

Evaluation of Battery Energy Storage System to Provide Virtual Transmission Service

Qiushi Wang, Xingpeng Li

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Houston,
Houston, US

Abstract—An immediate need in the transmission system is to find alternative solutions that improve system operation and defer the need for new transmission lines. This study comprehensively evaluates the performance and economic benefits of using battery energy storage systems (BESS) as virtual transmission (VT) to promote power transfer cross distant regions. Specifically, this work implements various day-ahead energy scheduling models to analyze the impact of VT on system operation cost, network congestion, model computational time, and market performance. The performance of VT is compared with three alternative network congestion mitigation methods, including building new high-voltage physical transmission lines, cost-driven battery energy storage systems, and network reconfiguration, as well as combinations of two of aforementioned methods. The benchmark day-ahead scheduling model is a traditional security-constrained unit commitment model without system upgrades or other network congestion mitigation. Numerical simulations conducted on the IEEE 24-bus system demonstrate that among all the examined schemes, VT is the only one comparable to physical transmission lines that can provide satisfying congestion relief and operation cost reduction without sacrificing computing time and load payment significantly.

Index Terms--Battery Storage, Congestion Analysis, Market Implications, Power System Operations, Virtual Transmission.

NOMENCLATURE

g	Transmission element (line or transformer) index.
k	Transmission element (line or transformer) index.
n	Bus index.
w	Solar generation index.
e	Battery index.
vt	Virtual transmission line index.
t	Time period index.
$G(n)$	Set of generators at bus n .
K	Set of all transmission elements.
N	Set of all buses.
$ES(n)$	Set of all battery storage systems at bus n .
$ES(vt)$	Set of all battery-based virtual transmission systems.
$S(n)$	Set of all solar generators at bus n .
$K(n-)$	Set of branches with bus n as the to-bus.
$K(n+)$	Set of branches with bus n as the from-bus.

X_k	The reactance of transmission element.
C_g	Linear cost for generator g .
C_g^{NL}	No-load cost for generator g .
C_g^{SU}	The start-up cost for generator g .
d_{nt}	Predicted load demand of bus n in the time period t .
$BigM$	A big real number.
p_g^{min}	The minimum capacity of generator g .
p_g^{max}	Maximum capacity of generator g .
p_k^{max}	Emergency thermal line limit for line k .
u_{gt}	Commitment status of unit g in the time period t .
v_{gt}	Start-up variable of generator g in the time period t .
θ_{kt}	Phase angle difference between from-end and to-end of line k in the time period t .
P_{gt}	The output of generator g in the time period t .
P_{kt}	Flow in line k in the time period t .
P_{st}	The output of solar generators in the time period t .
P_{et}^c	Charging rate of battery e in the time period t .
P_{et}^d	Discharging rate of battery e in the time period t .
E_{et}	Energy storage energy level in the time period t .
u_{et}^c	1 indicates charging mode; otherwise, 0.
u_{et}^d	1 indicates discharging mode; otherwise, 0.
E_e^{min}	Minimum energy storage energy level.
E_e^{max}	Maximum energy storage energy level.
$P_e^{c,max}$	Maximum energy storage charge rate.
$P_e^{d,max}$	Maximum energy storage discharge rate.
η_e^c	Charging efficiency.
η_e^d	Discharging efficiency.
ΔT	Length of a time interval.
J_{kt}	1 indicates branch k is in the network in the time period t ; otherwise, it is 0.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although fast growth of solar and wind power substantially decarbonizes the electricity sector, a large portion of clean energy generation is expected to be frequently curtailed and thus wasted due to limited transmission capacity. Even with the current penetration level of renewable generation in many practical power grids, curtailment of clean energy generation is

often observed. For example, in California Independent System Operator (ISO) territory, 187,000 MWh of wind and solar generation was curtailed in 2015. The curtailment amount increased by a factor of 8.5 to 1,587,000 MWh in 2020 [1]- [2].

The 2023 National Transmission Needs Study [3] by the United States Department of Energy concluded that an immediate need for updated and/or new transmission infrastructure is required by 2030 to meet the load growth and clean energy penetration. However, the overall transmission investment has decreased over the past decades, while the average timeline for building a new high-voltage transmission line is ten years. To bridge the gap between short-term transmission needs and long-term transmission planning and deployment, non-wire alternatives that can help alleviate transmission network congestion and reduce renewable generation curtailment are investigated and compared to traditional wired solutions in this paper.

One of non-wire solutions is the use of large-scale battery energy storage system (BESS). BESS can help reshape the load profile and thus impact the power flow in the adjacent area. Alberto and Steven provided a brief overview of existing energy storage technologies and their applications in [4]. They also illustrated the concept of using battery storage to increase transmission capability by relaxing $N-1$ contingency conditions in thermally constrained networks of high-voltage transmission lines. [5] [6] further developed the economic dispatch algorithm to enable merchant storage facilities to compete in an electricity market to provide transmission congestion relief services.

A few BESS studies on real power systems in the literature [7] and [8] concurred with the research conclusion that adding BESS can help reduce congestion and offset transmission needs. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory examined the technical and financial feasibility of using a BESS and a combustion turbine generator (CTG) to defer the investment in a third transmission cable for Nantucket Island [9]. The assessment results showed that the benefits of BESS plus CTG operations with minimal low-cost distribution upgrades outweighed constructing a third transmission line.

Besides the stationary battery storage system, prior efforts in the literature also evaluated the possibility of mobile energy storage systems. There is a feasible solution of the integrated optimization model for distribution planning problems, which uses temporary, transportable energy storage to reduce or defer the distribution network expansion [10]. The research in [11] and [12] further extended the application of the integrated planning strategy to the transmission network. The researchers presented different algorithms to minimize the cost of a combination of transmission lines and battery-based energy storage units. The BESS includes stationary and mobile storage.

Most BESS-related research and applications demonstrate the benefit of a single BESS application to improve local system performance [13] [14]. With the continuous technology advancement, BESS has become more cost-effective, while its size and duration have increased [15] [16]. As a result, BESS may provide more benefits in its existing applications and gain the potential to support new applications to be explored. Nguyen demonstrated the virtual transmission (VT) concept in

a two-machine network, which uses BESSs at the two ends of a line to mimic a new parallel line [17]. The objective of VT in [17] is to increase revenue for generators in the region during congested and non-congested times. Another objective of the VT application is to minimize the total relative congestion level. In [18], a research team evaluated the congestion management (CM) performance of grid operator-owned VT lines where there is no interface with the energy market. When the BESS is used in preventive CM mode, it is referred to as VT, while it is referred to as grid booster (GB) when used for curative CM. The researchers found that using GB as a curative CM is more effective than VT as a preventive CM for the battery size and location in the test network.

Although ongoing pilot VT projects are happening globally, it is essential to understand how VT schemes would behave in a meshed network and a deregulated market environment. In addition, it is also important to investigate how well VT performs compared to other CM schemes and how well VT coordinates with other CM schemes. Network reconfiguration (NR) has been demonstrated to be a low-cost but very effective CM strategy in both transmission and distribution systems [19] [20] [21]. NR is able to relieve network congestion as a preventive control scheme in the pre-contingency situation [22] and as a corrective control scheme in the post-contingency situation [23] [24]. As a congestion relief strategy, NR is shown to achieve substantial system cost savings and reduce significant renewable generation curtailment [25] [26].

To bridge the research gaps and address the aforementioned research questions, this paper will investigate the effectiveness of VT as a non-wire transmission capacity expansion solution in the application of day-ahead operational planning that solves the security-constrained unit commitment (SCUC) problem. Its performance will be evaluated and compared to other options, including new high-voltage physical transmission (PT) lines and NR. In addition, this paper will also combine multiple CM options to achieve better grid performance.

Particularly, this paper will implement seven different SCUC optimization models to evaluate various congestion mitigation schemes for day-ahead generation scheduling. These seven SCUC models are explained as follows: (1) a traditional benchmark SCUC, (2) an enhanced SCUC with a new physical transmission (SCUC-PT), (3) an enhanced SCUC with BESS (SCUC-BESS), (4) an enhanced SCUC with non-simultaneous charging and discharging constraints on BESS as VT (SCUC-VT), (5) an enhanced SCUC with NR (SCUC-NR), (6) an enhanced SCUC with both VT and NR (SCUC-VT-NR), and (7) an enhanced SCUC with BESS and NR (SCUC-BESS-NR).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The formulations for various SCUC models of interest are described in Section II. The test case and simulation results are presented in Section III. Finally, Section IV concludes this paper and presents potential future work.

II. MODELING AND METHODOLOGY

Power system day-ahead energy scheduling is determined by solving SCUC. This section presents the formulations used by a traditional SCUC model as a benchmark, as well as various

enhanced SCUC models with congestion mitigation strategies. It also explains the metrics used for analyzing the impacts of different CM strategies on the wholesale power markets.

A. Traditional SCUC

SCUC minimizes the total cost of generations over multiple time periods while maintaining the solution physically feasible for each period. A widely used formulation for a traditional SCUC model is presented as follows.

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{g \in G} \sum_{t \in T} (c_g P_{gt} + c_g^{NL} * u_{gt} + c_g^{SU} * v_{gt}) \quad (1)$$

Constraints:

$$u_{gt} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall g, t \quad (2)$$

$$v_{gt} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall g, t \quad (3)$$

$$v_{gt} \geq u_{gt} - u_{g,t-1}, \forall g, t \quad (4)$$

$$P_g^{min} * u_{gt} \leq P_{gt}, \forall g, t \quad (5)$$

$$P_{gt} \leq P_g^{max} * u_{gt}, \forall g, t \quad (6)$$

$$P_{gt} - P_{g,t} \leq R_g^{hr}, \forall g, t \quad (7)$$

$$P_{g,t-1} - P_{g,t} \leq R_g^{hr}, \forall g, t \quad (8)$$

$$P_{kt} = \theta_{kt}/x_k, \forall k, t \quad (9)$$

$$-P_k^{max} \leq P_{kt} \leq P_k^{max}, \forall k, t \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{g \in G(n)} P_{gt} + \sum_{k \in K(n-)} P_{kt} - \sum_{k \in K(n+)} P_{kt} \\ & = d_{nt} - \sum_{w \in S(n)} P_{st}, \forall n, t \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The objective function (1) minimizes the system's total cost, including generator operation, start-up, and generators' no-load costs. Equations (2)-(11) are the constraints for the traditional SCUC optimization model. Binary variables u_{gt} for generation commitment status and v_{gt} for generator startup indicator are defined in (2) and (3), respectively. Constraint (4) defines the relation between u_{gt} and v_{gt} . Generator output limits are enforced in (5)-(6). Generator ramping rate limits are respected in (7)-(8). The line power flow equation and thermal capacity limit are presented in (9) and (10), respectively. Constraint (11) guarantees the power balance will be met at each node in each time interval.

B. Network Congestion Mitigation Solutions

This sub-section will first present the formulations for several CM schemes, including BESS, VT, PT, and NR. The corresponding SCUC models are then summarized.

When BESS is present in the system to be scheduled along with generators, some existing constraints need to be updated to capture the impact of BESS. At the same time, new constraints are also required to represent BESS's unique characteristics in SCUC. BESS cannot be charged or discharged at the same time. Instead, the status of a BESS

should be either charging, discharging, or idle, as represented in (12). When the BESS is in charging or discharging mode, the charging and discharging power rate must be within the maximum physical limits as enforced in (13)-(14). Constraint (15) sets the boundaries of BESS energy level. In (16), the BESS energy level calculation considers charging and discharging efficiencies. In a network with BESSs, (11) needs to be replaced by the updated nodal power balance constraint (17) due to BESS charging and discharging activities.

$$u_{et}^c + u_{et}^d \leq 1, \forall e, t \quad (12)$$

$$0 \leq P_{et}^c \leq P_e^{c,max} u_{et}^c, \forall e, t \quad (13)$$

$$0 \leq P_{et}^d \leq P_e^{d,max} u_{et}^d, \forall e, t \quad (14)$$

$$E_e^{min} \leq E_{et} \leq E_e^{max}, \forall e, t \quad (15)$$

$$E_{et} = E_{e,t-1} + (\eta_e^c P_{et}^c - P_{et}^d / \eta_e^d) \Delta T \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{g \in G(n)} P_{gt} + \sum_{k \in K(n-)} P_{kt} - \sum_{k \in K(n+)} P_{kt} \\ & = \sum_{e \in ES(n)} (P_{et}^c - P_{et}^d) + d_{nt} - \sum_{w \in S(n)} P_{st}, \forall n, t \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

A transmission line absorbs the power from one end while injecting that power into the other end. Therefore, to ensure the behavior of BESS-based VT is consistent with a parallel PT line, constraints are needed to avoid BESSs on both sides of the transmission line charging simultaneously or discharging simultaneously. Equations (18)-(19) are constraints to limit the status of BESSs for VT lines, in which $ES(vt)$ is a set of two BESSs that are located at the two ends of a congested physical line respectively to ensure VT behavior for each vt .

$$\sum_{e \in ES(vt)} u_{et}^c \leq 1, \forall vt, t \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{e \in ES(vt)} u_{et}^d \leq 1, \forall vt, t \quad (19)$$

Network reconfiguration that can leverage the flexibility in the transmission network is another effective method to help relieve line congestion. This study will also implement the NR scheme to evaluate the performance of stand-alone BESSs and VTs. The updated constraints when implementing NR in SCUC are listed as (20)-(23), replacing (9)-(10). The model also includes a constraint (21) to limit the number of line switching actions to at most one in a single time interval to avoid severe system stability risks.

$$J_{kt} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall k, t \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} (1 - J_{kt}) \leq 1, \forall t \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -BigM(1 - J_{kt}) & \leq P_{kt} - \theta_{kt}/x_k \\ & \leq BigM(1 - J_{kt}), \forall k, t \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$-J_{kt} P_k^{max} \leq P_{kt} \leq J_{kt} P_k^{max}, \forall k, t \quad (23)$$

Seven different SCUC optimization models for day-ahead generation scheduling are then formulated and implemented to evaluate various congestion mitigation schemes. They are explained in Table 1.

Table 1 Model Descriptions and Formulation Summary

Models	Descriptions	Equations
SCUC	The traditional SCUC optimization model is a benchmark.	(1)-(11)
SCUC-PT	A new physical line is added to the system and the SCUC model.	(1)-(11)
SCUC-BESS	BESSs are added to the system and the SCUC model.	(1)-(10), (12)-(17)
SCUC-VT	VT operation constraints are added to the SCUC-BESS model.	(1)-(10), (12)-(19)
SCUC-NR	Network reconfiguration strategy is applied to the SCUC case.	(1)-(11), (20)-(23)
SCUC-BESS-NR	Network reconfiguration strategy is applied to the SCUC-BESS case.	(1)-(10), (12)-(17), (20)-(23)
SCUC-VT-NR	Network reconfiguration strategy is applied to the SCUC-VT case.	(1)-(10), (12)-(23)

C. Market Analysis Metrics

Congestion management and transmission transfer capacity investment are essential to meet load growth and support clean energy penetration. It is also important to analyze the impact of those schemes on the wholesale power energy markets. In this paper, it is assumed that the power market follows a locational marginal price (LMP)-based market clearing mechanism that is adopted by most US grid operators.

LMP is the marginal cost of supplying one additional MW of power to a given location. It is dependent on not only the location but also the time. Mathematically, it is equal to the dual variable of the nodal power balance constraint. In addition to the total generation cost, another metric for evaluating the system efficiency and market performance is the load payment which is defined as follows,

$$LoadPayment = \sum_n \sum_t d_{nt} LMP_{nt} \quad (24)$$

III. CASE STUDIES

All the aforementioned variations of SCUC models were implemented and tested on the IEEE 24-bus system that is modified to reflect the current trend of transforming coal power into more sustainable generation resources. The optimization problems were solved using the Gurobi solver in the Python-based Pyomo package. The Python scripts were run in the Anaconda Spyder environment with Python version 3.8.6 on Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-3570K CPU @ 3.40GHz 3.40 GHz computer system.

A. Test Power System Case

The IEEE 24-bus system was first developed in 1979 with a load model, generation system, and transmission network [14]. Since then, it has been widely used as a test system for transmission planning and reliability tests. The system has 24 buses with 38 connected elements at voltage levels of 230 kV and 138 kV. Figure 1 shows the configuration of the IEEE 24-bus system. The branch and conventional generation and load data can be found in [27].




Figure 1. Network topology of the IEEE 24-bus system [28].

Modifications to the generation are made to the case based on the assumption that the future power system will be free of coal-fired generation. All conventional coal-type generators on buses 2, 15, 16, and 23 are removed from the system. Instead, solar generators totaling 1,110 MW are added to buses 14, 15, and 16. In this paper, the solar deliveries are fixed at their maximum available power, as there will be no curtailment even when transmission lines are congested. It is assumed that the daily peak load is 80% of the maximum load. The load profiled in the test cases uses summer weekday data in [27] as the hourly peak load in percent of daily peak.

B. Traditional SCUC Results

Traditional SCUC optimization is run to evaluate the congestion level of the modified IEEE 24-bus network. Results show two lines with congestion: line 11 during evening hours and line 19 during peak sun hours. Besides line 11 and line 19, line 29 gets stressed and operates above 70% of the line capacity between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m.

Line 11 is a generation tie line that connects generators 9-11 to the system through the point of connection bus 8. Line 11 hits its thermal limit mainly because generators 10 and 11 need to deliver power at their total capacity to meet the load profile when solar resources are unavailable after sunset. Since generation tie lines are usually designed to match the plant's maximum power output limit, upgrading line 11 for more transfer capacity against inter-area congestion is unnecessary.

On the other hand, line 19 is connected to one of the corridors between the 230 kV and 138 kV systems. The line gets congested when the system utilizes all the available solar power during peak sun hours. Applying new infrastructures to this line can help us better understand how BESS helps relieve congestion and reduce system costs in a meshed system. Therefore, line 19 is selected as the targeted line to place new

lines and BESSs. Additionally, adding new infrastructure to line 19 has the potential to help eliminate the congestion observed on line 11.

In the SCUC-PT line case, the new line is added in parallel to line 19 between buses 11 and 14 with identical line parameters as line 19. In BESS-related cases, both batteries on each side of line 19 are assumed to have the same size and technical specifications. The size of each BESS is 800 MWh with a maximum charging/discharging rate of 200 MW.

C. Comparison of Simulation Results

As the objective of the models is to minimize the total cost, this paper compares the system's economic performance under different CM schemes. In addition, the associated system congestion and computing time are analyzed and compared. These comparisons are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Transmission Facility Performance Comparison

Model	Operation cost reduction	Average No. of congested lines per hour	Computing time (s)
SCUC	0.00%	0.38	6.5
SCUC-PT	11.71%	0.13	5.4
SCUC-BESS	14.09%	0.42	2.3
SCUC-VT	14.04%	0.25	2.3
SCUC-NR	6.38%	0.38	268.1
SCUC-BESS-NR	15.26%	0.38	1446.2
SCUC-VT-NR	15.16%	0.42	10300.4

The “operation cost reduction” column provides an overview of the percentage decrease in the daily total system operation cost compared to the SCUC base case. It shows that all examined CM schemes can achieve cost reduction.

The “average No. of congested lines per hour” column describes the overall congestion status of the 24-bus system over the 24 hours. The higher the average number of congested lines per hour in the system, the more line(s) or the more hour(s) the line(s) are congested. Among all the CM schemes, only the PT and VT schemes provide Pareto improvement solutions and can well balance between system congestion relief and cost reduction. Although both BESS and VT schemes are implemented by adding two identical batteries on both sides of the transmission line, the standalone BESSs without VT constraints did not relieve line congestion but led to more network congestion. Subsection III D below provides a detailed analysis of the cause of different battery behaviors under BESS and VT schemes.

The NR is the only scheme that does not require additional capital investment costs, while it can substantially reduce the operation cost. However, one serious concern when using BESS/VT with NR in SCUC problems is the computational complexity since such scheme combinations would result in a much longer solving time than other schemes in an order related to the number of branches.

D. BESS Operation Analysis

The main difference between BESS and VT schemes is the battery charging and discharging status restriction. The BESS scheme allows batteries to charge or discharge freely within their energy level limits. In contrast, the VT scheme prohibits the two batteries on each side of the transmission line from charging simultaneously or discharging simultaneously. The

VT operation constraint leads to a different optimal battery operation solution for the testing system. Figure 2 and Figure 3 show the energy exchange profiles of the batteries on bus 11 and bus 14, respectively.




Figure 2. Charging and discharging profile of the battery at bus 11 under different CM strategies.




Figure 3. Charging and discharging profile of the battery at bus 14 under different CM strategies.

These two figures show results from both SCUC-BESS and SCUC-VT. The green area between the charging/discharging curves of the two CM schemes represents the difference in the energy being stored in the batteries when in the charging mode or the difference in the energy that the batteries inject into the grid in the discharging mode.

The battery on bus 11 shows a higher charging/discharging rate in the SCUC-VT case than in the SCUC-BESS case. One possible explanation is that allowing only one battery in the charging mode will force the energy to be stored in a more concentrated manner. As a result, the battery on bus 11 in the VT case stores more energy before dawn, enabling it to provide more power between 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. when line 19 is congested and line 29 gets stressed. In the BESS case, the average number of congested lines per hour rises to 0.42 from the SCUC base case’s 0.38, mainly because generator 23 at bus 18 delivers more power during peak sun hours, causing already-stressed line 29 to become congested.

No matter with or without the VT operation constraint, the energy usages of the two BESS on each side of the transmission line are not balanced. With the solar and load profile of the test case, the battery on bus 14, close to the solar resources, is used heavier than the battery on bus 11.

E. Market Analysis

Other important metrics to evaluate VT compared with other CM schemes would be the energy market settlements, including the system operation cost and load payment reflecting social welfare. These results are presented in Figure 4.




Figure 4. System operation costs and energy market settlement for different SCUC models under various CM schemes.




Figure 5. LMP difference between VT and NR cases.

The load payment is not necessarily correlated with system operation costs and congestion status. Although all six enhanced SCUC models with various CM schemes have less system operation cost, only the PT CM strategy leads to lower load payment than the SCUC benchmark. Although the VT CM scheme provides more congestion relief than the NR CM scheme, its load payment is higher than the NR CM scheme. Stronger evidence can be observed from the results of SCUC-BESS-NR and SCUC-VT-NR that lead to much greater cost reduction but much higher load payment.

The load payment is related to the load profile because batteries re-shape the load profile through charging and discharging activities. Figure 5 illustrates the difference in LMP between the SCUC-VT model and the SCUC-NR model at each bus during each hour. It is observed that, compared with the SCUC-NR model, the SCUC-VT model significantly increases the LMP when the battery on bus 11 absorbs energy from the grid as an additional load, as shown in Figure 2, without enough low-cost generation online. The occasions are when the system is not congested, especially between 4 and 5 a.m.

This explains why the load payment of SCUC-VT is higher even though SCUC-VT can lead to lower total cost, indicating less network congestion with the proposed VT CM scheme as compared to utilizing the flexibility in the transmission network to mitigate the congestion without additional asset investments.

F. Sensitivity Analysis: Battery Size

The size of the battery significantly impacts the battery charging/discharging decisions that affect the market settlement results. Figure 6 summarizes system operation costs and load

payments for different BESS sizes ranging from 100 to 400 MW with an increment of 50 MW, assuming the same duration.




Figure 6. System operation cost and energy market settlement for different BESS sizes.




Figure 7. Power flows on line 19 from benchmark SCUC and SCUC-PT.

It is observed from Figure 6 that as the BESS size increases, the system operation cost reduces accordingly, which is expected. However, it is interesting to observe the total cost remains the same after it drops to \$878,636 when the BESS size increases to 250 MW; further increasing BESS size will not provide any further benefits against network congestion. Similarly, the load payment does not change when BESS size reaches the same turning point of 250 MW, precisely, a range of 200 MW - 250 MW. It is also interesting to observe that there is no fixed pattern regarding load payment change concerning BESS size change before BESS size hits this turning point.

Figure 7 shows the power flows on line 19 for two models: (i) SCUC benchmark and (ii) SCUC-PT with a new line parallel to line 19 and sharing the same parameters with line 19. For SCUC-PT, the total flow crossing the path of line 19 is slightly over 700 MW for the congestion hours from 12 pm to 3 pm, indicating that entirely relieving the congestion would require slightly over 200 MW additional transfer capacity, which aligns with the optimal BESS size of power capacity per Figure 6.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

BESS-based virtual transmission, as a new concept of alternative transmission lines, can help relieve network congestion and reduce the total grid operation cost. This study demonstrates that compared with the options of a new physical line or network reconfiguration strategy, BESS as VT can achieve greater cost reduction and shorter computational time, but higher load payment. The battery size on each side of the critical line that may be congested in peak hours would affect the VT performance in terms of congestion relief, cost reduction and market clearing results. Limiting the operation of BESS to mimic physical transmission lines helps relieve system congestion under normal system operating conditions with negligible cost increases. Combining VT with other system congestion-relieving methods such as NR may further reduce the system total operation cost, but it may significantly increase the load payment as well as the optimization calculation time.

Further research is needed to (1) evaluate VT's behavior in power systems with higher renewable energy penetration levels and (2) optimize the size of the BESS on each side of the critical line to achieve the optimum VT performance with least cost.

REFERENCES

- [1] California ISO, "Fast Facts: Impacts of renewable energy on grid operations," May 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.caiso.com/documents/curtailmentfastfacts.pdf>.
- [2] California ISO, "Stay Informed - Managing oversupply," [Online]. Available: <http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/ManagingOversupply.aspx>.
- [3] "National transmission needs study draft for public comment February 2023 national transmission needs study," United States Department of Energy, 2023.
- [4] A. D. D. Rosso and S. W. Eckroad, "Energy Storage for Relief of Transmission Congestion," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1138-1146, 2014.
- [5] H. Khani and M. R. D. Zadeh, "Transmission congestion relief using privately owned large-scale energy storage systems in a competitive electricity market," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 31, no. 2, p. 1449-1458, 2016.
- [6] J. Arteaga, H. Zareipour and N. Amjadi, "Energy Storage as a Service: Optimal Pricing for Transmission Congestion Relief," *IEEE Open Access Journal of Power and Energy*, vol. 7, p. 514-523, 2020.
- [7] J. Jorgenson, A. W. Frazier, P. Denholm, and N. Blair, "Grid Operational Impacts of Widespread Storage Deployment," National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO, 2022.
- [8] N. Pinsky and L. O'Neill, "Tehachapi Wind Energy Storage Project - Technology Performance Report #3," Southern California Edison Company - Advanced Technology, United States, 2017.
- [9] P. Balducci, J. Alam, T. McDermott, V. Fotedar, X. Ma, D. Wu, B. Bhatti, K. Mongird, B. Bhattarai, A. Crawford and S. Ganguli, "Nantucket Island Energy Storage System Assessment," Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 2019.
- [10] S. Koopmann, M. Scheufen and A. Schnettle, "Integration of stationary and transportable storage systems into multi-stage expansion planning of active distribution grids," in *IEEE PES ISGT Europe 2013*, Lyngby, Denmark, 2013.
- [11] D. Lu and Z. Li, "Long-Term Planning with Battery-Based Energy Storage Transportation in Power System," in *2017 Ninth Annual IEEE Green Technologies Conference (GreenTech)*, Denver, CO, USA, 2017.
- [12] G. Pulazza, N. Zhang, C. Kang, and C. A. Nucci, "Transmission Planning With Battery-Based Energy Storage Transportation For Power Systems With High Penetration of Renewable Energy," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 4928-4940, 2021.
- [13] X. Wu, A. J. Conejo and S. Mathew, "Optimal Siting of Batteries in Distribution Systems to Enhance Reliability," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 3118-3127, 2021.
- [14] R. Hidalgo-Leon, D. Siguenza, C. Sanchez, J. Leon, P. Jacome-Ruiz, J. Wu and D. Ortiz, "A survey of battery energy storage system (BESS), applications and environmental impacts in power systems," in *IEEE Second Ecuador Technical Chapters Meeting (ETCM)*, Salinas, Ecuador, 2017.
- [15] International Energy Agency, "Innovation in batteries and electricity storage - a global analysis based on patent data," IEA, 2020.
- [16] MIT, "The future of energy storage," Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2022.
- [17] T. A. Nguyen and R. H. Byrne, "Evaluation of Energy Storage Providing Virtual Transmission Capacity," in *2021 IEEE Power & Energy Society General Meeting (PESGM)*, Washington, DC, USA, 2021.
- [18] J. P. N. O. C. B. M. T. O. P. J. M. U. H. Martin Lindner, "Operation strategies of battery energy storage systems for preventive and curative congestion management in transmission grids," *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution*, vol. 17, no. 3, p. 589-603, 2023.
- [19] X. Li and K. W. Hedman, "Enhanced Energy Management System with Corrective Transmission Switching Strategy— Part I: Methodology," *IEEE Transaction on Power Systems*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 4490-4502, 2019.
- [20] X. Li and K. W. Hedman, "Enhanced Energy Management System with Corrective Transmission Switching Strategy— Part II: Results and Discussion," *IEEE Transaction on Power Systems*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 4503-4513, 2019.
- [21] R. Fatima, H. Zahid, and X. Li, "Optimal Dynamic Reconfiguration of Distribution Networks," in *55th North American Power Symposium*, Asheville, NC, USA, 2023.
- [22] S. R. Salkuti, "Congestion management using optimal transmission switching," *IEEE Systems Journal*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 3555-3564, 2018.
- [23] P. B. M. S.-A. M. A.-K. K. W. H. a. R. P. Xingpeng Li, "Real-Time Contingency Analysis with Correct Transmission Switching," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 2604-2617, 2017.
- [24] X. L. a. K. W. H. Arun Venkatesh Ramesh, "An Accelerated-Decomposition Approach for Security-Constrained Unit Commitment with Corrective Network Reconfiguration," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 887-900, 2022.
- [25] X. L. Arun Venkatesh Ramesh, "Reducing Congestion-Induced Renewable Curtailment with Corrective Network Reconfiguration in Day-Ahead Scheduling," in *PES General Meeting*, Montreal, QC, Canada, 2020.
- [26] X. Li and Q. Xia, "Stochastic Optimal Power Flow with Network Reconfiguration: Congestion Management and Facilitating Grid Integration of Renewables," in *IEEE PES T&D Conference & Exposition*, Chicago, IL, USA, 2020.
- [27] P. M. Subcommittee, "Ieee reliability test system," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 98, no. 6, pp. 2047-2054, 1979.
- [28] A. V. Ramesh and X. Li, "Security Constrained Unit Commitment with Corrective Transmission Switching," in *2019 North American Power Symposium (NAPS)*, Wichita, KS, USA, 2019.