

Methodologies for Selection of Optimal Sites for Renewable Energy Under a Diverse Set of Constraints and Objectives

Arunabha Sen^{*}, Christopher Sumnicht^{*}, Sandipan Choudhuri^{*}, Suli Adeniye^{*}, Amit B. Sen[†]

^{*}Arizona State University

[†]Palantir Technologies

{asen, csumnich, s.choudhuri, sadeniye}@asu.edu, amit@rilke.us

Abstract

In this paper, we present methodologies for optimal selection for renewable energy sites under a different set of constraints and objectives. We consider two different models for the site-selection problem - coarse-grained and fine-grained, and analyze them to find solutions. We consider multiple different ways to measure the benefits of setting up a site. We provide approximation algorithms with a guaranteed performance bound for two different benefit metrics with the coarse-grained model. For the fine-grained model, we provide a technique utilizing Integer Linear Program to find the optimal solution. We present the results of our extensive experimentation with synthetic data generated from sparsely available real data from solar farms in Arizona.

Keywords: Optimal site selection, Renewable energy, Seasonal variation in supply and demand, Network Flow, Mathematical Programming

1. Introduction

In alignment with the goal of reducing CO_2 emissions in the power sector, most utility companies in the USA are currently in the process of decommissioning fossil fuel-based energy generating stations. Salt River Project (SRP), the utility company providing electricity to the Phoenix metropolitan area, has an aggressive plan to decommission a number of its units in the next few years. SRP has announced that it will decommission four of its existing plants by 2032, SRP (2023a). While decommissioning of these units will certainly reduce generation, electricity demand in cities like Phoenix is growing significantly due to migration from other states to Arizona, making Maricopa County, where Phoenix is located, the fastest

growing county in the country SRP (2021b). Moreover, the large-scale introduction of electric vehicles in the next few years will significantly increase energy demand SRP (2023b) Under the circumstances, the role of renewable energy in compensating for the decrease in fossil fuel-based energy generation becomes paramount. Solar and wind power present themselves as practical renewable energy alternatives, particularly in southwestern states like Arizona. Because of an abundance of sunlight in Arizona, several privately owned solar farms have appeared in the Arizona landscape and are currently generating a moderate amount of energy. In 2023 and 2024, more than 1000 MW of additional renewable energy is expected to be available to SRP for distribution to its consumers, indicating future growth of solar facilities SRP (2021b). SRP is currently very actively engaged in necessary infrastructure expansion taking into account various socioeconomic and sustainability impacts of such an expansion SRP (2021a).

Identification of suitable sites for setting up solar/wind farms is critical, as poor site choices will have serious repercussions on meeting economic, societal and energy demands. Accordingly, the site selection process must take into account a multitude of factors, such as Climate: (Solar irradiation, Average temperature, Annual sunshine hours), (ii) Environment: (Land accessibility, Land use), (iii) Orography: (Land slope, Elevation, Land orientation), (iv) Location: (Distance to urban areas, transmission lines, substations), (v) Economic: (Return on investment, Net profit, Land cost), (vi) Social: (Agricultural effect, Public interest, Public security), and (vii) Risk: (Environmental risk, Time-delay risk).

In the last few years, a large number of studies on optimal site selection via Multi-Criteria Decision




Figure 1: Arizona Climate and Orographic Characteristics

Making (MCDM) have appeared in the scientific literature, Barzehkar et al. (2021) and Türk et al. (2021). Although different tools and techniques are available to solve the MCDM problems, the techniques of choice for researchers in this domain are Geographic Information System (GIS), DeMers (2009) and Guaita-Pradas et al. (2019) and Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), Koc et al. (2019) and Saaty (1994). The GIS-based approaches take into account factors such as *Terrain Inclination*, *Solar Irradiance* and *Temperature*. Terrain Inclination is taken as a factor as the inclination or slope angle affects solar panels' efficiency by altering the angle at which sunlight strikes the panel surface. Generally, flatter terrains are preferable for solar power plant construction. Although the AHP-based approaches are also extensively used, it is well known that the AHP has limitations and may produce inconsistent results. A comprehensive evaluation of the AHP, based on an empirical investigation and objective testimonies by 101 researchers, found at least 30 flaws in the AHP and found it unsuitable for complex problems, and in certain situations even for small problems, Munier (2021).

Although both GIS and AHP-based approaches have limitations, they do capture certain aspects that are useful in the optimal site selection process. In this paper, we propose a Mathematical Programming+Network Flows-based technique to complement the GIS+AHP-based approach undertaken by many other researchers. Our process comprises a two-phase scheme where during the first phase, utilizing GIS and AHP, we conduct a preliminary site selection, and during the second phase, final site selection is conducted utilizing Network Flows and Mathematical Programming, Schrijver (1998).

In Phase I part of the analysis, for *Terrain Inclination* we used the United States Geological Survey National

Elevation Dataset (NED) as the source for topographic data. To calculate slope angles across Arizona, Google Earth Engine's terrain algorithms were employed, resulting in a comprehensive slope dataset. For *Solar Irradiance* we used the University of Idaho Gridded Surface Meteorological Dataset (GRIDMET) to analyze solar irradiance across Arizona. We filtered this dataset for 2022 and selected the surface downward shortwave radiation (W/m^2) variable. We generated an annual mean solar irradiance layer and clipped it to the Arizona boundaries. For *Temperature* we used the TerraClimate: Monthly Climate and Climatic Water Balance for Global Terrestrial Surfaces dataset filtered for 2020 and selected the maximum temperature (tmmx) variable. We generated an annual mean and clipped it to the Arizona boundaries. The computational results of *Terrain Inclination*, *Solar Irradiance*, *Temperature* of Arizona utilizing the datasets mentioned earlier are shown in Figure 1.

In our two-phase approach, we use currently existing techniques for Phase I and the novelty of our approach lies in the Phase II. In the following, we list our contributions:

- We propose a Mathematical Programming and Network Flow based-technique to refine the site selection process after the preliminary site selection process is completed through GIS+AHP-based approaches in Phase I
- We provide two different versions of optimal site election problem - *Coarse Grained* and *Fine Grained*, where the difference between the two is that the former doesn't take into account *transmission infrastructure cost and capacity*, while the later does
- For the Coarse Grained version of the problem, we provide three different metrics to measure

the *benefit* (or the *utility*) of selected sites, namely *Interval Utility*, *Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility* and *Minimum Sub-Interval Utility*. These metrics provide options for the decision-makers to measure utility in the short or the long term.

- We provide $(1 - 1/e)$ approximation algorithms for the computation of (i) Interval Utility and (ii) Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility
- We show that the Minimum Sub-Interval Utility function is not sub-modular and as such a simple greedy algorithm with a guaranteed performance bound may not exist for this problem, as it does for the Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility problem
- For the Fine Grained version, we provide an Integer Linear Program to find the optimal sites
- We provide results of our extensive evaluation to study the impact of the *infrastructure design budget*, *energy supply and demand* on the percentage of the *energy demand* that can be met with these additional renewable energy sites.

The objective of our exercise is to find the locations of *optimal sites* subject to various sets of constraints, such as energy demand, design budget, etc. The difference between the Coarse-Grained and Fine-Grained versions of the problem is that while the former doesn't take into account the transmission line setup cost and the transmission line capacity, the latter does take these two factors into account.

2. Related Work

In recent studies, researchers have employed Geographic Information System (GIS) databases to analyze various criteria for the sustainable development of solar photovoltaic power. Guaita-Pradas et al. (2019) utilize GIS to assess factors such as land availability, solar radiation potential, and proximity to infrastructure, enabling the identification of suitable areas for solar farm establishment. Similarly, Türk et al. (2021) focuses on the specific case of the Erzurum province in Turkey.

Another line of research concentrates on determining the key criteria for selecting optimal sites for solar farms. Kereush and Perovych (2017) propose a comprehensive methodology that combines GIS analysis and multi-criteria decision-making techniques to evaluate environmental, technical, and economic factors. Deveci et al. (2021) focus on evaluating criteria for solar photovoltaic projects using fuzzy logarithmic additive estimation of weight coefficients and GIS.

GIS-based multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) techniques have been employed in different regions to

identify suitable locations for solar farms. Mierzwiak and Calka (2017) perform a multi-criteria analysis for solar farm location suitability by developing a comprehensive framework that considers solar irradiation, land use, and environmental constraints to identify suitable locations for solar farms.

In addition to solar energy, Barzehkar et al. (2021) apply GIS and MCDA techniques to select wind and solar farm sites in Isfahan Province, Iran. The work by Koc et al. (2019) focuses on the multi-criteria site selection problem for wind and solar energy projects in Iğdir Province, Turkey. They propose an approach based on Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to evaluate different sites.

3. Problem Formulation

In this section, we discuss both the *Coarse-Grained* and *Fine-Grained* models for the optimal site selection problem and analyze the models to provide solutions to the problem. It may be noted that the distinction between the two models is that the Fine-Grained model use the last two parameters $LCost_{i,j}$ and $LCap_{i,j}$, while the Course-Grained model doesn't. The goal of both the models is to satisfy the largest percentage of the demand created at the demand (or load) points, subject to various constraints, such as *generation capacity* of each site $SCap_i$, facility setup cost for each site $SCost_i$ and the design budget B . Both the models take into account the variation of generation at site S_i and the variation of demand (load) at load point L_j over the time interval 0 to T (for instance, a time interval may correspond to a year, comprising multiple sub-intervals which may correspond to a month).

3.1. Coarse-Grained Model and Analysis

In this model, we assume that it is economically viable for a renewable energy generation facility to supply energy only to nearby *demand (load) points*. More precisely, we assume that a facility S_i can supply energy only to those demand points that are within a circle of radius R . Our problem setting is illustrated on a map of a generic geographic area in Figure 2 where the blue circular dots indicate the *potential* locations (PL_1 through PL_{10}) of renewable energy generation sites and the red triangular dots indicate the location of demand points (I_1 through I_{16}). The circle with center at PL_9 indicates its *service range*. The solution is to select sites that maximizes a fraction of the demand, subject to various constraints if energy generation facilities are built in those locations. In Figure 2, the blue circles in square boxes (sites SL_1 through SL_4) indicate the sites




Figure 2: Potential Generation Sites and Actual Demand Points

selected for that problem instance.

The goal of maximizing the fraction of the total demand is over a *time interval* T , which is divided evenly into r sub-intervals $T_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$. The time interval 0 to T is the observation period. This implies $\sum_{i=1}^r T_i = T$.

We define an *area of interest* A , where all demand (load) points, $l_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, and potential renewable energy generation sites, $L_i, 1 \leq i \leq m$, are located. The service area associated with a facility at location L_i will be denoted by $SA(L_i)$. In this Coarse-Grained Model, we make a few simplifying assumptions: (i) the cost of building facilities at every location is *identical* and it is of *unit cost* ($SCost_i = 1, \forall i, 1 \leq i \leq n$), (ii) the demand at each demand point is either 0 or 1, (iii) the *budget* for building the infrastructure is an integer B . Accordingly, in this model, all subsets of the set of locations $L = \{L_1, \dots, L_m\}$ of cardinality at most B are potential solutions to the site selection problem. It may be noted that an improper subset of the potential solutions will maximize the fraction of the total demand that can be met. The service area associated with a $L' \subseteq L$ will be denoted by $SA(L')$ and is defined as $SA(L') = \cup_{L_i \in L'} SA(L_i)$. The goal of the site selection problem is to identify the subset $L' \subseteq L$ that *maximizes* the “benefit”, subject to the constraint that $|L'| \leq B$, where B is the budget. It may be noted that in this context, the “benefit” of setting up facilities at certain locations may be considered a fraction of the total demand that can be met by setting up facilities at those locations.

We have defined the goal of the site selection problem as to identify locations for setting up renewable energy generation facilities (from among the set of potential locations), which maximizes “benefit” subject to budgetary constraints. Delving deeper, one has to address the question of how the “benefit” of setting up a generation facility should be measured over a period of time. In the following, we lay out three different metrics,

any one of which can be used to measure the benefit of setting up a facility. We leave it up to the policymakers to decide as to which metric is most appropriate for their environment. In addition to laying out metrics, we also provide algorithms to find facilities that will maximize benefits. The formal definition of these metrics is given below.

Definition 1. *Interval Utility of a subset of a location set $L' \subseteq L$, within the time period T , $IU(L', T)$, is defined as the ratio between the number of demand points with the demand of one unit during time interval T that can be met by the generating facilities located at L' , divided by the total demand during time T , i.e.,*

$$IU(L', T) = |I(SA(L'), T)| / |I(A, T)|$$

where $|I(SA(L'), T)|$ represents the number of demand points in the service area of L' with demand of one unit during time interval T and $|I(A, T)|$ is the total demand in the area of interest A during time interval T .

The Interval Utility metric $IU(L', T)$ pays attention to the demand that can be met by L' over the time interval T , without paying detailed attention to its effectiveness in each of time sub-intervals $T_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$. In order to capture the effectiveness of setting up facilities in locations L' in each of time sub-intervals $T_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$, we define the following two metrics.

Definition 2. *Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility of a subset of a location set $L' \subseteq L$, over time interval T , where $T = \sum_{j=1}^r T_j$, denoted by $CSIU(L', T)$, is defined as the sum over r time sub-intervals, the ratio between the demand that could have been served by the facilities at L' during time sub-interval T_i , divided by the total number of incidents in T_i , i.e.,*

$$CSIU(L', T) = \sum_{i=1}^r (|I(SA(L'), T_i)| / |I(A, T_i)|)$$

where $I(SA(L'), T_i)$ represents the demand during T_i that could have been met if facilities existed in locations L' , and $|I(A, T_i)|$ is the total demand in the area of interest A during time sub-interval T_i .

Although the Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility metric $CSIU(L', T)$ pays attention to demand that can be met by L' during each of time sub-intervals $T_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$, due to its *additive nature*, it may fail to recognize the scenario where the service in a particular time sub-interval T_i is unacceptably poor. In order to remedy this shortcoming of $CSIU(L', T)$, we define the following metric.

Definition 3. *Minimum Sub-Interval Utility of subset of location set $L' \subseteq L$ over time interval T , denoted*

by $MSIU(L', T)$, is defined as the minimum over r time sub-intervals, the ratio between the demand that could have been met by the facilities at L' during time sub-interval T_i , divided by the total demand in T_i , i.e.,

$$MSIU(L', T) = \min_{i=1}^r (|I(SA(L'), T_i)| / |I(A, T_i)|)$$

where $I(SA(L'), T_i)$ represents the demand during T_i that could have been met if facilities existed in a subset of locations L' , and $|I(A, T_i)|$ represents the total demand in the area of interest A during time T_i .

We provide intuition for the preceding metrics using an example:

Example: Consider a problem instance where the budget constraint allows building only one facility. Suppose that $L' = \{l_a\}$, $L'' = \{l_b\}$, and $L''' = \{l_c\}$ are three different subsets of L , and they are being evaluated for their suitability as the “best choice” for the facility. Moreover, let $r = 2$ (i.e., only two time sub-intervals T_1 , and T_2 need to be considered). The total demand and the demand met by different choices of locations L' , L'' , and L''' are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Demand in time sub-intervals and the demand-met by different subsets of location

	Sub-interval T_1	Sub-interval T_2
Total Demand	100	10
Demand met by L'	80	2
Demand met by L''	70	4
Demand met by L'''	55	5

Whether facilities at L' , L'' , or L''' are built depends on the metric used. In this example, T_1 has a demand of 100 and T_2 has a demand of 10. Therefore, the total demand $T_1 + T_2 = 100 + 10 = 110$. It can be verified that under the Interval Utility metric, building the facility at L' is optimal as L' contributes a utility of $80 + 2 = 82$, which is greater than L'' contribution of $70 + 4 = 74$, and L''' of $55 + 5 = 60$. However, if one examines that choice carefully, one finds shortcomings with that solution. The L' solution covers 80% of the incidences in T_1 and only 20% in T_2 . This is because the metric pays attention to the entire interval $T_1 + T_2$ but does not take in account to individual sub-intervals. If one wants to examine the quality of the solution with respect to each sub-interval T_1 and T_2 , the L'' and L''' solutions may be better than the L' solution. If, instead, one uses the Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility, then L'' is the best choice as $(70/100 + 4/10 = 1.1)$ is greater than $(80/100 + 2/10 = 1.0)$ for L' and $(55/100 + 5/10 = 1.05)$ for L''' . Similarly, if one wants to use Minimum Sub-Interval Utility, then L''' is the best

choice as a minimum $(55/100, 5/10) = 0.5$ is greater than the minimum $(80/100, 2/10) = 0.2$ for L' and minimum $(70/100, 4/10) = 0.4$ for L'' . This discussion is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Demand in time sub-intervals and the number of them met by different subsets of location

	IU(·, T)	CSIU(·, T)	MSIU(·, T)
L'	$(80 + 2)/(100 + 10) = .75$	$80/100 + 2/10 = 1$	$\min(80/100, 2/10) = 0.2$
L''	$(70 + 4)/(100 + 10) = .67$	$70/100 + 4/10 = 1.1$	$\min(70/100, 4/10) = 0.4$
L'''	$(55 + 5)/(100 + 10) = .55$	$55/100 + 5/10 = 1.05$	$\min(55/100, 5/10) = 0.5$

Definition 4. *Optimal Interval Utility (OIU) Solution:* OIU solution is defined as a subset of a location set $L' \subseteq L$, that maximizes Interval Utility $IU(L', T)$, i.e.,

$$OIU_Solution = \max_{\{L' \subseteq L, |L'|=B\}} IU(L', T)$$

where $IU(L', T)$ is the Interval Utility defined earlier, and B is the budget.

In the following we first state a well studied combinatorial optimization problem, *Maximum Set Cover (MSC)* and then show that the OIU is equivalent to MSC. MSC is NP-complete and a $(1 - 1/e)$ factor approximation algorithm is known for it Vazirani (2001).

Definition 5. *Maximum Set Cover (MSC) Problem:* Given a set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ and subsets $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ ($S_i \subseteq S, 1 \leq i \leq m$) and an integer B , find the largest subset $S' \subseteq S$ that can be covered by using a subset $S' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, where $|S'| \leq B$.

Let \mathcal{O} be an instance of OIU with time interval T and budget B . Denote the locations of the demand points with demand equal to 1 within the time interval T as D , and the potential locations of renewable energy sites as $L = \{L_j : 1 \leq j \leq m\}$. Each $L_j \in L$ has a covering area (i.e., the demand at these points can be met by the facility located at L_j), which in this model is assumed to be a circular area with radius R . Each location $L_j \in L$ will have an associated subset D_j of the demand points D (i.e., subset of the demand points whose demands can be met by the facility at L_j).

We create an equivalent instance \mathcal{M} with set S , \mathcal{S} , and B of MSC as defined above from \mathcal{O} in the following way:

- (i) Set $S := D$.
- (ii) Set $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{D}$.
- (iii) Let the B of \mathcal{M} be the same as the B for \mathcal{O} .

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{O} \equiv \mathcal{M}$. Hence, the $(1 - 1/e)$ approximation algorithm that exists for the MSC can be used to solve the OIU problem.

Next, we focus our attention on the Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility function and show that it is submodular. For ease of reference, we define a *submodular* function next.

Definition 6. *Submodular function:* If Ω is a finite set, a submodular function is a set function, $f : 2^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where 2^Ω denotes the power set of Ω which satisfies the following condition: For every $X, Y \subseteq \Omega$ with $X \subseteq Y$ and every $z \in \Omega \setminus Y$, we have $f(X \cup \{z\}) - f(X) \geq f(Y \cup \{z\}) - f(Y)$. (Nemhauser et al. (1978)).

Lemma 1. *Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility function of a subset of a location set $L' \subseteq L$ over time interval T (see Definition 2) is monotonic.*

Lemma 2. *Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility function, $CSIU(L', T)$ is submodular.*

Proof. In order to claim that $CSIU(L)$ is submodular, we need to show that for any pair $L', L'' \in L$, $L' \subseteq L''$ and $L_i \in L \setminus L''$, $CSIU(L' \cup \{L_i\}) - CSIU(L') \geq CSIU(L'' \cup \{L_i\}) - CSIU(L'')$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& CSIU(L' \cup \{L_i\}) - CSIU(L') \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L') \cup \{L_i\}, T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'), T_k)| + |I(SA(\{L_i\}), T_k)| - |I(SA(L' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} + \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(\{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L_i), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L_i), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&\text{(as } L' \subseteq L'', |I(SA(L'), T_k)| \leq |I(SA(L'' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L''), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} + \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(\{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L''), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L''), T_k)| + |I(SA(\{L_i\}), T_k)| - |I(SA(L'' \cap \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L''), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L'' \cup \{L_i\}), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} - \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|I(SA(L''), T_k)|}{|I(A, T_k)|} \\
&= CSIU(L'' \cup \{L_i\}) - CSIU(L'') \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

It has been shown in Nemhauser et al. (1978) that a greedy heuristic for the problem of maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a cardinality constraint admits a $(1 - 1/e)$ approximation algorithm.

Theorem 3. *A greedy heuristic for the Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility function ($CSIU(L')$ computation problem provides a $(1 - 1/e)$ approximation guarantee.*

Proof. Follows from lemmas 1, 2 and Nemhauser et al. (1978). \square

In the following we show that unlike the *Cumulative Sub-Interval Utility function* $CSIU(L', T)$, the *Minimum Sub-Interval Utility function* $MSIU(L', T)$ is not submodular.




Figure 3: Problem instance to demonstrate that $MSIU(L', T)$ is not submodular

Theorem 4. *Minimum Sub-Interval Utility function of a subset of a location set $L' \subseteq L$, defined as $MSIU(L', T) = \min_{i=1}^r (|I(SA(L'), T_i)| / |I(A, T_i)|)$ is not submodular.*

Proof. If $MSIU(L, T)$ is submodular, then for any pair $L', L'' \in L$, $L' \subseteq L''$ and $L_i \in L \setminus L''$, $MSIU(L' \cup \{L_i\}, T) - MSIU(L', T) \geq MSIU(L'' \cup \{L_i\}, T) - MSIU(L'', T)$. In Figure 3, we provide a counterexample that demonstrates that there exists $L', L'' \in L$, $L' \subseteq L''$ and $L_i \in L \setminus L''$ such that $MSIU(L' \cup \{L_i\}, T) - MSIU(L', T) < MSIU(L'' \cup \{L_i\}, T) - MSIU(L'', T)$.

Consider the instance shown in the Figure 3, where $L' = \{L_1, L_2\}$, $L'' = \{L_1, L_2, L_4\}$ and $L_i = \{L_3\}$. The red squares indicate the locations of demand points. It may be seen from the diagram that 14 and 12 units of demand existed during the time sub-intervals T_1 and T_2 respectively. From the Figure 3, the following observations can be made: (i) the facilities in L' can meet demand of 1 out of 14 units in T_1 and 2 out of 12 units during T_2 , (ii) the facilities in L' and L_i can cover 3 out of 14 units of demand in T_1 and 6 out of 12 units of demand during T_2 , (i) the facilities in L'' can cover 13 out of 14 units of demand in T_1 and 9 out of 12 units of demand during T_2 , (i) the facilities in L'' and L_i can cover 14 out of 14 units of demand in T_1 and 12 out of 12 units of demand during T_2 . The results are tabulated in Table ??.

From the results in the Table ??, it can be verified that $MSIU(L' \cup \{L_i\}) - MSIU(L') = .21 - .07 < 1 -$

	MSIU(\cdot, T_1)	MSIU(\cdot, T_1)	MSIU($\cdot, T_1 + T_2$)
$SA(L')$	1/14 = .07	2/12 = .17	$\min(.07, .17) = .07$
$SA(L') \cup \{SA(L_i)\}$	3/14 = .21	6/12 = 0.5	$\min(.21, 0.5) = .21$
$SA(L'')$	13/14 = .93	9/12 = .75	$\min(.93, .75) = .75$
$SA(L'') \cup \{SA(L_i)\}$	14/14 = 1	12/12 = 1	$\min(1, 1) = 1$

Table 3: Incidences in time sub-intervals and the number of them covered by different subsets of location

$.75 = MSIU(L'' \cup \{L_i\}) - MSIU(L'')$. Accordingly, this counterexample establishes that the $MSIU(\cdot, \cdot)$ is not a sub-modular function. \square

3.2. Fine-Grained Model and Analysis

As discussed earlier, in addition to all the parameters used in the Coarsed-Grain Model, the Fine-Grained model takes into account two additional parameters (i) cost $LCost_{i,j}$ of building a transmission line connecting generating site S_i to (demand) load point L_j , and (ii) maximum capacity of the transmission line $LCap_{i,j}$ connecting site S_i to demand point L_j . Moreover, (i) energy demand at each of the demand (load) points is no longer required to be 0 or 1, and can take on any arbitrary demand values, (ii) the cost $SCost_i$ of building a site at S_i is no longer required to be identical and of one unit, but allowed to take on any arbitrary value, (iii) Variation of generation at site S_i over time interval 0 to T can take on arbitrary values, and (iv) variation of demand (load) at load point L_j over the time interval 0 to T can also take on any arbitrary values. The variables used in the Fine-Grained analysis and their explanations are summarized in Table 4.

Notation	Explanation
$\{S_i\},$ $1 \leq i \leq n$	A set of <i>potential</i> renewable energy generation sites
$SCost_i$	Cost of building a site at S_i
$SCap_i$	Maximum capacity of generation at site S_i
B	Budget allocated for the design of renewable energy infrastructure
$LCost_{i,j}$	Cost of building a transmission line connecting generating site S_i to (demand) load point L_j
$LCap_{i,j}$	Maximum capacity of the transmission line connecting site S_i to demand point L_j

Table 4: Notations and their Explanations

In order to meet the largest fraction of demand subject to budget and capacity constraints, we utilize an Integer Linear Program (ILP) to find the optimal solution to the problem. However, in order to utilize

ILP to find a solution, we need to set up the problem in a manner that is conducive to ILP solution. In the following we describe our set up and provide an ILP to find the optimal solution to the problem.

We introduce a binary indicator variable x_i to indicate whether a facility is built at site S_i .

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if a facility is built at site } S_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we use a binary indicator variable $y_{i,j}$ to indicate whether a transmission line $e_{i,j}$ (connecting generating site S_i to the load point L_j) is built or not.

$$y_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if transmission line } e_{i,j} \text{ is built} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Observe there is no point in building the transmission line $e_{i,j}$ if it is decided not to build a facility at the site S_i . Mathematically, it implies that if $x_i = 0$, then $y_{i,j}$ must also be 0. This condition may be ensured by the following constraint

$$y_{i,j} \leq x_i$$

The *Total Cost* of construction of facilities and transmission lines is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n SCost_i \cdot x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m LCost_{i,j} \cdot y_{i,j}$$

We require the construction cost of sites and transmission lines cannot exceed a budget B , and enforce this with the following constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n SCost_i \cdot x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m LCost_{i,j} \cdot y_{i,j} \leq B$$

In order to capture energy flow from the generating sites to the demand points, we create a bipartite graph where the nodes on one side of bi-partition correspond to the potential sites (S_i), and the other side of bi-partition corresponds to the demand points (L_j). We add a directed edge from every potential site S_i to every demand point L_j , resulting in a *complete* bipartite graph. Each node corresponding to S_i has a cost $SCost_i$ and a capacity value $SCap_i$ associated with it. Similarly, each link $e_{i,j}$ has two parameters, cost ($LCost_{i,j}$) and capacity ($LCap_{i,j}$) associated with it. Finally, we add two additional nodes, SuperSource (SS) and SuperLoad (SL), add a directed edge from SS to every S_i , and

direct edges from every L_j to SL . The cost of these edges is taken to be zero. Let $Cap(SS \rightarrow S_i) = SCap_i \cdot x_i$, as this capacity will be equal to 0 if the decision is made not to build a facility at st S_i , i.e., $x_i = 0$. Similarly, $Cap(S_i \rightarrow L_j) = LCap_{i,j} \cdot y_{i,j}$, as the capacity will be equal to 0 if the decision is made not to build the transmission line corresponding to $e_{i,j}$. The capacity of $Cap(L_j \rightarrow SL)$ link is set equal to the demand, D_{L_j} , at the demand point L_j , to ensure that energy supplied at L_j doesn't exceed the demand at that load point. With this formulation, if we compute the *maximum flow* from the SuperSource (SS) to the SuperLoad (SL), that provides the solution to the optimal site selection problem. A graph with six potential sites and four demand points is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Energy flow diagram from the potential sites to the load/demand points

If there are n potential sites and m load (demand) points, the corresponding network graph as shown in Figure 4 will have $(n + m + 2)$ nodes and $n + m + n \cdot m$ directed edges. The nodes will correspond to SS , SL , $S_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $L_j, 1 \leq j \leq m$. There will be three groups of edges:

- (i) $SS \rightarrow S_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$,
- (ii) $S_i \rightarrow L_j, 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m$
- (iii) $L_j \rightarrow SL, 1 \leq j \leq m$,

Energy flow on a link $S_i \rightarrow L_j$ will be denoted as $f(i \rightarrow j)$. Network flow constraints can be written as follows:

- (i) $\forall_i, f(SS \rightarrow S_i) \leq Cap(SS \rightarrow S_i) = SCap_i \cdot x_i$
- (ii) $\forall_{i,j}, f(S_i \rightarrow L_j) \leq Cap(S_i \rightarrow L_j) = LCap_{i,j} \cdot y_{i,j}$
- (iii) $\forall_j, f(L_j \rightarrow SL) \leq D_{L_j}$
- (iv) *Total Flow*, F at the node SS :

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^n f(SS \rightarrow S_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$$

- (v) At node $S_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$:

$$f(SS \rightarrow S_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m f(S_i \rightarrow L_j)$$

- (vi) At node $L_j, 1 \leq j \leq m$:

$$f(L_j \rightarrow SL) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(S_i \rightarrow L_j)$$

Objective: *Maximize F (Total Flow)*

It may be noted that the ILP formulation above will provide the solution only for one one-time sub-interval during which the generation at the sites S_i and demand at load points L_j remain constant. However, the formulation above can be easily extended to take care of multiple sub-intervals, where both supply and demand might change by replicating the network shown in Figure 4 as many times as there are time sub-interval and also replicating the ILP constraints with changed values for supply and demand during each of the sub-intervals. A modified graph with four-time sub-intervals is shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Energy flow diagram from the potential sites to the load/demand points

4. Experimental Results

In this section, we present the results of our experimental evaluation of the site selection process. In our evaluation, we studied the impact of (i) *budget*, (ii) *increase in supply*, and (iii) *demand* on the *percentage of demand met*. Our experimentation was conducted on synthetic data. However, *we made a significant effort to make the synthetic data as realistic as possible*. In that vain, we collected publicly available domain data from most of the operating solar farms in Arizona. There are 15 operating solar farms in Arizona generating from 18 to 400MW of power. The data related to the cost of setting up a solar farm and associated infrastructure is sparsely available in the public domain. The cost of setting up farms varied from 19 to 401 million dollars. The cost of setting up 45 miles of 500kV

transmission line is approximated at 95 million dollars. We created our synthetic data using the above figures as a baseline. We created three groups of datasets, each comprising 100 members. These three groups were created to study the impacts of (i) budget, (ii) supply, and (iii) demand. Each group was further divided into ten sub-groups, where each sub-group corresponds to a solar farm design problem instance, with variations in budget, supply, and demand. Figures 6, 7, and 8 show the impact of budget, supply, and demand, respectively, on the *percentage of demand met*.

In our experimentation, we used 300 datasets and each dataset had 14 solar farms. In alignment with our goal of creating synthetic data as realistic as possible, the data values used in our experiments were derived from the generation capacity of existing solar farms in Arizona. The demand values and the site building budget numbers were also collected from the same sources. The generation capacity of these solar farms varied from 15 MW to 403 MW. Each dataset had 9 demand points, and demands in these points varied from 0 to 4057.48 MW. The cost of building a site facility varied from 13.63 to 402.14 million dollars. The cost and the capacity of the transmission lines connecting site S_i to demand (load) point L_j varied from 1.27 to 117.30 million dollars and from 250 to 1000 MW, respectively.




Figure 6: Impact of budget on the percentage of demand met

From public domain information made available by operating solar farms in Arizona, we collected data related to (i) site establishment cost, (ii) maximum site capacity, and (iii) monthly generation of energy. From SRP, we collected data on (iv) transmission line capacity, (v) transmission line construction cost, and (vi) monthly variation of energy demand. To create our synthetic data, we utilized a maximum variance vector, $[\sigma_i]_{1 \leq i \leq 6}$, for the six parameters indicated earlier. We created 300 datasets by tweaking the original dataset with the variance setup and including a range of budget values, generation capacities, and demand values for generating the plots in Figures 6, 7, and 8. It may be




Figure 7: Impact of increase in the generation capacity at the sites




Figure 8: Impact of increase in the demand

noted that the difference between the two plots in these figures corresponding to datasets i and j is due to the difference in their corresponding variance parameters sampled from $[\sigma_i] (1 \leq i \leq 6)$.

The 300 datasets were split into three sets of 100 each. The impact of variation of budget, on the first set is shown in Figure 6. The impact of variation of generation capacities of the sites on the second set is shown in Figure 7. The impact of variation of demand on the third set is shown in Figure 8. Figure 6 shows 10 different plots where each curve corresponds to results obtained from ten different datasets. Similar settings apply for the curves in Figures 7 and 8.

It may be observed that each curve in Figure 6 reaches a saturation point for a certain value of budget, and a further increase in budget has no impact on the percentage of demand met. Despite its counter-intuitive nature, this phenomenon occurs because each power station and transmission line has fixed generation and transmission capacities. Once all are activated, only a certain amount of energy can be relayed from the generation sites to the demand points. At that point in time, only a certain percentage of the total demand can be met. Further, increase in budget is not going to change that percentage.

In the experiments shown in Figure 7, the

demand met consistently rose with increased generation capacity, indicating that transmission line capacity wasn't a limiting factor. It may be observed that some of the curves stopped after a smaller value of generation capacity, whereas others continued for a larger value. This is due to the fact that the variation of the generation capacity of a site is limited by its maximum capacity, and the maximum capacity of some sites is much smaller than other sites.

In all our experimentations presented in Figure 8, the percentage of demand met decreased with an increase in demand. This is quite intuitive, although we recognize that due to demands at different demand points being different, we could have seen somewhat different behavior. It just so happened that we did not observe any counter-intuitive phenomenon.

Our experiments were conducted on a platform running Ubuntu 22.04 LTS with an AMD Ryzen 9 4900HS CPU equipped with 16GB RAM. For code deployment, we used Python 3.10 with the Gurobi 10.0.1 library. The computation time for each dataset in our experiments never exceeded five minutes.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented techniques for the optimal selection of renewable energy sites that goes beyond conventional ways of selecting sites, utilizing GIS and AHP. We propose a two-phase approach where phase I, using GIS and AHP, does the preliminary selection, and phase II, utilizing mathematical programming, does the final selection. We conducted significant experimentation using synthetic data that attempts to mimic real data associated with currently operating solar farms in Arizona.

References

- Barzehkar, M., Parnell, K. E., Dinan, N. M., & Brodie, G. (2021). Decision support tools for wind and solar farm site selection in Isfahan province, Iran. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 23, 1179–1195.
- DeMers, M. (2009). *Fundamentals of geographic information systems* (4th). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Deveci, M., Cali, U., & Pamucar, D. (2021). Evaluation of criteria for site selection of solar photovoltaic (pv) projects using fuzzy logarithmic additive estimation of weight coefficients. *Energy Reports*, 7, 8805–8824.
- Guaita-Pradas, I., Marques-Perez, I., Gallego, A., & Segura, B. (2019). Analyzing territory for the sustainable development of solar photovoltaic power using GIS databases. *Environmental monitoring and assessment*, 191, 1–17.
- Kereush, D., & Perovych, I. (2017). Determining criteria for optimal site selection for solar power plants. *Geomatics, Land management and Landscape*, 4, 39–54.
- Koc, A., Turk, S., & Şahin, G. (2019). Multi-criteria of wind-solar site selection problem using a GIS-AHP-based approach with an application in Iğdir province/Turkey. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26, 32298–32310.
- Mierzwiak, M., & Calka, B. (2017). Multi-criteria analysis for solar farm location suitability. *Reports on Geodesy and Geoinformatics*, 104(1), 20–32.
- Munier, N. (2021). *Uses and limitations of the AHP method: A non-mathematical and rational analysis*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60392-2>
- Nemhauser, G. L., Wolsey, L. A., & Fisher, M. L. (1978). An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—i. *Mathematical programming*, 14, 265–294.
- Saaty, T. L. (1994). *Fundamentals of decision making and priority theory with the analytic hierarchy process* [“A thorough exposition of the theoretical aspects of AHP.”]. RWS.
- Schrijver, A. (1998). *Theory of linear and integer programming*. John Wiley & Sons.
- SRP. (2021a). *Inputs for the ISP study plan*. <https://www.srpnet.com/grid-water-management/grid-management/integrated-system-plan>
- SRP. (2021b). *Srp summer stakeholder series - near-term planning: Part 2*. <https://www.srpnet.com/assets/srpnet/pdf/grid-water-management/grid-management/isp/ISP-Meeting-4-Presentation.pdf>
- SRP. (2023a). *Grid-water management at srp*. <https://www.srpnet.com/grid-water-management/grid-management/improvement-projects/coal-communities-transition>
- SRP. (2023b). *Sustainability overview at srp*. <https://www.srpnet.com/grid-water-management/sustainability-environment/sustainability-overview>
- Türk, S., Koç, A., & Şahin, G. (2021). Multi-criteria of PV solar site selection problem using GIS-intuitionistic fuzzy based approach in Erzurum province/Turkey. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 5034.
- Vazirani, V. V. (2001). *Approximation algorithms* (Vol. 1). Springer.