
Aggregated Electricity Load Modeling & Control for Regulation and Load Following Ancillary Services

Duncan Callaway

UC Berkeley Energy and Resources Group


PSERC Webinar

November 3, 2009

Thermostatically Controlled Loads (TCLs)

- 50% of commercial and residential energy is consumed by thermal loads in the United States.
- Hysteresis control typical (on / off)
- Exact time of operation doesn't matter to user
- Aggregated demand =
$$\sum (\text{duty cycle}) \times (\text{peak demand})$$

...due to system diversity
- “Latent” source of energy storage, with efficiency near 100%



PCTs and AMI

- PCT = Programmable Communicating Thermostat
- Remote manipulation of temperature set point
- Potential for high resolution response for utility
- May appeal to mass market for convenience




- AMI = Advanced Metering Infrastructure
 - Facilitates communication with all end-use loads



Conventional Load Control

- Interrupt power to loads with relays



Source: Vittal and Ramanathan, "Security Enhancement through Direct Non-Disruptive Load Control" Final Project Report Part II. PSERC Publication 06-02

- Previous research focuses on:
 - Optimal control (esp. Bhattacharyya & Crow 1996)
 - MPC approaches (Molina *et al* 2000)
- But there are challenges: system identification is one...

Challenges with Load Control

The California Energy Commission proposed in January 2008 to require PCTs on all new construction. The response:


“There will be governors or limits on your thermostat from the utility company, and it will be whatever the state mandates...If we're not careful, this is the kind of stuff we're going to elect people to start implementing all over the country.”

- Rush Limbaugh, January 9, 2008

Are there alternatives?

- Can we get value without compromising end-use function?
- Possible answer: balance shorter time scale fluctuations via partial synchronization

“Energy storage is key to expanding the use of renewable energy.... The technology we’re testing has the potential to reduce the impact caused by the variability and limited predictability of wind and solar generation.” - Xcel Energy brochure



This work will focus on:

- Thermostat control (not relays)
 - controlling end-use function, not the desired power consumption level
- Small perturbations in operating state → low impact on end-user
- Developing methods amenable to system ID and feedback control
- Managing variable output from renewables
- Identifying design parameters for load control program

Modeling individual TCLs

θ_i = temperature of i^{th} load

$m_i \in \{0,1\}$ = state of load

Thermal capacitance, resistance and heat gain are heterogeneous

$$C_i \frac{d\theta_i(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{R_i} (\theta_i(t) - \theta_a) - m_i(t) P_i + w_i(t)$$


cooling model

$$m_i(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \theta_i(t) < \theta_{-,i}(\theta_s, \delta, u(t)) \\ 1, & \theta_i(t) > \theta_{+,i}(\theta_s, \delta, u(t)) \\ m_i(t), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thermostat 'deadband', defines hysteresis control

$$y(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\eta_i} P_i m_i(t)$$

Aggregated response to setpoint change




Discretized individual model, 10,000 simulated simultaneously, coupled by setpoint change

No parameter heterogeneity; limited damping from noise term

Parameter heterogeneity provides more damping


Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF




Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF




Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF




Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF






Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF




Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF






Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF






Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF






Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF






Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF






Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF




Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF




Load Modeling and Control:

Evolution of the PDF



- Observation: distributions are near steady state at the deadband limits
- Changes in power demand are due to partial load sync.
- Prediction: characteristics that dissipate disturbances will improve performance

“Static” picture of disturbance rejection



Stochastic
input signal:

$$u_{t_n} = \sum_{i=1}^M v_{n+i}$$

$$v_n = N(0, \sigma_v)$$

$$M = 25, \sigma_v = 5 \times 10^{-3}$$

Quantiles
converge as they
approach the
deadband limit

Linear Approximation

- Assume steady state probability distribution
- Assume small process noise, w_i
- Model response to change in setpoint, Δu_t
- Then it is straightforward to show that the change in power demand is:

$$\Delta y_{t_{n+1}}^{ss} = -\frac{\Delta u_{t_n}}{\delta} \sum_i \frac{1}{\eta} P_i$$

- If disturbances from steady state are stochastic


$$\Delta y_{t_{n+1}} = -\frac{\Delta u_{t_n}}{\delta} \sum_i \frac{1}{\eta_i} P_i + e_{t_n}$$

Generic time series representation

- The linear model is a sub-model of the ARMAX time series model:

$$A(q)y_{t_n} = B(q)u_{t_n} + C(q)e_{t_n}$$

- Parameters can be determined by prediction error minimization – $IF y_{tn}$ can be measured



Minimum variance controller

- Rearrange time series model


$$u(t_n) = \frac{C(q)y^m(t_{n+1}) - \frac{C(q) - A(q)}{q^{-1}}y(t_n)}{B(q)}$$

- $y^m(t_{n+1})$ is the reference output
- ...assumes that one time step is required for the input signal to affect the output; use $y^m(t_n)$ if the input signal has an immediate effect.
- A , B , and C vectors can be determined by system identification or from theoretical parameterization

$$\Delta y_{t_{n+1}}^{ss} = -\frac{\Delta u_{t_n}}{\delta} \sum_i \frac{1}{\eta} P_i$$

Load Modeling and Control:

Variable output from renewables




Smoothed output is easier for dispatchable generation to follow

Theoretical MVC Performance

Buffalo Ridge wind production matched to
60,000 TCLs


(output scaled, four hour moving average removed)



...and ARMAX MVC Performance

Buffalo Ridge wind production matched to
60,000 TCLs


(output scaled, four hour moving average removed)



Can we identify load characteristics that will improve performance?

- Need a measure of how quickly disturbances decay

Fokker-Planck Approximation



$$\frac{\partial f_0}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[\left(\frac{1}{CR} (\theta(t) - \theta_a) \right) f_0 \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} f_0$$

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[\left(\frac{1}{CR} (\theta(t) - \theta_a) + \frac{P}{C} \right) f_1 \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} f_1$$

- Coupled by B.C. at deadband limits
- Original formulation due to Malhamé & Chong, 1985
- Assumes parameter homogeneity
- M&C found stationary sol'n with $\theta(t) - \theta_a$ constant


Fokker-Planck Approximation, ctd

- Non-stationary solution eigenvalues will determine how quickly disturbances decay to steady state.
 - ...unable to find nonstationary solutions under M&C assumption
- However, the original system can in fact be solved by separation of variables ($f(\theta, t) = \varphi(\theta)e^{-\lambda t}$) and the series method. The result:

$$\varphi = a_0 e^{-\xi^2} {}_1F_1\left(-\frac{\lambda CR}{2}; \frac{1}{2}; \xi^2\right) + a_1 \xi e^{-\xi^2} {}_1F_1\left(-\frac{\lambda CR - 1}{2}; \frac{3}{2}; \xi^2\right)$$

${}_1F_1$ is the confluent hypergeometric function of the first kind and ξ is a state-dependent transformation of θ .

Fokker-Planck Solution




- Although the hypergeometric functions are not very intuitive, the eigenvalues are:

$$\lambda_k = \frac{k}{CR}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$


- CR is the building thermal constant $\rightarrow$ smaller CR , faster transient decay

MVC performance for different load characteristics – smaller eigenvalue



- RMSE, original parameters = 0.25
- RMSE, 4x smaller eigenvalue = 0.75


MVC performance for different load characteristics – less heterogeneity



- RMSE, original parameters = 0.25
- RMSE, 4x smaller parameter s.d. = 0.98

What about thermostat resolution?

- Previous results were for infinitely adjustable thermostats
- Figure below shows result when state changes happen only at the indicated



- 14 bit resolution sensors are available and inexpensive

Back of the envelope...

- Simulations showed average load of 140MW, with ± 40 MW of fluctuation
- Consider two operation scenarios:
 1. Run 100 MW baseload plant at constant output and simple cycle gas turbine (SCGT) to manage fluctuations, average 40 MW
 2. Run 140 MW baseload plant at constant output and use TCLs to manage fluctuations
- Consider two generation scenarios:
 - A. 'baseload' is coal
 - B. 'baseload' is combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT)
- Assume:
 - coal (base load) = \$0.015/kWh, 1.9 lbs CO₂/kWh
 - gas (combined cycle) = \$0.05/kWh, 0.84 lbs CO₂/kWh
 - gas (simple cycle) = \$0.075/kWh, 1.27 lbs CO₂/kWh

Back of the envelope...CTD

Baseload = coal		Baseload = gas	
Change in CO ₂	Change in cost	Change in CO ₂	Change in cost
+11%	-50%	-13%	-13%

Caveats:

- In practice, a mixture of generators will be used to follow fluctuations → Full system dispatch model needed to evaluate the approach
- Cooling loads not always available (others e.g. water heaters might be).
- Wind fluctuations from one plant will be partly counteracted by natural fluctuations in load or from other wind plants
- But if PCTs or AMI are being installed for other reasons, this is a “free” resource

Summary

- Load synchronization produces large response
- Linear approximation performs well
- Eigenvalue is a function of thermal time constant
- System diversity improves performance
- TCLs can provide services in regulation and load following time scales without affecting comfort

Open questions and future work

- What bandwidth is needed? What's available?
- Identification of output signal from total system demand
- Better thermal load models (heterogeneity)
- Examine other loads (e.g. water heating, refrigeration) and quantify potential

Open questions and future work...

- Control strategies –
 - distributed / decentralized?
 - predictive?
- Integration with power system simulations
Ongoing research funded by California Energy Commission
- Collaboration with CA ISO to direct research

Additional Slides

Table 1: Model parameter values

Parameter	Value
R , Average thermal resistance	2 °C/kW
C , Average thermal capacitance, unless noted otherwise	10 kWh/°C
P , Average energy transfer rate	14 kW
η , Load efficiency	2.5
θ_s , Temperature set point	20°C
δ , Thermostat deadband	0.5°C
θ_a , Ambient temperature, unless noted otherwise	32°C
σ , Noise standard deviation, unless noted otherwise	0.01°C s ^{-1/2}
σ_p , <i>Standard deviation of lognormal distributions, as a fraction of the mean value, for R , C , and P , unless noted otherwise</i>	0.2

Linear Approximation: One Step Ahead Model Performance

$$u_{t_n} = \sum_{i=1}^M v_{n+i}$$

$$v_n = N(0, \sigma_v)$$

$$M = 25, \sigma_v = 5 \times 10^{-3}$$

Fit is measured as

$$(1 - \|\hat{y}_t - y_t\|) / \|\bar{y} - y_t\|$$

$\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean Norm.

