

Our “Sputnik Moment?”



Is this the car of the future? The 2011 Chevrolet Volt—GM’s long-delayed electric-powered hybrid—is now a reality and appearing at auto shows around the country (all photos courtesy GM).

Opportunities Amidst Crises:

ENERGY-CHALLENGED INDUSTRIES—
AND COUNTRIES—CAN BENEFIT FROM
IMPROVED MOTOR DESIGN AND MATERIALS

(Reprinted courtesy the Motor & Motion Association)

Wally E. Rippel

Introduction

In almost every crisis, there are hidden opportunities for something good. In 1957, the Soviet Union launched the planet’s first artificial satellite—Sputnik. At the time, Sputnik was seen as something bad for America. Through Sputnik, we could see Soviet influence spreading and we could see a new military threat just over the horizon. However, America responded to the challenge and we benefited greatly. Now, when a hurricane threatens, we are better able to protect life and property, thanks to orbiting satellites, which, at best, would have been

delayed without the Soviet challenge. Likewise the technologies spawned from the space race of the late 1950s and 1960s have given us so many of the technological wonders we now take for granted—computers, the Internet and cell phones—to mention but a few.

Today, we now in fact face two crises—each of which is far greater than Sputnik, oil depletion and global warming. Oil is the “blood” which powers transportation and agriculture. Without it, conventional cars, trucks, tractors and airplanes would all be “dead.” And without

continued

use of these machines, most people would also be dead. There would be no way to get to the store—but no matter—for there would be no food at the store for lack of transport. And even if there were a means for food transport, there would be little to ship given the absence of fuel for farm equipment and chemicals for fertilizers. While oil will not suddenly “run out,” it appears that we are now at the point where scarcity factors are overpowering technological advances to the point that the real cost (hours-of-work-per-barrel-produced) is increasing. We have likely crossed the threshold commonly known as “peak oil.” Two years ago, world oil production was at 85 million barrels a day. Now it is at 83 million barrels. In 2008, oil reached \$147 a barrel with \$5 gas close at hand. It is likely that this spike contributed to the present world recession. It is also likely that future prosperity will be limited by the price of oil.

While peak oil may be a threat to “our way of life,” global warming may be a threat to life itself. Since the mid-19th century, atmospheric carbon dioxide has increased from 270 to 385 parts-per-million. This has in turn caused the average temperature of the lower atmosphere to increase by nearly one degree C—thus triggering massive ice loss around the globe. All of this is also serving to magnify weather patterns, including drought and severe storms. Unchecked, the process of global warming may lead to a runaway situation where the loss of planetary, light-reflective ice leads to further global warming and a spiraling cycle of destruction.

Humanity’s response to these two crises will determine our future. We have some choices—just as we did five decades ago with Sputnik:

- We can pretend that the problems do not exist.
- We can accept the problems as real, but choose to not respond because of the difficulty.
- We can respond, but without the needed commitment.
- Or we can meet the problems head-on with the required response.

Should we choose the last option, there will of course be expense, just as there was with the space program. There will also be benefits, such as the development of new technologies and new markets. If the future is anything like the past, the benefits will far outweigh the costs.

It is interesting to see how and where we, the designers and developers of electric motors, relate to these two crises. Let’s first consider oil. While approximately half of the electrical energy generated in the United States is delivered



The cost, availability and accessibility of charging stations like the one pictured above will dictate the acceptance and popularity of electric vehicles. GM recently announced that “more than 5,300 home and workplace” stations will be installed throughout Michigan in the coming year.

to electric motors, only about 1.5 percent of the generated energy comes from oil. Therefore, it appears that electric motors have little to do with oil consumption. On the other hand, we are now beginning to see electric motors used significantly in connection with hybrid, plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles. In all of these cases, the use of electric motors enables either a more efficient use of oil—as in the case of hybrids, or the direct replacement of oil—as is the case with plug-in hybrids or pure electrics. So, when it comes to oil, we may be part of the solution. After decades, this is now being recognized. Federal and private investment funds are now becoming increasingly available for the development of hybrid and electric vehicles. This will mean new opportunities for the development of electric motors—which are already reducing manufacturing costs—combined with increased power densities and

continued



Many say that the planet's very survival and economic well-being will soon dictate the need for alternative energy sources to fuel the world's economy.

increased energy efficiencies.

In the case of global warming, electric motors have some “guilt by association” in that more than 10 percent of the world's CO₂ generation is associated with the generation of electric power specifically supplied to electric motors. The key to solving this problem will be the replacement of coal-fired generation with carbon-free generation such as wind, solar and nuclear. However, to a lesser extent, the development of more energy-efficient electric motors will also play a role. Accordingly, there will likely be expanded opportunities in connection with the development of high-efficiency electric motors for all sorts of applications, ranging from air conditioning systems, refrigerators and washing machines to large industrial applications such as steel rolling and water pumping.

In the following, we will focus on the challenges and opportunities for electric motors in connection with the transportation sector, i.e.—electric and hybrid vehicles.

Trade-Offs

Involving Electric Propulsion Motors

For every application, the ideal electric motor would be one that costs nothing to manufacture, weighs nothing and has unity (or higher) energy efficiency. Unfortunately, none of these attributes can be attained in the

real world. Like it or not, we have to settle for machines that cost money to make, and, once made, have mass and lose energy. The issue at hand is to quantify the trade-offs between these and other parameters.

Trade-off numbers differ widely, depending on the application. In industrial applications, cost and efficiency may be crucial, with mass relatively unimportant. Conversely, for aerospace applications, mass and efficiency are usually the key drivers—with cost taking a back seat. For all those involved in the design process, it is important that readily available trade-off numbers are at hand. Without this, it is possible, for example, that one designer will focus on achieving low mass but at high manufacturing cost, while a second designer might do just the opposite. When two such efforts are merged, the worst of all worlds happens and the product is both heavy and costly; the “bad” overpowers the “good.” Indeed, it is better for all designers to be working to a common set of flawed trade-off numbers than to have no trade-off numbers at all.

Of course, the best situation is to have the right trade-off numbers. Using these, rational decisions can be made concerning candidate approaches for reducing cost (at the expense of mass or efficiency), or for reducing mass (at the expense of manufacturing cost or efficiency), etc.

All of this is quite important for electric and hybrid vehicle applications. Manufacturing cost of the motor will of course have a direct impact on the cost of the vehicle—which in turn will determine how many vehicles can be sold. Mass, size and efficiency are also critical as they, too, relate to cost. As efficiency drops, the battery must be up-sized, which means that the rest of the vehicle must be enlarged, and which further means more money up front and more money over time in the form of energy costs. The story is much the same concerning size and mass, which cost money up front and over time. With that, step one in the design process should be the evaluation of the trade-off numbers for the specific environments associated with electric and hybrid vehicles.

Determining the cost-efficiency trade-off for motors in EVs and HEVs. The economic impact of efficiency is determined primarily by battery depreciation and, to a lesser degree, by the cost of electrical energy. With state-of-the-art lithium ion batteries, the high-volume, packaged manufacturing cost is approximately \$400 per kWh—with an average life corresponding to about 500 (100 percent depth) cycles. It then follows that the depreciation cost is therefore about $\$400/500 = \0.80 per

kWh throughput. The cost of electricity varies from location to location and, in some cases, with the time of day. Given the fact that rates are rising, a moderately high cost is assumed—\$0.15/kWh. Finally, an account must be given for energy loss in both the battery and the battery charger. For the present, state-of-the-art charger efficiency (averaged over a complete recharge) is approximately 87 percent (including energy losses associated with blowers, etc.). For the lithium ion battery, the round trip energy efficiency is typically 92 percent. Taken together, the combined charger-battery efficiency is about 80 percent. Thus, when battery depreciation, electricity cost and energy efficiency are combined, the total cost of energy delivered at the battery terminals is approximately \$1.00 per kWh.

In the case of a mid-sized, 1,500-kg electric or plug-in hybrid vehicle, the electricity use averages about 0.3 kWh per mile. And, over an assumed vehicle life of 150,000 miles, the energy use is 45,000 kWh; based on the above, the value of that energy (including battery depreciation) is \$45,000. Approximately five percent of this energy is used for non-propulsion functions such as lights, air conditioning and power steering; the remaining energy, valued at approximately \$43,000 is applied to the drive system. Accordingly, a one percent improvement in the energy efficiency of the drive system can be valued at \$430. Accordingly, the motor cost efficiency trade-off is determined as \$430 = 1 percent.

The meaning of this trade is that one who specifies and purchases the motor should be willing to spend up to \$430 to gain one percent efficiency, provided other factors—such as weight—remain constant. When the “cost of money” and various sales issues are considered, this number will likely revise downward.

Determining the cost-mass trade-off for motors in EVs and HEVs. For each kg of added mass, the vehicle structure and drive system mass must increase by a total of about 0.3 kg in order to maintain range and performance. Likewise, the battery mass must increase by about 0.2 kg. Thus, adding 1 kg results in a total mass gain of 1.5 kg. For each kg of added mass, the vehicle energy use (at the wall plug) increases by approximately 0.06 Wh/mile. With the addition of 1.5 kg, the energy use (at the wall plug) would increase by 0.09 Wh/mile. Since the battery output energy is 80 percent of the wall plug, the energy increase at the battery would be 0.072 Wh. Thus, over the 150,000-mile vehicle life, energy use (at the battery terminals) will increase by 10.8 kWh. As noted earlier, the value of battery-delivered energy is



2011 Chevrolet Volt Delayed Charging Screen - The 2011 Chevrolet Volt allows owners to program charging times based on departure time from the Volt's center stack 7-inch LCD touch screen.



2011 Chevrolet Volt Climate Control screen: Volt owners can control the in-vehicle climate through the Volt's center stack 7-inch LCD touch screen.



The guts of the 2011 Chevrolet Volt.

approximately \$1.00-per-kWh—which brings the energy-related costs to \$10.80. To this we must add the cost of the added vehicle structure, added propulsion and added battery. The added vehicle structure and propulsion cost approximately \$4/kg. For an added 0.3 kg, this cost component comes to about \$1.20.

The battery-specific energy is typically 150 Wh/kg, and the battery cost is \$0.40/Wh., which means that the added-battery-cost associated with 0.20 kg of battery is approximately \$12. The three costs sum to \$24. Accordingly, the motor cost/mass trade-off is determined to

continued

Charge Time

4 hours @ 240V

All Electric

When battery is fully charged, first 35 miles only.

93 MPGe equivalent
36 kW-hrs per 100 miles
combined city/hwy

\$601 cost per year if always run in All Electric


Gas Only

When electricity is used up, runs on gas for another 344 miles.

37 MPG
2.7 gallons per 100 miles
combined city/hwy


\$1,302 cost per year if always run in Gas Only mode

Range (Miles)




How This Vehicle Compares (combined composite)

Among all vehicles and within compact cars



Greenhouse Gases (CO₂ g/mile, tailpipe only)



Other Air Pollutants



Examples: Charging Routines

Miles driven between full charge	Fuel Economy MPG	Electricity Consumed	Electricity + Fuel Energy Cost
30	N/A	10.9 kWh	4¢/mi
45	168	12.9 kWh	5¢/mi
60	89	12.9 kWh	6¢/mi
75	69	12.9 kWh	7¢/mi
Never Charge	37 35 city / 40 hwy	N/A	9¢/mi

Your actual mileage and costs will vary with fuel cost, temperature, driving conditions, and how you drive and maintain your vehicle. Cost estimates are based on 15,000 miles per year at \$3.20 per gallon and 11 cents per kW-hr. MPG equivalent: 33.7 kW-hrs = 1 gallon gasoline energy.

Visit www.fueleconomy.gov to download the Fuel Economy Guide (also available at dealers).



New battery technology is essential to the Volt's or any other electric vehicle's success. Design trade-offs regarding battery size vs. power (charging) duration are still up for debate. For now, drivers will have the option of employing either electric- or gasoline-powered energy.

be \$24 = 1 kg.

The meaning of this trade is that specifiers and purchasers of motors should be willing to spend up to \$24 to reduce mass by 1 kg—provided other factors, such as efficiency, remain constant. When the “cost of money” and various sales issues are considered, this number will also revise downward.

Determining the mass-efficiency trade-off for motors in EVs and HEVs. The mass-efficiency trade (where cost is held constant) is simply the quotient of the cost-efficiency trade and the cost-mass trade. Accordingly, the mass-efficiency trade is determined as (\$430/one percent)/(\$24/kg) = 18 kg/one percent, or 18 kg = one percent. This means that the one who specifies and purchases the motor should be willing to accept a mass increase of 18 kg in order to gain an efficiency of one percent.

Efficiency is of course a function of both speed and torque, and so for a vehicle application, where speed and torque are continually changing, some sort of weighted average is required. The weighting should be with respect to energy, not time. The weighting factors are based on how vehicles are driven and therefore

may change some from vehicle to vehicle. In the end, all that is needed is a characteristic speed and torque under which one efficiency point is measured. From experience, it appears that for most on-road applications, the speed and torque associated with 60 mph on a two-percent upgrade work reasonably well.

Applying the trade-offs to the AC Propulsion EV motor. AC Propulsion builds complete drive and recharge systems based on induction motors using copper-cage structures. For their 150-kW system, the inverter-motor system has a peak rating of 150 kW (shaft) at 6,000 rpm. The continuous rating is approximately 40 kW. The measured peak-point efficiency of the inverter-motor combination is 92 percent (at 30 kW, 6,000 to 8,000 rpm); the motor itself achieves a peak-point efficiency of 95 percent. The motor mass is 46 kg and the estimated high-volume production cost (rough estimate) is \$1,000.

Since the cost-efficiency trade is \$430/one percent, it follows that for the ACP motor, one should be willing to increase the manufacturing cost by something approaching 43 percent to gain one-percent average efficiency (assuming

mass is constant). Likewise, with the cost-mass trade at \$24/kg, it follows that one should be willing to increase the manufacturing cost by 1.1 percent in order to reduce the mass by one percent (assuming efficiency is constant). Finally, using the mass-efficiency trade of 18kg/one percent, one should be willing to increase the ACP motor mass by 39 percent in order to gain one percent in efficiency (assuming the manufacturing cost is held constant).

As mentioned, one of the main purposes in establishing these trade-off numbers is to determine which developments make sense and which do not. For example, in using the cost-efficiency trade-off it can be determined whether the added cost of the copper rotor cage is justified. Likewise, using the cost-mass trade, one can determine whether a candidate lightweight power cable might be justified.

Making Ever-Better Motors for EVs

The quest will never end for designing and building ever-better motors—ones that have lower manufacturing costs, are smaller and lighter and yet are more energy-efficient. The question is what to focus on. Which areas of development stand to yield the greatest “bang for the buck?” We start with some basic equations which deal with power conversion and heating:

$$P = K_1 * S^4 * (J * K_p) * (B * f) \quad (1)$$

$$P_d = S^3 * [K_2 * \rho * (J * K_p)^2 / K_p + K_3 * B^\alpha * f^\beta] \quad (2)$$

$$\Delta T = \theta * P_d \quad (3)$$

$$M = K_4 * S^3 \quad (4)$$

In the Equation 1, P is the shaft power; S is a characteristic linear dimension of the motor, such as bore diameter or stack height; J is the current density; K_p is the winding packing factor; B is the magnetic flux density; f is the applied electrical frequency; and K_1 is a constant that is based on details of the motor design.

In Equation 2, ρ is the resistivity of the winding averaged with the resistivity of the rotor cage; K_2 is a constant based on design; K_3 is a constant based on design and is proportionate to the magnetic loss; and α and β are magnetic-loss constants (typically, α is around 2.2 while β is around 1.5).

From Equation 3, ΔT is the temperature difference between the “hot-spot” and ambient; P_d is the motor loss; and θ is a fictitious thermal-impedance constant relating to these two quantities.

Finally, in Equation 4 M is the total-machine mass and K_4 is a constant (that chang-

es somewhat with machine design).

Achieving increased specific power. From Equation 1 we see that if either J , K_p , or f are increased, the shaft power will also increase. When we do any of these, the power dissipation P_d will also increase—as noted by Equation 2. This then means that the hot-spot temperature will rise unless the critical thermal impedance is lowered via improved cooling. In most cases, it will also mean that the machine efficiency drops due to either rapidly increasing I^2 losses or rapidly increasing magnetic losses. If, however, both J and f are increased in near-proportion, the rate at which losses increase may be similar to the rate at which shaft power increases—and energy efficiency is maintained while specific power increases.

If, for example, current density and frequency (and so shaft speed) are doubled, the shaft power will increase by a factor of four, while the heat dissipation will increase by a factor of four (in fact, a little less than a factor of four since β is usually less than 2.0). Accordingly, the efficiency remains constant (or slightly increases) while the specific power increases by some 300 percent. If the critical thermal impedance is then reduced by a factor of four, the hot-spot temperature rise will remain the same as for the baseline case—which is definitely a good thing.

In order to carry out the above algorithm, it is clear that several areas of design improvement must be tackled at once.

One needed improvement is that thermal impedance must be improved. In the case of induction machines this generally means that an improved means of rotor cooling must be achieved. For both induction and brushless machines, it also means that an improved means of stator cooling must be employed, i.e.—end-turn cooling must be improved; heat transfer within the winding must be improved; and heat transfer through the slot liners must be improved. The list goes on. The good news is that present designs present much room for improvement, especially when fluid cooling means are implemented. Reducing θ by a factor of ten for many designs is in fact realistic.

Item two is that the machine must be capable of operating at increased mechanical speed. In many cases this means that design modifications are required, such as the addition of end-ring captures and a stiffening of the rotor stack. It may also mean that modified gearing and bearing lubrication must be used.

One direct means for increasing P is where a copper rotor cage is used in place of the conventional aluminum cage. This enables J to increase without increasing P_d , meaning that

continued



Inside the 2011 Chevrolet Volt.



2011 Chevrolet Volt Driver Information Center charging screens: Even when the vehicle shuts down, Volt vehicle charging information is accessible through the reconfigurable 7-inch LCD driver information center.

both rated power and efficiency can be simultaneously increased. (The efficiency increase is typically around 1.5 percent at the rated power point). Copper-cage fabrication, however, comes at a price. Per unit volume, the cost of copper has ranged between five and fifteen times that of aluminum over the last decade. (The ACP motor rotor uses 13.6 lb. of copper per rotor. In 2008, copper reached a high of \$4.00 per pound. At this price, the copper cost for the rotor was \$54.40. If the same cage were structured from aluminum, the cage mass would be 3.63 lb. In 2008 aluminum also reached its high of \$1.75 per pound. At this price, the aluminum cost would have been

only \$6.36.) In addition to the large difference in material costs, the casting of copper is also much more expensive than aluminum, due in part to the higher melting temperature of copper. Other copper-cage fabrication techniques—such as where extruded bars are inserted into the rotor stack and then welded within the end-ring structure—are even more expensive. But when the trade-offs are considered, the copper cage appears to be justified for most EV applications.

Achieving increased efficiency. In Equations 1 and 2 we note that if the packing, K_p , is increased, that shaft power P will increase more rapidly than the P_d losses. Thus, one means for improving efficiency is to find a way in which the packing factor can be increased. One approach is where machines are hand-wound, but in most cases the cost trade-off numbers rule this option out. Another means is to use rectangular “bus conductors” in place of stranded conductors. This approach is typically used for large machines, but generally requires hand labor. Recently, techniques have been developed where segments of bus windings are machine-inserted in slots and then welded together using automated processes to form the completed winding. While these approaches can achieve very high packing factors combined with good heat transfer and good manufacturing economics, they have one imperfection when compared with conventional multi-strand windings, i.e.—increased skin and proximity losses. This problem is amplified in the EV environment where relatively high excitation frequencies are involved (up to 400 Hz).

Considering the combination of issues, the ultimate answer for achieving a low-cost winding that achieves a high packing factor but does not suffer from AC losses is where a pre-formed multi-strand winding is pre-formed and then applied to a two-piece stator stack; the winding can then be easily inserted in fully open slots. However, further development is required before these approaches are ready for manufacturing.

Improvements in the stator and rotor magnetic cores may offer even greater opportunities for improving efficiency. While global efforts will surely continue to provide lamination materials that have reduced losses and better cost effectiveness, it is unlikely that any major materials breakthroughs will suddenly occur. Despite this, there may be some “low-hanging fruit” that has yet to be picked.

One idea is using different lamination materials for the stator and rotor. For the stator, the ideal material is thin, low-loss silicon steel. For the rotor, the fundamental frequency component is quite low (equal to the slip frequen-

cy), so with the exception of harmonics due to tooth and slot interactions (and harmonics due to the inverter), low-loss characteristics are not nearly as important as with the stator laminations. Then, thicker, lower-cost materials can be used where the saturation flux density is higher than for the stator. This in turn allows narrower rotor teeth that serve to increase the cage bar cross sections. This will of course lower R_2 and may make cage casting a bit easier. It is also true, however, that the economic gains may be compromised if the stator lamination centers are lost; but in cases where the “donut” holes can be used for other products, the economic penalty can even be a plus.

Another idea currently being investigated is where grain-oriented material is used—either exclusively or in combination with non-oriented materials. One design approach that might benefit from the use of oriented steel is where each lamination is replaced by several equal sectors that join together to substitute for a conventional lamination. By systematically misaligning the joining points of contacting laminations, a rigid core structure can be provided while possibly achieving improved loss and permeability characteristics. While the manufacturing-costs-per-unit frame size will surely increase, it is nevertheless possible that the reduced losses will be justified by the trade-offs discussed earlier.

How Good Can it Get?

One of the things that makes engineering exciting is the contemplation of radical, technical improvement. While it is hard to see the future, we can gain some insights based on the laws of physics. Physics tells us that we cannot make motors that are 110 percent efficient, telling us what is impossible. But, where the laws of physics do not indicate impossibility, there is always the implication of possibility. For example, with batteries, power electronics and electric motors, there are no laws setting ultimate limits on specific power.


Today we have the T-Zero and the Tesla Roadster, both of which demonstrated accelerations of under four seconds to 60 mph. Today we have the ACP-150 induction motor that boasts a measured peak-point-efficiency of 95 percent. Surely there is room for improvement.

So we ask: How good could we make batteries and motors? What are the physical limits? If we start with existing materials such as silicon, steel, copper or aluminum, what horsepower (or kW) could one expect per pound (or kg) of machine on a continuous basis? Could we beat jet engines that produce out something like six-horse-power-per-pound?

Using some of the principles presented

here—in which state-of-the-art heat transfer is combined with high speed—the results are quite surprising:

- For both induction and brushless machines (in the 20-cm-diameter class), continuous, specific torques of better than four Nm/kg should be possible in the near-term.
- Likewise intermittent, specific torques above ten Nm/kg should also be possible.
- For the same machines, peak efficiencies above 97 percent should also soon be attainable.
- And where speed is pushed to material limits, continuous power levels above 3,500 W/kg should be also be reachable in the near-term.

Fifty years ago, it seemed that induction motors were a mature technology. Today, it seems that we are just getting started. 

Wally E. Rippel received a bachelor's degree in physics from Caltech in 1968 and a master's degree in electrical engineering from Cornell University in 1970. While a sophomore at Caltech, he became interested in electric vehicles as a means for combating air pollution—which in turn led to his converting a 1959 VW bus to electric drive. During his senior year, in an attempt to focus university research on the technical problems of electric propulsion, he challenged MIT to a cross-country electric car race. The MIT students accepted and the result was the “Great Electric Car Race”—won by Caltech. Between 1976 and 1990, Rippel was a member of the technical staff at Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, where he focused on the development of batteries and electric vehicle drives based on induction motors. In 1985, he initiated a joint effort between JPL and AeroVironment for the development of a high-performance electric passenger vehicle—code named Santanna. But requested funding from General Motors was not obtained and the effort was shelved. In 1987, Rippel consulted for AeroVironment in connection with the development of a solar-powered “race vehicle” for GM—the Sunraycer. This vehicle zoomed to victory in the first Australian cross-country solar race and paved the way for AeroVironment to re-propose the Santanna development. This time, GM granted the funds and the result was the development of the Impact vehicle, which then led to the EV-1. The rest of the story can be seen in the film, “Who Killed the Electric Car?” Rippel is now with AC Propulsion, Inc., a San Dimas company he co-founded in 1992, which develops and manufactures high-performance induction motor drives for electric vehicles. He is currently working on the next-generation development of induction motors and inverters for electric vehicles. Rippel holds 26 U.S. patents with four more on the way.

