



2012 DOE Energy Storage Program Peer Review

Second Generation Emissions Study

Washington, DC

September 26 - 28, 2012



OFFICE OF
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY &
ENERGY RELIABILITY



Sandia
National
Laboratories



Original KEMA Study on Emission Benefits

- Study was conducted in 2007 and compared a flywheel to traditional technologies
 - Study highlights
 - Showed emission savings from utilization of storage
 - Study provided a simple “snapshot” of potential trends
 - Compared a flywheel to natural gas, coal, and pumped hydro systems
 - Methodology “vetted” at 2007 EESAT Conference
 - Next steps called for a “deeper dive into actual performance numbers”
 - Actual simulations of specific ISO

- Today, study is still cited as the main “Emission “ Study for such applications
 - Results referenced in many cases as a secondary benefit of storage systems
 - But model simply lacked the granularity such roles require

2nd Generation Study on Emission Benefits

- Goal was to update the study using tools that have been developed since the time of the first study
 - Actual ISO territories were modeled instead of the original “snapshot” approach
 - Used emission models of actual generators instead of a “generic” plant
 - Coordinated with actual ISOs to collect the data for the study
 - CAISO model included 590 power plants and 14 control areas
 - PJM Model included 600 power plants and 19 control areas
- Results provided a more accurate assessment of the potential emissions savings to utilizing advanced storage systems vs. traditional power plants
 - Study substituted specific plants with Lithium and flywheel devices from a 25% penetration of regulation supplied up to 100% of the regulation



Tools Used for the Study

■ DNV KEMA KERMIT Model

- Designed to study a power systems frequency behavior over a 24 hour period
- Able to simulate AGC signals as well as grid-scale storage
- Defines hourly and sub-hourly generation schedules for 100s of generators

■ Emission feature of KERMIT Tools

- Incorporates a dynamic emissions model to estimate CO₂ and NO_x emissions for combustion turbines, coal plants, and combined cycle plants
- Estimates emissions based on a generators current output level and for utilizes ramp rates for combustion turbines



Courtesy Dr. Jay Apt & Dr. Warren Katzenstein

Results for PJM Territory

- Emissions reductions seen for PJM

- Key Points about PJM

- Largest of the ISO/RTO Territories
- Regulation provided by a combination of coal, combined cycle, and hydro plants
- Largest of ISO territories – regulation typically represents approximately 1% of total load

- Drivers for the market

- Only a portion of the generators supplying services considered less efficient – hence optimal savings occurred when portion of regulation total supplied by storage
- Really don't have devices dedicated to regulation, typically will provide 5-20% of their output to regulation market
- Can't really "bump" device out of market – devices typically go back to performing in real time energy market

Selected Day	CO2 Tons Base Case	CO2 Tons 50% Storage	Difference	Estimated Month Total
21-Jan	887359	887314	45	1395
18-Feb	639117	639081	36	1008
20-Mar	544915	544881	34	1054
11-Apr	665802	665765	37	1110
10-May	658456	658406	50	1550
15-Jun	999290	999230	60	1800
10-Jul	944278	944250	28	868
15-Aug	848813	848763	50	1550
7-Sep	842677	842613	64	1920
28-Oct	675138	675097	41	1271
11-Nov	667589	667553	36	1080
13-Dec	961636	961605	31	961
Total Year				15567

Results for CAISO Study

- Results less conclusive

- Simulations were run over 6 days throughout the year – model was not able to pick up trends or patterns of reduction or increases
 - Why? Regulation market made up of pumped hydro, combustion turbines, combined cycle plants
- Follows similar trends to PJM where generators contribute partial amounts of nameplate capacity to regulation

- Using storage to replace Spinning Reserve

- Examined as a potential area of benefit
- Four cases examined
 - Hypothetical 100 MW of spinning reserve where it is replaced by 20 MW of storage and 80 MW of traditional generation

Case	CO2 (ton)		NOx (lb)	
	Before	After	Before	After
1	64.59	63.20	70.81	56.65
2	3.32	0	5.67	0
3	79.00	63.20	70.81	56.65
4	15.80	0	14.16	0



The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Department of Energy/Office of Electricity's Energy Storage Program

Questions?

