1 Dynamic rating of overhead transmission lines over
2 complex terrain using a large-eddy simulation paradigm

3 Tyler Phillips^a, Rey DeLeon^{a,b}, Inanc Senocak^{a,*}

4 ^a*Department of Mechanical & Biomedical Engineering*
5 *Boise State University, Boise, Idaho 83725*

6 ^b*Department of Mechanical Engineering*
7 *University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83844*

8 **Abstract**

9 Dynamic Line Rating (DLR) enables rating of power line conductors using real-
10 time weather conditions. Conductors are typically operated based on a con-
11 servative static rating that assumes worst case weather conditions to avoid line
12 sagging to unsafe levels. Static ratings can cause unnecessary congestion on
13 transmission lines. To address this potential issue, a simulation-based dynamic
14 line rating approach is applied to an area with moderately complex terrain.
15 A micro-scale wind solver — accelerated on multiple graphics processing units
16 (GPUs) — is deployed to compute wind speed and direction in the vicinity of
17 powerlines. The wind solver adopts the large-eddy simulation technique and
18 the immersed boundary method with fine spatial resolutions to improve the
19 accuracy of wind field predictions. Statistical analysis of simulated winds com-
20 pare favorably against wind data collected at multiple weather stations across
21 the testbed area. The simulation data is then used to compute excess trans-
22 mission capacity that may not be utilized because of a static rating practice.
23 Our results show that the present multi-GPU accelerated simulation-based ap-
24 proach — supported with transient calculation of conductor temperature with
25 high-order schemes — could be used as a non-intrusive smart-grid technology
26 to increase transmission capacity on existing lines.

27 *Keywords:*

28 Computational Fluid Dynamics, Dynamic Line Rating, Wind Power

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 208 426 4066. E-mail: senocak@boisestate.edu
Preprint submitted to Renewable Energy *February 20, 2017*

29 1. Introduction

30 Investments in renewable energy has been driven by several factors, including
31 energy security and stability, climate change, and economics. Since 2000, wind
32 energy has been the largest source of new renewable generation installed in the
33 United States [1]. However, wind power generation is much more complex than
34 installing wind turbines in windy areas. Grid integration is a major challenge,
35 many of the best locations for wind farms do not have access to the needed
36 transmission capacity [2]. Congestion in existing transmission lines is a growing
37 concern, resulting in inefficiencies for both renewable energy producers, utilities
38 and balancing authorities [3]. At times, transmission service providers (TSPs)
39 may not be able to absorb the power generated, therefore, power production
40 can be curtailed.

41 Potential sites for wind power generation are usually found in remote open
42 areas that are away from populated cities, where electricity is needed most.
43 Historically, transmission systems have been built together with power produc-
44 tion installations in order to meet the electricity demand. For economic reasons
45 they are usually not over-sized, therefore, current transmission networks in many
46 of these sites may not support additional generation. Many wind projects have
47 been able to patch into the existing transmission network, however, these oppor-
48 tunities are shrinking. Further expansion of wind energy may require large in-
49 vestments in transmission networks, creating an obstacle for cost-effective wind
50 deployment [1, 4].

51 Transmission capacity can be increased in several ways. The obvious way
52 is to reinforce the transmission network with new powerlines. However, this
53 is constrained by the high costs and legal challenges of building new power-
54 lines [5]. Therefore, TSPs have focused on innovative solutions that modifies
55 existing network to increase transmission capacity. Different techniques include
56 prediction of meteorological conditions by means of deterministic [6] or proba-
57 bilistic [7] forecasting methods, and adopting the newest innovations in smart-
58 grid real-time monitoring of temperature, sag, tilt, power, current and weather

59 conditions [8, 9, 10]. In the case of wind energy integration, monitoring meteo-
60 rological conditions in real-time can be very beneficial for both power generation
61 and transmission purposes. Strong winds needed for wind generation, will also
62 cool down the conductor of local transmission lines, creating additional capacity,
63 which would enable TSPs to “overload” the line when it is needed most [11, 12].

64 Transmission conductor capacity is limited by its maximum allowable tem-
65 perature. The maximum amount of electric current a conductor can transmit
66 before structural damage is known as *ampacity*. Currently, ampacity is gen-
67 erally determined using a static line rating (SLR) methodology. SLR is based
68 on conservative assumptions regarding environmental conditions, such as high
69 ambient temperature and low wind conditions. These assumptions were made
70 to avoid lines sagging to unsafe levels. However, they are overly conservative
71 for areas where wind generation is abundant. Therefore, TSPs are investigating
72 dynamic line rating (DLR) methods to increase ampacity on existing lines. DLR
73 utilizes real-time environmental conditions to better predict the temperature of
74 the conductor. Deployment of DLR has the potential to reduce the estimated
75 \$60 billion needed in transmission infrastructure to meet the 20% wind energy
76 by 2030 [2].

77 Fernandez et al. [13] provide a comprehensive review of real-time DLR
78 technologies that have been developed over the last 30 years, endorsing the
79 potential of DLR for wind power integration. Commercially available DLR
80 technologies include direct line sag, line tension, and conductor temperature
81 measurements [14]. Wind turbines are increasingly being built in areas of com-
82 plex terrain, as available sites on flat terrain is diminishing. In complex terrain
83 elevated positions like hill tops are favorable sites due to the increased wind
84 speed. However, complex terrain proves to be challenging for the aforemen-
85 tioned DLR systems. Sag and tension monitoring systems can only inform
86 TSPs of the average sag or tension measurement over large sectionalized trans-
87 mission spans, therefore, only the average temperature of the conductor over
88 large sections can be known. Direct temperature measurements at a single lo-
89 cation may not necessarily represent the critical span, or the hottest section

90 along a conductor. Studies have shown that conductor temperature can vary
 91 spatially by 10–20°C due to variations in wind speed and direction [15, 16, 17].
 92 Therefore, currently adopted DLR systems may not be a good solution for de-
 93 termining the real-time transmission capacity in regions of complex terrain. If
 94 implemented, they may potentially lead to severe overestimation of the actual
 95 ratings, allowing the conductor to be overloaded and causing degradation of the
 96 line. Adding more monitoring devices could be a solution, however these sys-
 97 tems are typically expensive for wide deployment that is needed to reduce risks
 98 to an acceptable level [18]. Additionally, implementation of direct DLR systems
 99 can prove to be challenging, as transmission lines need to be de-energized during
 100 installation and regular maintenance. Therefore, a non-intrusive DLR solution
 101 is highly desirable, which also motivates the present study.

102 In Greenwood et al. [19] two non-intrusive approaches were compared. One
 103 approach adopted a CFD-based library approach to extract wind speeds and
 104 direction along the path of transmission lines and the other approach used an
 105 uncertainty model based on a small number of weather stations. Greenwood
 106 et al. suggested that a more sophisticated wind model that can accurately
 107 capture the time-dependent nature of winds over complex terrain coupled with
 108 uncertainty quantification would be invaluable to expand the DLR concept.
 109 Michiorri et al. [20] used actual environmental conditions from a limited number
 110 of meteorological stations as input to the steady-state thermal models. An
 111 inverse distance interpolation technique and a power law for wind profile were
 112 used to estimate the environmental conditions at transmission line. A state-
 113 estimation algorithm based on the Monte-Carlo approach was then used to take
 114 into account the uncertainty in data. Michiorri et al identified the source of
 115 errors as the physical models used in their approach, and suggested the use of
 116 wind flow models based on the computational fluid dynamics (CFD) approach.

117 With today’s improved wind and weather modeling and high performance
 118 computing capabilities, the use of computer simulations to forecast wind and
 119 determine transmission capacity has emerged as an alternative to intrusive hard-
 120 ware solutions. Short-term wind forecasting can potentially be a valuable tool

121 for TSPs, enabling conductor temperature calculations at dense intervals along
 122 transmission lines in complex terrain. Michiorri et al. [21] reviewed current me-
 123 teorological forecasting technologies for broadening the adoption of DLR and
 124 particularly drew attention to the current need to improve low wind speed mod-
 125 eling and turbulence. Michiorri et al. promote the viewpoint of moving from
 126 monitoring technologies to an active management technology where wind fore-
 127 casting for different time horizons becomes critical. To this end, our large-eddy
 128 simulation approach directly addresses the need to improve low wind speed
 129 modeling in the vicinity of transmission lines.

130 Meso-scale numerical weather prediction models have long been used to
 131 forecast winds and other meteorological variables, however their application to
 132 micro-scale atmospheric boundary layer flows over complex terrain with a hor-
 133 izontal spatial resolution ranging from 10 to 100m is still an on-going research
 134 and far from realizing the forecasting mode. Mesoscale weather forecasting
 135 models typically adopt spatial resolutions on the order of a few kilometers. Re-
 136 sults from existing forecasting models vary greatly depending on the locations and
 137 time period investigated [22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. On relatively flat terrain use of
 138 mesoscale models may prove effective, but fine-scale forecasting solutions that
 139 can resolve complex terrain features with horizontal resolution on the order of
 140 10m are needed. For instance micro-scale complex terrain forecasting models
 141 could be used to quantify the stochastic variations in line ratings, which could
 142 then be converted to dynamic constraints as described by Banerjee et al. [27].

143 In what follows, we present the equations for dynamic line rating, followed
 144 by our massively parallel micro-scale wind solver to predict wind speed and
 145 direction as a function of time. An actual test area with moderately complex
 146 terrain is simulated, and predictions are compared against available weather
 147 station data at multiple locations. Field and simulation data are then used to
 148 compute available ampacity for a dynamic line rating scenario, demonstrating
 149 the potential of the current non-intrusive approach to increase transmission
 150 capacity.

151 2. IEEE Standard 738-2012 transmission capacity calculation

152 Transmission line capacity is commonly calculated using procedures de-
153 scribed either in the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)
154 738 Standard [28] or the CIGRE Standard [29]. In this study, we follow the
155 IEEE standard and describe the salient features of the calculation procedure for
156 clarity.

157 Temperature of an overhead electrical conductor is a function of its material
158 properties, weather conditions, and electrical current. The steady-state heat
159 balance is given as

$$160 \quad q_c + q_r = q_s + q_j, \quad (1)$$

161 where q_c , q_r , q_s , and q_j are the conductor convective heat loss, radiated heat
162 loss, solar heat gain, and Joule heating, respectively.

163 Joule heating is calculated using the electric current, I , and conductor re-
164 sistance, $R(T_{ave})$, which is a function of its average temperature, T_{ave} . Joule
165 heating is given as

$$166 \quad q_j = I^2 \cdot R(T_{ave}). \quad (2)$$

167 The steady-state thermal rating used to calculate conductor capacity is then
168 expressed as

$$169 \quad I = \sqrt{\frac{q_c + q_r - q_s}{R(T_{ave})}}, \quad (3)$$

170 where resistance is determined at the maximum permissible conductor temper-
171 ature from lookup tables. It is common practice to use this equation under
172 conservative assumptions for weather conditions, especially for convective heat
173 loss, to rate transmission lines. This practice, known as the *static line rating*,
174 often leads to stringent limits, not enabling the real-time capacity of the line to
175 be utilized.

176 2.1. Dynamic ratings

177 The steady-state rating given in Eq. 3, is calculated using conservative esti-
178 mates of weather conditions. CIGRE [30] recommends that base ratings should

Figure 1: Transient temperature response to a step change in current from 800 to 1200/1300 Amps. Graph adapted from [28].

179 be calculated with an effective wind speed of 0.6 m/s, an air temperature near
 180 the seasonal maximum (40°C summer) and a solar radiation of 1,000 W/m².
 181 In reality the electrical current through the conductor and real-time weather
 182 conditions exposed to the line are constantly changing. In response to these
 183 changes, conductor temperature varies with an associated time scale. Since the
 184 temperature of the conductor is what limits its capacity, we want to track its
 185 temperature in real-time. The change in temperature from an increase in cur-
 186 rent from 800 to 1,200 and 1,300 Amps is shown by the digitized data [28] in
 187 Fig. 1.

188 Transient response of a conductor's temperature to changing current and
 189 weather conditions can be modeled as a first-order ordinary differential equation
 190 (ODE) expressed as

$$191 \quad \frac{dT_{ave}}{dt} = \frac{1}{mC_p} [q_j + q_s - q_c - q_r], \quad (4)$$

192 where mC_p is the total heat capacity of the conductor, given as

$$193 \quad mC_p = \sum m_i C_{pi}, \quad (5)$$

where m_i and C_{pi} are the mass per unit length of i^{th} conductor material and the specific heat of i^{th} conductor material, respectively. Therefore, if the electrical current and real-time conditions are known, the ODE can be solved numerically to calculate real-time temperature of the conductor. With the use of a wind forecasting model, conductor temperature can not only be potentially forecast, but it can be done at very dense intervals, which may not be feasible with current hardware solutions. This would give TSPs an unprecedented understanding of the current and future state of the transmission lines, allowing for better efficiency of the transmission and generation network.

The ODE given in Eq. 4 represents an initial value problem (IVP). The general form is expressed as

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = f(t, y) \quad (6)$$

over a time interval

$$a \leq t \leq b \quad (7)$$

subject to an initial condition

$$y(a) = y_0. \quad (8)$$

The IEEE Standard 738-2012 does not give a recommended numerical method to solve the ODE given in Eq. 4. However, it does supply a sample computer code as a convenience to the user. In that sample code, a first-order accurate forward Euler method is used. In the standard, it is also pointed out that other numerical methods may well be more appropriate in certain situations. Additionally, it is noted that time step size be kept small to reduce numerical errors.

We believe a forward Euler method is too crude for a critical system such as transmission lines. Therefore we examine the use of a fourth-order accurate Runge-Kutta (RK4) scheme [31] for improved accuracy and computation time. The IEEE standard states that there seems to be little advantage in using a time step greater than one second. This may be true when doing a single transient temperature calculation for demonstration purposes, as done in the IEEE standard. However, we are interested in implementing a real-time dynamic

rating in practice, which will likely require many thousands of these calculations to be performed along the length of transmission lines. Therefore, computational expense may become an issue when using a forward Euler method with small time steps. An RK4 scheme allow us to assume larger time step sizes while keeping the error low.

An RK scheme can be written as

$$y_{i+1} = y_i + \phi(t_i, y_i, h) \cdot h, \quad (9)$$

where $\phi(t_i, y_i, h)$ is called the increment function, which is a representative slope over the interval h . The following 4th order RK scheme (RK4) is used in this study.

$$y_{i+1} = y_i + \frac{1}{6}(k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3 + k_4) \cdot h, \quad (10)$$

where k 's represent slope estimates.

As a test case to compare both numerical methods, we have performed the same 800 to 1,200 step increase in current provided in the IEEE 738 Standard, shown in Fig. 1. A normalized L2-norm is used to quantify the difference between the two methods. The normalized L2-norm is given by

$$\|x\| = \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{x_i^2}, \quad (11)$$

where N is the number of comparisons between the exact and numerical solution and x_i is the difference between them. There is no analytical solution, therefore, a reference value was used as the exact solution. The exact value was calculated using the RK4 method and a time step of 0.01 seconds.

The results are shown in Fig. 2, and tabulated in Table 1. This test case makes it clear that care needs to be taken with the selection of a numerical method, the resulting conductor temperature and computation time can be greatly affected. If a DLR system is put in place it is critically important that temperature computations can be completed in near real-time while keeping numerical errors to an acceptable level. Using the RK4 method allows a time step size of 300s over the Euler of 1s, while keeping numerical errors at the same order of magnitude. This allows calculations to be completed over 90

Figure 2: Transient conductor temperature solution using a forward Euler method (top) and a 4th order Runge-Kutta method (bottom) with time steps of 5, 10, and 20 minutes. The “Exact” value was calculated using the RK4 and a time step of 0.01s. IEEE standard solution has been digitized.

times faster, potentially reducing computation time from minutes to seconds. This time could prove critical for TSP, giving them additional time to make needed transmission decisions. Therefore, we recommend an RK4 scheme for calculating the temperature of a conductor as it is easy to implement and there is a clear benefit to it.

3. Massively parallel wind solver

The need for accurate wind modeling , especially at low speeds and over complex terrain, were mentioned in recent studies [21, 13]. Steady-state CFD

Table 1: Normalized L2-norm of conductor temperature using a forward Euler and 4th order Runge-Kutta method. The “exact” values are calculated using the RK4 and a time step (dt) of 0.01s. The speedup is based of the Euler calculation with a time step of 1s.

dt(s)	L2-norm		Speedup	
	RK4	Euler	RK4	Euler
1	1.8E-14	1.1E-4	0.3	1
10	9.4E-11	3.4E-3	3.0	10
30	1.3E-8	1.8E-2	9.2	31
60	3.1E-7	5.0E-2	19	61
300	5.1E-4	0.58	93	314
600	1.4E-2	1.8	186	616
1,200	0.52	7.5	367	1,266

solutions based on Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) equations may not capture the unsteady nature of winds over complex terrain. The large-eddy simulation technique (LES) is inherently unsteady and generally produces better results for separated flows over complex terrain. However, LES is expensive in terms of computational resources, because fine spatial resolutions are needed to resolve energetic eddies. On the other hand, fine resolutions could be beneficial to better monitor the conductor temperature along its path. The unsteady nature of the wind simulations could also help capture the transient response of the conductor to establish a reliable line rating technique. To this end, advances in parallel computing technology can help broaden the adoption of LES technique in practical problems. Graphics processing units offer a relatively economical solution as a small-footprint computing platform because of their massively parallel architecture.

In this study, we adopt a multi-graphics-processing-unit-accelerated (multi-GPU), parallel wind solver, GIN3D [32, 33, 34, 35, 36], as an improved solution for wind modeling over complex terrain. Depending on the mesh size, GIN3D

277 has the potential compute winds over arbitrarily complex terrain faster than
 278 real-time. Computational domain size can range from meters to several kilo-
 279 meters. The computations are accelerated on GPU clusters with a dual-level
 280 parallel implementation that interleaves Message Passing Interface (MPI) with
 281 NVIDIA’s Compute Unified Device Architecture (CUDA). For instance for an
 282 area of approximately 6.5km by 5.7km with a spatial resolution of 15m in the
 283 horizontal and 8m in the vertical, simulations can be 2.2. times faster than
 284 real-time on four Tesla K20 GPUs. In this study, we will execute GIN3D by im-
 285 posing a wind direction inferred from local measurements to assess potential of
 286 a simulation-based DLR approach. Our future goal is to forecast micro-scale at-
 287 mospheric flows over complex terrain with a model-chain approach where lateral
 288 boundary conditions are informed by a mesoscale weather forecasting model.

289 The large-eddy simulation (LES) technique is used in GIN3D for subgrid-
 290 scale turbulence closure. In LES of atmospheric flows, it is common practice to
 291 employ a wall-model due to the complexity and roughness of terrain and the
 292 inadequate resolution in the vicinity of the surface. In particular we pursue a
 293 hybrid Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) LES technique. We employ
 294 the hybrid eddy viscosity model proposed in [37] which can be written as follows,

$$295 \quad \nu_t = \left[([1 - \exp(-z/h_{RL})] C_S \Delta)^2 + (\exp(-z/h_{RL}) \kappa z)^2 \right] |\bar{S}|, \quad (12)$$

296 where z is the surface-normal distance, h_{RL} is the RANS-LES transition height,
 297 $C_S \Delta$ representing the sub-grid-scale (SGS) mixing length (C_S being the model
 298 coefficient and Δ the LES filter width), and κz representing the RANS mixing
 299 length. The SGS mixing length is determined using the Lagrangian dynamic
 300 SGS methodology [38] applied to the Smagorinsky eddy viscosity model. The
 301 Lagrangian dynamic model is a localized SGS model that does not require any
 302 homogeneous directions in the computational domain. Therefore, it is adequate
 303 for arbitrarily complex terrain. The RANS mixing length is that of Prandtl [39].

304 We prefer a Cartesian method to solve the governing equations as it maps
 305 well to the computer architecture of modern GPUs. The immersed boundary
 306 (IB) method is used to impose boundary conditions on the surface using loga-

307 rithmic reconstructions [40] in conjunction with the above hybrid eddy viscosity
 308 model. Note that the goal is to produce the correct Reynolds stresses at the
 309 surface. Therefore, it is important that the velocity reconstruction scheme is
 310 consistent with eddy viscosity near the surface. A logarithmic reconstruction
 311 therefore is suitable because it is consistent with the Prandtl’s mixing length
 312 model near the surface.

313 While IB methods eliminate cumbersome meshing and poor mesh quality
 314 (e.g. skewed cells), the challenge is to impose the boundary conditions as the
 315 immersed surface will most likely not coincide with the Cartesian grid points.
 316 We employ the direct-forcing approach proposed by [41] and later applied by
 317 [42]. This IB method can be classified as a “sharp interface” IB method, as the
 318 boundary condition at the surface appears explicitly in the method. The first
 319 step of this IB method is to identify the Cartesian grid cells cut by the surface,
 320 which can be challenging with arbitrarily complex terrain. The details of the
 321 geometric pre-processing can be found in [43]. Once the geometric information
 322 is known, the values in near-surface grid cells cut by the immersed surface can
 323 be reconstructed each simulation time step by interpolating between the known
 324 boundary condition at the immersed surface, e.g. the no-slip condition for
 325 velocity, and resolved values from the flow field where the grid cells are not cut
 326 by the immersed surface. The logarithmic reconstruction scheme for velocity
 327 proposed by [40] is revised to explicitly enforce the impermeability condition
 328 over complex terrain. First, the velocity components are projected onto surface-
 329 parallel and surface-normal vectors, $u_{i,t}$ and $u_{i,n}$. The reconstruction scheme for
 330 the normal components is a linear interpolation between the flow at a sufficient
 331 surface-normal distance, z_2 , and the no-slip condition at the immersed surface,

$$332 \quad u_{i,n}|_{z_1} = u_{i,n}|_{z_2} \frac{z_1}{z_2}, \quad (13)$$

333 where z_1 is the IB node wall-normal distance. The impermeability condition
 334 is then explicitly enforced. The tangential reconstruction scheme is based on

Table 2: Simulation parameters. Target domain is centered in the total domain which includes the extension and tapering regions for the periodic boundary conditions.

Domain size (km)			Grid Points			Resolution (m)		
L_x	L_y	L_z	N_x	N_y	N_z	Δx	Δy	Δz
16.0	23.0	1.94	1025	1025	513	29.3	34.2	3.9

335 logarithmic-similarity in the atmospheric surface layer [44] and is given by

$$336 \quad u_{i,t}|_{z_1} = u_{i,t}|_{z_2} \frac{\log(z_1/z_0)}{\log(z_2/z_0)}, \quad (14)$$

337 using the same surface-normal distances as in Eq. 13, where z_0 is the aerody-
338 namic roughness length.

339 3.1. Simulation setup

340 The target computational domain is $\sim 368\text{km}^2$ shown in Fig. 3. Periodic
341 boundary conditions were applied in the lateral directions, deemed suitable as
342 the elevation changes relative to the total height of the computational domain
343 are small. As complex terrain may not be the same elevation on all sides of the
344 domain, we extended and tapered the target domain down such that the eleva-
345 tion is constant along the perimeter of the domain. This added approximately
346 6-7km to each side. The total domain height is $\sim 2\text{km}$ from the lowest elevation.
347 The Cartesian grid consisted of ~ 539 million points, giving lateral resolution of
348 $\sim 30\text{m}$ and vertical resolution of 4m. Simulation parameters are given in Table
349 3.1.

350 The wind flow is driven by a constant $6.0\text{e-}05\text{m/s}^2$ pressure gradient coming
351 from the north-east at an angle of 63.3° using meteorological conventions (i.e.
352 wind coming from north is 0° and clock-wise is positive.). The pressure gradient
353 was adjusted iteratively to approximately match the observed wind speed at a
354 weather station over flat terrain. The top of the domain is set to a free-slip
355 condition. Fluid properties are that of air at standard temperature. Surface
356 roughness, z_0 , is set to 0.15m, a value suggested in [44] for rural farmland

357 areas. Following [37], the RANS-LES interface, h_{RL} , is set to 31.6m, twice
 358 the size of the LES filter width, $\Delta = \sqrt[3]{\Delta x \Delta y \Delta z}$. The flow is initialized by
 359 superimposing high-amplitude, low-frequency sinusoidal perturbations onto a
 360 rough-surface log-law profile. This was a necessary step as the terrain elevation
 361 changes were not enough to trip turbulence unassisted, a further indication that
 362 periodic boundary conditions are suitable for this case. The flow was allowed
 363 to develop for two hours of simulated time before reaching a stationary state.
 364 The wind solver assumes incompressible flow, solving the Poisson equation with
 365 geometric multigrid designed for multi-GPUs [34] and uses second-order central
 366 difference schemes for spatial derivatives and a second-order Adams-Bashforth
 367 scheme for time integration.

368 **4. DLR test area**

369 Idaho Power Company (IPCo) and Idaho National Laboratory joint test bed
 370 area for DLR research is located on the Snake River Plain in southern Idaho.
 371 The test site lies in an area of high desert with complex terrain, covering an
 372 area approximately 1,500km² with an elevation range of 754m to 1,1198m.

373 Seventeen weather stations were mounted by IPCo/INL team at a height
 374 of 10m agl in strategic locations along more than 190km of high-voltage trans-
 375 mission lines. Data collection through a cellular network has been underway
 376 by IPCo since August of 2010. The measured quantities are wind speed, wind
 377 direction, ambient temperature, and solar irradiation. Data from the weather
 378 stations is collected every 3 minutes, it is an average of 2s readings over the
 379 3-minute time interval. Weather stations use NRG 40C [45] or the APRS
 380 #40R [46] three cup anemometers. Both models have similar specifications;
 381 wind speed accuracy of 0.1 m/s with a sensor range of 1–96m/s. In Phillips et
 382 al. [47] a year-long weather data was analyzed seasonally to demonstrate the
 383 limitation of the static rating approach on ampacity.

384 For the simulations used in this paper, we chose a 16km×23km area with an
 385 elevation change of over 330m. Figure 3 shows the elevation map and locations

Figure 3: Section of INL/IPCo test site for DLR research, colored by terrain height.

of the nine weather stations located in this area.

4.1. Test area prevailing winds

Wind flow patterns emerge from horizontal surface and atmospheric temperature contrasts on all spatial scales, from global to local size [48]. Both local and global systems exhibit large regularity of daily and seasonal wind and weather cycles [49]. This regularity can be largely attributed to the local terrain and surface properties. Using year-long data starting July 1, 2012 the prevailing wind direction is illustrated by the wind rose in Fig. 4. Two weather stations ~2km east of the area investigated were selected because they better represent the boundary conditions of the simulation, therefore used as discussed in Section 3.1.

Because weather stations operate unattended for a long period and adverse weather conditions can exist during winter months, it was necessary to validate the collected data against a common statistical distribution. The distribution of wind speed is commonly defined using the Weibull probability density function [50]. During any time interval the two parameter wind speed probability

Figure 4: Wind rose of year-long wind data starting July 1, 2012 from two weather $\sim 2\text{km}$ east of the area investigated.

is given as

$$f(v) = \left(\frac{k}{\lambda}\right) \left(\frac{v}{\lambda}\right)^{k-1} e^{-\left(\frac{v}{\lambda}\right)^k} \quad (15)$$

where v is the wind speed, k is the shape parameter, and λ is the scale factor, which is expected to be close to the mean speed. The Weibull probability density function of year-long measured wind data at each of the weather stations is shown in Fig. 5. The nondimensional shape parameter for the collected data is in agreement with the commonly observed values (i.e. k ranging from 1.6 to 2.4) [50].

5. Results

To demonstrate the feasibility of a simulation-based DLR approach, we first compare our wind solver predictions against field data. A horizontal slice of the eastern region of the target domain in Fig. 3 is the focus of Fig. 6. Eddy sizes vary visibly over the terrain. Long, streak-like structures with low wind

Figure 5: Weibull wind distribution using year-long wind data from each weather station.

415 speed are evident in the vicinity of the surface. The location of the canyon
 416 can be inferred as the flow in to and out of the canyon breaks down the larger
 417 eddies vertically above the canyon into much smaller ones. The wind breaks into
 418 smaller eddies as it blows over the canyons. Additionally, acceleration of the
 419 flow above the canyon can be observed from the color map. We next perform a
 420 statistical evaluation of the wind flow simulation.

421 5.1. Statistical validation of the wind solver

422 To evaluate the wind solver's performance against anemometer data collected
 423 at select locations across the test bed area, we follow an approach similar to the
 424 one presented in Carvalho et al [23] by using five statistical parameters: the
 425 mean and standard deviation, the root mean squared error (RMSE), the bias,
 426 and the standard deviation of the error (STDE). The mean is given as

$$427 \quad \bar{v} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \quad (16)$$

428 where $\bar{v}$ is the mean speed, N is the number of data points, and v_i is the i^{th}
 429 wind speed of either the real-time data or simulation results. The standard

Figure 6: Flow visualization. Horizontal slice across domain focusing on eastern part of the canyon in the target domain. Flow is from upper-right moving to lower-left. $2\text{km} \times 2\text{km}$ box provided to show scale.

430 deviation, S_v , is given as

$$431 \quad S_v = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (v_i - \bar{v})^2} \quad (17)$$

432 and the RMSE is computed as

$$433 \quad RMSE = \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (v'_i)^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad (18)$$

434 where N is the total number of deviations, v' , between the the simulated wind
 435 speed, v^{sim} , and the respective observed wind speed at the weather station,
 436 v^{obs} . The deviation is given as

$$437 \quad v' = v^{obs} - v^{sim} \quad (19)$$

438 The bias is defined as

$$439 \quad Bias = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v'_i \quad (20)$$

Figure 7: Mean and standard deviation of the field data and simulation results for wind speed

and makes possible the evaluation of the data systematic errors. A positive bias means that the simulations overestimate the measured values.

The standard deviation of the error (STDE), helps evaluate the dispersion of the error and it can be written as

$$STDE = [RMSE^2 - Bias^2]^{1/2}. \quad (21)$$

The STDE removes from the RMSE possible offsets (biases). A low STDE shows if a given error is mainly due to a kind of offset that can more easily be corrected because the underlying physics is correct, whereas a high STDE represents random error and hints unphysical results.

Figure 7 shows that the mean and standard deviation of the wind speed between the field data and simulation results. We observe that STDE is larger for weather stations B, D and F than the rest of the weather stations. We attribute this difference to the challenges of collecting seasonal data from weather stations that are unattended for long periods. Another issue is that these weather stations were placed to be close to the powerlines and not necessarily at locations

Table 3: Statistical comparison between the observed field data and simulated results at each weather station. A negative bias represents a simulated wind speed that is greater than the field data readings.

Weather Station	RMSE (m/s)	Bias (m/s)	STDE (m/s)
A	0.684	0.082	0.679
B	1.047	0.634	0.834
C	0.672	-0.141	0.657
D	0.997	0.526	0.847
E	0.680	0.332	0.591
F	1.295	-0.835	0.990
G	0.855	-0.130	0.846
H	0.762	0.124	0.752
I	0.774	0.318	0.706

that would capture the dominant wind patterns over the area. It is likely that these weather stations are picking up local details that may not be represented in the simulation.

The comparison between field and simulation data is further quantified in Table 3, with an average RMSE value of 0.863, bias of 0.101, and STDE of 0.767. These values are much lower than the values reported in Carvalho et al. [23]. In Michiorri et al [20] the standard deviation ranged from 0.9 to 1.5, whereas in our approach, it ranges from 0.6 to 1.0. For these reasons, we judge our simulation a reasonable realization of the wind conditions for the assumed global wind direction.

5.2. Dynamic conductor temperature

We perform the transient calculation of the ODE for temperature to demonstrate the dynamic thermal response of the conductor. Eq. 4, using field data from June 10, 2013 at weather station B. Wind speed and ambient temperature values used in the time-marching ODE are updated every three minutes, the

rate of field data collection. The initial temperature of the conductor is first solved using the initial wind speed and steady-state equation in the form

$$R(T) = \frac{q_c + q_r - q_s}{I^2} \quad (22)$$

After calculating the resistance, the temperature T is extracted from tabulated data of resistance versus temperature using a linear interpolation. For this hypothetical case we picked ACSR 26/7 as the conductor type. Static rating was calculated under the summer time assumptions of 0.61m/s wind, full sun on June 10 at 11AM (30° latitude, 0m elevation), and an ambient temperature of 40°C. Under these assumptions with an allowable maximum conductor temperature of 100°C the ampacity was calculated with Eq. 3, giving 1,025 Amps. We then imposed a current of 1,025A to the conductor and calculated the dynamic temperature using the wind speed and ambient temperature field data. Results, presented in Fig. 8, show that conductor temperature—overall—is much lower than the assumed static temperature. Equally important, when adverse conditions persist over long periods of time, TSPs will be informed when conductor temperature is in excess of their limits. Because of these advantages we recommend using a dynamic calculation method over the static rating practice.

As a feasibility test of a simulation-based approach, the conductor temperature was calculated using both field data and simulation results over a four-hour period. Since we are investigating the cooling effect of the wind, we kept other weather conditions constant. The initial conductor temperature used in the ODE calculation was solved using Eq. 22. We updated the wind speed every three minutes and solved the dynamic temperature with a RK4 method over the four hours. Figure 9 shows the true mean estimate and highlights the 99% confidence interval (CI). Data from nine weather stations are used to quantify the uncertainty or CI. The true mean estimate, v' is given as

$$v' = \bar{v} \pm CI \text{ (\%}P\text{)} \quad (23)$$

where CI is the confidence interval at a given probability, P , and is defined as

$$CI = t_{df,P} \cdot S_{\bar{v}} \quad (24)$$

Figure 8: Conductor dynamic temperature calculated using wind speed and temperature from field data and compared with the assumed 100 °C static temperature when loaded with 1,025 Amps.

here $t_{df,P}$ is the statistical t-value with degrees of freedom, df . The degrees of freedom is the number of data points minus one. The standard error, $S_{\bar{v}}$, is defined as

$$S_{\bar{v}} = \frac{S_v}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (25)$$

where S_v is the standard deviation and N is the number of data points.

There are two important conclusions to take away from Fig. 9. First, the conductor temperature is much lower than the 100°C imposed by the static rating. Second, conductor temperature variation relative to its location is significant as evidenced by the confidence interval. Spatial variation of conductor's temperature justifies the need to resolve wind field along the length of the line to identify critical segments.

5.3. Dynamic ampacity

When the conductor is below its maximum allowable temperature, any amount of current can be put on the conductor for a limited amount of time.

Figure 9: Resulting conductor temperature using the field data and simulation results. The highlighted area represents the 99% confidence interval.

513 We therefore calculate the dynamic ampacity using the conductors present tem-
 514 perature and use an iterative method to solve the current that will heat the
 515 conductor to 100°C in 15 minutes. To demonstrate this, we show a hypotheti-
 516 cal case using ACSR 27/6 conductor with an initial temperature of 60°C, wind
 517 speed of 3.5m/s, 40°C ambient temperature, and full sun. The ampacity is cal-
 518 culated to be 1,616A and the heating can be seen in Fig. 10. If the steady-state
 519 thermal rating, Eq. 3, is used under these conditions the ampacity would be at
 520 1,571A and the conductor response would have to be assumed instantaneous. In
 521 other words a dynamic ampacity calculation method would enable the operator
 522 to see the actual thermal response of the conductor and its ability to ride out
 523 sudden drops in wind speed as it takes some time for the conductor to heat up.

524 The dynamic ampacity across the test area is therefore calculated using the
 525 temperature calculated in section 5.2 and the 15 minute transient temperature
 526 response to reach 100°C. The resulting ampacity mean and 99% CI using both
 527 field data and simulation results are shown in Fig. 11. The results show that
 528 there is significant additional capacity available that is not being utilized.

Figure 10: Conductor heating from 60 to 100°C in 15 minutes with a current of 1,616 Amps.

Figure 11: Resulting dynamic ampacity using field data and simulation results, i.e. this ampacity will heat the conductor from it's present temperature to 100°C in 15 minutes. The highlighted area represents the 99% confidence interval.

529 6. Conclusions

530 Dynamic line rating (DLR) holds great promise to alleviate transmission
531 congestion that may hinder integration of new power generation. Using actual
532 weather data from measurements and an LES-based micro-scale wind solver, we
533 demonstrated that ampacity of transmission lines in windy areas with complex
534 terrain can be increased by 40-50% through the DLR concept. Our simulation-
535 based approach is non-intrusive for the powerlines, and it is potentially much-
536 more economical than building new transmission lines.

537 The use of a multi-GPU accelerated solver was critical to the success of our
538 study. Instead of using a commercially available general-purpose computational
539 fluid dynamics solver, we carefully selected our numerical methods and param-
540 eterizations to develop a fast wind solver, which was a multi-year effort with
541 multiple developers [32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. The hardware-oriented design of our
542 numerical solver —combined with the superior computing power of GPUs—
543 enabled us to accommodate spatial and temporal resolutions that are much
544 finer than the current practice for complex terrain wind simulations. Adop-
545 tion of fine spatial resolutions is important for the resolution of terrain-induced
546 motions, leading to more accurate line ratings. A potential benefit of using a
547 multi-GPU accelerated solver is that simulations can be performed on worksta-
548 tions or clusters that have a much smaller footprint than central processing unit
549 (CPU) based computing platforms.

550 Statistical analysis of simulation data for wind speed showed a very good
551 agreement with field data. Additionally, we demonstrated that a transient cal-
552 culation of the conductor temperature offers many advantages over the current
553 practice based on the steady-state response of a conductor. A transient calcula-
554 tion enables us to take advantage of the thermal capacity of a conductor under
555 variable wind conditions when considering a dynamic rating approach. We
556 found that a fourth-order Runge-Kutta scheme performs much better in terms
557 of accuracy and computation time than the forward Euler method suggested in
558 the IEEE-738-2012 standard.

559 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

560 This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foun-
561 dation under Grant No. 1056110 and 1229709. The second author would like to
562 acknowledge the University of Idaho President’s Doctoral Scholars Award. We
563 extend our thanks to Idaho Power for sharing the raw wind data, and helpful
564 discussions with Kurt Meyers and Jake Gentle of Idaho National Laboratory on
565 dynamic line rating concept.

566 References

- 567 [1] Wind vision: A new era for wind power in the United States, Tech. rep.,
568 U.S. Department of Energy (2015).
- 569 [2] D. of Energy, 20% Wind Energy by 2030: Increasing Wind Energy’s Contri-
570 bution to U.S. Electricity Supply, Technical report DOE/GO-102008-2567,
571 2008.
- 572 [3] A. Arroyo, P. Castro, R. Martinez, M. Manana, A. Madrazo, R. Lecuna,
573 A. Gonzalez, Comparison between IEEE and CIGRE thermal behaviour
574 standards and measured temperature on a 132-kv overhead power line,
575 MDPI Energies 8 (2015) 13660–13671.
- 576 [4] J. Metevosyan, Wind power in areas with limited transmission capacity, in:
577 T. Ackermann (Ed.), Wind power in power systems, John Wiley and Sons,
578 2005, Ch. 20, pp. 433–501.
- 579 [5] R. S. Jorge, E. G. Hertwich, Environmental evaluation of power transmis-
580 sion in norway, Elsevier: Applied Energy 101 (2013) 513–520.
- 581 [6] J. Hall, A. Deb, Prediction of overhead transmission line ampacity by
582 stochastic and deterministic models, IEEE: Power Delivery 3 (2) (1988)
583 789–800.

- 584 [7] J. Reding, A method for determining probability based allowable current
585 ratings for BPA's transmission lines, IEEE: Power Delivery 9 (1) (1994)
586 153–161.
- 587 [8] P. Pytlak, P. Musilek, E. Lozowski, J. Toth, Modelling precipitation cooling
588 of overhead conductors, Elsevier: Electric Power Systems Research 81 (12)
589 (2011) 2147–2154.
- 590 [9] J. Cho, J. Kim, J. Lee, J. Kim, I. Song, J. Choi, Development and im-
591 provement of an intelligent cable monitoring system for underground dis-
592 tribution networks using distributed temperature sensing, MDPI: Energies
593 7 (2) (2014) 1076–1094.
- 594 [10] C. Holyk, H. D. Liess, S. Grondel, H. Kanbach, F. Loos, Simulation and
595 measurement of the steady-state temperature in multi-core cables, Elsevier:
596 Electric Power Systems Research 116 (2014) 54–66.
- 597 [11] J. Hosek, Dynamic thermal rating of power transmission lines and renew-
598 able resources, in: ES1002 Workshop, Paris, France, 2011, pp. 1–3.
- 599 [12] J. Heckenbergerova, J. Hosek, Dynamic thermal rating of power transmis-
600 sion lines related to wind energy integration, in: Environment and Elec-
601 trical Engineering (EEEIC), 2012 11th International Conference on, 2012,
602 pp. 798–801.
- 603 [13] E. Fernandez, I. Albizu, M. Bedialauneta, A. Mazon, P. Leite, Review of
604 dynamic line rating systems for wind power integration, Renewable and
605 Sustainable Energy Reviews 53 (2016) 80 – 92.
- 606 [14] S. Uski-Joutsenvuo, R. Pasonen, S. Rissanen, Maximising power line trans-
607 mission capability by employing dynamic line ratings: Technical survey and
608 applicability in Finland, Research report, VTT-R-01604-13, 2013.
- 609 [15] EPRI, Increased Power Flow Guidebook: Increasing Power Flow in Trans-
610 mission and Substation Circuits, Palo Alto, CA. 1010627 (2005).

- [16] T. O. Seppa, A practical approach for increasing the thermal capabilities of transmission lines, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* 8 (3) (1993) 1536–1550.
- [17] T. O. Seppa, R. D. Mohr, J. Stovall, Error sources of real-time ratings based on conductor temperature measurements, Report to CIGRE WG B2.36 (2010) 20–21.
- [18] J. Gentle, K. S. Myers, T. Baldwin, I. West, K. Hart, B. Savage, M. Ellis, P. Anderson, Concurrent wind cooling in power transmission lines, in: 2012 Western Energy Policy Research Conference, 2012. INL/CON-12-27012.
- [19] D. M. Greenwood, J. P. Gentle, K. S. Myers, P. J. Davison, I. J. West, J. W. Bush, G. L. Ingram, M. C. Troffaes, A comparison of real time thermal rating systems in the U.S. and the U.K., *IEEE Transactions on Power and Delivery* 29 (4).
- [20] A. Michiorri, P. C. Taylor, S. C. E. Jupe, Overhead line real-time rating estimation algorithm: Description and validation, *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part A: Journal of Power and Energy* 224 (3) (2010) 293–304.
- [21] A. Michiorri, H.-M. Nguyen, S. Alessandrini, J. B. Bremnes, S. Dierer, E. Ferrero, B.-E. Nygaard, P. Pinson, N. Thomaïdis, S. Uski, Forecasting for dynamic line rating, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 52 (2015) 1713 – 1730.
- [22] M. G.-G. David Carvalho, Alfred Rocha, C. Santos, WRF wind simulation and wind energy production estimates forced by different reanalyses: Comparison with observed data for Portugal, *Applied Energy* 117 (2014) 116–126.
- [23] M. G. David Carvalho, Alfred Rocha, C. Santos, A sensitivity study of the wrf model in wind simulation for an area of high wind energy, *Elsevier: Environmental Modelling & Software* 33 (2012) 23–34.

- [24] M. Bhaskar, A. Jain, N. V. Srinath, Wind speed forecasting: Present status, Power System Technology (POWERCON), 2010 International Conference (2010) 1–6.
- [25] M. Negnevitsky, P. Mandal, A. Srivastava, An overview of forecasting problems and techniques in power systems, Power Energy Society General Meeting, 2009. PES 2009. IEEE (2009) 1–4.
- [26] S. Soman, H. Zareipour, O. Malik, P. Mandal, A review of wind power and wind speed forecasting methods with different time horizons, North American Power Symposium (NAPS) (2010) 1–8.
- [27] B. Banerjee, D. Jayaweera, S. Islam, Risk constrained short-term scheduling with dynamic line ratings for increased penetration of wind power, Renewable Energy 83 (2015) 1139 – 1146.
- [28] IEEE, IEEE standard 738-2012: IEEE standard for calculating the current-temperature relationship of bare overhead conductors.
- [29] CIGRE, The thermal behaviour of overhead conductors, *CIGRE WG 12*.
- [30] CIGRE Working Group B2.12, Guide for selection of weather parameters for bare overhead conductor ratings, Tech. Rep. 299 (August 2006).
- [31] S. C. Chapra, R. P. Canale, Numerical Methods for Engineers, 6th Edition, McGraw Hill, Boston, MA, 2010.
- [32] J. C. Thibault, I. Senocak, Accelerating incompressible flow computations with a Pthreads-CUDA implementation on small-footprint multi-GPU platforms, *Journal of Supercomputing* 59 (2) (2012) 693–719.
- [33] D. A. Jacobsen, I. Senocak, Multi-level parallelism for incompressible flow computations on GPU clusters, *Parallel Computing* 39 (1) (2013) 1 – 20. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.parco.2012.10.002>.

- [34] D. A. Jacobsen, I. Senocak, A full-depth amalgamated parallel 3D geometric multigrid solver for GPU clusters, in: 49th AIAA Aerospace Science Meeting, no. AIAA-2011-946, Orlando, FL, 2011.
- [35] R. DeLeon, K. Felzien, I. Senocak, Toward a GPU-accelerated immersed boundary method for wind forecasting over complex terrain, in: Proceedings of the ASME 2012 Fluids Engineering Division Summer Meeting, no. FEDSM2012-72145, 2012.
- [36] R. DeLeon, D. Jacobsen, I. Senocak, Large-eddy simulations of turbulent incompressible flows on GPU clusters, *Computing in Science and Engineering* 15 (1) (2013) 26–33.
- [37] I. Senocak, A. Ackerman, M. Kirkpatrick, D. Stevens, N. Mansour, Study of near-surface models for large-eddy simulations of a neutrally stratified atmospheric boundary layer, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 124 (2007) 405–424.
- [38] C. Meneveau, T. Lund, W. Cabot, A lagrangian dynamic subgrid-scale model of turbulence, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 319 (1996) 353–385.
- [39] L. Prandtl, Bericht über die Entstehung der Turbulenz, X. *Angew. Math. Mech.* 5 (1925) 136 – 139.
- [40] I. Senocak, A. Ackerman, D. Stevens, N. Mansour, Topography modeling in atmospheric flows using the immersed boundary method, in: Annual Research Briefs, Center for Turbulence Research, NASA-Ames/Stanford Univ., Palo Alto, CA, 2004, pp. 331–341.
- [41] J. Mohd-Yusof, Combined immersed boundary/B-spline methods for simulations of flow in complex geometries, Annual Research Briefs, Center for Turbulence Research, NASA-Ames/Stanford University (1997).
- [42] R. Verzicco, J. Mohd-Yusof, P. Orlandi, D. Haworth, Large eddy simulation in complex geometric configurations using boundary body forces, *AIAA Journal* 38 (2000) 427–433.

- 692 [43] I. Senocak, M. Sandusky, R. DeLeon, D. Wade, K. Felzien, M. Budnikova,
693 An immersed boundary geometric preprocessor for arbitrarily complex ter-
694 rain and geometry, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.* 32 (11) (2015) 2075–2087.
- 695 [44] R. B. Stull, *An Introduction to Boundary Layer Meteorology*, Kluwer Aca-
696 demic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1988.
- 697 [45] Renewable NRG Systems, Hinesburg, Vermont, NRG 40C Anemometer
698 (March 2015).
- 699 [46] APRS World, LLC, Winona, MN, APRS #40R (2015).
- 700 [47] T. Phillips, I. Senocak, J. Gentle, K. Myers, P. Anderson, Investigation of
701 a dynamic power line rating concept for improved wind energy integration
702 over complex terrain, in: *Proceedings of the ASME 2014 4th Joint US-*
703 *European Fluids Engineering Division Summer Meeting*, no. FEDSM2014-
704 21377, 2014.
- 705 [48] S. Emeis, *Wind Energy Meteorology: Atmospheric Physics for Wind Power*
706 *Generation*, Springer, Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.
- 707 [49] A. K. Deb, *Powerline Ampacity System; Theory, Modeling, and Applica-*
708 *tions*, CRC Press, Boca Raton London New York Washington, D.C., 2000.
- 709 [50] M. Brower (Ed.), *Wind resource assessment: a practical guide to developing*
710 *a wind project*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 2012.