The Energy-Water Nexus at U.S. DOE and the U.S.-EU Integrated Water and Power Systems Modeling Challenge

Diana Bauer, Ph.D

Director, Office of Energy Systems Integration Analysis

Office of Policy

U.S. Department of Energy

May 29, 2018

Energy and Water Flows are Interconnected



Energy reported in Quads/year. Water reported in Billion Gallons/Day.



Strategic Pillars for the Energy-Water Nexus

- Optimize the freshwater efficiency of energy production, electricity generation, and end use systems
- Optimize the energy efficiency of water management, treatment, distribution, and end use systems
- Enhance the reliability and resilience of energy and water systems
- Increase safe and productive use of nontraditional water sources
- Promote responsible energy operations with respect to water quality, ecosystem, and seismic impacts
- Exploit productive synergies among water and energy systems



Download the full report at energy.gov



Responding to Challenges in the Energy-Water System





DOE Energy-Water Nexus Focus Areas







Technology and Basic Science Research Focus Areas

ARPA-E: Dry Cooling for Electricity Generation

ARPA-E's Advanced Research in Dry Cooling (ARID) Research Solicitation is funding 14 projects in 2015 for a total of \$30 million:

- Air-cooling heat exchangers (3 projects)
- Sorption & other supplemental cooling (4 projects)
- Radiative cooling and cool storage (3 projects)
- Flue gas H₂O recovery & cool storage (2 projects)
- Combined ACC & cool storage (2 projects)

Sample Indirect Dry-Cooling System that Satisfies ARID Program Objectives





Cooling Water Sources Are Diversifying

U.S. Power Sector is Increasing Utilization of Dry Cooling and Nontraditional Water (2016)



However...

- Current dry cooling technologies are more expensive and come with efficiency penalties
- Using nontraditional water usually means more electricity for pumping and treatment

Data Source: EIA (2017)



- Address manufacturing barriers to producing low-energy, cost-competitive clean water
- Technology priorities arise from facility-level systems-relevant challenges ۲
- Leverage existing federal resources (e.g. DOI/Bureau of Reclamation testbeds) ٠
- Request for Information to be issued soon



Table 4-1 – Top 10 States for 2010 Water Withdrawn for Oil and Natural Gas Production (MGD)
The top 10 states total 94% of water withdrawn for oil and natural gas

Live Link Database Variables	= LLB_OilW + LLB_GasW				
Data Type	2010 MGD of water withdrawn for oil & natural gas production	2010 Percent of water withdrawn for oil & natural gas production			
State Totals	475	100%			
TOP 10 STATES					
AK	133.7	28.1%			
CA	123.5	26.0%			
TX	67.8	14.3%			
LA	28.6	6.0%			
OK	24.4	5.1%			
CO	19.8	4.2%			
PA 13.2		2.8%			
AR 12.7		2.7%			
NM	10.8	2.3%			
KS	10.7	2.3%			
BOTTOM 5 STATES ¹					
MO	0.0349	0.007%			
AZ	0.0244	0.005%			
FL	0.0200	0.004%			
VA	0.0001	0.00003%			
NY	0.00004	0.00001%			

 Table 4-3 – Top 10 States for 2010 Produced Water for Oil and Natural Gas Extraction (MGD)

 The top 10 states total 93% produced water for oil & natural gas extraction

Live Link Database VariablesLLF {OilW_to_(OcDisch+ SurfDisch+Wcons+Winj)+ GasW_to_(OcDisch+ SurfDisch+Wcons+Winj)}Data Type2010 MGD of produced water for oil & gas extraction2010 Percent of produced water for oil & gas extractionState Totals1,236100%TX470.538.1%CA191.315.5%OK141.211.4%LA103.18.3%KS90.37.3%NM43.93.6%WY36.02.9%CO31.02.5%ND27.52.2%AR16.51.3%FOTOM 5 STATES*0.01%MO0.040.003%AZ0.010.0009%						
Data Type water for oil & gas extraction water for oil & gas extraction State Totals 1,236 100% TOP 10 STATES TX 470.5 38.1% CA 191.3 15.5% OK 141.2 11.4% LA 103.1 8.3% KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES 3.002% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01%	Database	SurfDisch+Wcons+Winj)+ GasW_to_(OcDisch+				
TOP 10 STATES TX 470.5 38.1% CA 191.3 15.5% OK 141.2 11.4% LA 103.1 8.3% KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	Data Type	water for oil & gas	water for oil & gas			
TX 470.5 38.1% CA 191.3 15.5% OK 141.2 11.4% LA 103.1 8.3% KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	State Totals	1,236	100%			
CA 191.3 15.5% OK 141.2 11.4% LA 103.1 8.3% KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	TOP 10 STATES					
NN IAA IAA OK 141.2 11.4% LA 103.1 8.3% KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	TX	470.5	38.1%			
LA 103.1 8.3% KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	CA	191.3	15.5%			
KS 90.3 7.3% NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	OK	141.2	11.4%			
NM 43.9 3.6% WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	LA	103.1	8.3%			
WY 36.0 2.9% CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	KS	90.3	7.3%			
CO 31.0 2.5% ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.03%	NM	43.9	3.6%			
ND 27.5 2.2% AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ 0.02% 0.1 TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.03%	WY	36.0	2.9%			
AR 16.5 1.3% BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴ SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	CO	31.0	2.5%			
BOTTOM 5 STATES4 SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	ND	27.5	2.2%			
SD 0.3 0.02% TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	AR	16.5	1.3%			
TN 0.2 0.01% KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	BOTTOM 5 STATES ⁴					
KY 0.1 0.01% MO 0.04 0.003%	SD	0.3	0.02%			
MO 0.04 0.003%	TN	0.2	0.01%			
	KY	0.1	0.01%			
AZ 0.01 0.0009%	MO	0.04	0.003%			
	AZ	0.01	0.0009%			

Development of Energy-Water Nexus State-level Hybrid Sankey Diagrams for 2010 (2018)



Energy Efficiency and Energy Recovery in Wastewater Utilities

- NSF/EPA/DOE/WE&RF Collaboration: Energy Positive Water Resource Recovery
 - Acceleration of advanced technology deployment in a complex policy environment
 - Design concept for testbed network



Wastewater testbed facilities (LIFT)

J.S. DEPARTMENT OF





DOE Basic Energy Sciences (BES) Basic Research Needs Workshop for Energy and Water



PURPOSE: To assess the basic science gaps in fundamental understanding of issues related to the energy-water nexus, with an emphasis on new insights and innovations in chemistry, materials science, biochemistry, and geological sciences to help enable scientific and technological advances for the energy water nexus. The workshop panels focused on: (1) enhancing efficiency of water use in energyintensive processes; (2) minimizing water use for energy production; (3) increasing availability of fresh water in energy-intensive water purification and distribution processes; and (4) cross-cutting research.

Plenary Session Speakers:

The Energy-Water Nexus at DOE, *Diana Bauer, DOE* Complex Aqueous Interfaces, *Geraldine Richmond, Univ Oregon* Advanced Water Treatment Materials, *Jaehong Kim, Yale* Engineered & Natural Water Treatment, *David Sedlak, UCB*

	Workshop Chair: Co-chairs:	Matt Tirrell (ANL/U Chicago) Susan Hubbard (LBNL) David Sholl (Georgia Tech)	
	Workshop Date:	January 4-6, 2017	
	SC Technical Lead:	Gail McLean (BES)	
	Breakout Sessions and Panel Leads:		
р	Basic science challenges to improve water use for industrial applications & electricity generation, <i>Eric Peterson (INL) and Michael Tsapatsis (Univ. Minnesota)</i>		
	Basic science challenges to reduce water use in energy & fuel production, Daniel Giammar (Washington Univ. St. Louis) and Benjamin Gilbert (LBNL)		
	Basic science challenges to in <i>Kate Maher (Stanford Univ.) a</i>	ncrease fit-for-purpose water availability, <i>nd William Tumas (NREL)</i>	
		11 1 1	

Crosscutting basic science in the energy-water systems, Lynn Loo (Princeton Univ.) and Martin Schoonen (BNL)

> Porosity and Subsurface Rocks, *Susan Brantley, Penn State* Non-traditional Water Sources, *Seth Darling, ANL* Subsurface Resource Extraction & Storage, *Charles Werth, UT-Austin* Smart Distributed Water Treatment, *Yoram Cohen, UCLA*



Workshop report is available at:

https://science.energy.gov/bes/community-resources/reports/

Basic Research Needs for Energy and Water Priority Research Directions

 Predict static and dynamic properties of multicomponent fluids

Key question: How can we predict and control molecularto-macroscopic properties and behavior of complex, multicomponent fluids?

- Achieve mechanistic control of interfaces and transport in complex and extreme environments *Key question: What are the underlying mechanisms of affinity and reactivity at interfaces in aqueous systems?*
- Exploit specific material-fluid interactions to design and discover innovative fluids and materials *Key question: How can we codesign the dynamic interactions between materials and reactive fluids for unprecedented tunability?*

BASIC RESEARCH NEEDS FOR Energy and Water



 Advance science to harness the subsurface for a transformational impact on water

Key question: How do we develop the ability to predict and control multiscale, multiphase, multiphysics subsurface properties?





Data, Modeling, and Analysis



Office of Science

BER's work in Energy and Water through the lens of Multi-Sector Dynamics

Exploring the interactions, influences, and complex dynamics among natural, built, and economic systems and sectors



Motivated by several major scientific questions/challenges

- 1. How do natural environments and built environments interact and how are they interdependent across systems and temporal and spatial scales?
- 2. What combination of factors, varying by region and sub-region, contribute most significantly to observed development in transregional, regional, and sub-regional landscape evolutions, including settlement and infrastructure expansions and type?
- 3. How might future co-evolutions within landscapes, including demands for natural resources, environmental services, and products and sectoral services diverge from historical patterns based on compounding stressors and influences?
- 4. What characteristics of combined built and natural landscapes lead to instabilities and/or resilience?

Underpinned by growing science community interest and perspectives

Understanding Dynamics and Resilience in Complex Interdependent Systems *Prospects for a Multi-Model Framework and Community of Practice*



U.S. Global Change Research Program



Importantly, energy systems respond to changes in weather and hydrology, with corresponding feedbacks



Research Gaps

- What are the tradeoffs and synergies between energy diversity and resilience enhancements?
- What spatial and temporal scales, degree of coupling, data needs, etc., are required for accurate simulations?
- What other factors must be accounted for (e.g., urbanization, air quality, feedbacks related to water use,...)



Regional Analysis

New State-Level Energy and Water Sankey Diagrams (LLNL)



https://flowcharts.llnl.gov/report



L

ENERGY

INVERSION DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF THE PA



Beta Database of Water Policies Impacting Energy

- More than 1,700 entries with searchable fields such as jurisdiction, dates enacted, energy subsector affected, relevant statute, contact information of implementing authority, and a concise summary of the policy
 - State and national PDES and NPDES permitting programs
 - Underground injection control permitting
 - Policies affecting surface water rights and groundwater rights
 - Water quality standards
 - Hydraulic fracturing water regulations
 - River and/or dam operations

www.energywaterpolicy.org







International Collaboration

US-Israel Integrated Energy and Desalination Design Challenge

- The joint US-Israel challenge sought innovative desalination systems that could operate flexibly to provide demand response and ancillary services to support electricity system reliability.
- ORNL's winning design features a RO system that operates at a range of salinity and corresponding electricity demand
- Current work is a full technical design and market analysis





US-EU Integrated Water And Power Modeling Challenge

- Exploring emerging water and power infrastructure questions, particularly related to expansion planning and flexible operations.
- Workshop Sept 28-29, 2016 Ispra, Italy
 - Understanding the water-energy nexus: integrated water and power system modelling
- Sponsored modeling teams examining flexibility in current and future energy and water systems
 - US: Ames/ Iowa State, NREL/ Dartmouth, PNNL/ NWPCC/ BPA
 - EU: ICCS/E3M-Lab, Fraunhofer ISE power sector modeling, Politecnico di Milano DEIB water modeling
- Expected workshop Fall 2018 USA

I.S. DEPARTMENT OF





Reimagined flexible electric & water infrastructure

(Ames Team)



1. Increased water storage ability:

- Virtual pumped hydro (VPH) [A] for regulation, reserves, and weekly, seasonal, & annual changes
- •[B].Aquifer storage & recovery (ASR)



- Agricultural pumping
- Water treatment plants
- Wastewater treatment plants

[A] Y. Gu, et al., "A novel market simulation methodology on hydro storage," IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid, V. 5, No. 2, March 2014. This is MISO work.

[B] "Hydropower Vision: A New Chapter for America's 1st Renewable Electricity Source," July 26, 2016, available at https://energy.gov/eere/water/articles/hydropower-vision-new-chapter-america-s-1st-renewable-electricity-source.





Wastewater treatment plants having on-site anaerobic digestion w/ electric power gen.

Water

outflow

flow

Electric

Virtual pumped hydro (VPH)

U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center: Energy and Water Track





Office of Policy

California's Complex

Water Conveyance System

Sustainable

Hydropower Design

and Operation

Inform Planning,

Policy, and Other

Decisions