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Motivation

DELIVER vision: “Can we bring 100 years of aeronautics knowledge to the new entrepreneurs’ desktop with a design environment for emerging vertical lift vehicles?”

Present tools and methods do a pretty good job for today’s vehicles and missions. However, there is increasing interest in new classes / types of vertical-lift vehicles, improving mobility and overall utility / flexibility. Advanced electric propulsion and power systems offer the potential for reduced noise and point of use emissions, enhanced vehicle and mission capability, etc.

Assess the capabilities of methods and tools to capture these new vehicles and propulsion / power technologies.
Outline

• Introduce baseline vehicle and hybrid systems studied
• Review propulsion and energy systems
• Vehicle sizing and mission analysis tool
• Genset sizing and mission profiles
• Results
  – Mission power levels
  – Maximum mission range and number of on-demand mobility (ODM) missions, also recharge / refuel
  – Thermal loads, cooling airflow requirements
• Summary
• Next Steps
Baseline vehicle and propulsion

Urban aerial taxi (VTOL-ops)
450 lb. of passengers / luggage / cargo
+ 200 lb. pilot

Baseline propulsion system
Baseline vehicle and hybrid propulsion

Hybrid propulsion system

- Battery (resized)
- Fuel Tank
- Fueled Genset
- Power Electronics
- Electric Motor(s)
- Rotor(s)

Pilot / passengers

Battery, Power-Electronics, Genset, Fuel, Etc.
Baseline vehicle and LNG hybrid propulsion

Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) Hybrid propulsion system

Battery, Power-Electronics, Genset, Fuel, Etc.

LNG cryo-cooling (only $\eta$ and $\Delta$ fuel tank weight captured)
Impressive weight and loss reductions for Electric Motor / Electronics are occurring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology year</th>
<th>Power/weight, hp/lb. (kW/kg)</th>
<th>Electric motor η, %</th>
<th>Power Electronics η, %</th>
<th>Net η, %</th>
<th>Net Loss, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of the art</td>
<td>1.9 (3.1)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 year</td>
<td>3.4 (5.6)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 year</td>
<td>4.9 (8.0)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-cryogenic**

*Power-to-weight includes electric motor (3,8,16 hp/lb.) + power electronics (5,6,7 hp/lb.)*

“Some 15 year” goals are being demonstrated today

**Reduced losses = less thermal management (less weight)**

* Dever, T.P.; Duffy, K.P.; Provenza, A.J.; Loyselle, P.L.; Choi, B.B.; Morrison, C.R.; and Lowe, A.M.

Electric motors significantly better than fueled systems in efficiency and power to weight
BUT efficiency doesn’t overcome deficiencies in energy storage (critical for range / endurance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine type</th>
<th>Power / weight, hp/lb. (kW/kg)</th>
<th>η, %</th>
<th>Fuel, energy density, MJ/kg (Wh/kg)</th>
<th>Net energy density, MJ/kg (Wh/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all-electric, SOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 year</td>
<td>3.4 (5.6)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.75 (486)</td>
<td>1.63 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 year</td>
<td>4.9 (8.0)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.15 (875)</td>
<td>3.06 (850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel cycle, SOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 year</td>
<td>1.06 (1.8)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Diesel, 43.0 (12,000)</td>
<td>15.9 (4,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 year</td>
<td>1.59 (2.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For electric systems, “Fuel” is lithium battery, cell only average of lithium ion and sulfur technologies

Electric system power to weight for electric motor reported at 3, 8, and 16 hp/lb. and power electronics at 5, 6, and 7 hp/lb. for state of the art (SOA), 15 and 30 year technology assumptions (from Dever).

Only 15 year technology levels reported for this study
Analysis Tool: NASA Design and Analysis of Rotorcraft (NDARC)

Overall Program Layout

Propulsion / energy models
Vehicle sizing (150 nmi) maximum range and ODM (20 or 50 nmi) mission profile

Fueled genset sized at 150, 175, and 200 hp (engine hp, not generated electric power)

1) 5 min. idle, Takeoff + 2 min. hover (OGE)
2) Climb to cruise at maximum power, range credited
3) Cruise at \(V_{br}\) or \(V_{be}\) at 2,000 ft, ISA
4) Descent not modeled
5) 2 min. hover (OGE) + landing (10% fuel & energy reserve)

ODM = on demand mobility
OGE = out of ground effect
Results
Power requirements over the mission

Max power requirement set by hover

Cruise power levels significantly less

*Climb power level can be lower (only limited to hover power)*

1) 5 min. idle, Takeoff + 2 min. hover (OGE)

2) Climb to cruise altitude at MCP, Range credit

3) Cruise at $V_{br}$ or $V_{be}$ at 2,000 ft, ISA

4) Descent not modeled

5) 2 min. hover (OGE) + landing (10% fuel & energy reserve)
Vehicle Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter, Vehicle → Parameter ↓</th>
<th>All-Electric Baseline</th>
<th>150 hp conventional cooled hybrid</th>
<th>200 hp cryo-cooling assisted hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design gross weight (DGW), lb. (kg)</td>
<td>3,676 (1,671)</td>
<td>3,678 (1,672)</td>
<td>3,673 (1,669)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty weight, lb. (kg)</td>
<td>3,021 (1,373)</td>
<td>2,813 (1,279)</td>
<td>2,788 (1,267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal fuel weight, lb. (kg), % DGW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210 (95), 6%</td>
<td>230 (105), 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery + BMS weight, lb. (kg), % DGW</td>
<td>919 (418), 25%</td>
<td>498 (226), 13.5%</td>
<td>437 (199), 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genset Weight, lb. (kg), % DGW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211 (96), 6%</td>
<td>256 (116), 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel volume, gallon, (l)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.7 (116)</td>
<td>89.1 (337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery volume, gallon, (l)</td>
<td>80.4 (304)</td>
<td>43.6 (165)</td>
<td>38.3 (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Energy, MJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>4,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery energy, MJ</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 15 year technology: Genset size+fuel trades well for weight and energy versus battery (1.75 MJ/kg, 486 w-h/kg)
- Will have to check LNG fuel tank volume
## Hybrid system significantly improves max range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle→</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Conventionally-cooled hybrid</th>
<th>Cryogenically cooled hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150 hp</td>
<td>175 hp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150 hp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maximum range missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All $V_{br}$, nmi</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>298*</th>
<th>460*</th>
<th>496</th>
<th>378*</th>
<th>530*</th>
<th>580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mix of $V_{br}$ and $V_{be}$, nmi</td>
<td>122 (all $V_{be}$)</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Battery energy limited range

Hybrid systems increased max range by 2 to 4 times (hydrocarbon energy density)

Larger genset improved range (reduced battery weight, more fuel, more mission at best range speed)
### Hybrid system enables more ODM missions (before recharge / refuel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle→</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Conventionally-cooled hybrid</th>
<th>Cryogenically cooled hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 hp</td>
<td>175 hp</td>
<td>200 hp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 hp</td>
<td>175 hp</td>
<td>200 hp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multiple ODM missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>6.9</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>7.8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of 20 nmi missions (17 min.)</td>
<td>7 ‡</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold time, minutes †</td>
<td>10 ‡</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Time on ground between ODM missions to self-recharge battery to full
‡ No self-recharge capability, 3C / 500 kW charger required (cooling?)

Hybrid systems significantly increased number of possible ODM missions before recharge / refuel.

Hybrid genset self-recharge takes longer than “fastest” electric recharge
Hybrid genset thermal loads dominate (where present)

Battery thermal loads similar over different configurations

Power electronics load fairly minimal, cryo cooling reduces it further
Thermal requirements  
(alt=0, ISA and alt=5k-ft, ISA+20°C/36°F)

Hover cooling airflow, ft^3/minute)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Battery</th>
<th>Genset</th>
<th>Power Electronics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0, ISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5k-ft, ISA+20°C/36°F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5k-ft altitude, hot day increases volumetric airflow rate

Genset cooling flows still dominate

Greater airflow increase for battery, lower maximum use temperature

Climb results similar (similar power levels, compensating effects of temperature and density)
Hybrid genset thermal loads dominate (where present)

Battery thermal load is $\alpha I^2R$, drops by order of magnitude from hover / climb

Battery and power electronic thermal loads fairly minimal
Thermal requirements (alt=0, ISA and alt=5k-ft, ISA+20°C/36°F)

Cruise cooling airflow, ft^3/minute)

5k-ft altitude gain and hot day increases volumetric airflow rate

Genset cooling flow still dominates, minimal change from hover / climb results because genset operation at constant power (turbocharged diesel)

Battery airflow change similar to previous, but much smaller totals (battery discharge rate is < 1C), order of magnitude smaller than hover / climb
Summary

• Hybrid systems with energy-dense hydrocarbon fuels can significantly increase maximum range or number of shorter range missions vehicle can achieve. (Genset size, figure of merit?)
• Vehicles with hybrid system can self-recharge battery, but requires more time than all-electric (infrastructure)
• LNG cryo-cooling improves performance (even before further design efforts for weight, volume, drag of cooling systems - TBD)
• Hybrid systems generate a lot of waste heat that must be removed
• Battery and power electronics heat seems to be hover / climb dominated. Although fast charging is another high-heat condition. (Active cooling or design / infrastructure consideration.)
• NDARC design tools appears capable of modeling vehicle, mission and systems, although need to develop propulsion and power systems models outside of NDARC.
Next Steps

• Perform more detailed layout / analysis for conventionally and LNG cryo-cooled gensets.
  – Check if bulk sizing parameters capture real system considerations (more / how detailed)
  – Develop validated models (although data may be lacking)
  – Document process, methods, etc. for others to use (and build upon). DELIVER ends with FY17, unsure who might pick up work, Revolutionary Vertical Lift Technology project?
    – Other cycles? (Fuel cells, recuperative gas turbines, ?)

• Further tool development
  – Methods / tools to automate the process
  – Include in NDARC directly or through new OpenMDAO framework (also in development)
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## Vehicle Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle →</th>
<th>All-Electric Baseline</th>
<th>150 hp conventional cooled hybrid</th>
<th>200 hp cryo-cooling assisted hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design gross weight (DGW), lb. (kg)</td>
<td>3,676 (1,671)</td>
<td>3,678 (1,672)</td>
<td>3,673 (1,669)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk loading / wing loading, lb./ft^2</td>
<td>10 / 50</td>
<td>10 / 50</td>
<td>10 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty weight, lb. (kg)</td>
<td>3,021 (1,373)</td>
<td>2,813 (1,279)</td>
<td>2,788 (1,267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal fuel weight, lb. (kg), %DGW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210 (95), 6%</td>
<td>230 (105), 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery+BMS weight, lb. (kg), %DGW</td>
<td>919 (418), 25%</td>
<td>498 (226), 13.5%</td>
<td>437 (199), 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genset Weight, lb. (kg), %DGW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211 (96), 6%</td>
<td>256 (116), 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel volume, gallon, (l)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.7 (116)</td>
<td>89.1 (337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery volume, gallon, (l)</td>
<td>80.4 (304)</td>
<td>43.6 (165)</td>
<td>38.3 (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Energy, MJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>4,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery energy, MJ</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea level max rated power, hp (kW)</td>
<td>578 (431)</td>
<td>578 (431)</td>
<td>578 (431)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion engines and power electronics weight, lb. (kg), %DGW</td>
<td>307.3 (140), 8%</td>
<td>310 (141), 8%</td>
<td>312 (141), 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rotor area variation → hover efficiency / effectiveness (& hover power)

For similar vehicle size and weight, tiltrotor and VTOL require 2-3x hover power than single main rotor helicopter.
END