Integrating space weather and ground-based magnetotelluric data with powerflow solutions for real-time assessment of risk to the power grid

Adam Schultz[1], Naoto Imamura[1], Eduardo Cotilla-Sanchez[2], Adam Mate[2], Sean Murphy[3], Jerry Schuman[3]

[1]College of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University. [2]College of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, Oregon State University. [3]PingThings, Inc.

Utility control room operators need 15 min heat map forecast for actionable human intervention in control loop


Figure source: (left) Antti Pulkkinen, NASA.
(right) A Generator Step Up (GSU) transformer failed at the Salem River Nuclear Plant during the March 1989 geomagnetic storm. The unit is depicted on the left; some of the burned 22kV primary windings are shown on the right. Though immersed in cooling oil, the windings became hot enough to melt copper, at about 2000 degrees F. John Kappenman, Metatech

GMD/GIC Risk Assessment and Mitigation – requirements and regulatory framework

- The National Space Weather Action Plan and NSWA Strategy [NSTC, 2015; update 2019]

- Executive Order 13744 [Obama, 2016]

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Orders 779 [2013], 851

- North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) TPL 007-1,2/3

Risk assessments must factor in ground conductivity; mandate transmission system sensor and magnetic field data to be collected

EMP

- Executive Order 13865 [Trump, March 26, 2019], President's Budget Request FY2020

Sect'y Interior directed to:
1) Support the research, development, deployment, and operation of capabilities that enhance understanding of variations of Earth's magnetic field associated with [natural and human-made electro-magnetic pulses] EMPs, and
2) Within 4 years of the date of this order, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete a magnetotelluric survey of the contiguous United States to help critical infrastructure owners and operators conduct EMP vulnerability assessments.

By measuring the electric (E) and magnetic (H) fields at the Earth's surface, we determine the frequency dependent *impedance tensor*, which we use to image the electrical conductivity structure of the **near-surface** through the **upper mantle, and to assess the impact of geomagnetically induced currents in critical infrastructure.**

Given **H** and **Z**, **E** can be predicted; **Z** acts like linear filter on H projecting magnetic field to electric field

$$E_x(f) = Z_{xx}(f)H_x(f) + Z_{xy}(f)H_y(f) + noise$$
$$E_y(f) = Z_{yz}(f)H_x(f) + Z_{yy}(f)H_y(f) + noise$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_x(f) \\ E_y(f) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Z_{xx}(f) & Z_{xy}(f) \\ Z_{yz}^{yx}(f) & Z_{yy}(f) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H_x(f) \\ H_y(f) \end{bmatrix} + noise$$

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{ZH} + noise$$

Oregon State
University

College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences

MT Array Operations Center

A unified public domain database of Transportable Array (70-km) station spacing long-period MT station time series, MT response functions available from IRIS.edu

blue dots   1167 OSU/NSF sites
yellow dots   47 USGS sites incl.
                Parts of FL; TN, AR,
                MO (not shown)
red dots   54 OSU/NASA sites in
                CA planned for 2019

Yellow dots: currently operating
   mag observatories
                 USGS, NRCan

*Note: Fresno, Stennis/BSL, Shumagin support ends this month – particularly unfortunate timing*

3-D conductivity structure

Vertically integrated Earth conductance (from 15–150 km) calculated from the 3-D MT inverse solutions of Meqbel et al. (2014) (northwestern USA), Yang et al. (2015) (north-central USA), and Murphy and Egbert (2017) (southeastern USA).

[From: Murphy & Egbert, 2018]

Vertically Integrated Conductance (S)

EM RED61 Sep 7–8 2017

EHD (top) credit: Sebastién Guillon, Hydro-Québec.

Coherency between ground electric fields recorded at OSU/NSF EarthScope MT stations (this example: SW Maine) and Even Harmonic Distortion in voltage measured on Hydro-Québec transmission system

Electric field (N-S at top, then E-W) components, magnetic field (vertical, N-S then E-W) components from an OSU EarthScope MT station in SW Maine during a GMD in September, 2017.

Top panel – Even Harmonic Distortion (harmonics 2,4,6,8 as percentage) in voltage, measured on Hydro-Québec power grid during the GMD.

MT stations are generally temporary and there are few magnetic observatories or long-term variometer stations. How do we know the magnetic field today at a location distant from an observatory when no magnetometers are installed?

Real-time predictions based on real-time geomagnetic observatory data streams:

- Physics model based methods such as spherical elementary currents (Amm & Viljanen, 1999; Pulkkinen et al., 2003)

- Geometrical projection method using multi-observatory-to-MT station transfer function (Bonner & Schultz, 2017)

Real-time prediction of the magnetic field near Portland, Oregon by projecting the magnetic fields at:

- Newport, WA
- Fresno, CA
- Boulder, CO
- Honolulu, HI

through the multi-station transfer function for that location

Poker Allsky, 19 Feb, 2012, 557.7 nm
PFISR Low (km): 95
PFISR Hi (km): 125
Log_10(ne)
Time (UTC): 04:09:47.12
TOF (s): −5479.88

Project support: NSF-AGS and EAR

Poker Flat PFISR
(Advanced Modular Incoherent Scattering Radar)

Alaska experiment area Sep - Dec, 2015

PFISR 300 km Altitude

PFISR 100 km Altitude

What density of magnetic observatories is needed to adequately represent the complexity of the geomagnetic field for GIC purposes? We look to the auroral zone for the worst case scenario.

Image IBCAO
Image Landsat
Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO
© 2015 Google

400 km

North and east magnetic field wavelength spectra above Poker Flat AK PFISR array from equivalent thin sheet (Hall) currents for 3 different snapshots. Peak k_p=2.7, AE=1000 nT

At base of ionosphere, z = 100 km

1. Our approach is to pipe the predicted magnetic fields at the locations of former MT stations through the impedance tensors we obtained for those locations, to obtain the predicted electric fields there

$$\begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{E_x} \\ \widetilde{E_y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Z_{xx} & Z_{xy} \\ Z_{yx} & Z_{yy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{H_x} \\ \widetilde{H_y} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{U_x} \\ \widetilde{U_y} \end{bmatrix}$$

where the tilde indicates the *predicted* field.

2. We use a distance weighted algorithm to project the predicted electric fields from all the neighboring MT station locations onto each point along the transmission line path.

3. Alternatively one can use 3-D models of ground conductivity derived from inversion of the impedance tensors; solve the forward problem, and derive electric fields on a grid of points. This is the USGS/NOAA approach.

4. For our approach, electric field prediction misfits at most sites are typically around 1–2 mV/km RMS at the great majority of MT sites that we have examined (for modest k_p levels, within the BPA operating area) where the distance to the nearest magnetic observatory is < 600 km.

G012 Error Ex Comparison
(a) — Site TS, Prediction

G012 Error Ey Comparison
(b) — Site TS, Prediction

12

Substation voltage
1989/03/13 09:00

OSU/NASA's Cal. MT Array Data in 2019

No OSU/NSF MT Array Data Here

1000V

100 V

10 V

Calculated 3-D ground electric fields integrated along the path of the high-voltage transmission lines. Voltage is shown relative to ground at one Ohio substation.

Note – true voltage state calculation requires integration with power flow model.

(Path integration and mapping using BEZPy by G. Lucas, USGS)

Note – large GMD induced bus voltages in the South as well as in the North – impact of 3-D ground conductivity

High-voltage transmission system line voltages induced by GMD using OSU/NSF EarthScope 3-D ground impedance information and magnetic field algorithm.

For power transmission network we've used the RTS-GMLC (Reliability Test System Grid Modernization Lab Consortium) test case but moved to Oregon, and currently we are using LANL's Julia and PowerModelsGMD package, for power flow simulations on the test case, and to determine the GIC flows and possible impacts on the power waveforms in the system elements.

Note – the orientation of the transmission lines and 3-D ground induction effects that vary throughout the region lead to dramatic variations in transmission line induced voltages. The longest transmission line does not necessarily have the largest voltage.

Oregon State University

College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences

MT Array Operations Center

Questions? Adam.Schultz@oregonstate.edu