

**Exceptional service in the national interest** 

# QUEST EQUITY

A New Open Source Tool for ESS Equity Analysis

David Rosewater

Tu Nguyen, Walker Olis, Raymond Byrne

Sandia National Laboratories is a multimission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology and Engineering Solutions of Sandia LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International Inc. for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525.



### **QUEST EQUITY**

Open source code published in July 2023: <u>https://github.com/sandialabs/snl-quest-equity</u>

An application for assessing energy equity and environmental justice of energy storage projects. This application currently has the powerplant replacement wizard that estimates the health and climate benefits of substituting a powerplant with energy storage and PV. It then calculates the county level benefits to estimate how much the project would impact disadvantaged communities and people with low incomes.



#### **POWERPLANT REPLACEMENT ANALYSIS**

#### Inputs

- Powerplant Data File
- Battery and Analysis Parameters
- Dispatch Type Assumption

#### Outputs

- Minimum capital cost solution(s)
- Health Benefits
- Distributional Impacts





## POWERPLANT EQUITY SURVEY

#### **ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS**

- Health impacts based on the EPA's COBRA tool
- County level resolution for health impact magnitude
  - Undervalues health impact in direct proximity to powerplant
  - Ignores health impact outside US boarders
  - No analysis for Alaska, Hawaii, or US territories
- Powerplant pollution data from calendar year 2019 and 2022
- COBRA API uses 2023 forecast baseline pollution
- Justice40 designation of Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) from 2010 census with overall population numbers from Alaska, Hawaii, or US territories subtracted
  - Population for census tracts are averaged by county to match health impact data.

#### Data

- 3477 powerplants in the PPNC database
- 3,142 counties in the continental US
- 84,414 census tracts identified as DAC or not by justice40



#### **AVERAGE IMPACT AND DISTRIBUTION**

Overall, at the county level, pollution impacts of powerplants on DAC are aligned with population fraction of DAC.



#### **SPATIAL IMPACT EQUITY CLUSTERING (2022 DATA)**



#### **A TALE OF TWO COUNTIES**

Health impacts per-capita from powerplant pollution

2019 Power Plant Data

Mono County CA Total = \$184,260 (2019) 14,310 people (17% DAC) \$<u>12.87</u> per-person

Gallia County OH Total = \$90,289,000 (2019) 30,088 people (65% DAC) \$<u>3,000.83</u> per-person







n

# POWERPLANT REPLACEMENT

#### TOP TWENTY POWERPLANTS BY IMPACT ON DISADVANTAGED POPULATION (2019)

			Capacity		Total Health	Total Health	impact on
ORIS_id	Name	State	(MW)	CF	Benefits (low)	Benefits (high)	disadvantaged
3559	Silas Ray	ТΧ	170.4	4.42%	423988.3105	954701.4617	72.07%
55123	Magic Valley Generating Station	ТΧ	801	40.62%	6669382.568	14999965.13	71.20%
50660	Covanta Tulsa Renewable Energy LLC	ОК	16.8	8.33%	710538.7144	1601016.229	69.57%
7762	Calpine Hidalgo Energy Center	TX	551.3	56.37%	8671792.455	19505900.96	69.06%
55146	Green Country Energy, LLC	ОК	903.9	59.68%	6464173.105	14567228.51	62.46%
3439	Laredo	ТΧ	450.8	2.83%	102222.5183	230221.6667	61.43%
621	Turkey Point	ТΧ	3678.7	59.80%	33715677.27	75954281.7	61.11%
54624	South District Wastewater Treatment Plt	FL	10.7	15.83%	3022030.852	6808113.717	60.71%
54623	Central District Wastewater Treat Plant	FL	9.6	5.29%	93279.67093	210142.083	60.71%
10062	Miami Dade County Resource Recovery Fac	FL	77	43.58%	55912567.74	125973004	<u>60.6</u> 0%
54338	Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers	ТΧ	24.9	0.33%	3873.026077	8715.47457	60.44%
59391	Red Gate Power Plant	TX	224.4	22.11%	41803081.41	94083950.17	59.35%
58562	Montana Power Station	TX	527.2	22.77%	6810147.226	15350376.44	57.48%
7988	Silver Creek Generating Plant	MS	250.5	2.08%	126652.0546	285875.7069	56.45%
4940	Riverside (4940)	ОК	1121.7	6.04%	8118836.862	18298235.14	<u>55.</u> 49%
56707	El Nido Facility	CA	12.5	42.55%	2243331.289	5047056.19	55.44%
55419	Plaquemine Cogen Facility	LA	987	61.78%	8693682.045	19610169.13	55. <mark>3</mark> 3%
2965	Tulsa	ОК	443.2	8.58%	5850960.252	13187007.53	<u>54.</u> 86%
55404	Carville Energy Center	LA	555	61.10%	3229834.697	7285403.935	54. <mark>59%</mark>
58478	LEPA Unit No. 1	LA	74.1	24.37%	266287.9958	600507.9219	54. <mark>33%</mark>

### **CALPINE HIDALGO ENERGY CENTER (TX)**

Capacity: 551.3 MW Capacity Factor: 56.36% Health Impacts: \$9M -\$20M / year Impact on disadvantaged

population: 69.06%

Open Example Quest Equity Report



Image credit: google street view

### **RIVERSIDE (OK) POWER STATION**

Capacity: 1121.7 MW Capacity Factor: 6.04% Health Impacts: \$8.1M -\$18.3M / year Impact on disadvantaged population: 55.5%

Open Example Quest Equity Report



**KEY CONCLUSIONS FROM ANALYSIS** 

2019 Power Plant Data

- 531 powerplants in the continental US (~15.3% of 3477) are located where >40% of the impact of their pollution go to people in DACs
- 161 powerplants in the continental US (~4.6% of 3477) cause at least \$0.50 / kWh in health impacts.
- 15 powerplants fall in both categories and can be prioritized for early retirement

This work was funded by the **US DOE OE Energy Storage Program**. We would like to thank Dr. Imre Gyuk for his support of energy storage EEEJ research.



#### **BACKUP SLIDES**



### **OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM (FLEXIBLE DISPATCH)**

Inputs

- Input 1: power plant data file
- Input 2: Cost of PV per MW (with 0MW cost)
- Input 3: Cost per MW and MWh of BESS (with 0MW/0MWh cost)
- Input 4: BESS Round Trip Efficiency
- Input 5: Replacement Fraction ho [0.5, 1]

$$\begin{split} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{3n+3}} C_{PV}^{MW} P_{PV} + C_{ES}^{MW} P_{ES} + C_{ES}^{MWh} E_{ES} + \prod \|\mathbf{g}\|_{1} \\ D\mathbf{\varsigma} &= \eta \mathbf{p}^{+} + \mathbf{p}^{-} \\ \mathbf{p}^{+} + \mathbf{p}^{-} + P_{PV} \mathbf{p}_{pv} \geq \mathbf{p}_{plant} \mathbf{g} \ \forall i \in P_{peek} \\ \mathbf{p}^{+} - \mathbf{p}^{-} \leq P_{ES} \\ \mathbf{0} &\leq \mathbf{\varsigma} \leq E_{ES} \\ \mathbf{p}^{\top}_{plant} \mathbf{g} \geq \rho \sum \mathbf{p}^{\top}_{plant} \\ \mathbf{x} \in \{\mathbf{\varsigma}, \mathbf{p}^{+}, \mathbf{p}^{-}, \mathbf{g}, P_{PV}, P_{ES}, E_{ES}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3n+3} \times [0,1]^{n} \end{split}$$

System Limits

**Replacement Fraction** 

#### **PUBLIC INVESTMENT DRIVEN BY DISTRIBUTED BENEFITS**

This plot illustrates the distributed benefits verses concentrated costs of candidate projects.

A local, state, or federal entity can select a replacement fraction, and desired ROI, and this plot will tell them the level of cost share that will present a positive social NPV.

