

Multi-Feeder Restoration using Multi-Microgrid Formation and Management

Valliappan Muthukaruppan, Rongxing Hu, Ashwin Shirsat,
Mesut Baran, Ning Lu, Wenyuan Tang, and David Lubkeman

Abstract—This paper highlights the benefit of coordinating resources on multiple active distribution feeders during severe long duration outages through multi-microgrid formation. A graph-theory based multi-microgrid formation algorithm is developed which is agnostic of the underlying energy management scheme of the microgrids and solved in a rolling horizon fashion. The algorithm is then enhanced to handle multiple feeders where formation of long laterals needs to be avoided due to potential voltage control issues in distribution systems. The algorithm is evaluated on a synthetic two feeder system derived from interconnecting two IEEE 123 node system. The results indicate increased service to loads in the system and better utilization of renewable resources.

Index Terms—multi-feeder restoration, multi-microgrid formation, microgrid management, active distribution system

I. INTRODUCTION

Forming a microgrid within a distribution system following a significant weather-related outage is gaining prominence as a practical approach to enhance resilience at the distribution level. This approach becomes particularly appealing when the distribution system incorporates substantial amount of distributed photovoltaic (PV) generation [1]. Nevertheless, the management of these microgrids at the feeder level or involving multiple feeders presents several challenges. These challenges encompass constrained resources for rapid deployment on the feeders and limited capabilities for real-time monitoring and control within the distribution system [2].

In the presence of significant amount of renewable resources like rooftop solar and large service territory, it is challenging for a microgrid with low inertial resources to maintain power balance and support service over a long period of time [3]. Hence, it is beneficial to manage multiple microgrids together. When it comes to multi-microgrid management during power system restoration two methods have found prominence in literature, networked microgrids [4] and dynamic multi-microgrid formation [5].

There are significant challenges with managing networked microgrids due to complicated control requirements [6]. Hence, dynamic multi-microgrid is a good solution especially for Utilities managing microgrids owned by different stakeholders during extreme weather events. The control architecture is simple and the boundary of the microgrids can

be easily controlled by Utilities. In existing literature, this problem is solved as a critical service restoration problem where critical loads are routed to existing microgrid resources through numerous circuit switches [7]. The issue with this type of restoration approach is that the topology of microgrid remains same throughout the restoration process once the critical loads are energized, which may not be optimal for all operating conditions.

Another approach with multi-microgrid formation is to use mobile devices and dispatch them from one location to another during the restoration as the system condition changes [8]. The focus here is the routing of mobile devices to designated load zones which is solved as a planning problem. Even though this seems like a viable solution, the time taken to interconnect mobile devices with distribution system is ignored which can hinder timely resotation of loads and increase their downtime as well.

Current works in literature do not consider the challenging and realistic conditions of a distribution system such as limited microgrid resources, limited controllability, and significantly high solar penetration in the problem formulation. Furthermore, none of the existing work have considered a multi-feeder problem and the inherent issues in the setup.

This paper aims at developing a comprehensive restoration strategy for multiple feeders using multi-microgrid formation. The main contribution of the proposed method are listed below:

- Multi-feeder restoration through formation of multiple-microgrids has a risk of leading to long laterals which can lead to voltage issues. We consider a special formulation of multi-microgrid problem that addresses this issue by providing DSO with a control on length of laterals that can be formed during the microgrid formation. Furthermore, the proposed formulation is agnostic of underlying energy management scheme of the microgrids and significantly improves the restoration process by coordinating the resources in different feeders.
- Realistic distribution system operating conditions are considered: limited load and PV visibility and controllability, and limited controllable switches on the feeder. The load and PV are assumed to be controlled only in zones formed by the existing circuit switches in the network.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: sec-II introduces the multi-feeder multi-microgrid formation problem and the interface with the microgrid energy management schemes, sec-III illustrates the performance of proposed scheme with

The authors are with Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695 USA. This material is based upon work supported by U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) under Solar Energy Technologies Office Award Number DE-EE0008770.

a case study using synthetic multi-feeder system derived from two IEEE 123 node feeders and multi-day operating conditions based on field data.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Microgrid Formation

The underlying multi-microgrid formation problem is a form of graph splitting problem which can be solved using the single commodity flow method from graph theory [9]. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected and undirected graph with set of vertices and edges denoted by V and E respectively representing the distribution network under outage. Let the binary decision variables y_{ij} represent the status of circuit switches connecting load groups i, j . If the switch is open, $y_{ij} = 0$; otherwise, $y_{ij} = 1$. We assume that there will be only one grid forming source per microgrid, thus the number of microgrids is equal to the number of master control units. Which means, $|\Pi|$ number of microgrids will be formed where Π is the set of grid forming resources in the network.

Objective function is given in (1) where the first term minimizes the total load shedding in the network during microgrid formation where D_j^{max} indicates the total connected load in load zone j and \mathcal{N}^d indicates the total number of load zones in the network. The second term minimizes the fictitious flow F_{ij} in the lines with higher priority to lines connected directly to critical loads. The larger weight on incoming flows to critical loads ensures that they are closer to the grid forming sources of the microgrid thereby ensuring higher probability of service during the energy management phase.

$$\min_y \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{N}^d|} (D_j^{max} - D_j) + \sum_{ij \in E} w_j |F_{ij}| \quad (1)$$

Let, \mathcal{N}_p be the index set of number of microgrids to be formed. The binary variable $x_{i,k} = 1$ indicates that load group i belongs to microgrid k . Equation (2) ensures that each load group belongs to only one microgrid. While equations (3-4) ensures that nodes (f, k) connected to a closed switch l belong to the same microgrid k .

$$\sum_{i \in V} x_{i,k} = 1 \quad \forall k \in 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_p \quad (2)$$

$$y_l = \sum_{k \in 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_p} z_{l,k} \quad \forall l \in E \quad (3)$$

$$z_{l,k} = x_{f,k} x_{t,k} \quad \forall l \in E, (f, t) \in E(l) \quad (4)$$

For all $l \in E$ and $(f, t) \in E(l)$, equation (5) is the McCormick Linearization of (4).

$$\begin{aligned} z_{l,k} &\leq x_{f,k}; \\ z_{l,k} &\leq x_{t,k}; \\ z_{l,k} &\leq x_{f,k} + x_{t,k} - 1 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For all $(f(l), t(l)) \in E(l)$, $l \in E$, and $i \in V$, (6)-(10) define the DC power flow equations with limits on the line

flow, power generation, and demand. Where, T_l is the net load flowing through line l connecting load zones $f(l)$ and $t(l)$. P and D indicate the total PV generation and load in the individual load zones. y_l indicates the status of switch l .

$$\sum_{l: f(l) \rightarrow t(l)} T_l - \sum_{l: t(l) \rightarrow f(l)} T_l = P_{f(l)} - D_{f(l)} \quad (6)$$

$$-T_l^{min} y_l \leq T_l \leq T_l^{max} y_l \quad (7)$$

$$-M(1 - y_l) \leq T_l \leq M(1 - y_l) \quad (8)$$

$$P_i^{min} \leq P_i \leq P_i^{max} \quad (9)$$

$$D_i^{min} \leq D_i \leq D_i^{max} \quad (10)$$

Equation (11) ensures radiality in the network by determining the total number of closed switches possible. Here, $|V|$ is the number of nodes, $|\Pi|$ is the number of microgrid resources available in the system, and $|\mathcal{R}|$ is the number of load islands. Load islands are load groups that cannot be connected to any microgrid resources due to existing faults in the system.

$$\sum_{ij \in E} y_{ij} = |V| - |\Pi| - |\mathcal{R}| \quad (11)$$

To ensure the individual microgrid connectivity via mathematical programming formulations, the single commodity flow method is employed as shown in equations (12) - (17). The equations are similar to the DC power flow equations but all nodes are assumed to inject a load of value 1 and the sources are indicated by W

$$\sum_{s \in \delta(j)} F_{js} - \sum_{i \in \pi(j)} F_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in V/\Pi \quad (12)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \delta(j)} F_{js} - \sum_{i \in \pi(j)} F_{ij} = W_j \quad \forall j \in \Pi \quad (13)$$

$$-M y_{ij} \leq F_{ij} \leq M y_{ij} \quad \forall ij \in E \quad (14)$$

$$-M(2 - y_{ij}) \leq F_{ij} \leq M(2 - y_{ij}) \quad \forall ij \in E \quad (15)$$

$$W_j \leq 1 \quad \forall j \in \Pi \quad (16)$$

$$F_{ij} \geq n^{min} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{GFM} \quad (17)$$

Consider the simplified graphical representation of a simple multi-feeder restoration example as shown in fig. 1. Nodes 1 through 5 belong to feeder-1 and 6 through 10 belong to feeder-2. There are two normally open switches interconnecting the nearby feeders. When restoring multiple feeders using multiple microgrids, the length of the radial network inside each microgrid needs to be controlled since the underlying distribution system voltage regulation may not be capable of handling the different microgrid topologies. Hence, it is critical to limit the boundary of the microgrids.

To avoid creating long radial networks, we modify the single commodity flow method such that only leaf nodes (feeder-1: nodes 2 and 5; feeder-2: nodes 6 and 10) will be exchanged between the microgrids during restoration. Leaf nodes are the nodes connected to the normally open switches in the network.




Fig. 1. Graphical representation of a two feeder restoration problem

This strategy is implemented using constraint (17) where we control the fictious flow on the lines directly connected to the grid forming sources (root of the graph) in each microgrid.




Fig. 2. Fixed and Flexible Topology Classification to avoid voltage issues caused by long radial networks because of picking up too many load groups from adjacent feeder.

For example, in figure 2 the left lateral of node-1 with grid forming resources (GFM) in MG-1 is restricted to two such that load groups 3 and 4 are always connected to MG-1 while node-5 can be interchanged with the neighboring microgrids. Since node-2 is directly connected to the GFM in MG-1 the fictious flow on the right branch of GFM is set to zero. This approach can be extended any number of feeders with interconnecting switches and different topologies.

B. Energy Management

The advantage of the proposed microgrid formation problem is that it is agnostic of the underlying energy management scheme (EMS), each microgrid can use its own EMS implemented through its microgrid controller. No modification to the underlying control architecture is necessary. In this paper we use our previously proposed rolling horizon based two-stage hierarchical EMS for each established microgrid [10].

The decision variables from multi-microgrid formation problem is the optimal topology of individual microgrids which will be relayed to the microgrid controllers. The microgrid controllers will then manage the resources and load groups in their assigned topology until next topology change by multi-microgrid formation module.

The horizon, time step, and coordination of the various modules in the multi-microgrid formation and management

problem is shown in figure 3. The multi-microgrid formation module is also formulated as a rolling horizon problem to avoid frequent topology changes in the microgrids. Note that equations in section-II-A are defined for a single time step for ease of explanation but the problem is solved for a whole horizon with multiple timesteps.




Fig. 3. Timeline of Different problems and their coordination

Eventhough the multi-microgrid fomration module determines the optimal topology of each microgrid, the decision to supply the load groups within each microgrid is still determined by the individual microgrid EMS system depending on the availability of the resources.

III. RESULTS

The test system considered for evaluating the proposed algorithm is shown in figure 4. We have used two IEEE 123 node system which are assumed to be supplied from same substation to develop the multi-feeder test case. The location of microgrid resources on feeder-1 is at the substation while in feeder-2 they are towards the end of the feeder. These locations are pre-determined and fixed throughout the restoration. Two interconnecting switches which are normally open at nodes 250 and 350 interconnect the two IEEE 123 feeders. All load groups defined by the shaded polygons have significant penetration of distributed behind-the-meter PV. There are 3 critical loads per feeder highlighted as purple stars in the figure. The graphical representation of this system is shown in figure 1. The rating of the resources are highlighted in table I. The horizon and time step of the EMS and MMG formation module are highlighted in table II.

TABLE I
RATING OF RESOURCES IN THE MULTI-FEEDER TEST CASE

Resources	Feeder-1	Feeder-2
Mobile Energy Storage	3 MW/ 12 MWh	2 MW/ 8 MWh
Diesel Generator	4 MW	4 MW
Total PV	4 MW	4 MW
Peak Load (Day-1)	3.5 MW	3 MW
Peak Load (Day-2)	3 MW	2 MW

Total load and PV on each feeder is highlighted in figure 5. Since, these feeders are adjacent to each other, the overall PV profile looks similar, but the load profiles are different to highlight the difference in characteristics of these feeders. The




Fig. 4. Multi-feeder test system developed from two IEEE 123 node feeders

TABLE II
HORIZON AND TIME STEP OF DIFFERENT PROBLEMS IN MMG RESTORATION

Problem	Horizon	Time Step
Multi-Microgrid Formation	24 hour	3 hour
Scheduling Stage-1	24 hour	30 minutes
Dispatching Stage-2	30 minutes	5 minute

overall load is considerable lower on day-2 in feeder-2. With 4 MW of PV in each feeder, it would be challenging to absorb all the PV in feeder-2 with the smaller 2 MW battery.




Fig. 5. Total Load and PV on feeder-1 and feeder-2

Table III highlights the topology changes on day-1 and day-2 of the restoration. The change in topology on day-1 is minimal since the load and PV are quite similar between the two microgrids. Initially, more load groups are connected to MG1 since it has higher sized battery. During PV, load group 10 which is a critical load group is connected to MG1 in exchange for load group 5 which is a non-critical load group.

On day-2 we see a lot of topology changes that happen towards the end of restoration which is due to the limited resources towards the end of restoration. Also, more load groups are shifted from MG1 to MG2 even though it has a smaller battery size because the peak load on day-2 in MG2 is much lower than MG1, so MG1 load groups have more chance of being served when connected to MG2.

The SoC of mobile energy storage devices and the fuel of diesel generators in both microgrids are highlighted in figure 6. Both battery and DG have been appropriately used and completely depleted by the end of the restoration. The devices were kept within limits even with significant number of topology changes.




Fig. 6. (top) State of Charge of Mobile Energy Storage Devices and (bottom) Fuel usage of Diesel Generators during the two day restoration period.

The load group connectivity status is highlighted in figure 7 which shows how different load groups are served by the two microgrids in the system. There are instances where load groups are not served by the microgrids even though they are assigned to the microgrid by multi-microgrid algorithm. The downside of multi-microgrid algorithm is that when a load group is assigned to a particular microgrid there is no guarantee that the load group will be served by that microgrid which is subject to availability of resources and handled by the individual energy management scheme. Nevertheless, we do minimize such outage of critical loads which can be communicated to the customer in advance and the customer can prepare back up local generation during these scheduled outage hours.




Fig. 7. Load Group connectivity status highlighted using different colors to indicate which microgrid was utilized to energize the load groups. Two topology important changes to improve critical load connectivity is highlighted in red with corresponding topologies.

Critical load groups 4 and 10 have significant duration of

TABLE III
OPTIMAL TOPOLOGY CHANGES ON DAY-1 AND DAY-2

Duration	MG1 Load Groups	MG2 Load Groups	Comments
Day-1			
00:00 to 12:00	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9, 10	LG-6 connected to MG1 due to bigger battery size.
12:00 to 15:00	1, 2, 3, 4, 10	5, 6, 7, 8, 9	Since 2MW battery in MG2 cannot absorb all PV, might lead to outage of LG-10.
15:00 to 24:00	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9, 10	LG-6 connected back to MG1 due to bigger battery size.
Day-2			
00:00 to 12:00	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9, 10	More chance of load being served in MG1 since it has higher battery size. Hence, LG6 connected to MG1.
12:00 to 15:00	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	6, 7, 8, 9, 10	Default topology of feeder is maintained.
15:00 to 18:00	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9, 10	More chance of service to load groups in MG1.
18:00 to 21:00	1, 2, 3, 4	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	More loads connected to MG2 even though lower battery size because loading is much lower in MG2 compared to MG1 on day-2.
21:00 to 24:00	1, 3, 4	2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	

unserved periods by both microgrids and this is because under any topology configuration the distance from load group 4 and 10 to microgrid resources 1 and 7 is long. Hence, to serve these load groups all the other load groups between the resources and these groups need to be served which is challenging with limited resources and during peak load duration. Hence, load groups 4 and 10 have maximum number of unserved duration.

To analyze the performance of our proposed multi-microgrid algorithm we compare the results against base case where the topology of the microgrids are fixed through the restoration period. Nodes 1 through 5 are always connected to MG1 and 6 through 10 to MG2 through out the 2 day restoration.

Percentage service to each load group is compared between proposed scheme and base case in figure 8. It can be seen that service to critical loads is significantly increased with proposed scheme and service to leaf nodes like load groups 5 and 6 is also considerably increased. Due to efficient management of the leaf nodes in flexible topology, other nodes pertaining to fixed topology like load group 4 and 8 also have improved service. This highlights the advantage of coordinating multi-microgrids during restoration rather than using a fixed topology. The overall PV utilization with proposed scheme is **82%** which is higher than the utilization by base case with **79.12%**.




Fig. 8. Percentage of Load Groups served during restoration period between base case (fixed topology) and proposed scheme (flexible topology). Critical Load Groups: 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper highlights the advantages of optimizing resource coordination across multiple feeders during prolonged outages

through dynamic multi-microgrid formation. We introduce a graph-theory based multi-microgrid formation problem, extending it to multiple feeders with adjustable lateral lengths to mitigate potential voltage issues. A case study, using a synthetic two-feeder system with varied load characteristics derived from a realistic IEEE-123 node system, demonstrates substantial enhancements in service to critical and non-critical loads. Coordinating microgrid resources across multiple feeders also results in improved utilization of photovoltaic (PV) systems compared to a fixed microgrid topology.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Labonte, "Microgrids Can Provide Resiliency During Extreme Weather Events." [Online]. Available: <https://www.powermag.com/microgrids-can-provide-resiliency-during-extreme-weather-events/>
- [2] M. H. Saeed, W. Fangzong, B. A. Kalwar, and S. Iqbal, "A Review on Microgrids' Challenges & Perspectives," vol. 9, pp. 166 502–166 517.
- [3] A. Pratt, "Addressing Challenges for Single Microgrids and Networked Microgrids at Large Scales." [Online]. Available: <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1778193>
- [4] A. Arif and Z. Wang, "Service restoration in resilient power distribution systems with networked microgrid," in *2016 IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting (PESGM)*, pp. 1–5.
- [5] M. A. Igder and X. Liang, "Service Restoration Using Deep Reinforcement Learning and Dynamic Microgrid Formation in Distribution Networks," vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 5453–5472.
- [6] M. Islam, F. Yang, and M. Amin, "Control and optimisation of networked microgrids: A review," vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1133–1148.
- [7] Y. Xu, C.-C. Liu, K. P. Schneider, F. K. Tuffner, and D. T. Ton, "Microgrids for Service Restoration to Critical Load in a Resilient Distribution System," vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 426–437.
- [8] S. Lei, J. Wang, C. Chen, and Y. Hou, "Mobile Emergency Generator Pre-Positioning and Real-Time Allocation for Resilient Response to Natural Disasters," vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 2030–2041.
- [9] T. Ding, Y. Lin, Z. Bie, and C. Chen, "A resilient microgrid formation strategy for load restoration considering master-slave distributed generators and topology reconfiguration," vol. 199, pp. 205–216.
- [10] V. Muthukaruppan, A. Shirsat, R. Hu, V. Paduani, B. Xu, Y. Li, M. Baran, N. Lu, D. Lubkeman, and W. Tang, Feeder Microgrid Management on an Active Distribution System during a Severe Outage. arXiv.org. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.10712v1>