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Models for EV Charging Station Network Design

- Develop models and methods - “charging station network design”
  - Determine number, location, Capacity, and type of charging levels at stations
- Assess impact on traffic flows (reduced congestion), improve livability metrics (reduced noise, greenhouse emission, increase walkability)
- Consider user choices/behaviors (e.g., range anxiety, trip distributions, walking preference, charging price, charging cost at home) as well as preferences of charging station operators (cost of location, electricity, utilizations and revenues)

Target Adoption by SEMCOG & Other Planning Agencies

- Ensure models can work with routine and available datasets and planning requirements
- Collaborate to pilot models in few communities
- Account for potential integration into larger planning projects
- Contribute to development of a practical tool kit for agencies
Multi Model Transport Network:

- **Fernandez et. al.(1994)** - Choice models to estimate the demands for different travel modes. User equilibrium (UE) models to determine the traffic flow on each route.


- **Chen et.al. (2017)** - Impact of on-street parking on urban cities.
  - Estimation of vehicle delays for different traffic situations and parking occupations.
  - Suggested policies for bicycle lane design and parking permit.

- **Antolin et.al.(2018)** - Estimate the factors which affect the parking selection of users. Using scenario for the estimations.
Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (EVCS) Network Design:
Deterministic approach

- A capacitated refueling location model with limited traffic flow Uupchurch et al.(2009): Maximize the vehicle miles traveled by alternative-fuel vehicles

- He et. al.(2013) - Allocation of public charging stations to increase the social welfare associated with transportation and power networks

- Xi et. al.(2013) - Simulation-optimization model to maximize the service level to the EV drivers. Combination of level 1 and level 2 charger is more desirable than installing only charger level 1

- Cavadas et. al (2015) - EVCS in an urban area. A mixed integer programming (MIP) model for locating the slow-charging stations. Travelers’ parking locations as well as their daily activities in order to aggregate the demand on different places
Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (EVCS) Network Design:

Stochastic approach

- **Pan et. Al.(2010)** - A two-stage stochastic model for locating the charging stations to support both the transportation system and the power grid. Uncertainty is considered in demand for battery, loads, generation of renewable power sources.

- **Hosseini et.al.(2015)** - Uncertainty in traffic flow into a two-stage stochastic model with both capacitated and uncapacitated versions to locate the charging station locations.

- With an objective to maximize the EV vehicle-miles-traveled and environmental benefits, **Arslan et.al.(2016)** present the EVCS problem as an extension of the flow refueling location problem (FRLP).
Charging behavior:

- Using choice model into optimization framework: Locating new facilities in a competitive market by Benati et. al. (2002). A random utility model was used in order to model the customer's behavior aiming to predict the market share of the locations.

- Xu et. al. (2017)
  - A mixed logit model to explore the factors that affect the battery electric vehicle users (BEV) in Japan
  - Fast and normal type of chargers and specific locations such as home, company, and public station for installing the EVSEs
  - Battery capacity, midnight indicator, the initial state of charge (SOC) are identified as the main predictors for drivers’ charging and location choice behaviors

- Wolbertus et. al. (2018)
  - Study on policy effect on charging behavior and EV adoption at the same time
  - Large data set to investigate the daytime parking and free parking policies influence on EV drivers charging behavior
Problem Description

- **Research Gap:**
  - Focus on large-scale state-wide networks and not on urban areas
  - Deterministic charging demand
    - Demand is quite stochastic in reality (varying by hour of day, weekday/weekend patterns, commute purpose, destination, etc)

- **Research Goal:**
  - Develop a stochastic programming approach to determine location, type of chargers and capacity of charging stations
    - Assess community livability metrics
      - Accessibility to charging service
      - Charging station utilization rate
      - Walkability
    - Account for behaviors of EV drivers
      - Willingness to walk

- **Assumptions:**
  - Public parking facilities
  - Vehicle parking location
  - Vehicle charging time
Solution Approach

1. Collecting Data
2. Preprocessing
3. Constructing the utility function
4. Mathematical Model
5. Case Study
6. Sensitivity Analysis
Data Collection

- Data gathered from the literature and the other part is collected from SEMCOG.
- SEMCOG supports coordinated, local planning with technical, data, and intergovernmental resources.
Preprocessing:
Generating Demand Using Uncertainties

Traffic Demand Pattern (Arrival Times and Dwell Times; Weekdays)

Fraction of arrivals as a function of destination and time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charging location</th>
<th>Dwell time (hours)</th>
<th>Next trip avg distance (miles)</th>
<th>Energy required (kWh)</th>
<th>Power required (kW)</th>
<th>EVSE type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Level 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVSE power requirements, as determined from dwell times and next trip average distance

Preprocessing: Generating Demand Using Uncertainties

Arrival Pattern in Weekdays and Weekends

The expected breakdown of vehicle arrival percentages for weekdays (left) and weekends (right)

Source: Brooker, R., Qin, N., 2015. Identification of potential locations of electric vehicle supply equipment.
The initial distribution of State of Charge at the Time of Arrival

Source: Brooker, R., Qin, N., 2015. Identification of potential locations of electric vehicle supply equipment.
Preprocessing: Generating Demand Using Uncertainties

- Average Dwell Time at Final Destination

Source: Brooker, R., Qin, N., 2015. Identification of potential locations of electric vehicle supply equipment.
Preprocessing:
Generating Demand Using Uncertainties

- EV Market Penetration

Cumulative 2010-2014 BEV market share (left) and PHEV market share (right) across the U.S.

Willingness of Walking Distance of Drivers (USA)

Distance decay function for walking trips to different destination types

## Willingness of Walking Distance of Drivers (USA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td>Winter (Dec-Feb)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring (Mar-May)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer (Jun-Aug)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn (Sep-Nov)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Town and County</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated parameter for distance decay function for different factors and their categories

Preprocessing:
Generating Demand Using Uncertainties

- Willingness of Walking Distance of Drivers (Netherlands)

Maximum distance car drivers are willing to walk per trip purpose

Choice Model

Choice modeling approach captures the charging pattern for EV users and will lead to:
- Accelerating the adoption of EVs
- Better distribution of budget to charging infrastructures
- Increasing the mobility, accessibility

- *Wen et al. (2015)* analyzed the charging choices of BEV owners based on a web-based survey in different parts of U.S. *(Journal of the Transportation Research Board)*
- The choice model computes the volume flowing from demand sources to selected locations, requires to know EV driver preference data, namely the utility of drivers.

\[ P(\text{Charge}) = \frac{e^{U_{it}}}{\sum e^{U_{it}}} \]

Where \( U_{it} \) is the utility of charging for respondent \( i \) under charging situation \( t \)

- The Choice decision was characterized by the following factors: *Charging price, maximum charging power, dwell time, distance to home, current electric range.*
- A *Mixed Logit Choice Model* was used to estimate those factors
Choice Modelling - Framework

- Different Level of Chargers (Price, charging time, installation cost)
  - Range Charged
  - Cost at Home
  - Cost at Stop

- Derived Interaction Variables

- Utility Function

- Mixed logit Model

- Probability of charging

- Mathematical Model

- Improving the accessibility
Mathematical formulation – Two-stage Stochastic Programming Model

- **Notations**
  - $J$: Set of parking lots, indexed by $i$
  - $B$: Set of buildings
  - $S(b)$: Set of possible parking lots based on drivers walking preference who are going to building $b$
  - $\Gamma$: Set of arrival and departure times
  - $T$: Set of time periods
  - $\Omega$: Set of scenarios
  - $N$: Set of charger types

- **Fixed Model Parameters**
  - $F$: Total amount of budget for installing EVSEs.
  - $k_{ij}$: Capacity of parking $j$ for installing EVSEs.
  - $c_{jn}$: Cost of installing EVSE of type $n$. 
Scenario Dependent Parameters

- $d_{\gamma,b} (\omega)$: Total Demand of building $b$ within arrival and departure
- $u_{n,j} (\omega)$: The aggregated utility of EV drivers who are willing to use EVSE type $n$ at parking lot $j$ in scenario $\omega$
- $u_{n^C,j} (\omega)$: The aggregated utility of EV drivers who are not willing to use EVSE type $n$ at parking lot $j$ in scenario $\omega$
- $d_{\gamma,b,s^T}(\omega)$: The demand of building $b$ who are willing to use parking from set $s$ within arrival and departure time set for a given $t$ in scenario $\omega$

First-Stage Decision Variables

- $x_{n,j}$: 1 if parking $j$ is chosen for installing EVSE type $n$; 0 otherwise.
- $z_{n,j}$: Number of EVSE type $n$ in parking $j$

Second-Stage Decision Variables

- $y_{\gamma,b,j,n^S}(\omega)$: The proportion of the demand of building $b$ from set $S(b)$ within arrival and departure time set $\gamma \in \Gamma$ for a given $t \in T$, which is satisfied by parking lot $j \in s$, where $s \in S(b)$, using EVSE $n$ in a scenario $\omega \in \Omega$. 

Mathematical formulation – Two-stage Stochastic Programming Model

- Non-linear Two-Stage Stochastic Model

First-Stage Model:

Max $E_{\Omega}[\varphi(x, z, \tilde{\omega})]$

\begin{equation}
\sum_{n \in N} z_{n,j} \leq k_j \quad \forall j \in J (2)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
z_{n,j} \leq k_j x_{n,j} \quad \forall n \in N, j \in J (3)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\sum_{n \in N} \sum_{j \in J} c_n z_{n,j} \leq F \quad \forall n \in N, j \in J (4)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
x_{n,j} \in \{0, 1\}, z_{n,j} \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \quad \forall n \in N, j \in J (5)
\end{equation}
Mathematical formulation - Two-stage Stochastic Programming Model

- **Second-Stage Model:**

\[
\varphi(x, z, \omega) = \max \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sum_{b \in B} \sum_{s \in S(b)} \sum_{j \in s} \sum_{n \in N} d_{\gamma,b}(\omega) y^{s}_{\gamma,b,j,n}(\omega)
\]

\[\text{s.t.}
\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma: \gamma(a) \leq t \leq \gamma(d)} \sum_{b \in B} \sum_{s \in S(b): j \in s} d_{\gamma,b}(\omega) y^{s}_{\gamma,b,j,n}(\omega) \leq z_{n,j}
\]

\[\forall t \in T, j \in J, n \in N
\]

\[\sum_{s \in S(b): j \in s} y^{s}_{\gamma,b,j,n}(\omega) \leq \frac{e^{u_{nc,j}}(\omega)x_{n,j}}{e^{u_{nc,j}}(\omega) + \sum_{l \in N} e^{u_{l,j}}(\omega)x_{l,j}}
\]

\[\forall \gamma \in \Gamma, b \in B, j \in J, n \in N
\]

\[\sum_{n \in N} \sum_{s \in S(b)} \sum_{j \in s} y^{s}_{\gamma,b,j,n}(\omega) \leq 1 \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, b \in B
\]

\[d_{\gamma,b}(\omega) \sum_{n \in N} \sum_{j \in s} y^{s}_{\gamma,b,j,n}(\omega) \leq d'_{\gamma,b,s} \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, b \in B, s \in S(b)
\]

\[0 \leq y^{s}_{\gamma,b,j,n}(\omega) \leq 1 \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, b \in B, s \in S(b), j \in s, n \in N
\]
Mathematical formulation- Two-stage Stochastic Programming Model

- The Linear Equivalent Model

Consider constraint (8):

\[ \sum_{s \in S(b)}: j \in s \uparrow \gamma, y_{j}, b, j, n \uparrow s \leq e_{\uparrow n}, j \downarrow j / e_{\uparrow n} \]

As the denominator is positive this is equivalent to:

\[ y_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n \uparrow s \left( e_{\uparrow n} c_{j} + \sum_{l \in N \downarrow l} e_{\uparrow n}, j \downarrow l \right) \leq \]

For bounded continuous and binary variables \( y \) and \( x \), respectively, a bi-linear variable will be defined as
follow:

\[ o_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n, l \uparrow s \leq x_{\downarrow n}, j \downarrow y_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n \uparrow s \leq x_{\downarrow n}, j \downarrow y_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n \uparrow s \]

\( \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, n \in N, l \in N, b \in B, j \in J, s \in S(b) \)

A standard approach adopted for linearizing the bi-linear terms is to replace each term by its convex and concave envelopes, also called the McCormick envelopes.

\[ o_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n, l \uparrow s \leq x_{\downarrow n}, j \downarrow y_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n \uparrow s \leq x_{\downarrow n}, j \downarrow y_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n \uparrow s \]

\( \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, n \in N, l \in N, b \in B, j \in J, s \in S(b) \)

\[ o_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n, l \uparrow s \geq x_{\downarrow n}, j + y_{\downarrow \gamma}, b, j, n \uparrow s - 1 \]

\( \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, n \in N, l \in N, b \in B, j \in J, s \in S(b) \)
Computational Study: Case Study

- **Setting:** Part of Detroit Midtown
  - Wide range of **employment types** (type of final destination) in this area
    - University faculties
    - Offices
    - Hospitals
    - Museums
  - Attracts a lot of traffic
  - **32 parking lots** as potential locations for installing charging stations

- **EV Market Share:** Two Cases
  - **Conservative:** 1% for BEV
  - **Optimistic:** 2% for BEV
Experiments and Results

Daily Traffic = A random number between (10000,20000)
Number of Scenarios = 10
BEV Market Share = 1%
Number of Stations = 10
Types of EV Drivers Activities = Work, School, Family, Meal, Social, Shopping
Time Slots = (6:00 A.M - 9 A.M), (9:00 A.M - 12 P.M), (12:00 P.M - 14 P.M), (14:00 P.M - 18 P.M)
Installing Cost = Charger Level 1: $900, Charger Level 2: $3450, Charger Level 3: $25000
Experiments and Results

Test Case 1:
Capacity at each station = 5

Heat map of demand flow
Experiments and Results

Test Case 1:

Number of installed Level 1 and Level 2 chargers for different budgets at capacity 5, labeled by accessibility percentage.
Experiments and Results

Test Case 1:

Distribution of EVSE Level 1 and level 2 based on limited budget of $50,000
Experiments and Results

Test Case 2: Market Share Effect on Accessibility

Effect of increase in market share on accessibility
Experiments and Results

Test Case 3: Pricing effect of Level 3 charger 3 on consumers Utility

Key observations:
- Utility is sensitive to $3/hr for Level 3
- Level 2 at $1.50/hr
- Level 3 at $0.50/hr
Multi-Modal Network
Multi-Modal Framework

GIS Data

Nodes Type
O-D pairs, Parking-Charging candidate sites

Links Type
Boarding, alighting, road link

Define feasible flow patterns

User’s Choice Behavior

Aggregated Utility

Determine Parking-Charging location
Conclusions

- **A modeling framework** for planning agencies to design network for EV charging stations based on consideration of randomness in OD demand, walking range, arrival pattern, SOC, accessibility, multi-modal transportation.

- **Interdisciplinary behavioral study** on the drivers’ willingness to walk and adoption of multi-modal transportation based on the quality, accessibility and proximity to EV charging station.

- **Case study for a community** with the guidance of a planning agency such as the SEMCOG. Documentation and reports on results of the study and details on the integration of the tool.

- **Pricing scheme for stockholders** was proposed toward different type of chargers.
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