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Abstract—Built upon real-world SCADA and other measurements of a featured utility-scale testbed, this paper addresses the participation of customer side battery energy storage in providing peak load shaving at a 12.47 kV distribution feeder. A stochastic optimization-based battery operation framework is developed that enables feeder load peak shaving under offline (day-ahead) as well as online (close-to-real-time) control settings. Both designs work through establishing a secured communications link to the utility’s feeder-level SCADA system. Multiple field experiments are conducted, including a full day test with complete control of a 1 MWh / 200 kW battery system, as well as various numerical assessments based upon one year of real feeder data.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The principles of utilizing customer side battery resources for distribution feeder peak load reduction are simple [1], [2]; yet there are several technical challenges that need to be addressed in practice. For example, any arrangement for customer-side battery resources to respond to changes in feeder load would require communications between the customer and the utility’s feeder-level supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system. Some of these issues are gradually being addressed, e.g., in recent regulatory efforts such as in [3]. However, additional studies and access to real-world test data are needed to understand how customers can provide feeder-level utility-scale services. Accordingly, the goal of this paper is to identify, explain, and characterize the challenges in utilizing customer-side battery resources to conduct distribution feeder peak load reduction. The analysis in this paper is built upon a utility-scale testbed developed through a university-utility collaboration in Riverside, CA.

A. Utility-Scale Test Setup

The test set up in this project has two main components: a micro-grid and a commercial building; and a communications platform between the utility SCADA system and the microgrid. Several distributed energy resources (DERs) are installed at the microgrid, including a battery system with 1 MWh energy and 200 kW power ratings, three solar arrays with a total of 460 kW nominal capacity, and several level-2 electric vehicle chargers. The building is served by a 12.47 kV feeder, number #1224, on Riverside Public Utilities (RPU)’s 69 kV Hunter Station. The test setup is shown in Fig. 1. This figure also shows how the Hunter substation is located with respect to the rest of the sub-transmission, and transmission systems. Additional details about this testbed are discussed in [4]–[8].

As a key feature of this test platform, the microgrid battery controller is granted access to the utility’s SCADA system to remotely read the feeder’s active and reactive power load data in a minute-by-minute resolution. This is facilitated through establishing a secured communications line.

B. Contributions

The contributions in this paper are summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to develop and test a real-world utility-scale optimization-based customer-side battery operation mechanism in order to perform peak-shaving at a distribution feeder.

- A battery scheduling framework based on stochastic optimization is developed that utilizes various measurements, accounts for feeder load uncertainties in offline (day-ahead) and online (close-to-real-time) control settings, and addresses various design objectives and constraints.

- Multiple real-world field experiments, including a full-day full-scale field test, are conducted and the results are analyzed. Also, one year of real-world feeder data is used to extend the experiments and to report a variety of lessons learned, such as the impact of load estimation.

The authors would like to thank Alan Woodcock, Alan Lee, Ed Sponsler, and Alex Vu for their help in establishing the secure communications line.
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II. Discovery Analysis of the Feeder Data

We start off, in this section, by seeking to uncover various complications that may exist in the operational conditions across the customer, distribution, and sub-transmission systems. The examination of the available field data, provides evidence and design hints for some key concepts with respect to the operation of the distribution grid with active customers, which shed light on the development of an effective design.

A. Conflict of Feeder-level and Customer-level Requirements

Examples of the feeder daily load profiles are shown in Fig. 2(a) for July 10, a representative week-day, and July 18, a representative weekend. First, we see that the weekday profile has clear peak hours, while the weekend load is fairly flat. Similar trends are observed throughout the SCADA data. Therefore, our focus in this study is on weekdays. Second, we see that the utility feeder peak load often does not last long, which means even a relatively small battery system might be able to make a noticeable impact on the feeder peak load.

Fig. 2(a) also shows the net load of the building on the same weekday. We see that the peak load hours of the building are very different from those of the feeder. This is also confirmed in Fig. 2(b), where the distributions of the peak load hours for the feeder and for the building - without battery operation - are shown during the Winter. The Summer season at this utility is from June to September and the Winter season is from October to May. From Fig. 2(b), it is inferred that, should the customer seek to lower its own peak demand, it will not necessarily lower the distribution feeder peak load; to the contrary, it could even increase the peak. Thus, the demand charges that a utility sets to reduce a customers peak load, do not necessarily lead to reducing the peak demand on the distribution feeder. Of course, since the feeder load is the combination of many customer loads, this is not necessarily strange; however it does show that there is potential for conflict and that any schema that is developed in which a customer provides grid services, like feeder peak shaving, must consider these potential conflicts that have impacts on the design.

B. Conflict of Feeder-Level and Utility-wide Requirements

Next, we compare the average daily load of the feeder with the average daily load of the entire sub-transmission system, i.e., the utility as a whole. The comparison is done for the month of February, which is within the utility’s Winter season. The results are shown in Fig. 3. We can see that, the peak load hour at the feeder is very different from the peak hour at the utility as a whole. This observation is notable, as it suggests that the system-wide policies for the control and correction of the load profile, such as time-of-use (ToU) pricing, may not often help with peak load shaving at this feeder.

Next, we compare the distribution of the daily peak load hour at the feeder, with that of the daily peak price hour in the California ISO day-ahead market. The price data is based on the locational marginal price (LMP) at the transmission-level Vista substation. Note that, the entire RPU sub-transmission system is interconnected with the rest of the California transmission grid, at Vista substation. The results are shown in Fig.
C. The Need for Localized Solution

The analysis in Sections II-A and II-B, further motivates the goal of our study to conduct peak load reduction at feeder-level through a localized solution, rather than a customer-level or a utility-wide solution; recall Figs. 2 and 3. It also shows the conflict between the best ways to run the battery system as a customer-side financial asset versus the best ways to run the battery to contribute to feeder-level peak load reduction.

We should point out, however, that while the above analysis and observations show the possibility that following system-wide policies would not necessarily lead to reducing feeder peak loading condition, we cannot make statements on the generality or severity of such conditions on other feeders. For instance, we analyzed the loading conditions of a second feeder, that is geographically close but is electrically isolated from the Feeder 1224. The analysis was performed on the winter data from October to February. The results are shown in Fig. 4. Here, we can see that for this second feeder, the peak hour conflict with utility peak hours also exist, yet it is not as severe as Feeder 1224. Nevertheless, regardless of the frequency of the feeders that may have conflicts with the utility-wide load pattern, for those feeder that this conditions do exist a localized solution would be effective and necessary.

III. OPTIMAL BATTERY-ASSISTED DISTRIBUTION FEEDER PEAK LOAD REDUCTION

In this section, we present two optimization-based approaches, offline and online, to operate the 1 MWh / 200 kW battery system at the building, so as to perform feeder peak load shaving. The offline approach is a day-ahead control mechanism. The online approach however uses close-to-real-time access to the data in the utility’s SCADA system.

We assume granularity $\Delta$ for all charge and discharge schedules of the battery system. Unless stated otherwise, $\Delta = 15$ minutes. Each charge or discharge interval is referred to as one time slot. The charge and discharge schedule at time slot $\tau$ is denoted by $x[\tau]$, where $\tau \in T = [1, \ldots, T]$. Here, $x[\tau]$ takes a positive value if we charge the battery and a negative value if we discharge the battery. We denote the average feeder load at time slot $\tau$ by $l[\tau]$. Note that, $l[\tau]$ is a random variable, whereas $x[\tau]$ is a decision variable. We define $l = [l[1]; \ldots; l[T]]$ and $x = [x[1]; \ldots; x[T]]$.

A. Offline Optimization Approach

In the offline approach, the battery controller has access to the feeder-level SCADA data once per day, in the evening. Accordingly, the schedule $x$ is decided once at the beginning of each day and such schedule is not changed during the day.

1) Objective Function: In the offline approach, we seek to minimize the expected daily feeder peak load, i.e., the expected maximum of the utility feeder load across all the $T$ time slots during the next day. This objective can be formulated as

$$\mathbb{E}\{\max_{\tau \in T}(l[\tau] + x[\tau])\},$$

where $\mathbb{E}$ denotes mathematical expectation. The expected value is calculated with respect to the feeder load vector $l$.

The objective in (1) can be interpreted by considering that the feeder peak load is the daily maximum, i.e., the maximum over the time periods $[1, \ldots, T]$, of the total load which at any given time $t$, can be disaggregated as the sum of battery output power $x[t]$ that can be controlled, plus the rest of feeder load $l[t]$ that is uncontrollable. Additionally, since $l[t]$ is a random variable, the feeder peak load which is a function of this variable is a random variable as well. Accordingly, we shall minimize the expected value of this random variable.

Even if the probably distribution of random vector $l$ is known, it is still not a straightforward task to use the objective function in (1) in an optimization problem due to the presence
of the max function inside the expected value operator. One quick fix is to approximately replace (1) with

$$\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{E}\{l(\tau)\} + x[\tau]) = \|\mathbb{E}\{l\} + x\|_{\infty},$$

(2)

where the stochastic nature of the problem is now abstracted into a single expected value of the feeder load vector [20], [21]. Of course, due to Jensen’s inequality, the above objective function provides only an upper bound for the original objective in (1), c.f. [22, p.77]. Therefore, the optimality gap could potentially be significant, see Section IV-B.

In order to create a more robust model, suppose the randomness in $l$ is modeled using $S$ scenarios, each with a probability $\gamma_s$ that is weighted according to the correlation of that previous day to the current day (see Fig. 5). We can rewrite (1) as

$$\sum_{s=1}^{S} \gamma_s \|l_s + x\|_{\infty}. \quad (3)$$

Note that, the above expression is a convex function [22, p.79]. Nevertheless, the difficulty in solving a minimization problem that has (3) as its objective function is to properly choose $S$ as well as $\gamma_s$ and $l_s$ for each $s = 1, \ldots, S$.

Another challenge is to properly estimate the distribution of $l$ from the historical data. This challenge can be tackled once we can leverage the key data-driven observation that the cross-correlation between the daily load profile on one day and those on its prior days is quite high for Feeder #1224, see Fig. 5. The correlation analysis is done on the feeder load time series based on all weekdays, see Section II, for one year of real-world load data [23]. We can see that a high correlation, i.e., above 0.88, exists between today’s load and the load yesterday, the day before yesterday, and the same day last week. Therefore, it is reasonable to use an auto regressive moving average (ARMA) model to estimate the feeder’s daily load using data over the past $P = 10$ weekdays [24]:

$$l[\tau] = \sum_{p=1}^{P} a_{p,\tau} l_{-p}[\tau] + e[\tau] \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (4)$$

where $l_{-p}$ denotes the load at $p$ weekdays prior to the present day; $a_{1,\tau}$ to $a_{P,\tau}$ denote the ARMA model coefficients for each weekday in the past $P$ weekdays; and $e[\tau]$ denotes the estimation error at each time slot, which is assumed to have a zero mean and a Gaussian distribution [25], also see [26].

There are different approaches to obtain the coefficients in (4), such as the methods provided in [27], [28]. Here, we select the coefficients by solving the Yule-Walker equations for the seasonal historical data on different days [29]. The coefficients are set lower for older data. From (4), we arrive at a distribution for the random feeder load vector $l$. We can then use this distribution to generate scenarios using a uniform discretization grid, e.g., by using equal weight scenarios that follow the distribution of the intended random variable. Other Monte-Carlo sampling methods, such as sample average approximation (SAA) can also be used, c.f. [30].

With this forecasting method, the impact of DERs on the feeder load is considered implicitly in the randomness of the customer load, because the net load is considered as one quantity. This was done for simplicity of the analysis and implementation and also because the penetration of DERs in this real-world testbed is still not too high, despite the fact that it is higher than most typical feeders. Note that, the only major DERs on the understudy real-world feeder are the PVs and batteries that are part of this study itself. Still, the DER deployment at this test feeder, with more than 15% of feeder average peak load, is among the largest across the RPU service territory. For a majority of the feeders, even in larger utilities, e.g. Southern California Edison, the target hosting capacity of DERs is well below 15% [25]. Nevertheless, if the DER penetration level increases, the forecast could be more accurate if the output of solar PV generation is obtained separately.

One can use an ARMA model similar to the one above to separately forecast the PV profile. Such disaggregation approach that relies only on previous PV data works very well in sunny days. An example is shown in Fig 6.

In the presence of bad days with major clouds and rains, an ARMA model does not do well in forecasting PV output on its own. In such a case, one should rather use more advanced solar prediction methods, that use weather, temperature, and cloud data, such as cloud imaging [31]–[33], in order to forecast the solar output. If such advanced forecasting methods are available, they can be integrated into our design framework as
5 well. However, from the practical perspective, the use of such advanced methods to separately forecast solar generation is not in the scope of this paper, as there is no concern at this point or in foreseeable future on the forecast performance degradation (due to extreme DER penetration) on the understudy feeder.

2) Battery Operation Constraints: Several constraints need to be considered to assure proper operation of the battery system. Here, we model the most basic and typical constraints. More details on battery operation constraints is available in [34]. We will also examine some practical aspects with respect to battery system modeling later in Section IV-A.

Let \( C[\tau] \) denote the state-of-charge (SoC) at the end of time slot \( \tau \). Suppose \( \eta_{bat}^c \leq 1 \) and \( \eta_{bat}^d \geq 1 \) denote the charge- and discharge-efficiency parameters of the battery cells, respectively. We can model the changes in SoC as

\[
C[\tau] = C[\tau - 1] + \Delta t(\eta_{bat}^c x^c[\tau] - \eta_{bat}^d x^d[\tau]), \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T},
\]

where \( x^c[\tau] \geq 0 \) and \( x^d[\tau] \geq 0 \) are the charge and discharge power at battery terminals; \( C(0) \) is the initial SoC at the start of day. The second term is the energy that is charged into or drawn from the battery at a time slot. The following constraints can capture the relationship between \( x^c[\tau] \), \( x^d[\tau] \), and \( x^d[\tau] \):

\[
\begin{align*}
0 & \leq x^c[\tau] \leq \theta[\tau] x^c[\tau] \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \\
0 & \leq x^d[\tau] \leq (1 - \theta[\tau]) x^d[\tau] \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \theta[\tau] \) is an auxiliary binary variable and \( x^c \) is the maximum charge and discharge rate of the battery inverters. Accordingly, \( \eta_{bat}^c \geq 1 \) and \( \eta_{bat}^d \leq 1 \) denote the charge efficiency and discharge efficiency parameters of the battery. Since \( \theta[\tau] \) takes only 0 or 1, it can force the batteries to be either charging (\( \theta = 1 \)) or discharging (\( \theta = 0 \)), but not both.

In practice, the SoC for batteries should be kept within certain ranges that assure the health of the battery:

\[
C^{\min} \leq C[\tau] \leq C^{\max} \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T},
\]

where \( 0 \leq C^{\min} \leq C^{\max} \leq C^{\max} \). For the batteries at our microgrid, \( C^{\min} = 0.2 \), \( C^{\max} = 0.9 \), and \( C^{\max} = 1 \) MWh.

Additionally, we may enforce the following constraint to keep the SoC at the end of each day to always be above a minimum level in order to assure energy availability:

\[
C^0 \leq C[T],
\]

where \( C^0 \geq C^{\min} \) is a predetermined design parameter. In this paper we use \( C^0 = C(0) \).

Another constraint is about the charge and discharge rates:

\[
x^{\min} \leq x[\tau] \leq x^{\max} \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}.
\]

For the battery inverters at our microgrid, \( x^{\max} = 200 \) kW.

Finally, one may want to restrict the charging of the batteries to hours other than the utility’s system-wide peak-hours. This can be achieved by imposing the following constraints:

\[
x[\tau] \leq 0 \quad \forall \tau \in \text{Utility Peak Hours}.
\]

B. Online Optimization Approach

In the online approach, the battery controller has closed-to-real-time access to the utility SCADA system. As in the offline design, an initial schedule is obtained at the beginning of the day, however, the schedule is then updated at every time slot as more data becomes available, using a receding horizon optimization approach, c.f. [35]. This allows the optimization to take into account today’s load conditions as they develop.

1) Objective Function: Suppose we are at time slot \( \kappa \), where \( \kappa \) is between 1 to \( T \). At this point in time, we have already implemented schedules \( \hat{x}[1], \ldots, \hat{x}[\kappa - 1] \), and we know the load values \( l[1], \ldots, l[\kappa - 1] \). Next, we want to select schedules \( x[\tau] \), where \( \tau = \kappa, \ldots, T \). Let \( l^\kappa \triangleq [l[\kappa], \ldots, l[T]], \hat{x}^\kappa \triangleq [x[\kappa], \ldots, x[T]] \), and \( \hat{a}^\kappa \triangleq [\hat{x}[1], \ldots, \hat{x}[\kappa - 1]] \). We again minimize the expectation of peak net load, i.e., feeder load plus storage, but subject to the observations of \( \hat{l}^\kappa \).

We can write the objective as

\[
\mathbb{E}\{\|l + x\|_\infty | \hat{l}^\kappa\}.
\]

Once we separate the random feeder loads and battery decision variables for the remaining horizon versus the already observed values, we can re-write (11) as

\[
\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|l^\kappa - \hat{l}^\kappa\right\|_\infty + \left\|x^\kappa - \hat{x}^\kappa\right\|_\infty\right\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{\|l^\kappa + x^\kappa\|_\infty - \alpha_+ | \hat{l}^\kappa\}
\]

where \( \alpha_+ = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \hat{a}^\kappa \cdot \hat{\lambda}_{\tau} \cdot l[\tau] - \hat{\eta}_{\tau} \cdot (\hat{x}[\tau] - x[\tau]) \). Note that, \( \alpha_+ = \|\hat{a}^\kappa\|_\infty \) is already known. Given the conditional distribution of the feeder load in the remaining decision horizon the optimization in (12) can now be solved in a way similar to Section III-A1.

The conditional distributions in (12), are approximated by modifying the ARMA model in (4) for the remaining horizon, so as to include only those prior days with similar load profiles to those observations \( l^\kappa \) in the previous time slots. We use the cross-correlation as a measure of similarity between the above time series [23]. At each time slot \( \kappa \), we obtain the cross-correlation between \( l[1], \ldots, l[\kappa] \) and the feeder load during the same time frame on a previous day [36]. We include the data points of those previous weekdays \( p \in \mathbb{Q} \) over the past two weeks that have correlation higher than a minimum threshold, here set at 0.75, during the time slots \( \tau = 1, \ldots, \kappa \), with the load data of the operating day:

\[
l[\tau] = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Q}} a_{p,\tau} l[p][\tau] + e[\tau] \quad \forall \tau = \kappa, \ldots, T.
\]

The model coefficients in (13) are estimated similar to the offline approach. The constraints in (12) are the same as those described in Section III-A2; only here they are applied on the remaining time slots of the decision horizon. The initial SoC for the optimization at time slot \( \kappa \) is \( C[\kappa - 1] \), which was fixed at the optimization step during the previous time slot.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL AND NUMERICAL RESULTS

The results in this section are presented in two categories: experimental results, and numerical results. The experimental results are inevitably bounded by two operational constraints:
1) The real-world battery system that is studied in this paper was owned by the customer and intended to help the customer lower its own electricity bill. However, based on the analysis in Section II, there is a conflict between the customer’s goal and the goal of conducting feeder-level peak load reduction. Therefore, we had no choice but to do only a few number of experiments in order to minimize the financial loss that our experiments would impose to the customer on its electricity bill.

2) While the utility was able to provide the research team with reliable access to the feeder data in a minutely resolution on a daily basis, moving to the next step of providing access to the feeder data in real time was not an option due to logistical and legislative challenges. Accordingly, our experimental results are based on the offline design while our numerical results cover both the offline and online designs. Of course, even the numerical results are based on real-world feeder data and therefore they can shed light on what can be achieved, should the utility provide access to the feeder data in real time.

A. Experimental Results

To facilitate the experiments, an automated computer control system was developed that collects the utility and building data, processes it, obtains the battery schedules, and applies them through an Ethernet connection to an ARDUINO controller [37] that directly commands the inverters and the battery management system (BMS) for the two available 500 kWh / 100 kW battery units, which together form the 1 MWh / 200 kW battery system in the building microgrid. Each battery unit consists of 160 cells of 1000 Ah Li-ion Winston batteries [38], connected in series with nominal 3.2 V per cell. Each battery pack is connected to a 100 kW Princeton GTIB-100 Bi-directional inverter with a 290-800 V DC bus [39].

1) Experiments 1 and 2, Feeder Impact Experiments: These initial experiments were designed to validate system operation and control prior to the testing and evaluation of the proposed operation approach in Section III, and to test whether a substantial impact could be made on the feeder load profile. In these two experiments, the batteries are discharged and charged at full rated capacity of the inverters, i.e., about 200 kW combined, in order to examine to what extent their operation can have visible impact on the building’s and feeder’s load profiles. The latter was of particular interest because the building’s load only constitutes a small portion of the feeder’s total load. Experiment 1 was done on April 23, 2:45-3:15 PM, during which the feeder load was relatively low. The batteries were discharged for 30 minutes. Experiment 2 was done on September 11, 10:45-11:30 AM, during which the feeder load was relatively high. This time, given the higher load of the feeder, the experiment included charging of the batteries for 20 minutes, immediately followed by a discharge for 25 minutes.

Fig. 7 shows the impacts on the building’s load profiles. In Fig. 7(a), the net load of the building drops by about 200 kW for a period of 30 minutes. In Fig. 7(b), the net load of the building first increases by about 180 kW, during the charge operation, and then suddenly drops by about 350 kW, once the discharge operation starts. The signatures in both experiments are clearly visible in the building’s net loads.

Fig. 8 shows the impacts on the feeder’s load profiles. As expected, the signatures are not as extreme as in the case of the building’s net load profiles; nevertheless, the signatures in both experiments are still clearly visible. Importantly, the results of these experiments also confirm the correct operation of the developed computer control modules of the battery system.

2) Experiment 3, Feeder Peak Load Reduction Experiment: In this experiment, we implemented our proposed optimization-based design for the operation of the batteries in order to reduce the feeder’s peak load. Accordingly, Experiment 3 took a whole day, on November 2. The charge and discharge schedule is decided right before mid-night on November 1. Due to the complexity of the real-world battery and charger system, the true charge and discharge round-trip efficiency is not known in advance. Thus, the batteries were assumed to have ideal efficiency, with a caveat to monitor the true efficiency from the results. This true efficiency can then be used in future operation, see Section IV-B4.

Fig. 9 shows the feeder’s load profile with and without the use of batteries. Note that, only the load with the use of batteries was actually measured in this experiment; however, one can also accurately estimate the load profile without the batteries by subtracting the power consumption and power injection of batteries, which too were measured separately.
are discharged, the power flow from the batteries is slightly more than the set points, which is more notable at higher inverter power outputs. This is due to the non-ideal efficiency of inverters. While the controllers try to follow the set points at the AC side of the inverters, the losses, though very small, deviate the power outputs of batteries from their set-points. From the results in Fig. 10(a), and also by using the charge and discharge signature data in Fig. 7, we estimated the inverter efficiency to be \( \eta_{inv}^d \approx 1/\eta_{inv}^c = 0.97 \) for both inverters.

**Second**, there is a gradually increasing difference between the experimental and analytical SoC values. This is again due to the non-ideal efficiency of both batteries and inverters. The energy losses from batteries’ non-ideal efficiency lead the measured SoC to slowly drift downward from the analytical SoC throughout the day. Note that, neglecting the non-ideal battery efficiency would have a less severe impact in the online design, as the SoCs are repeatedly acquired from the BMS and the optimization solution is updated at each time slot. The impact of batteries non-ideal efficiency should be taken into account by considering appropriate charge and discharge efficiency values in both online and offline designs.

Estimating the battery efficiency accurately, can be achieved by different approaches such as in \([40]\). One option is approximate the values of \( \eta_{bat}^d \) and \( \eta_{bat}^c \) in (5) by minimizing the fitting error of the model and the experimental results. We used the data of both batteries during the one day experiment, assuming that both batteries have similar characteristics. Accordingly, we obtained \( \eta_{bat}^c \approx 1/\eta_{bat}^d = 0.95 \). Yet, these values also include the errors of BMS SoC estimation and the true efficiency may be even lower.

In Fig. 10, we can see that when these efficiency coefficients are taken into account, the SoC curve fitting is much better, barring any unforeseen events such as the SoC jump on Battery 2. The actual SoC drift can be seen in Fig. 11. When the estimated efficiency is close to the true efficiency, the maximum drift is \( \leq 3\% \) at all times, while in the case where efficiency is ignored, the SoC continues to drift away from the true SoC up to almost 8\%. This means that the third experiment has provided us with another operational variable that can be used to refine the model. If the true SoC were to violate the limits in an operational system, for example by sending a discharge command when the battery is empty, then the system would have no choice but to shut down for safety. However, now that the maximum drift and efficiency are known, we can, as a reliability measure, tighten the SoC limits in (7) by 3\% to guarantee that the SoC drift will never impact the battery schedule. This condition of sending a discharge command when the battery is empty is exactly what causes the issues seen in Table II in Section IV-B4.

The charge and discharge battery efficiency coefficients will be used later in Section IV-B to assess the impact of considering non-ideal battery and charger efficiency on the performance of both offline and online designs.

**Third**, we see that the SoC for the second battery suddenly drops to \( C_{min} \) at 4 PM. Since the SoC is lowered to below \( C_{min} \), the battery stops discharging. This event can be understood by considering the BMS errors in estimating SoC.

It is important to note that, in practice, unless the battery is

---

**Fig. 9.** Experimental result for peak feeder-load reduction on November 2.

**Fig. 10.** Experimental results for operation of two battery modules on November 2: (a) charge and discharge powers; (b) state-of-charge.
fully charged or fully discharged, the SoC estimation that is made by BMS has some error. Without regular calibration, the reported SoC drifts apart from the actual SoC over time.

At Event 1, the true SoC was much lower than what the BMS reported, when a battery cell triggered the BMS low limit the system recalibrated to the true SoC and the drift was corrected. Calibration can be done, e.g., by operating a full charge or a full discharge cycle. In this experiment, once the battery reaches a very low SoC, the BMS is able to recalibrate, suddenly realizing the error in SoC estimation, and subsequently stopping the discharge cycle.

We note that the quality of how closely the SoC levels that are calculated by the optimization follow the reported SoC values of the BMS depends on the accuracy of the parameters such as cell capacity, battery efficiency, and round-trip efficiency. In Experiment 3, in absence of knowing such parameters, the system is assumed ideal and in turn those parameters are estimated from the operation results.

B. Numerical Results

The experimental results in the previous section are promising and show how the proposed approach can reduce the peak load at distribution feeder. However, in order to make solid conclusions about the proposed schemes, one needs to conduct similar experiments for several weeks and months and for different choices of objective functions and constraints. Therefore, next, we conduct several numerical studies to further evaluate the proposed offline and online designs.

The numerical studies are performed based on utility’s SCADA data on Feeder #1224 from March 2015 to February 2016. The schedules for the battery system are obtained continuously and optimally over this SCADA data.

1) Feeder Peak Load Reduction - Ideal User: This test case is aimed at assessing the maximum peak shaving performance of the two designs with respect to the feeder load uncertainty at the time of decision. Accordingly, the cost implications for the battery owner are not considered. That is why we refer to this test as Ideal User. With the same goal, for now, the batteries are assumed ideal to remove the battery inefficiency impact on performance loss in the offline and online designs.

Fig. 12 shows the results of feeder peak shaving achieved by the offline and online designs, as well as the ToU Response design. The weekly average peak reductions are normalized based on the maximum achievable values in the ideal user design. One can make several observations from this figure.

First, both offline and online stochastic designs outperform the ToU response. The performance of the online design is particularly promising as it more frequently updates its prediction of the feeder load profile during the operation. Therefore, we can conclude that there is great potential benefit to deliver an online design, as long as the logistical and legislative issues could be resolved to allow DERs, such as large batteries, to have access to feeder SCADA data.

Second, all approaches perform weaker during the Winter. This is also verified in Fig. 13, where the distributions of peak shaving achieved in offline and online designs are compared in Summer and Winter. The feeder load fluctuates more in Winter, thus, the prediction error is greater. The ToU Response is particularly poor in Winter, when no peak shaving is achieved. Recall from Section II that in Winter, the feeder peak load does not often reside in utility’s peak hours.

Third, the battery system operation based on ToU Response, leads to much less feeder peak reduction, particularly in Winter when in fact no peak shaving is achieved. Note that, in ToU Response, the battery system does not have the objective of shaving the feeder peak load. Instead, it operates for customer internal purposes, to reduce the energy charges with respect to ToU pricing (refer to Appendix A for design formulation). Recall from Section II that in Winter, the feeder peak load does not often reside in utility’s peak hours. Accordingly, while in the summer season discharging the battery in the utility peak hours might also lead to some feeder peak shaving by chance, during the winter season, discharging in those hours will not lead to any feeder peak load shaving.

Fourth, in a few instances, the performance of the proposed designs falls below the ToU response designs. These rare cases are mostly due to forecast errors or abnormalities in the feeder
The detailed analysis of the battery efficiency modeling and its impacts on storage performance is complex and still an open problem [41]. However, we can still assess the impact of inaccurate efficiency parameters within our optimization, open problem [41]. However, we can still assess the impact of inaccurate efficiency parameters within our optimization.

The optimization models often have errors in the estimation of the battery’s available energy. The error results from multiple factors, e.g., inaccuracy of most battery models, inaccurate models parameters, and the approximations made to have a tractable optimization. This may affect the storage system performance at times, when the model in (2) is used, and online deterministic. The results, in the form of the distributions of peak-shaving during one year of feeder data, are compared in Fig. 14. The performance is noticeably better for proposed stochastic optimization than the deterministic optimization in both offline (49 kW on average) and online (40 kW on average) scenarios. This confirms that the proposed stochastic optimization approaches improve feeder peak-shaving performance.

4) Impact of Battery Inefficiency: The optimization models often have errors in the estimation of the battery’s available energy. The error results from multiple factors, e.g., inaccuracy of most battery models, inaccurate models parameters, and the approximations made to have a tractable optimization. This may affect the storage system performance at times, when the battery halts discharging and is forced a down-time, such as in Event 1, which is not foreseen by the controller.

The results are shown in Table I. The schedules obtained based on Case I, i.e., where the battery operation objective is to shave feeder peak load with no regards for the cost, generally lead to better performance. At the same time, in this design, the energy costs of the customer, billed by ToU pricing, are more because the battery may not lower utility peak hour loads. We also observe in Table I that in Cases II and III, by including the user cost considerations while the peak load shaving is still the primary objective, the customer can also utilize the batteries to reduce the energy costs. The performance loss due to extra constraints or objective terms in Cases II and III is not significant, particularly in Summer. This is consistent with our discussion in Section III. Accordingly, if for example the customer is compensated by the utility for each kW of feeder peak shaving service, the revenues of the customer for Cases II and III will be higher. Finally, the energy costs in Cases I to III, i.e., the designs that battery operates to provide feeder peak shaving service, are more than that of Case IV, i.e., the design that battery is operated only for energy cost reduction. Interestingly, the additional cost in Case II, where reducing the energy costs is secondary objective, is insignificant.

3) Method of Optimization: Next, we compare the peak-shaving performance under four different optimization approaches: offline stochastic, i.e., as in Section III-A, online stochastic, i.e., as in Section III-B, offline deterministic, i.e., when the model in (2) is used, and online deterministic. The results, in the form of the distributions of peak-shaving during one year of feeder data, are compared in Fig. 14. The performance is noticeably better for proposed stochastic optimization than the deterministic optimization in both offline (49 kW on average) and online (40 kW on average) scenarios. This confirms that the proposed stochastic optimization approaches improve feeder peak-shaving performance.

Interestingly, the additional cost in Case II, where reducing the energy costs is secondary objective, is insignificant.

2) Performance and Cost Trade-off: From the second observation in the previous subsection, the battery operation for feeder peak load shaving may lead to extra costs under typical ToU pricing. Therefore, in this section, we assess the trade-off between the two objectives of feeder peak shaving and user’s charge minimization. We evaluate the cost and performance in four cases, where the battery operates to:

1) Exclusively shave the peak load of the distribution feeder based on the online design as in Section IV-B1. This method has no regard for the customer costs.
2) Primarily shave the peak load, but with the additional objective terms related to reducing the user’s charges. This is accomplished by adding a low value term to the objective that has the goal of penalizing charging during anytime besides off-peak hours, see Appendix A.
3) Primarily shave the peak load, but with additional constraints in (10) to limit peak hour charging. This design will not allow any charging during on-peak hours.
4) Exclusively reduce the user’s charges based on ToU pricing, with no regard to peak load shaving. The battery simply discharges evenly during peak times and charges evenly during off peak times, see Appendix B.

The results are shown in Table I. The schedules obtained based on Case I, i.e., where the battery operation objective is to shave feeder peak load with no regards for the cost, generally lead to better performance. At the same time, in this design, the energy costs of the customer, billed by ToU pricing, are more because the battery may not lower utility peak hour loads. We also observe in Table I that in Cases II and III, by including

Table I: Trade Off Between Energy Cost and Peak Shaving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Average Monthly Cost ($) (Summer/Winter)</th>
<th>Peak Load Reduction (KW) (Summer/Winter)</th>
<th>80% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1861/2359</td>
<td>140/113</td>
<td>[86,200] [28,200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1496/1481</td>
<td>140/110</td>
<td>[85,200] [27,200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1831/2002</td>
<td>140/100</td>
<td>[86,200] [15,200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1229/1436</td>
<td>88/0</td>
<td>[0.133] [0.0]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the overall performance of the offline and online designs. Note that, with respect to efficiency, the two designs have a difference in how frequently they update the SoC estimates from the BMS reported values. We assume that the SoC values are obtained from (5), given the efficiency parameters, and based on the schedules set in each design, prior to each operation horizon. The true SoC at the end of each horizon is then given as inputs for $C_0$ in the next round of optimization. Additionally, the down-time periods are calculated by the evaluation simulation, after the optimization schedules are set for each time horizon in both designs.

Table II shows the results of down-time hours and peak-shaving loss due to battery inefficiency for both offline and online designs. We can see that, the impact of efficiency mismatch on the down-time hours caused by discharging the battery when it is already depleted is particularly notable in the offline design. As the SoC estimation error accumulates over time, so do the events that lead to storage downtime. Although, not all of such events affect the peak-shaving performance. In fact, ultimately, the average peak-shaving is reduced considerably during one year of battery operation.

An interesting observation is that the online design performance is also very sensitive to the estimation error in the battery’s SoC. While the total downtime duration due to such errors is much less than the offline design, the peak reduction is severely affected by the few instances the battery halt discharge in a required period. This further raise attention to the SoC estimation error impact, which may not be neglected even with frequent updates from the measured values.

We can see from Table II that the feeder peak load reduction is significantly impacted by efficiency mismatch, therefore, it is important that one does not assume ideal efficiency in practical hardware operation. This leads to a need to model and further study the impact of system efficiency. Therefore, we use an experiment similar to Experiment 3 in Section IV-A2 to estimate the charge and discharge efficiency and then use these numbers to assess the impact on peak load reduction. Table III shows the effect of efficiency on peak reduction. When the optimization considers the efficiency the results are much better than those shown in Table II. The efficiency also has an impact on the peak reduction distributions. Fig. 15 shows the distribution for 100%, and 80% efficiency. Even though the potential maximum reduction is the same, the lowered efficiency begins to have a substantial impact on the distribution. However, this impact is still less than if the battery efficiency is estimated incorrectly, so a proper estimate is vital.

**V. Conclusions**

It was shown that the feeder peak load and the utility-wide peak hours may not be aligned, confirming the need for a localized solution with proper utility-resource communications for feeder-level peak load reduction. A stochastic optimization-based framework was developed and implemented, to demonstrate conducting peak load reduction at a distribution feeder using customer owned batteries, under both offline and online control settings. The feeder load uncertainty was addressed under both designs and was shown that the auto-regressive nature of the load, observed in historical data, may be leveraged to achieve effective performance. Multiple experimental tests were performed by operating a 1 MWh / 200 kW battery at a commercial building. They verified the considerable reduction of the feeder peak load achieved based on the proposed framework. They also showed many operational issues that may not be foreseen in computer simulations, such as the need to carefully calibrate BMS state-of-charge estimates and to take into account operational efficiency/SoC drift. Additionally, various numerical assessments was performed based upon one year of real-world feeder data, that allowed further evaluations of the proposed design as well as practical observations.
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\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Impact of Battery Efficiency Mismatch}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Assumed Efficiency & Actual Efficiency & Downtime (h) & Reduction (kW) \\
& & (Offline / Online) & (Offline / Online) \\
\hline
100 & 100 & 0 / 0 & 99 / 140 \\
100 & 95 & 17.5 / 50.5 & 94.5 / 85.5 \\
100 & 90 & 27.5 / 55.75 & 85 / 83.5 \\
100 & 85 & 37.5 / 58.75 & 73 / 81.6 \\
100 & 80 & 40 / 64 & 59.3 / 79 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Sensitivity of Feeder Peak Load Reduction to Efficiency}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Efficiency & Average Daily Reduction (kW) \\
\hline
100 & 128 \\
95 & 124 \\
90 & 118 \\
85 & 112 \\
80 & 105 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
APPENDIX A

MULTIOBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION

Due to the use of $\max$ function in the objective function in (1), there are infinite solutions to this optimization problem. Therefore, within the solution space of problem (1), we can further narrow down to the solutions that result in the highest reduction also in the customer’s own utility bill. The feeder peak-shaving service is regarded as primary objective, while reducing the customer bill at the same time is the secondary objective. The properties of this problem allow us to utilize the optimization with ordered objectives. A simple approach to formulate the problem is to utilize the weight coefficients for combining both objectives into a single one as follows [42]:

$$
\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{l} + x^T\|_{\infty}] + \epsilon_1 \sum_{\tau \in \text{On-Peak}} x[\tau] + \epsilon_2 \sum_{\tau \in \text{Mid-Peak}} x[\tau] + \epsilon_3 \sum_{\tau \in \text{Off-Peak}} x[\tau],
$$

where the weight coefficients $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2,$ and $\epsilon_3$ are chosen to reflect the cost difference of energy during peak, mid-peak, and off-peak time periods. However, note that, these coefficients must be small enough such that they do not cause any significant change in feeder peak load reduction, i.e., they do not jeopardize the primary objective. Thus, the objective will lead to the solutions that have the same feeder load reduction, yet lead to more utility bill reduction for the customer.
APPENDIX B
CUSTOMER OBJECTIVE ONLY OPTIMIZATION

If the customer that owns the batteries were to entirely ignore the feeder and rather solely consider ToU price reduction as its operation optimization objective, then it would use Algorithm 1. This would result in full and even battery charges during the off-peak hours, inactivity during mid-peak hours, and full battery discharges during the on-peak hours.

Algorithm 1 ToU Operation

\[ t \leftarrow \text{current timeslot} \]

\[ \text{if } t \in \text{On-Peak Hours} \text{ then} \]
\[ x \leftarrow \frac{(C_{\text{max}} - C_{\text{min}})}{\text{Total On-Peak Hours}} \]

\[ \text{else if } t \in \text{Off-Peak Hours} \text{ then} \]
\[ x \leftarrow \frac{(C_{\text{max}} - C_{\text{min}})}{\text{Total Off-Peak Hours}} \]

\[ \text{else if } t \in \text{Mid-Peak Hours} \text{ then} \]
\[ x \leftarrow 0 \]

end if
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