

Hydropeaking Mitigation Measures Impacts on Use

Markus Pfleger, Verbund Hydro Power GmbH - Austria Peter Matt, Vorarlberger Illwerke - Austria

IEA – Brussels, May 2017 Hydropower and Fish

Partnership of R&D Hydropeaking





On behalf of the Austrian federal ministry of agriculture, forestry, environment and watermanagement as promotor in cooporation with the university of environmental sciencies Vienna, e3 expert for energy economy and steakholders of hydropower generators



IEA Brussels, May 2017

Storage Power plants in Austria Renewable Energy – Renewable Capacity

Annual Generation 65 TWh 8.7 TWh 27 TWh 15 TWh 14 TWh Installed Capacity 24,7 GW 3,8 GW 5.7 GW 7,2 GW **8 GW** Run of River (Pumped) Storage Thermal (fossil) Other renewables



Verbund

Vorariberger Illwerke AG

Intermittent production of Wind und PV (Germany) Siberian High → Very cold → Very high → Low wind

- The relevant Day-Ahead forecast values for the are shown
- Characteristic
 Summer Winter
- Two winters two different wind profiles
- Forecast errors greater than 5GW are common

In 2014 approx. 10,5% of Production were forecast error \rightarrow ca. 8.8 TWh



Quelle: Netzkennzahlen von: Amprion, 50Hz, Tennet TSO GmbH, EnBW Transportnetze AG 4

Benefits of Storage Power Plants



At high demand and/or low renewable production \rightarrow Production (Turbine)

At low demand and/or high renewable production \rightarrow No production (keep water in high reservoir)

Additional and simultaneous provision of flexibility and ancillary services

- Operating reserve
- Reactive Power
- Black start Capability
- Congestion Management
- Grid fault management

Storage Power Plant Group

(real complexity!)

•Connected storage and pumped-storage power plants

•Strong interaction between power plants in the group (shared reservoirs, ..)



Storage Power Plant (simplified depiction)



SuREmMa Case Studies



- Ten Storage Power Plant Groups at six rivers
- Representing 4000 MW flexible storage capacity

\rightarrow Representing 50% of the total Austrian storage power plant capacity

→ Projection of the effects on all of Austria is possible by applying a factor of two to the results of the SuREmMa project



Impacts of hydro peaking mitigation measures



Evaluated measures

- Diversion power plant
- Construction of retention basin- for ramping rate attenuation
- Operational restrictions-ramping rate attenuation

Impacts on the electricity system and macro-economic effects

- Security of supply Loss of flexible power
- Climate protection goals
- Additional costs of system operation

Micro-economic effects

- Direct costs (investment, operation)
- Reduction of revenue





Flexibility of storage power plant is highly reduced!

→ Significant negative impact on the electricity system and macro-economic effects

•Security of supply – loss of flexible power

•Climate protection goals

Additional costs of system operation

→ Very strong negative Micro-economic effects
•Reduction of revenue

Operational restrictions: Loss of flexible Power





Gray: Sum of the lost flexible power of the ten SuREmMa case studies in the in dependence of the intensity of ramping rate attenuation. Green: Sum of remaining flexible Power

More than 50% of flexible power are lost at high ramping rate attenuation!

Projection for all of Austria:

→ Loss of over 50% of flexible power of storage power plant groups at high down ramp rate attenuation (ca.. 4000MW)

→ Comparable to <u>10 big gas fired combine-cycle power plant blocks</u>!

Operational restrictions : Additional Verbund

Rise of CO_2 emissions in the electricity system due to not integrateable renewable energy (wind and pv). •Per MW of flexible power 1,5 und 2 MW of fluctuating renewable power can be integrated. Corresponding to 2.600 bis 3.400 MWh per year.

Vorariberger Illwerke AG

•Quantified as substituting this energy with a modern gas fired combine-cycle power plant



Sum of additional CO_2 -emissions of the ten SuREmMa case studies in the in dependence of the intensity of ramping rate attenuation.

Additional CO₂-emissions of 2,2 -2,8 Mio.t CO₂-equivalent per year in the SuREmMa Case studies at high down ramp rate attenuation!

Projection for all of Austria:

→ Additional CO₂-emissions comparable to almost 25% of Austrian traffic (ca. 4,4 – 5,6 Mio.t_{CO2ea/a})

Operational restrictions: Additional costs of system operation



Investment in alternative sources of flexibility leads to a rise in system operation cost.¹⁾



Sum of additional costs of system operation of the ten SuREmMa case studies in the in dependence of the intensity of ramping rate attenuation.

Additional system costs of 105 – 315 Mio. € per year in the SuREmMa Case studies at high down ramp rate attenuation!

Projection for all of Austria:

→ Increase in system operation cost up to 2 ‰ of Austrian GDP (200 – 630 Mio. € per year)

1) Costs of alternative sources of flexibility are between 50.000 – 150.000 €/MW per year.

Effects of retention basins





Flexibility of storage power plant remains!

 \rightarrow No negative impacts on the electricity system or macro-economic effects \rightarrow Impact on land use and landscape (narrow alpine valleys, availability of land)

→ Micro-economic effects
Investment and operational costs

Effects of Diversion power plant





Flexibility of storage power plant remains

- → Positive impacts on the electricity system and macro-economic effects
- •Security of supply Additional installed peak capacity
- •Climate protection goals Additional renewable energy
- •Costs of system operation Avoided additional cost of energy production

 \rightarrow Micro-economic effects

•In the current market situation diversion power plants are often not profitable (Missing revenues)

 \rightarrow Not possible at all locations

Key findings regarding the mitigation measures

Diversion power plant

Highest ecological benefits. Renovation of hydro peaking in the entire length of the river.

Verbund

Vorariberger Illwerke AG

- Positive impacts on the electricity system and macro-economic effects
- In the current market diversion power plants are often not profitable (Missing revenues)
- Not possible at all locations

Retention basin

- Ecological benefits regarding down ramp and up ramp rate
- No impacts on the electricity system and macro-economic effects
- Micro-economic effects through investment and operational costs
- Impact on land use and landscape (narrow alpine valleys, availability of land)

Operational restrictions

- · Ecological benefit only evaluated for down ramp rate
 - Significant negative impact on the electricity system and macro-economic effects
 - Very strong negative Micro-economic effects

Result - SuremMa







Procedure to meet the target GEP



- 1. significant ecological improvement?
- 2. significant economical restriction?
- 3. significant impact on use?
- 4. Balancing between all relevant public interrests, the GEP and the economy to find the less servere measures



Progress, Solutions and Remaining Challenges



Path of challenge:

- Process of understanding: common basis
 = from mutual distrust to mutual trust
- Fact finding mission on all fields
- Common discussion and finally acceptance of the facts
- Based on clear facts we'll have to find a common balanced solution

Conclusion for mutual success of implementation WFD



- Ecology: to be aware of the trade-offs between climate target and WFD – the needed balancing of Wind and PV with Hydro
- 2. Economy: Hydro generators should be aware of the needed fish habitats e.g. stranding of fishes in the larval stadium
- **3. Authority:** the best possible way support the public interests for mitigation measures is to utilise the legislative bargained latitude.

Additional Examples of Prosperous Cooperations



Questions?

XXXXAAZ

Please don't hesitate to contact me

peter.matt@illwerke.at

124