



STUDENTS: CESAR ROBLES, FURY MENG, GHOVINDO SIADARI, JACKSON MARROTT, JOSE CORTEZ, SOURYADEEP MONDAL

Abstract

- Grid carbon intensity measures the carbon dioxide emissions (in pounds) per kilowatt-hour of electricity produced.
- Installing rooftop solar reduces carbon emissions, and adding a battery further enhances carbon reduction by storing and discharging excess solar energy.
- Battery scheduling is the process of determining when and how much to charge/discharge a battery energy storage system to optimize the carbon reduction.
- The project's objective is to develop battery management software that effectively reduces carbon emissions through battery scheduling.

Overall Conceptual Design

- The solar panel will be equipped with an on-grid inverter to operate in parallel with the utility grid.
- Battery system will be provided to store energy produced by the solar panels.
- An additional inverter will be required to couple the DC voltage from battery to AC voltage in the building electric system.
- Automatic transfer switch (ATS) systems will also be installed to facilitate make/break maneuvers.



Software list to design the hardware:

• Solar panel : Helioscope • Battery Sizing : Energy Toolbase

Software Architecture

• Two controller designs are proposed, the first is heuristic controller and the second is linear programming optimization (LPO) controller.





ELECTRICAL & COMPUTER ENGINEERING



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

Battery Scheduling for Carbon Reduction

Heuristic Approach

- GUI **Results Calculator**
- Calculate emissions reduction Calculate battery cycling

- Heuristic model utilizes a simple conditional logic to decide the charging/discharging of the battery.
- advantages is it The perform faster calculation and uses less resources.
- The disadvantages is it inferior results gives compared to LPO.

Linear Programming Optimization (LPO) Approach

Calc. A

- LPO utilizes a mathematical optimization to find the most optimum battery charging/charging.
- The advantages is it gives the best solution possible. • The disadvantages is it requires longer time to run.

\min_{c}	CF(L - (s + c))	٠	CF
a t	$\alpha > 0$	•	L
5.6.	$q \ge 0$	•	S
	$q \leq Q$	•	Q
	$c \leq D$	•	q (kWh)
	$c \ge -D$	•	С
		•	С
	$c \leq s$	٠	D

= charging rate at a given time (kW) = charging capacity of battery (kW) = discharging capacity of battery (kW)

Graphical User Interface (GUI)

• GUI is designed based on the user's need. The potential user of this software is the facility manager of a commercial building. • Some features in the GUI are real time forecasted values, actual values, and summary of the actual values.



ADVISERS: JESSE GANTZ, AVNAESH JAYANTILAL, BAOSEN ZHANG **SPONSOR:** GENERAL ELECTRIC



= carbon factor (kg/kWh) = energy consumption (kWh) = energy production from solar (kWh) = battery capacity (kWh) = battery capacity at a given time

Hourly Emissions Forecas	t							
200				variable				
150				Emissions Reduction (lbs) Carbon Factor (100(lbs/kWh)^2)				
5 100								
50								
U.	5 10	 15 Time (hours)	20					
0								
Solar and Battery Forecas	t							
200				variable —— Solar Prod. (kW)				
150				Charge Level (kW)				
50								
0								
	5 10	15 Time (hours)	20					
	Sin	nulation Rep	ort					
 Simulation 	is are conducted	d for various so	enarios with dif	ferent forecast				
conditions	•							
• Scenario [•]	I: Perfect one-yea	r foresight for car	bon factor, solar	production, and				
load. Carb	on emissions are	minimized using	LPO optimizer.					
		Scenario 1						
		278618.97 Pounds						
	F	Relative reduction 1009	%					
• Scenario 2	: 48-hour forecast	ed data for carb	• Scenario 2: 48-hour forecasted data for carbon factor, solar production, and					
load are u	icad Carbon on		•					
	iseu. Carbon er	nissions are mi	nimized using L	PO optimizer.				
Forecasted	data vary by 0%	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20%	nimized using L deviation from	PO optimizer. actual data to				
Forecasted simulate fo	data vary by 0% recast error.	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20%	nimized using L deviation from	PO optimizer. actual data to				
Forecasted simulate fo	data vary by 0% recast error.	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2	nimized using L deviation from	PO optimizer. actual data to				
Forecasted simulate fo	data vary by 0% recast error.	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds	PO optimizer. actual data to				
Forecasted simulate fo	data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds	PO optimizer. actual data to				
Forecasted simulate fo	data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97%	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96%	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91%	PO optimizer. actual data to				
 Forecasted simulate fo Scenario 3: 	data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
 Forecasted simulate fo Scenario 3: carbon emi 	data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions.	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
 Forecasted simulate fo Scenario 3: carbon emi 	data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions.	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heurist Scenario 3	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3: carbon emi	Jata vary by 0% o% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions.	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heurist Scenario 3 10%	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use	PO optimizer. actual data to				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3: carbon emi	Jata vary by 0% o% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions.	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heurist Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us 20% 271150.6 Pounds	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
Forecasted simulate fo	Josed. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35%	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heurist Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34%	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32%	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
From above	Josed. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35%	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34%	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32%	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
From above scenario 1, 2	Josed. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize				
From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific	Itsed. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm ant effect on the	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heurist Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is ore the variation carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not				
From above scenario 1, 2, have a signific	O% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the stant of the st	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is nore the variation carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3 carbon emi From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific	O% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the	nissions are mi 5, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heurist Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is ore the variation carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3 carbon emi From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific	O% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar Similar to Scenar sions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the Works, Ref	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is ore the variation carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro n.	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not				
From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific Future • Utilizing ar	Image: Carbon end data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the stand of the standard sector of the sector of the standard sector of the sec	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is hore the variation carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro n. J Acknowled	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not gement				
From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific Future • Utilizing an the proi	Itsed. Carbon end data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the Works, Ref API call to obtain ected value o	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is nore the variation carbon reduction carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro n. JACKNOVIED	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not gement				
From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific Future • Utilizing an the proj carbon fa	Itsed. Carbon end data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and 1. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there is nore the variation carbon reduction carbon reduction	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro n. J Acknowled How PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three generation-to-meet-demand. [Acc n.d.). WattTime Explore g/explorer/#4/47.61/-122.34. [Acce	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize erence between r also does not gement • Meet Demand." PJM Learning -priorities/keeping-the-lights- cessed: Mar. 12, 2023]. r [Online]. Available: essed: Mar. 12, 2023].				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3 carbon emi From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific Future • Utilizing an the proj carbon for production	Ised. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the Works, Ref NAPI call to obtain ected value o actor and sola n.	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there in ore the variation carbon reduction Cereens, and for a control of the content of the formation carbon reduction (1) PJM Interconnection. "Here in a content of the conte	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 20% 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight different in forecast error in forecast error 1 Acknowled How PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three gneration-to-meet-demand. [Accompleted for the top of	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize ed to minimize erence between r also does not gement Meet Demand." PJM Learning -priorities/keeping-the-lights- cessed: Mar. 12, 2023]. r [Online]. Available: essed: Mar. 12, 2023]. r [Online]. Available:				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3 carbon emi From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific Future • Utilizing an the proj carbon fa production • Conductin	Jsed. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the Works, Ref API call to obtain ected value o actor and sola n. g software testing	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there in ore the variation carbon reduction Carbon reduction (1) PJM Interconnection. "H Center. [Online]. Availa on/how-pjm-schedules-{ [2] WattTime. (a) f on/how-pjm-schedules-{ [2] WattTime. (a) f https://www.dailyuw.com ima/article_95935bfe-c20	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is use 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight different in forecast error in forecast error 1. J Ackenowled How PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three gneration-to-meet-demand. [Accond.] Not PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three gneration-to-meet-demand. [Accond.] Not PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three gneration-to-meet-demand. [Accond.] Not PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three gneration-to-meet-demand. [Accond.] Not PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three gneration-to-meet-demand. [Accond.] n.d.). WattTime Explore g/explorer/#4/47.61/-122.34. [Accond.] n/arts_and_culture/your-student- 07-11e8-9a52-5f20068d20bc htm	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize ed to minimize erence between r also does not Gement Meet Demand." PJM Learning -priorities/keeping-the-lights- cessed: Mar. 12, 2023]. r [Online]. Available: essed: Mar. 12, 2023]. r [Online]. Available: essed: Mar. 12, 2023].				
Forecasted simulate fo • Scenario 3 carbon emi From above scenario 1, 2 have a signific Future • Utilizing an the proj carbon fa production • Conductin to evaluat	Jsed. Carbon er data vary by 0% recast error. 0% 275761.2 Pounds 98.97% Similar to Scenar ssions. 0% 271223.8 Pounds 97.35% results it can be and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm and 3. Furtherm cant effect on the Works, Ref API call to obtain ected value o actor and sola n. g software testing e its functionality	nissions are mi b, 10%, and 20% Scenario 2 10% 275732.7 Pounds Relative reduction 98.96% io 2, but a heuris Scenario 3 10% 271199.2 Pounds Relative reduction 97.34% seen that there in ore the variation carbon reduction 6 6 7 6 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	nimized using L deviation from 20% 275586.4 Pounds 98.91% tic approach is us 271150.6 Pounds 97.32% is only slight diffe n in forecast erro n. J Acknowled how PJM Schedules Generation to ble: https://learn.pjm.com/three generation-to-meet-demand. [Acc n.d.). WattTime Explore g/explorer/#4/47.61/-122.34. [Accor r student guide to the IMA," Th Sep. 2018. n/arts_and_culture/your-student- 07-11e8-9a52-5f20068d20bc.htm eal-Time Insight: Transforming Gr Solutions Brochure. Apr.	PO optimizer. actual data to ed to minimize ed to minimize erence between r also does not of Meet Demand." PJM Learning -priorities/keeping-the-lights- cessed: Mar. 12, 2023]. Meet Demand." PJM Learning -priorities/keeping-the-lights- cessed: Mar. 12, 2023]. Meet Demand." Available: essed: Mar. 12, 2023]. Me Daily of the University of [Online]. Available: guide-to-the- l. [Accessed: Mar. 15, 2023]. Me Daily of the University of [Online]. Available: guide-to-the- l. [Accessed: Mar. 15, 2023].				



