#### Energy 185 (2019) 1143-1153

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Energy

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/energy

# Assessing climate sensitivity of peak electricity load for resilient power systems planning and operation: A study applied to the Texas region



ScienceDire

# Panteha Alipour<sup>a</sup>, Sayanti Mukherjee<sup>b,\*</sup>, Roshanak Nateghi<sup>c, d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Engineering Technology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 47907, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University at Buffalo (SUNY), Buffalo, NY, 14260, USA

<sup>c</sup> School of Industrial Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 47907, USA

<sup>d</sup> Environmental and Ecological Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 47907, USA

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 22 November 2018 Received in revised form 9 July 2019 Accepted 11 July 2019 Available online 17 July 2019

Keywords: Predictive energy analytics Climate sensitive peak-load Dew point temperature Statistical learning theory

#### ABSTRACT

Accurate forecasting of peak electricity load has long been an active area of research in electricity markets, and power systems planning and operation. Unanticipated climate-induced surges in peak load can lead to supply shortages causing frequent brownouts and blackouts, and large-scale socioeconomic impacts. In this paper, the climate sensitivity of daily peak load is characterized by leveraging advanced statistical machine learning algorithms. More specifically, a rigorously tested and validated predictive model based on the Bayesian additive regression trees algorithm is proposed. Results from this study revealed that maximum daily temperature followed by mean dew point temperature are the most important predictors of the climate-sensitive portion of daily peak load. Among the non-climatic predictors, electricity price was found to have a strong positive association with the daily peak load. Economic growth was observed to have an inverse association with the daily peak load. While the proposed framework is established for the state of Texas, one of the most energy-intensive states with geographic and demographic susceptibility to climatic change, the methodology can be extended to other states/ regions. The model can also be used to make short-term predictions of the climate-sensitive portion of daily peak load.

© 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

# 1. Introduction

Ensuring the resilience of the grid, considering a multidimensional perspective [1], is of utmost importance to minimize the socio-economic impacts in face of extreme events [2]. Accurate estimates of peak electricity load is an integral component of electric power system adequacy planning, contributing to its resilience [3]. Unlike many other commodities, electricity cannot be stored. Thus, supply and demand have to be matched in real-time to ensure that power is available to the consumers when the switch is turned on [4]. Adequate generation capacity and demandside resources have to be specifically planned and built, not only to meet the maximum load and minimize blackout risks [5], but also

\* Corresponding author. Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University at Buffalo, The State University of New York (SUNY), Buffalo, NY, 14260, USA.

E-mail address: sayantim@buffalo.edu (S. Mukherjee).

for efficient policy planning and implementation [6]. Accurate forecasts of daily peak load can help electric utilities and energy professionals make optimal resource allocation decisions, assess the security of power systems, and adequately schedule maintenance plans. Over- or under-estimation of daily peak load will result in either excess or inadequate supply respectively, resulting in inefficient investments and expenditure patterns. The evolution of daily peak load is not deterministic and depends on many uncertain, stochastic factors [7]— including climate variability, so-cioeconomic condition, technology change, and population growth as well as infrastructure and building types [8].

In this paper, a generalized, probabilistic predictive framework is proposed, using a state-of-the-art Bayesian ensemble-of-trees algorithm. The proposed framework is used to characterize the sensitivity of daily peak load to climate, as climate variability and change has been projected to have significant impacts on the evolution of peak electricity load [9]. While the proposed datacentric framework can be applied to any geographical area



(contingent on data availability), geographical scope of the proposed analysis is focused on a single state. The rationale for limiting the spatial scope of this analysis is that the consumption patterns of electricity consumers are generally a function of where and how they live [10], and is influenced by regional differences in climate, infrastructure systems, policies, and societal norms [11].

The state of Texas is selected as a case study due to a number of reasons such as the state's infrastructure vulnerability to climate and weather [12]. The climate variance in Texas is attributed to its unique location and is considered to be the consequence of interactions between several weather and climate factors such as the movement of seasonal air masses (e.g., Arctic fronts) from Canada, subtropical west-winds from the Pacific Ocean and Northern Mexico, tropical cyclones or hurricanes from the Gulf of Mexico, a high pressure system in the Atlantic Ocean (aka the Bermuda High) and the movement of jet streams (see Fig. 1) [13].

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), Texas produces more electricity than any other state, generating almost twice as much as Florida which is the second highest electricity-producing state [14]. More than three-quarter of the state's electricity is generated by independent power producers and industrial generators [14]. It is noteworthy that not only is Texas the largest electricity generating state in the country, but also one of the largest electricity consuming states, and has experienced rapid growths in both electricity demand and generation in recent years [14]. Texas experienced a notable population increase of around four million people, making the state rank among the top five largest growing states in the U.S [14]. With rapid population growth in Dallas, Houston, Austin and San Antonio metropolitan areas, the state of Texas has led the nation in terms of annual population growth since 2006 [14].

The largest share of retail electricity sales in Texas belongs to the residential sector [14], which is most sensitive to climate variability and change [15]. A significant fraction of the households in the state use electricity as their primary heating fuel in the winter [14]. The demand for air conditioning is also substantially higher during the hot summer months. In recent years, Texas has observed multiple episodes of unexpected demand surge during periods of heatwaves. The Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) region broke all previous records of peak demand during the 2016 hot summer months across the state [14]. Texas, therefore, exhibits a



Fig. 1. A schematic of the weather and climate systems in the state of Texas [13].

very interesting case study for understanding the nexus between climate variability and peak electricity load to inform adequate investment decisions related to electric infrastructure capacity expansions and/or reliable power systems planning and operation.

The proposed data-centric predictive framework goes beyond the existing deterministic models with linear architecture, and uses the state-of-the-art statistical learning techniques to probabilistically assess the climate sensitivity of daily peak load in the state of Texas. The models' performance is evaluated based on both goodness-of-fit and out-of-sample predictive accuracy to ensure high generalization performance as well as its ability to explain the variance in the historical data. Then, the 'best model', selected based on both the generalizability and goodness-of-fit principles, was used to characterize the climate-sensitivity of daily peak load in Texas.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, a brief overview of the existing literature is presented, highlighting the current knowledge gaps. The data used in the analyses is discussed in Section 3. Sections 4 and 5 outline the methodologies and results. Section 6 concludes the paper by summarizing the key findings and delineating the future research directions.

# 2. Literature review

There exists a significant body of literature in power system load forecasting. The bulk of the existing research in this area has primarily focused on short-term load forecasting (STLF). The goal of STLF is to predict the future hourly and daily loads for a service area of interest, and plays a key role in various electricity system operations planning such as identifying optimum spinning reserve capacity as well as conducting reliability analysis and security assessment.

STLF has been modeled using a wide range of approaches including (a) simulation; (b) time series models; (c) regression analysis and statistical machine learning; and (d) and hybrid models. Below is a brief outline of the current state of knowledge in short-term load forecasting. The review starts with highlighting studies based on simpler generalized linear regression and time-series models and then progresses to more complex approaches based hybrid modeling techniques as well as machine learning techniques.

Haida and Muto [16] presented a regression-based daily peak load forecasting method consisting of a regression model to predict the nominal load, and a learning method to predict the residual load. Haida et al. [17] expanded this model by introducing two trend processing techniques designed to reduce errors in transitional seasons. Ramanathan et al. [18] leveraged multivariate regression modeling using historical data for the Puget Sound Power and Light Company. In this research, the statistical models were trained using the hourly load and weather observations during the fall and winter months of 1983–1990, in order to estimate short-term peak load. More specifically, a number of multiple linear regression (MLR) models were developed for each hour of the day. The lead-time for the forecast models ranged from 16 to 40 h into the future.

Alfares and Nazeeruddin [19] presented a regression-based daily peak load forecasting method for a whole year, including holidays. To forecast load precisely throughout a year, various seasonal factors were considered. In the winter season, average wind chill factor was also added as an explanatory variable. In the transitional seasons (e.g., spring and fall), a transformation technique was used; and for holidays, a holiday effect load was deducted from the normal load.

Papalexopoulos et al. [20] developed a hybrid regression-based approach to improve the short-term system load forecasting for the Pacific Gas and Electric Company in California. The initial model consisted of an autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) peak load model and a MLR peak load model, which used historical data from last 15 days in the inland valley and mountain regions. The results from these two models were combined using a weighted average scheme in the initial model. The improved model removed the ARIMA peak forecast model and only relied on the MLR model. Amiady [21] proposed a time series model for shortterm hourly forecasting of peak load. The results revealed that the proposed ARIMA model provided a better fit to the actual hourly peak load compared to the artificial neural network (ANN) models. Auffhammer et al. [9] used a time-series model to parameterize the relationship between peak electricity load and temperature, and estimated temperature response functions for daily peak load and total daily energy consumption for the entire U.S. They found peak load, at both the daily and annual levels, to be more sensitive to climate change than the total daily consumption. Their results showed that the impacts of climate variability on peak load varied substantially across geographical space, driven by differences in the distribution of heating and cooling degree days as well as differences in heating and cooling technologies.

Fan et al. [22] used a MLR methodology along with eight other models—including ARIMA, support vector regression (SVR), random forests (RF), multi-layer perceptron (MLP), boosting tree (BT), multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS), and k-nearest neighbors (kNN)—for predicting the next-day commercial energy consumption and peak electricity loads for the tallest buildings in Hong Kong. The authors concluded that SVR and RF models outperformed traditional statistical models such as MLR and ARIMA models. The analysis identified the peak power demand and daily energy consumption of seven days and fourteen days before the prediction day as the top four most important inputs for the predictive models based on the random forest algorithm.

Sigauke and Chikobvu [23] developed a predictive model for daily peak demand in South Africa, using the multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS) methodology. They demonstrated the model's capability of yielding a significantly lower root mean square error (RMSE) when compared to piecewise regressionbased models. Liu et al. [24] developed a semi-parametric, twocomponent modeling procedure for forecasting hourly load in the eastern United States. The developed model consisted of a nonparametric component and a parametric ARIMA component. The model estimation was carried out using a modified back-fitting algorithm and was found to have a high predictive performance.

Lusis et al. [25] assessed the effects of calendar dates and forecast granularity (length of each forecast interval) on the accuracy of day-ahead household load forecast using various statistical learning techniques. Their statistical analysis demonstrated that the model based on regression trees yielded a better overall ability to predict the household load for the next 24 h.

Chen et al. [26] applied a hybrid SVR model, both with and without multi-resolution wavelet decomposition (MWD) preprocessing, to predict hourly electric power load in a hotel building. With 15-dimensional parameters of 29 clustered days as the training sample, a nonlinear SVR model was developed. Al-Musaylh et al. [27] evaluated the performance of data-driven models based on MARS, SVR and ARIMA algorithms, for predicting short-term electricity demand using Queensland area's aggregated demand data from the Australian Energy Market Operator. For identifying significant inputs for the three prediction horizons (0.5 h, 1.0 h, and 24.0 h), they changed the electricity demand data by applying partial autocorrelation functions. They found that the model based on the MARS algorithm yielded the most accurate results for 0.5 h and 1.0 h forecasts, whereas the SVR model was better for a 24.0 h horizon. Beccali [28] used Elman's recurrent ANN algorithm to predict (with a 1 h lead time) the intensity of the electric power supplied to households in a suburban area of Palermo (Italy) between June 1, 2002 and September 10, 2003. The forecasting performance of the model was tested by comparing the model predictions with the electric current intensity recorded during a summer week. The research pointed out the importance of a thermal discomfort index for a simple but effective evaluation of the conditions affecting the occupant behavior, and thus influencing the household electricity consumption related to the use of heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) appliances.

Saini and Soni [29] predicted daily peak load using a feed forward neural network (FFNN) based upon the conjugate gradient (CG) back propagation methods. They incorporated the effects of previous day peak load information, the type of day, and eleven weather parameters. The training dataset was selected using a growing window concept. To reduce the redundancies in the input space, principal component analysis (PCA) was leveraged. The resulting dataset was used to train a 3-layered neural network (NN). By comparing four different techniques, they concluded onestep secant back propagation algorithm (OSS-BP) to be the best learning technique for peak load forecasting.

Mukherjee and Nateghi [10] investigated the predictive performance of several different parametric and non-parametric statistical learning methods—e.g., generalized linear model (GLM), generalized additive model (GAM), multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS), random forest (RF) and Bayesian additive regression trees (BART)—to investigate the nexus between total electricity consumption and climate variability. They found that the model based on the BART algorithm outperformed all the other statistical learning methods.

Despite the significant recent advances in the field, as outlined above, some knowledge gaps remain. More specifically, many of the existing models focus primarily on forecasting the load (with various lead times), and do not necessarily focus on characterizing the climate-demand nexus, which is the focus of this study. In addition, the models that focus on capturing the sensitivity of daily peak load to climate variability either (a) are based on 'rigid' modeling assumptions (e.g., based on multiple linear regression and/or time series modeling); which while interpretable, tend to underperform in terms of predictive accuracy [30], or (b) focus primarily on developing accurate predictive models with very little emphasis on model inferencing and interpretation. This paper aims to bridge these gaps by proposing a generalized, probabilistic predictive framework—grounded in statistical learning theory to (a) develop an accurate predictive model, based on both in-sample-fit and out-of-sample predictive accuracy, (b) identify the key predictors of the climate-sensitive portion of daily peak demand, and (c) characterize and interpret the relationship between the key climate predictors and the daily peak load. While the state of Texas is selected as a case study to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed framework, the methodologies presented in this paper are generalizable to other regions.

#### 3. Data source, description, and visualization

This section summarizes the data used to train, test and validate our daily peak load prediction models. The explanatory variables are discussed in Section 3.1, the response variable is summarized in Section 3.2, and the full data-set is presented in Section 3.3.

# 3.1. Input data (explanatory variables) preparation

The two categories of explanatory variables, namely, the weather time-series, and the socio-economic data are used as input

variables in this analysis. The datasets are described in the following subsections.

# 3.1.1. Weather data

Daily weather data was obtained from the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) ranging from 01-January-2002 to 31-December-2017 from multiple weather stations across the geographical area of Texas. The various weather variables (see Table 1) include: daily mean temperature (TEMP), mean dew point temperature for the day (DEWP), daily mean sea level pressure (SLP), mean visibility for the day (VISB), daily mean wind speed (WDSP), maximum daily sustained wind speed (MXSPD), maximum daily temperature (TMAX), minimum daily temperature (TMIN), and daily total precipitation (PRCP).

# 3.1.2. Socio-economic data

Socio-economic data was obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) [31]. The data include variables such as per capita real gross state product (GSP) and unemployment percentage for the state of Texas as observed in a particular year. Monthly electricity price for the state of Texas was obtained from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (form EIA-826). The socio-economic variables are added to the analysis to serve as control variables in the models. Such non-climatic variables control for the socioeconomic changes in the state of Texas over the period of analysis (2002–2017), and thus help to isolate the climate-induced effects on the electricity demand [10].

# 3.2. Response variable preprocessing

Hourly load data for the state of Texas was obtained from the "Hourly Load Data Archives" reported by the Electric Reliability

Table 1

Weather variables description.

Field	Description	Unit
TEMP	Mean temperature for the day	Fahrenheit
DEWP	Mean dew point temperature for the day	Fahrenheit
SLP	Mean sea level pressure for the day	Millibars to tenths
VISB	Mean visibility for the day	Miles to tenths
WDSP	Mean wind speed for the day	knots to tenths
MXSPD	Maximum sustained wind speed of the day	knots to tenths
TMAX	Maximum daily temperature	Fahrenheit
TMIN	Minimum daily temperature	Fahrenheit
PRCP	Total daily precipitation	Inches

Council of Texas (ERCOT) [32]. Also, the daily electricity sales data was extracted for the state of Texas from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) database [14]. To obtain the daily peak load data, maximum of the hourly loads recorded in a day, over the period of 01 January 2002–31 December 2017 was estimated. Similar to previous studies [33], the estimated daily peak load timeseries data was detrended. Detrending was performed to remove the effect of population increase and technological growth over the years, and thus isolating the influence of climate factors on the daily peak electricity load. In order to detrend the response variable, the yearly average of the daily peak load was first calculated for the entire period of study in the following way [33]:

$$\overline{P} = \sum_{y=2002}^{2017} \sum_{d=1}^{365} E(d, y)$$
(1)

The adjustment factor  $F_{adj}$  for each year was calculated from:

$$F_{adj} = \overline{P}(y)^{-1} \sum_{d=1}^{365} E(d, y)$$
(2)

Daily peak load data was adjusted by dividing it by the adjustment factor for that year, i.e.,

$$E_{adj}(d, y) = \frac{E(d, y)}{F_{adj}}$$
(3)

In all the equations above, y denotes the variable "year" and d denotes the variable "day". The final analysis and model development were conducted with the trend-adjusted daily peak load data.

Fig. 2 (a) and (b) show the raw and detrended daily peak loads, respectively. It is evident that the slight upward linear trend in Fig. 2 (a) is removed after applying the de-trending methodology (Fig. 2 (b)). The trend-adjusted daily peak load time-series varies seasonally over the months, signaling climate sensitivity of the daily peak electricity load (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3 shows the violin plot of daily peak electricity load across the months. A violin plot combines a box-plot and a kernel density plot in one graph. More specifically, in a violin plot, a rotated kernel density plot is overlain on the two sides of a box-plot. Fig. 3 shows that there are significant seasonal variations in peak electricity load. It is observed that in TX, the daily peak load is much higher during the summer months, which is expected since the use of airconditioning is highest during the hottest days of summer, and



Fig. 2. Daily peak electricity load (a) before detrending (left), (b) after detrending (right).



Fig. 3. Violin-plot of response variable for different months.

lowest during the temperate winter months and intermediate seasons (i.e., fall and spring).

# 3.3. Final dataset

Table 2

The final dataset was created by combining the daily peak electricity load, weather variables, and socio-economic information, as described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 above. Also, the days of the week is included as a control variable since there are important differences in electricity load patterns between weekdays and weekends. The load on different weekdays can also be quite different. For example, Mondays and Fridays (adjacent to weekends) may have structurally different loads than Tuesday through Thursday. This is particularly true during the summer season. The summary statistics of the response data is presented in Table 2.

Fig. 4 depicts the correlation among all the selected predictors as well as the trend-adjusted response variable. In this figure, each of the variables included in the analysis is shown on the diagonal. At the bottom of the diagonal, the bivariate scatter plots with a fitted line, and at the top of the diagonal, the value of the correlation with the associated significance levels (as stars) are displayed. The significance level is denoted by stars, representing p-values of 0.001 (\*\*\*), 0.01 (\*\*), and 0.05 (\*). The size of the numbers in the top diagonal represent the degree of correlation, with larger numbers (and sizes) indicating higher correlation levels and smaller numbers (and sizes) representing lower correlation levels. Fig. 4 reveals that the relationship between most of the predictors and the daily peak load (response variable) is not linear. Thus, analyzing the sensitivity of daily peak load using linear regression models will likely miss the potentially statistically significant non-linear relationships. Significant linear correlations are observed between the WDSP (mean wind speed) and MXSPD (maximum sustained wind speed)-with a Pearson correlation of 0.78-and between the PC.-Real.GDP (per capita gross domestic product) and the PCT.Unemployment (percentage of unemployment)-with a Pearson correlation of -0.48. Moreover, the temperature variables DEWP, TMAX, TEMP and TMIN are highly correlated with one another (Pearson correlation coefficient:  $\rho > 0.8$ ). Therefore, to reduce

Descriptive statistics of daily peak load (GW) during 01/01/2002-12/31/2017.

Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Kurtosis	Skewness	Min.	Max.
36.26	34.27	9.02	0.44	0.89	19.27	71.09

masking effects due to correlation, three separate models are developed: a model with DEWP and TMAX, a second model using TMIN, a third model using TEMP, keeping all the other predictor variables same in all the models (details described in Section 5).

# 4. Methodology

This section presents the generalized research framework proposed in this study, and provides a brief theoretical background of the models developed to evaluate the climate sensitivity of the daily peak load for the state of Texas.

# 4.1. Research framework

In this research, a generalized, probabilistic predictive framework is leveraged to evaluate the climate sensitivity of the daily peak load. Fig. 5 describes the various steps and flow of the proposed research. As discussed before, data on hourly electricity demand (from which the daily peak load was calculated) was collected for the state of Texas, together with various climate and weather variables as well as socio-economic information. Several types of data transformation techniques were implemented including (i) trend-adjustment of the peak load data, (ii) spatiotemporal aggregation for the climate and weather data, and (iii) inflation-adjustment on the socio-economic data, as needed. The datasets were then aggregated from various sources using year, month, and day as the key variables to generate the "Final Dataset". This step was followed by the model development phase which is described in the subsequent subsections. As evident from this framework, while data specific to the state of Texas was used to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed research, the approach and methodology is transferable and can be extended to other geographical regions.

#### 4.2. Statistical learning and model development

Supervised learning theory is leveraged to characterize the climate-daily peak load nexus. Broadly speaking, the goal of supervised learning is to estimate a function capable of predicting a statistical moment of a target variable (e.g., daily peak load) conditioned on one or more predictor variables (e.g, various climate variables), such that the loss function of interest (measuring the distance between the predictions and the observed values) is minimized. Supervised statistical learning methods can be parametric, semi-parametric or non-parametric. Parametric models generally assume a particular functional form that relates the input variables to the response. The assumed functional forms help with ease of estimation and model interpretability, but come at the cost of predictive accuracy since the assumptions (such as normality and linearity) often do not hold for real data. Non-parametric models do not make many assumptions about the distribution of the response variable or the shape of the function relating the response to the predictors. Instead, they use the data in novel ways to approximate the dependencies. Their predictive power is generally superior to parametric models owing to their better approximation of the true functional forms. Moreover, nonparametric methods are data-intensive and highly dependent on data quality. In this research, the data is trained with a range of parametric and non-parametric supervised learning models to investigate the sensitivity of daily peak load to climate change. More specifically, the data is trained with generalized linear models (GLM), generalized additive models (GAM), multi-adaptive regression splines (MARS), and ensemble tree based models including random forest (RF), Bayesian additive regression trees (BART) and neural network (NN). While the overview of each of



these algorithms is discussed in Appendix A, a brief explanation of the BART algorithm is provided in the following section since it was found to best capture the daily peak load—climate nexus.

#### 4.2.1. Bayesian Additive Regression Trees (BART)

m

BART is a non-parametric, Bayesian, sum-of-trees model as shown in the equation below [34].

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g(x; T_j, M_j) + \varepsilon; \quad \text{where} \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$$
(4)

g(x; T, M) is the function which assigns the parameters of the terminal nodes of trees to the predictors *x*. Regularization priors are used to control model's complexity and restrict the overwhelming influence of the large tree components. Regularization priors eliminate an individual tree's effect of being unduly influential on

the sum-of-trees model [34].

4.2.2. Predictive accuracy vs. model interpretability

As mentioned earlier, flexible non-parametric methods generally have higher predictive power than the parametric models. The improved predictive power, however, comes at the cost of ease of interpretability. Partial dependence plots (PDPs) are efficient methods of conducting variable inference for non-parametric models. PDPs help in understanding the individual effects of the predictor variables ( $x_j$ ) on the response variable in a ceteris paribus condition (i.e. controlling for all the other predictors). Mathematically, the estimated partial dependence function is given as [35]:

$$\widehat{f}(x_j) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{f}(x_j, x_{-j}, i)$$
(5)



Fig. 5. Research framework

Here,  $\hat{f}$  denotes the statistical model; n denotes the number of observations in the training dataset;  $x_{-j}$  denotes all the variables except  $x_j$ . The estimated PDP of the predictor  $x_j$  provides the average value of the function  $\hat{f}$  when  $x_j$  is fixed and  $x_{-j}$  varies over its marginal distribution.

#### 4.3. Bias variance trade off

The generalization performance of a predictive model hinges on the ability to simultaneously minimize the bias and variance of the model. Cross validation is one of the most widely used methods for balancing bias and variance [30]. The method of *k*-fold cross validation is used to estimate predictive accuracy. *K*-fold crossvalidation involves randomly dividing the data into *k* equallysized subsets. In each iteration, the model is fitted to all the data subsets except the  $k^{th}$  held-out subset, and the predictive accuracy is calculated based on the model's performance on the  $k^{th}$  held-out subset. In this paper, the out-of-sample model performance was estimated using a 20% holdout cross validation approach. The outof-sample mean square error (MSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) are then calculated using the following formula [10]:

$$MSE_{out-of-sample} = \frac{1}{k} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{m} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( y_{i,k} - \hat{y}_{i,k} \right)^2 \right) \right]$$
(6)

$$MAE_{out-of-sample} = \frac{1}{k} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{m} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( y_{i,k} - \widehat{y}_{i,k} \right) \right| \right]$$
(7)

k = number of times cross validation is performed; m = number of holdouts during each cross validation  $y_{i,k}$  = *ith* actual observation that was randomly holdout during the  $k^{th}$  cross-validation  $\hat{y}_{i,k}$  = predicted *i*<sup>th</sup> observation during the  $k^{th}$  cross validation using the model developed using the training set data during the  $k^{th}$  cross validation.

The model selection is conducted based on both in-sample fit and out-of-sample predictive accuracy. The in-sample error is measured using the in-sample MSE, MAE, and adjusted  $R^2$  while the out-of-sample error was measured using the out-of-sample MSE and MAE as discussed above.

# 5. Results

Using each algorithm described in the methodology section, three sets of models are developed, namely, one using TMAX and DEWP (Model 1) [i.e., not including TEMP and TMIN], one using TEMP (Model 2) [i.e., excluding DEWP, TMAX, and TMIN], and finally a model using TMIN (Model 3) alone [i.e., excluding DEWP, TMAX, and TEMP], while keeping the non-temperature variables the same in all the models. The rationale for the development of three separate models are: 1) including highly correlated variables within the same model could mask the individual effects of the variables while inferencing; and 2) assessing separate models can help identify which temperature variable(s) best capture(s) the climate sensitivity of daily peak load. The results showed that the model with DEWP and TMAX outperformed the other two models. This is not surprising since (1) DEWP accounts for humidity which has been shown to be a key predictor of the electricity demand for space conditioning [10]; and (2) using TMAX can help capture temperature extremes in Texas which have occurred with a higher frequency in recent years leading to unanticipated demand surges during the hot spells [36].

# 5.1. Model performance

Table 3 summarizes the goodness-of-fit and predictive performance of each of the trained models. The percentage improvement (%imp) metric is also provided in Table 4, indicating the percentage improvement yielded by each of the trained models over having no statistical model and using the historical average as a predictor (i.e., the 'mean-only' model).

The predictive model is selected based on the BART algorithm as the final model, since it outperformed all the other models in terms of out-of-sample predictive accuracy (Tables 3 and 4). In terms of in-sample goodness of fit, the model based on the Random Forest algorithm ranked top, indicating potential over-fitting of the data (Table 3).

To further examine the performance of the final best model

Residuals (GW)

# Table 3

Comparative assessment of the model performance.

#	Models	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	In-sample err.		Out-of-sample err.	
			RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE
1	Mean-only	-NA	-NA	-NA	9.399	8.202
2	GLM	0.526	6.499	5.375	6.494	5.363
3	GAM	0.874	3.337	2.626	3.379	2.660
4	MARS-1	0.861	3.518	2.761	3.530	2.772
5	MARS-2	0.880	3.264	2.542	3.274	2.545
6	MARS-3	0.886	3.186	2.487	3.239	2.515
7	MARS-4	0.886	3.186	2.487	3.240	2.516
8	RF	0.980	1.350	1.044	3.112	2.441
9	BART	0.930	2.500	1.928	2.866	2.213
10	NN	0.899	3.000	2.316	3.382	2.641

Table 4

Models' percentage improvement over the 'null' (i.e., mean-only) model.

Models	Out-of-sample error (%imp)		
	RMSE	MAE	
GLM	31	35	
GAM	64	68	
MARS-1	62	66	
MARS-2	65	69	
MARS-3	66	69	
MARS-4	65	69	
RF	67	70	
BART	69	73	
NN	64	68	

(based on BART), the model predictions versus observed values of daily peak load (Fig. 6) is plotted. The 95% credible intervals provide 56.09% coverage for all the observations (Fig. 6a) whereas the 95% prediction interval offers a 97.09% coverage (Fig. 6b).

The observed deviations at the tails of the Q-Q plot of the residuals (Fig. 7) is attributable to other unobserved variables (probably non-climatic factors) that influence the daily peak load demand, but are not captured in the climate-peak load nexus model presented in this paper.

#### 5.2. Model inference

The ranking of the important predictors influencing daily peak electricity load is given in Fig. 8. The figure helps identify maximum temperature (TMAX) as the most important predictor followed by mean dew point temperature (DEWP), total monthly electricity price (Tot.Price.Monthly), and per capita real gross state product (PC.Real.GDP).





Norm Quantiles

**Fig. 7.** QQ-plot of the BART model (the red dashed lines in the QQ-plot represent 95% confidence intervals). (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)

The partial dependencies between the top six key predictors and daily peak load are plotted in the following sub-sections to characterize the marginal influence of the key predictors on the daily peak electricity demand.

# 5.2.1. Influence of maximum temperature and dew point temperature

The PDP of daily peak electricity load versus the maximum temperature (TMAX) (Fig. 9a) shows an initial inverse relationship between load and increasing temperatures until 70°F/21°C and then an increasing trend thereafter. The marginal plot indicates that for a 30°F/17 °C increase in TMAX (70°F/21°C —  $100 \circ F/38°C$ ), the daily peak load increases by 20 GW. Peak load is relatively insensitive to maximum temperature in the range of 67°F/19°C to 74°F/23°C since the need for space heating or cooling is minimum during the temperate ranges. The increasing trend associated with temperatures less than 67°F/19°C indicates increasing peak load due to increased space heating during the colder winter days.

Fig. 9b illustrates the PDP of daily peak electricity load versus the average daily dew point temperature. Three distinct regions are apparent in the figure. For days with colder dew point temperatures (i.e., colder and humid winter days with temperatures below  $30^{\circ}$ F/-1 $^{\circ}$ C) the daily peak load increases as the dew point temperature decreases. This can be attributed to increased demand for space heating with decreasing temperatures. The peak load is



Fig. 6. a. In-Sample fitted vs. actual values using 95% Credible Intervals. b. In-Sample fitted vs. actual values using 95% Prediction Intervals.

## **BART: Residuals Q-Q Plot**



Fig. 8. The ranking of the importance of the explanatory variables in contributing to the accuracy of the final best model.



Fig. 9. a. Influence of mean dew point temperature and b. Influence of maximum temperature on daily peak load.

minimum for DEWP in the range of  $30^{\circ}$ F/- $1^{\circ}$ C —  $40^{\circ}$ F/ $4^{\circ}$ C and rapidly increases for warmer days (i.e. DEWP above  $40^{\circ}$ F/ $4^{\circ}$ C).

#### 5.2.2. Relationship with electricity price

Electricity price is found to be one of the most important nonclimatic predictor of daily peak load. As discussed before, electricity price (along with other socio-economic variables) is used as a 'control variable' to isolate the effect of climate on daily peak demand. However, since it is found to be among the key predictors of daily peak demand, a brief discussion of its relationship with the response variable is included. Fig. 10 shows that the daily peak electricity load exhibit a positive correlation with the monthly mean electricity price which is in line with the existing literature [37] that indicates higher prices are charged during times of peak demands.

#### 5.2.3. Relationship with per capita gross state product

Fig. 11 shows that the peak electricity load is decreasing with the economic growth in terms of per capita real gross domestic product (PC.Real.GDP). Economic growth is positively associated with socio-technical advancements such as more investments in new energy-efficient equipment. Moreover, with the significant growth of cyber infrastructure and development of IOTs (internet of things), the key





Electricity price (monthly) plotted at specified quantiles (cents/KWh).

Fig. 10. Influence of total monthly electricity price on daily peak load.

driver of economy has shifted away from heavy manufacturing industries to cyber business and service-oriented industry. A recent study by the American Council for an energy efficient economy argued that since the mid-1990s, much of the observed downward trend in the energy demand intensity associated with the economic

**Partial Dependence Plot** 



Fig. 11. Influence of per capita gross state product on daily peak load.

growth can be attributed to the growth of such less energyintensive cyber businesses [38].

#### 5.2.4. Relationship of unemployment with peak load

The association of unemployment with the daily peak load (Fig. 12) shows a random fluctuation. Although there is no significant upward or downward trend in the marginal peak load with increasing unemployment rates, the levels of uncertainty changes. The uncertainty bands (shaded gray area) are wider at the higher percentage of unemployment, indicating a higher variability in peak loads associated with higher unemployment rates.

#### 5.2.5. Influence of maximum sustained wind speed

Daily peak electricity load has an inverse relationship with increasing maximum sustained wind speeds (Fig. 13). This is intuitive, as sustained winds lower the feels-like temperature, and increase the rate of evaporation from the human body as well as the built environment, and therefore, creating a cooling effect. Thus, during breezy/windy days the lower daily peak loads is attributable to lower electricity demands for space cooling [39].

# 6. Conclusion

Effective adequacy planning in the electricity sector is requisite for achieving grid resilience, as it helps minimize significant supply surplus/shortages and thus mitigates unpredictable electricity price hikes and rolling blackouts, which often result in large-scale socioeconomic losses. Effective adequacy planning hinges on access to accurate forecasts of demand patterns, particularly under



**Partial Dependence Plot** 

PCT.Unempt plotted at specified quantiles (%).

Fig. 12. Influence of PCT. Unemployment (%) on daily peak load.

**Partial Dependence Plot** 



MXSPD plotted at specified quantiles (Knots to tenth).

Fig. 13. Influence of maximum sustained wind speed (Knots to tenth) reported for the day on daily peak load.

exogenous shocks such as climate variability and change.

In this paper, the climate sensitivity of daily peak load is investigated using advanced machine learning algorithms. A generalized probabilsitic predictive framework is proposed—based on a Bayesian tree-ensemble algorithm—to assess the climate sensitivity of peak load and to identify its key predictors. Although the proposed model is used to characterize the climate sensitivity of the daily peak load, it can also be leveraged for short-term (daily) peak load predictions as it outperforms all the other models in regards to explaining the variations in data as well as out-of-sample predictions.

The results revealed that maximum daily temperature followed by mean dew point temperature of a day are the most important predictors of the climate sensitive portion of the daily peak load in the state of Texas. Moreover, it is observed that when the maximum temperatures lie in the range of  $67^{\circ}F(19^{\circ}C) - 74^{\circ}F(23^{\circ}C)$  and dew point temperatures in the range of  $30^{\circ}F(-1^{\circ}C) - 40^{\circ}F(4^{\circ}C)$ , the peak load is relatively temperature-insensitive. The results also indicated an inverse relationship between sustained wind speeds and daily peak load, with peak daily loads decreasing at higher sustained wind speeds. This inverse relationship is attributable to the cooling effect of the sustained winds.

Among the non-climatic predictors, the socio-economic variables such as electricity price, per capita gross domestic product, and percentage of unemployed populations were found to have a strong association with the daily peak load. The results indicated a strong positive association between the daily peak load and the electricity price, whereas the association between percent unemployed and the daily peak load was more uncertain. Economic growth was observed to have an inverse association with the peak load, mostly attributable to increased investments in energy efficient equipment as well as a move away from manufacturing-heavy industry to service/cyber industry.

The proposed framework in this study is transferable to other service areas, and can be used by utility planners and operators across the country to characterize the climate sensitivity of peak load. Moreover, the inferences from the Texas case study is of particular interest to the stakeholders in the ERCOT region that have faced frequent supply inadequacy risks during the more frequent episodes of heatwaves over the past decade. The study results demonstrate that the existing approaches based on parametric models (prevalent in many regions of the country including ERCOT) underperform in terms of predictive accuracy and thereby might underestimate the requisite reserve margins. Moreover, the existing approaches based on air temperature alone (that do not account for humidity levels) lead to understating the climatesensitivity of peak load in the state, with big implications for grid resilience in the ERCOT region.

#### Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge support from the NSF grants 1826161, 1832688 and 1728209.

#### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.07.074.

#### References

- Nateghi Roshanak. Multi-dimensional infrastructure resilience modeling: an application to hurricane-prone electric power distribution systems. IEEE Access 2018;6:13478–89.
- [2] Mukherjee Sayanti, Nateghi Roshanak, Hastak Makarand. A multi-hazard approach to assess severe weather-induced major power outage risks in the us. Reliab Eng Syst Saf 2018;175:283–305.
- [3] Mukherjee Sayanti, Nateghi Roshanak. A data-driven approach to assessing supply inadequacy risks due to climate-induced shifts in electricity demand. Risk Anal 2019;39:673–94.
- [4] Nateghi Roshanak, Guikema Seth D, Wu Yue, Bruss C Bayan. Critical assessment of the foundations of power transmission and distribution reliability metrics and standards. Risk Anal 2016;36(1):4–15.
- [5] Mukherjee Sayanti, Nateghi Roshanak. Estimating climate-demand nexus to support longterm adequacy planning in the energy sector. 2017. p. 1–5.
- [6] Raymond Leigh, Douglas Gotham, McClain William, Mukherjee Sayanti, Nateghi Roshanak, Preckel Paul V, Schubert Peter, Singh Shweta, Wachs Elizabeth. Projected climate change impacts on Indiana's energy demand and supply. Clim Change 2018:1–15.
- [7] Nateghi Roshanak, Mukherjee Sayanti. A multi-paradigm framework to assess the impacts of climate change on end-use energy demand. PLoS One 2017;12. e0188033.
- [8] Lokhandwala Mustafa, Nateghi Roshanak. Leveraging advanced predictive analytics to assess commercial cooling load in the us. Sustain. Prod. Consum. 2018;14. 66–8C1.
- [9] Auffhammer Maximilian, Baylis Patrick, Hausman Catherine H. Climate change is projected to have severe impacts on the frequency and intensity of peak electricity demand across the United States. Proc Natl Acad Sci 2017;114: 1886–91.
- [10] Mukherjee Sayanti, Nateghi Roshanak. Climate sensitivity of end-use electricity consumption in the built environment: an application to the state of Florida, United States. Energy 2017;128:688–700.
- [11] Boustead I, Yaros BR. Electricity supply industry in north America. Resour Conserv Recycl 1994;12:121–34.
- [12] Walewski John, Prozzi Jolanda P, Polunsky Steven, et al. How vulnerable is Texas freight infrastructure to extreme weather events? final report. Technical report. Texas A&M Transportation Institute; 2017.
- [13] Chapter 4 climate of Texas. http://www.twdb.texas.gov/publications/state\_ water\_plan/2012/04.pdf.
- [14] Texas state energy profile analysis u.s. energy information administration (eia). https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.php?sid=TX. [Accessed 14 May 2019].
- [15] Mukherjee Sayanti, Vineeth CR, Nateghi Roshanak. Evaluating regional climate-electricity demand nexus: a composite bayesian predictive framework. Appl Energy 2019;235:1561–82.
- [16] Haida Takeshi, Muto Shoichi. Regression based peak load forecasting using a transformation technique. IEEE Trans Power Syst 1994;9:1788–94.
- [17] Haida Takeshi, Muto Shoichi, Takahashi Yoshio, Ishi Yasutaka. Peak load forecasting using multiple-year data with trend data processing techniques. Electr Eng Jpn 1998;124:7–16.
- [18] Ramanathan Ramu, Engle Robert, Clive W, Granger J, Vahid-Araghi Farshid, Casey Brace. Short-run forecasts of electricity loads and peaks. Int J Forecast 1997;13:161-74. 6.
- [19] Alfares HK, Nazeeruddin M. Regression-based methodology for daily peak load forecasting, vol. 3; 1999. p. 468–71.
- [20] Papalexopoulos AD, Hesterberg TC. A regression-based approach to short-

term system load forecasting. IEEE Trans Power Syst 1990;5:1535-47.

- [21] Amjady N. Short-term hourly load forecasting using time-series modeling with peak load estimation capability. IEEE Trans Power Syst 2001;16: 798–805.
- [22] Fan Cheng, Fu Xiao, Wang Shengwei. Development of prediction models for next-day building energy consumption and peak power demand using data mining techniques. Appl Energy 2014;127(1-10).
- [23] Sigauke Caston, Chikobvu Delson. Daily peak electricity load forecasting in South Africa using a multivariate non-parametric regression approach. ORiON 2010;26:97-111.
- [24] Liu Jun M, Chen Rong, Liu Lon-Mu, Harris John L. A semi-parametric time series approach in modeling hourly electricity loads. J Forecast 2006;25: 537–59.
- [25] Lusis Peter, Khalilpour Kaveh Rajab, Andrew Lachlan, Liebman Ariel. Shortterm residential load forecasting: impact of calendar effects and forecast granularity. Appl Energy 2017;205:654–69.
- [26] Chen Yibo, Tan Hongwei, Song Xiaodong. Day-ahead forecasting of nonstationary electric power demand in commercial buildings: hybrid support vector regression based. Energy Procedia 2017;105:2101–6.
- [27] Al-Musaylh Mohanad S, Deo Ravinesh C, Adamowski Jan F, Li Yan. Short-term electricity demand forecasting with mars, svr and arima models using aggregated demand data in queensland, Australia. Adv Eng Inf 2018;35:1–16.
- [28] Beccali M, Cellura M, Lo Brano V, Marvuglia A. Short-term prediction of household electricity consumption: assessing weather sensitivity in a mediterranean area. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2008;12:2040–65.
- [29] Saini LM, Soni MK. Artificial neural network based peak load forecasting using levenberg–marquardt and quasi-Newton methods. IEE Proc Gener Transm Distrib 2002;149:578–84.
- [30] Friedman Jerome, Hastie Trevor, Tibshirani Robert. The elements of statistical learning, vol. 1. New York: Springer series in statistics; 2001.
- [31] American community survey (acs). https://www.census.gov/programssurveys/acs/.
- [32] Historical information on hourly loads by ercot for the years 1995-2018. http://www.ercot.com/gridinfo/load/load\_hist/. [Accessed 1 April 2018].
- [33] Sailor David J, Muñoz J Ricardo. Sensitivity of electricity and natural gas consumption to climate in the USA–methodology and results for eight states. Energy 1997;22:987–98.
- [34] Chipman Hugh A, George Edward I, Mcculloch Robert E. Bart: Bayesian additive regression trees 1,2. Ann Appl Stat 2010;4:266–98.
- [35] Adam Kapelner, Bleich Justin. bartMachine: machine learning with bayesian additive regression trees. 2013. arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.2171.
- [36] Gabriel Mel, Nathwani Jatin. Meeting the Texas electricity peak demand conundrum: a case for wind and solar. Electr J 2018;31:57–64.
- [37] Torriti Jacopo. Price-based demand side management: assessing the impacts of time-of-use tariffs on residential electricity demand and peak shifting in northern Italy. Energy 2012;44:576–83.
- [38] Laitner John A, Ehrhardt-Martinez Karen. Information and communication technologies: the power of productivity (part ii). Environ Qual Manag 2009;18:19–35.
- [39] Usman Fahad Muhammad, Arbab Naeem. Factor affecting short term load forecasting. J. Clean Energy Technol. 2014;2:305–9.

#### Nomenclature

- BART: Bayesian Additive Regression Trees
- DEWP: Mean Dew Point for the Day
- GAM: Generalized Additive Model
- GLM: Generalized Linear Model
- GDP: Gross Domestic Product (millions of USD measured in 2009 real dollars)

*GW:* Gigawatt-hour *MAE:* Mean Absolute Error

MAE: Mean Absolute Erro

- MARS: Multi Adaptive Regression Spline
- MXSPD: Maximum Sustained Wind Speed for the Day

NN: Neural Network

PRCP: Total Daily Precipitation RF<sup>•</sup> Random Forest

- KF: Random Forest
- RMSE: Root Mean Squared Error
- SLP: Mean Sea Level Pressure for the Day
- TEMP: Mean Temperature for the Day TMIN: Minimum Daily Temperature
- *TMAX:* Maximum Daily Temperature
- VISB: Mean Visibility for the Day
- *WDSP:* Mean Wind Speed for the Day
- 11251 · Inean 11 Ind Speed for the Buy