

Innovation for Our Energy Future

Energy Storage System Considerations for Grid-Charged Hybrid Electric Vehicles

presented at IEEE Vehicular Power and Propulsion Conference by Tony Markel and Andrew Simpson September 8, 2005





Disclaimer and Government License

This work has been authored by Midwest Research Institute (MRI) under Contract No. DE-AC36-99GO10337 with the U.S. Department of Energy (the "DOE"). The United States Government (the "Government") retains and the publisher, by accepting the work for publication, acknowledges that the Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this work, or allow others to do so, for Government purposes.

Neither MRI, the DOE, the Government, nor any other agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe any privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of the authors and/or presenters expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of MRI, the DOE, the Government, or any agency thereof.



Overview

- Study objectives
- Case study: plug-in HEV energy storage requirements and options for a mid-sized sedan
- Battery/engine sizing tradeoffs
- Conclusion



Motivation for this Study

 Traditional ZEV-range concept for plug-in HEV's requires ESS capable of high energy storage AND power capability = bigger, more-expensive battery

(high power, high energy, low annualized $cost^* \rightarrow pick$ any 2) (high power, high energy, low volume $\rightarrow pick$ any 2)

- Other HEV control strategy concepts (e.g. electric-assist) can still provide net-discharge, but with reduced battery power requirements.
 - This might facilitate the use of cheaper and/or smaller batteries

* Annualized cost = battery replacement cost / lifetime



Purpose of this Study

1. Calculate ESS power and energy requirements for plug-in HEV's with different control strategies

2. Consider implications for rest of system (in particular, engine efficiency and fuel economy)

Some Definitions

Degree of Hybridization (DOH):

 $DOH = \frac{battery \ / \ motor \ (kW)}{battery \ / \ motor \ (kW) + engine \ / \ generator \ (kW)}$

Power-to-Energy Ratio (P2E):

$$P2E\left(\frac{1}{h}\right) = \frac{power(kW)}{energy(kWh^{*})} = \frac{specific power\left(\frac{W}{kg}\right)}{specific energy\left(\frac{Wh^{*}}{kg}\right)} = \frac{power density\left(\frac{W}{L}\right)}{energy density\left(\frac{Wh^{*}}{L}\right)}$$

 relates suitability of energy storage to power events with different timescales * useable Wh

Case Study – Vehicle Specifications

Mid-size car from EPRI study:

- $C_D A = 0.71 m^2$
- C_{RR} = 0.008
- Pacc = 500W
- Test mass ≈ 1700kg

Peak motive power ≈ 115 kW

Continuous power requirement $\approx 45 \text{kW}$

- Top speed @ 90mph
- 7.2% gradeability @ 50mph

Electric energy consumption \approx 300Wh/mile



Case Study – Battery Specifications

	1	No ICE help)	With ICE help (45kW)			
	Power (kW)	Energy (kWh)	P2E (1/h)	Power (kW)	Energy (kWh)	P2E (1/h)	
HEV10	115	3	38.3	70	3	23.3	
HEV20	115	6	19.2	70	6	11.7	
HEV60	115	18	6.4	70	18	3.9	



ESS Technology Comparison - P/E Ratios



Battery Products for Comparison

Battery	Wh/kg	Wh/L	W/kg	W/L	Useable SOC	P2E	
High Energy (for EVs)							
SAFT VLE 45 cell	149	313	664	1392	~ 80%	5.6	Match
Cobasys 9500 module	60	155	250	650	~ 80%	5.2	$\int with HEV60$
Mid Range (for plugHEVs?)							
SAFT VLM 27 cell	124	252	987	2000	~ 80%	9.9	Match
Cobasys 4500 module	45	87	605	1180	~ 80%	16.8	$\int with HEV20$
High Power (for HEVs)							
SAFT VLP 20 cell	89	187	1413	2973	< 20%	>79	
Cobasys 1000 module	43	83	1100	2200	< 20%	>128	

NREL National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Battery/Engine Sizing Tradeoffs

45kW is only a lower constraint, engine can be larger than this.
→ This allows a smaller battery to be used...HEV20 example:

Battery	Total Power (kW)	Battery Energy (kWh)	Battery Mass (kg)	Battery Volume (L)	Battery Power (kW)	Engine Power (kW)			
Lithium-Ion									
SAFT VLM 27 cell	115	6.0	61	30	60	55			
SAFT VLE 45 cell	115	6.0	50	24	33	82			
Nickel-Metal-Hydride									
Cobasys 4500 module	115	6.0	167	86	101	45			
Cobasys 9500 module	115	6.0	125	49	31	84			



P/E = 14









P/E = 4

Battery/Engine Sizing Tradeoffs



1) Lower engine efficiency!



Battery/Engine Sizing Tradeoffs

2) Sacrificed all-electric operation and regenerative braking





Conclusions

- P2E ratios for existing high-energy and midrange battery products match with P2E requirements for plug-in HEVs
 - However, mid-range batteries may be bigger, more expensive due to simultaneous power and energy requirements
 - Note that high-value V2G services (i.e. regulation events) have high P/E ratios – does this affect ESS requirements?
 - Do dual-source ultracaps & EV batteries make a good alternative to mid-range batteries?

Conclusions (cont.)

- Engine size (power) can be increased to facilitate the use of smaller batteries with lower P2E ratios (i.e. EV types)
 - However, this incurs the cost of:
 - Reduced engine efficiency
 - Sacrificed all-electric capability and maybe some loss of regenerative braking
 - Potential reduction in vehicle fuel economy during both charge-depleting and –sustaining operation
 - Reduced mass/volume of ESS & motor must be traded against increased mass/volume of ICE
 - These issues should be explored further with dynamic simulation (including consideration of control strategy practicalities)

