquad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0,T] \times [0,L_{ij}] \qquad kg\cdot m^{-1} \qquad kg\cdot m^$	g• s <sup>−1</sup>	
$\overline{\alpha}_{ij} = \frac{p}{jk} \xrightarrow{kg.s^{-1}} (p,T)   kg.s^{-1}   kg.s^{-1}   p_{ij}(t,x)   (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} [0,T] \times [0,L_{ij}]   kg.m^{-1}   kg.m^{-1}   s^{-2}   (Pa)   kg.m^{-1}   (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} [0,T] \times [0,L_{ij}]   kg.m^{-1}   kg.m^{-1$	$1 \cdot s^{-2}$ (Pa)	
Parameters $p = [0, T]  (q, m + s^{2} \cdot (Pa))$ $\phi_{ij}(t, x)  (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}  [0, T] \times [0, L_{ij}]$ $\underline{\alpha}_{ij}(t), \overline{\alpha}_{ij}(t)  (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}  [0, T]$ $Table 2: Primal Variables$ $\overline{\alpha}_{ij}  \frac{p}{l}_{jk}$ Variable Set Domain Unit	$\cdot s^{-2}$ (Pa)	
Parameters $\begin{array}{c c} \varphi_{ij}(x,y) & (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \\ \underline{\alpha}_{ij}(t), \overline{\alpha}_{ij}(t) & (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} 0,T \end{bmatrix} \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} 0,T \end{bmatrix} \\ \hline \\$	o. s <sup>−1</sup>	
Table 2: Primal Variables $\overline{\alpha}_{ij}$ $\frac{p}{J^jk}$ Variable     Set     Domain     Unit	-	
$\overline{\alpha}_{ij}$ $\underline{p}_{jk}$ Variable Set Domain Unit	Table 2: Primal Variables	
$\alpha_{ij}$ $\beta^{ij} \rightarrow \beta^{ij}$	ts (SI)	
$\int \langle \mathbf{x}_{d_{1}} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x}_{d_{1}} \rangle $	kg <sup>-1</sup>	
$P_j \qquad \qquad$	kg <sup>-1</sup>	
$(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}  [0,T] \times [0,L_{ij}]  \qquad \$ \cdot s^2$	·kg <sup>-1</sup>	
$(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}  [0, T] \times [0, L_{ij}]  \$ \cdot \$^3 \cdot m^2 \cdot kg^{-1}$	$^{2}$ (\$·Pa <sup>-2</sup> ·s <sup>-1</sup> )	
$\frac{\underline{\alpha}_{jl}}{\underline{n}}  \underline{\Delta}_{ij}(t), \overline{\Delta}_{ij}(t) \qquad (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0, T] \qquad \$ \cdot s \cdot m \cdot kg^{-1}$	$(\$ \cdot Pa^{-1} \cdot s^{-1})$	
$\sum \frac{\underline{P}}{jl} \qquad \underline{\beta}_{ij}^{\min}(t), \underline{\beta}_{ij}^{\max}(t), \overline{\beta}_{ij}^{\max}(t), \overline{\beta}_{ij}^{\max}(t) \qquad (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0, T] \qquad \$ \cdot s \cdot m \cdot kg^{-1}$	$(\${\cdot}\mathrm{Pa}^{-1}{\cdot}\mathrm{s}^{-1})$	
$q_{j} = \underbrace{\gamma_{ij}}_{(i,j)} (t), \overline{\gamma_{ij}}(t) \qquad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0,T] \qquad \$ \cdot W$	$-1 \cdot s^{-1}$	
$\forall j i \qquad \qquad \underbrace{\theta_{ij}}_{(i)}(t), \overline{\theta_{ij}}(t) \qquad \qquad (i,j) \in \mathcal{E} \qquad [0,T]$	-	
$\tau_{ij}^{\hat{p}}(x), \tau_{ij}^{\phi}(x)$ $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ $[0, T]$ $\$ \cdot s$	11	

Table 3: Dual Variables

- A two-sided auction over pipeline network
- Shadow prices (dual variables)

Set

 $m \in \mathcal{G}$ 

 $m \in \mathcal{G}$  $j \in \mathcal{V}$ 

 $i \in \mathcal{V}$ 

Table 1: Market

- On mass flow withdrawal at nodes (congestion price)
- On pressure and compressor limits (capacity price)
- Proof of revenue adequacy for the Auctioneer
- Optimization of prototype 1500+ mile system in <5</li> mins at 98% accuracy (<2% error w.r.t. simulation)

Mathematics: • Constrained optimal control of hyperbolic PDEs on large graphs

• Fielding "transient optimization" is a long-standing grand challenge in the pipeline industry

# **Illustrative Example of LTVs: a 2-Node Model**



We explore a range of dynamic solutions by considering systems with different MAOP ranging between 500 and 1000

## LTVs vs Nodal Pressure by Scenario



# Line Pack by Scenario





## **Proposed Solution: Gas Balancing Market**

#### • We propose a Gas Balancing Market (GBM) that:

- Would have voluntary participation, honor existing transportation rights and contracts
- Enable trades of hourly imbalances from ratable schedules
- Assure that intra-day transactions cleared in the market are physically implementable
- Enable intra-day gas transactions between parties in a <u>liquid, transparent, flexible</u> and simple manner
- Provide transparent pricing signals to all gas players to inform decision making
- Enable more economically efficient utilization of the gas and power infrastructures

#### Participants

- Suppliers and offtakers submit Price/Quantity (P/Q) offers to sell/buy gas
- Shippers submitting P/Q offers to sell/buy gas relative to ratable schedule
- <u>Buyers and sellers submitting opportunistic P/Q bids to buy/sell gas not backed</u> <u>by reserved capacity</u>

# **Current Gas-Electric Decision Cycles**



# **Proposed Timing of the Gas Balancing Market**



- All times are in Central prevailing time.

- Standard gas cycles required by FERC are shown. Pipelines may offer additional cycles. Under emergency conditions scheduling could be done outside of these cycles.

# An Auction for Shippers & other Buyers and Sellers

#### Opportunistic buyers and sellers

- may have no reserved capacity rights but are allowed to participate to increase liquidity
- No capacity rights = no congestion hedging

### Offers and bids are node-specific

- submitted with hourly time step for the optimization horizon (e.g., 36 hours)
- Auctioneer's objective function is to maximize market surplus over the optimization horizon
  - accounting for accepted bids & offers less pipeline operating costs

## **Ratable schedules vs. non-ratable needs**



## Need more - schedule buy; Need less - schedule sell

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

# **GBM Support of Gas-Electric Coordination**

#### Provides intra-day forward prices

- Inform gas-fired generation bids for real-time power markets
- Simplify gas purchases for gas-fired fast-start power plants that clear in the real-time power markets and are called upon to provide ancillary services
- Provides many rounds of forward market clearings
  - For gas-fired units scheduled to operate in day-ahead power market to purchase gas
  - especially between HE 2400 and HE 0900 (belong to different Gas and Electric days)

#### • Under scarcity conditions in a gas pipeline

- high gas prices will immediately lead to real-time re-dispatch of gas-fired generating units receiving these high gas prices
- These units will be replaced by gas-fired units not affected by scarcity or other generating units

### GBM pricing information

- enables economic re-dispatch of gas-fired generators
- relieves scarcity events, simplifies pipeline operations

# Model Precision Validation – a pipeline in the Northeast

## Reduced model of subsystem:

- 78 nodes, 91 pipes, 4 compressors
  31 custody transfer meters at 24 locations (labelled A to X)
- Flow from meters at B to X, pressure at source at node A
- Comparing relative distance (%) of SCADA vs. simulation
  - Pressure at flow nodes B to X
  - -mean: 4.17%, (2.94% w/o U,V,W)
  - Mass flow into system at node A
  - mean (max) 2.45% (23.7%)

![](_page_20_Figure_9.jpeg)

## **Impact of Gas Balancing Market**

- Optimized throughput under the backcast of extreme <u>2014 Polar Vortex conditions</u>:
- Increased Pipeline Deliverability by 12%
- Using LTVs for intra-day gas trading could reduce gas prices for constrained pipeline
  - LTVs computed using transient optimization under backcast of extreme 2014 Polar Vortex conditions
- LTVs significantly lower than prevailing daily price indices:
  - Average price reduction: 11%
  - Times of high prices: up to 30%

![](_page_21_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_9.jpeg)

# Conclusion

#### New concept for gas-electric coordination

- Enabled by transient pipeline optimization (new tools developed by GECO team)
- Integration of markets, flow scheduling, and gas control

### Locational Trade Values (LTVs) for natural gas

- Obtained by single price two-sided auction mechanism
- Account for pipeline structure, physics and engineering

### Gas Balancing Market

- Voluntary intra-day auction mechanism
- Fits within existing practices and regulations
- Results Using Pipeline Model and Data
  - Validated modeling with respect to SCADA time-series
  - Quantify advantage of LTV market mechanism (capacity and price)

# Acknowledgement

#### ARPA-e Project GECO

 Advanced Research Project Agency-Energy (ARPA-e) of the U.S. Department of Energy, Award No. DE-AR0000673

## Advanced Grid Modeling Research Program

- D.O.E. Office of Electricity
- D.O.E. Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

## Los Alamos National Laboratory

 National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DEAC52-06NA25396

#### Kinder Morgan, PJM