

# UAM Hybrid Power System


## Final Report – Team 9

MECH 460: Team Project, Conceive and Design

Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering

Queen's University

Following the professional engineering practice, we bear the burden of proof for original work. We have read the Policy on Academic Integrity posted on the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science web site [engineering.queensu.ca/policy/Honesty](http://engineering.queensu.ca/policy/Honesty) and confirm that this work is in accordance with the policy.

 Date: December 6, 2021

Luke Ulsifer

 Date: December 6, 2021


Charlie Heinzl

 Date: December 6, 2021

Vincent Halis

 Date: December 6, 2021

Alex Parks

 Date: December 6, 2021

Ben Langlois

---

Based on the information provided to me by the Team, they have satisfactorily completed both the technical work and the deliverables for their project.

 Date: Dec 6, 2021

Professor Kim

## Executive Summary

Urban populations are quickly outgrowing existing intracity transportation infrastructure. To meet intracity travel demands, new technology must be developed to alleviate congested ground transportation. Urban Air Mobility (UAM) vehicles are increasingly becoming popular in the aviation industry, due to their small form factor and suitability for short intracity flights and utilization of the relatively empty airspace above cities. UAM vehicles take advantage of vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) strategy. The Structural and Multidisciplinary System Design (SMSD) team at Queen's University has been working on a UAM vehicle and has requested the design of a hybrid power system. The vehicle must have VTOL capabilities and the ability to complete a 150 km trip while travelling at least 110 km/h, with a desired power system weight of 700 kg or less. The hybrid power system to be developed for the UAM vehicle will consist of a gas turbogenerator, batteries, AC electric motors, and propellers.

To determine an accurate estimate of the power requirements needed for a 150 km trip, a mission simulation was created in Python. The mission simulation is based upon first principles, utilizing free body diagrams and power equations to determine the power output required during the entire trip. This simulation segmented the flight into 3 main sections: vertical takeoff, horizontal cruise, and vertical landing. By defining velocity profiles from assumed vehicle top speeds and vehicle accelerations, the forces and thus power requirements at each timestep in the flight simulation were determined. To find the forces acting on the aircraft, the software package OpenVSP was used to determine lift and drag coefficients. It was determined that a cruise speed of 264 km/h would generate a lift force equal to gravity, allowing the VTOL propellers to be completely turned off during cruise. Based on this cruise speed, the trip can be completed in just under 38 minutes. The simulation output resulted in a peak power for the VTOL motors of 560 kW, a peak power for the forward motors of 107 kW, and a total power consumption of 94.3 kWh. There are 8 VTOL motors and 2 forward motors. Using the simulation outputs, potential designs were suggested that utilize 350 kW, 250 kW and 150 kW turbogenerators, respectively. The turbogenerator operates at a constant power output to maximize efficiency, and the lithium-ion batteries cover fluctuations in power output. The resulting degrees of hybridization, power system weight, and battery power consumption for each initial design option are summarized in Table 6.

After presenting these findings to the client, the 250 kW turbogenerator design was chosen. The final design includes three different power strategies that can be implemented on the same aircraft. The first option had the turbogenerator on for the entire flight and fully recharged the batteries during the 33-minute cruise. The second design does not consider recharging and leaves the turbogenerator on for the entire flight. The final power strategy option would turn the turbogenerator off for the cruise phase of flight to reduce emission and utilize surplus battery capacity. The results of these three power strategies are summarized in Table 10. These power strategy options highlight the tradeoffs between downtime, degree of hybridization, and fuel consumption. The location of refueling stations, trip demand, and the life cycle of vehicle components must be considered when choosing a strategy, which is why the three options were presented to allow the client greater flexibility. Although three options are being presented, the option being recommended has a degree of hybridization (defined as  $\text{battery energy} / [\text{battery} + \text{fuel energy}]$ ) of 17.8%, a power system mass of 683 kg and requires less than 14 minutes of downtime between flights for charging and refueling.

## Table of Contents

1. Background and Introduction .....	1
2. Scope.....	2
3. Research Summary .....	3
Batteries.....	3
Turbogenerator.....	3
Electric Motors.....	4
Propellers .....	5
Vehicle Layout and Stability Considerations.....	6
4. Customer Requirements and Engineering Specifications .....	6
Customer Requirements .....	6
Engineering Specifications .....	7
5. Component Selection.....	9
Batteries.....	9
Turbogenerator.....	10
Electric Motors.....	11
Propellers .....	11
6. Lift and Drag.....	12
7. Simulation .....	13
Formulation and Governing Equations.....	13
Simulation Assumptions .....	17
Turbogenerator Sizing.....	17
Battery Pack Sizing .....	18
Battery Recharging.....	20
8. Simulation Results.....	20
Sensitivity Analysis .....	23
Environmental Considerations of Simulation .....	24
9. Aircraft Stability Analysis .....	25
10. Final Design.....	26
Power Strategy.....	26
Bill of Materials .....	27
Environmental Impact.....	29
Vehicle Comparison .....	29
Cost Analysis .....	30
Final Recommendation .....	31
11. Future Work .....	31
12. Conclusion.....	32
Appendix A – QFD .....	35
Appendix B – Weighted Evaluation Matrices .....	36

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Schematic diagram of a series hybrid power system. ....	1
Figure 2: Upper left: TF-2.0 Lift + Push [1]. Lower left: SureFly multirotor [2]. Right: VA-X4 air taxi [3]. ....	2
Figure 3: Left, standard aircraft propeller configurations, from [9]. Right, a VTOL concept with wing embedded propellers.....	5
Figure 4: Dimensions of the fuselage, with the red area representing the area where no components can be placed.....	6
Figure 5: Coefficients of the moment about the aerodynamic center, lift, and total drag versus angle of attack. ....	13
Figure 6: Example velocity profile for the forward velocity of the aircraft over the mission duration.....	15
Figure 7: Forces acting on the aircraft at each stage of flight. ....	15
Figure 8: Schematic diagram of the battery pack and electric motors.....	19
Figure 9: Flight simulation power usage per propellor over duration of the flight.....	21
Figure 10: (Left) Power versus DOH. (Right) Energy efficiency for the three different options. ....	22
Figure 11: Sensitivity analysis of mission parameters on total energy consumption.....	23
Figure 12: (Left) Example AOA vs. Moment Coefficient plot found using VSPAERO. (Right) Standard aircraft coordinate system.....	25
Figure 13: Final power system component layout and propeller placement.....	28

## List of Tables

Table 1: Customer requirements with weighting and justification. ....	7
Table 2: Engineering specifications with target and justification for the target. ....	8
Table 3: Pseudo code for the velocity profile algorithm with explanatory text. ....	14
Table 4: Pseudo code for the power calculations with explanatory text. ....	16
Table 5: Mission parameters and simulation output from Python simulation.....	20
Table 6: Results from the 3 design options chosen with the two different power strategies. ....	22
Table 7: Charging information for the different design options and power strategies.....	23
Table 8: CO2 Emissions for Three Design Options.....	24
Table 9: Comparison of various aerodynamic stability parameters given varying battery positions within the aircraft .....	26
Table 10: Results for the 3 different power strategies presented for the 250 kW turbogenerator design. ....	27
Table 11: Bill of materials for the final design. ....	28
Table 12: CO2 Emissions for three 250 kW Power Strategies.....	29
Table 13: Comparison of emissions and trip times of similar vehicles the UAM aircraft.....	30
Table 14: Operation cost for three design options.....	30
Table 15: Weighted evaluation matrix for the 3 different battery options.....	36
Table 16: Weighted evaluation matrix for the 3 different electric motors. ....	36
Table 17: Weighted evaluation matrix for the 3 different VTOL propellor configurations. ....	36