A comparative study between optimal metal and composite rotors for flywheel energy storage systems

V. Kale^a, M. Secanell^{a,*}

^aEnergy Systems Design Laboratory, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

Abstract

Most recent research on flywheel rotors has focused on high-speed composite rotors as the storage element of the flywheel energy storage system (FESS). Literature research indicates that this is primarily due to the high specific energy of composites compared to metals. However, a quantitative comparison of the performance of flywheels made from these materials has not been conducted. This paper aims to answer the question - 'Are composite flywheels better suited for energy storage than metal flywheels?'. This study uses three different performance indices: kinetic energy; specific energy; and, energy per cost, to compare the corresponding rotor designs. A plain-stress, linear elastic mathematical model of the flywheel rotor described by Krack et al. [1] is used for analysis. Different optimization formulations corresponding to performance indices chosen based on the FESS application are then solved to study optimal FESS designs. The study indicates that for applications where the energy-percost is to be maximized, metals are superior to composite rotor materials. On a total energy basis, metals and composites are on par with each other. Composite rotors are however, superior for applications requiring high specific energy. A hybrid rotor, with a metallic energy storage element and a thin composite burst-rim, is also optimally designed and found to be a viable solution, because it offers the cost benefit of metal rotors, as well as the burst-safety provided by

 $Preprint \ submitted \ to \ Renewable \ {\ensuremath{\mathcal C}}\ Sustainable \ Energy \ Reviews$

^{*}Corresponding author.

Email address: secanell@ualberta.ca (M. Secanell)

composites.

Keywords: flywheel energy storage, optimization, rotor materials, kinetic energy, specific energy, energy per cost

1. Introduction

In order to improve the reliability and robustness of the grid, short duration energy storage is of critical importance to electric utilities. Flywheels have become a feasible storage choice for typical short duration applications, such as frequency regulation [2], voltage leveling [3] and fault ride-through support [4] of intermittent sources like wind and solar farms [5]. As the integration of intermittent renewable resources in the grid continues, a proportional increase in energy storage capacity will be required in order to comply with existing and future grid codes for safety, reliability and profitability. The increasing use of

¹⁰ flywheel energy storage systems has resulted in a subsequent resurgence of research in the area of flywheel analysis and optimization in order to achieve more reliable and cost effective designs.

Some flywheel specifications for prototype storage installations across the world are listed in Table 1. The table depicts the type of flywheel rotor, power capacity, energy storage, mass, speed, self-discharge and round-trip efficiency of various manufactured flywheels. These flywheels have been installed for a variety of applications, ranging from frequency regulation, voltage support and resilience, which need short duration storage (in minutes or seconds), to reserve

²⁰ capacity, which needs longer duration storage (in hours). Some manufacturers have chosen to use composite rotors, while others use metal rotors. Thus, it is necessary to understand all the factors that may affect the choice of rotor material, and consequently, the optimal design and performance of the storage system.

The performance of a flywheel energy storage system (FESS) can be improved

Flywheel model	Rotor type	Power Capacity	Energy Storage	Mass	Specific Energy	Speed	Self-discharge	η	Ref
		kW	kWh	kg	Wh/kg	rpm	W	%	
Beacon Power, LLC (BP400)	Carbon composite	100	25	1133	22.06	8000-16000	4500	85	[6]
LEVISYS	Carbon composite	10-40	10	-	-	-	- ^a	-	[7]
Stornetic GmBH (EnWheel)	Carbon composite	22-80	3.6	-	-	$<\!45000$	-	-	[8]
Flywheel Energy Systems Inc.	Composite	50	0.75	135	5.55	15500-31000	500-1000	86	
Powerthru / Pentadyne	Carbon composite	190	0.528	590	0.89	30000-53000	250-300	-	[9]
Calnetix (VDS-XE)	4340 Aerospace steel	300	1.11	821	1.35	24500 - 36750	-	-	[10]
Amber Kinetcis (M32)	Low-carbon Steel	8	32	2268	14.10	$<\!8500$	65	88	[11]
Temporal Power	Steel	100-500	50	3500	14.28	$<\!10000$	500	85	[12]
ActivePower	Steel	50-250	0.958	272	3.55	7700	2500	-	[13]
ABB (PowerStore)	Steel	100-1500	5	2900	1.72	1800-3600	12000	-	[14]
Piller	-	2400	5.833	-	-	1500-3600	-	-	[15]
Energiestro	Concrete	5	5 kWh	1700	2.94	-	-	-	[16]

Table 1: Flywheel storage solutions deployed at utility scale applications

^aThree weeks standby time

by operating it at high speeds, by choosing high strength materials, and by optimizing the shape and dimensions of the flywheel rotor [17]. The use of multiple-rim composite rotors can further increase the energy content, by optimizing the number of composite rims, the sequence of materials used in the rims, the amount of interference between the rims, and their relative thickness [17], [18]. The properties of composite materials, such as high strength in the fibre direction, low density, and flexibility in tailoring of material properties make them a promising choice of rotor material. On the other hand, metal flywheels

- ³⁵ have advantages such as ease of manufacturing and lower cost. Standby losses occurring in FESS components, such as the bearings and electrical machine, scale with the speed of operation, thus the decreased operational speed in metal flywheels also reduces losses occurring in the system.
- ⁴⁰ Researchers have predominantly used the specific energy as a performance measure to compare flywheel designs. Genta [18] compared flywheel materials using their specific energy at burst speeds, which is given by the relation:

$$e = \frac{E}{m} = K\left(\frac{\sigma_u}{\rho}\right) \tag{1}$$

where e is the specific energy, E is the total energy, m is the mass of the rotor, σ_u is the ultimate strength and ρ is the density of the material. The shape factor K depends mainly on the flywheel geometry. Using equation (1), the specific strengths of some isotropic materials, Carbon Steel (Fe 34), Aluminium Alloy 2024, Titanium Alloy and Maraging Steel were found to be 12, 46, 63 and 66 Wh/kg respectively, and those of composites such as unidirectional Glass, Kevlar and Graphite reinforced plastics were 180, 230 and 240

⁵⁰ Wh/kg respectively. This indicated that the theoretical maximum specific energy of composites was greater than that of metals, by a factor of 4-5 on average.

As described by Genta, however, there are some precautions to be taken when using this method to compute the specific energy. When orthotropic materials such as composites are used to fabricate flywheel rotors, the ultimate strength,

- such as composites are used to fabricate flywheel rotors, the ultimate strength, σ_u , must be indicative of the failure mode of the composite rotor. Also, rotor designs with shape factors > 0.5 have bi-directional stress distributions, which cannot be handled by filament wound composite rotors with unidirectional laminates, since their tensile strengths transverse to the fiber direction (i.e., in the
- radial direction) are very low. Thus, designs with shape factors ≤ 0.5 must be chosen, or an alternative manufacturing method must be used, which would result in a multi-directional composite, with a better transverse tensile strength, albeit a lower hoop strength. Metal rotors, on the other hand, can be fabricated to have high shape factors, leading to improved performance. Thus, the shape
- ⁶⁵ factor depends on the choice of rotor material.

Liu et al. [19] estimated the theoretical maximum energy density of different flywheel rotors using (1), and found the specific energy of Maraging steel, Kevlar and T700-Graphite fiber composite flywheels to be 47, 370 and 545 Wh/kg re-

⁷⁰ spectively, when using a fixed shape factor of 0.5, corresponding to a rotor of constant thickness. The flywheel shape used for this comparison is unfavorable for metal rotors, since they can be manufactured with complex shapes to improve the shape factor K. Bitterly et al. [20], calculated the specific energy of the flywheel using the relation:

$$e = 1.57E - 5\left(\frac{\sigma_{\theta}}{\rho}\right)\xi_{Stress}\xi_{Design} \tag{2}$$

- ⁷⁵ where, σ_{θ} is the hoop stress, ρ is the material density, ξ_{Stress} and ξ_{Design} are safety factors for stress and design. They reported the theoretical maximum energy density e^{max} of 4340-Steel and Kevlar-49 flywheels to be 31.7 and 350 Wh/kg, using (2), with safety factors of 100% to estimate the energy density. Neither of these methods accounted for the different failure modes in compos-
- ites, and thus could not be used to reliably compare the specific energy of metal and composite rotors.

Arnold et al. [17] modified the shape factor to account for material anisotropy and stress-state multiaxiality and compared the specific energy of a slightly ⁸⁵ anisotropic and a strongly anisotropic material using the original and modified shape factors. They found that, for the strongly anisotropic material with a volume fraction of 40%, the calculated specific energy varied from 327.86 to 113.74 and to 115.36 Wh/kg when using the original 'hoop only', a modified 'radialonly' and 'multi-axial' shape factors respectively. Thus, the use of multi-axial

- ⁹⁰ shape factors could account for the geometry and operating conditions of the rotor more accurately. Also, this study showed that the shape factor of the type used in previous literature resulted in an over-prediction of the specific energy in the case of anisotropic materials such as composites.
- ⁹⁵ The data from Table 1 indicates that there is a balanced mix of composite and metal flywheels currently being manufactured, despite evidence from previously published work that the specific energy of composites is much higher than that of metals. This leads to the following two hypotheses, which will be investigated in this paper.

100

105

The first hypothesis is that the specific energy is not the only performance index which is important while selecting the rotor material, and that there might be other factors influencing the choice of materials during the design process. In utility or grid applications, the total energy and cost might be the most important performance indices; whereas, in mobile applications, the weight or space occupied by the FESS might be a major constraint, and thus the specific energy or energy density might be the most important performance indices. There is, therefore, a need to compare optimal flywheel designs based on different criteria, depending on the application. Krack et al. [21], [22] optimized the energy

per cost of fixed volume multi-rim composite annular disk-type flywheels, by varying the operating speed and relative thickness of the composite rims, using normalized costs of rotor materials. This approach can be extended to the current work to select the best rotor materials for the optimal flywheel for the application.

115

The second hypothesis is that the use of a simple geometric shape factor to estimate the specific energy of a material might not accurately predict the specific energy of a rotor made of that material, especially when anisotropic materials are used. Thus, a mathematical model of the rotor is needed, which will account for material anisotropy and failure modes. When this model is used to optimize the flywheel, a more realistic value of the specific energy of the rotor can be obtained, which can then be used to choose the appropriate rotor material. An additional advantage of using an optimization formulation to determine the performance of the rotor materials is that, practical constraints other than material failure can also be checked. For example, constraints on the radial tensile stresses at the interface of multi-rim press-fitted composite rotors ensure that the composite rims do not detach due to differences in the radial expansion of the various rims.

- This paper proposes to use an optimal flywheel rotor to compare and select rotor materials. The 1-D plane-stress axisymmetric flywheel model, proposed by Krack et al. [1] is used for the analysis. Several optimization formulations consisting of various configurations of metal and composite rotors are studied. For multiple-rim flywheels, additional interference constraints are applied, to
- ensure that there is no physical detachment of the rims. Comparing the optimal rotors ensures that the theoretical limits of the rotor material are reached,

while also ensuring a feasible rotor design, without other failures such as detachment of press-fitted rims from the hub. Optimization objectives, such as total kinetic energy, energy per cost and specific energy are used to compare the

¹⁴⁰ rotors and materials. A mesh adaptive direct search (MADS) algorithm is used to solve the optimization problem, instead of the hybrid and multi-start methods employed in [1]. The MADS algorithm is a local, gradient-free method, hence it converges faster than global methods, while being more reliable than gradient-based methods.

145

150

In Section 2, the analytical model of the flywheel is described. This model calculates the kinetic energy, stresses and deformations in the flywheel rotor at a given speed. Section 3 presents the optimization formulations, with constraints imposed on the flywheel rotor model developed in the previous section. Objectives such as kinetic energy, specific energy and energy per cost are optimized by varying the operating speed, number of rims, rim materials and relative thickness of the rims. Constraints on the material failure and rim detachment ensure that there is no failure in the flywheel. Finally, in Sections 4 and 5, the

¹⁵⁵ 2. Flywheel Structural Model

The flywheel mathematical model proposed by Krack et al. [1] is used in this study. A brief overview of the model is provided below. The stored energy of the flywheel is given by

results and conclusions drawn from the studies conducted so far are presented.

$$E = \frac{1}{2}I\omega^2 = \frac{1}{2}\rho\pi h\omega^2 \sum_{j=1}^n [(r_o^j)^4 - (r_i^j)^4]$$
(3)

where ω is the rotational speed, ρ is the density, h is the constant rotor height, n is the number of rotor rims and r_o^j , r_i^j are the outer and inner radii of the j^{th} rim. A linear elastic model is used to determine the developed stresses in the rotor, based on the assumptions of plane stress, and axisymmetric rotation. Cylindrical coordinates are used for convenience.

2.1. Governing equations

165

The flywheel stresses can be found by solving Euler's equation of balance of linear momentum for a body,

$$\nabla \underline{\sigma} + \rho \underline{b} = \rho \underline{a} \tag{4}$$

where $\underline{\sigma}$ is the Cauchy stress tensor, \underline{b} is the vector of body forces and \underline{a} is the linear acceleration. The strain-displacement relation for small deformations is used, along with a linear stress-strain relation, given by Hooke's law.

$$\underline{\underline{\epsilon}} = \frac{1}{2} [\nabla \underline{\underline{u}} + (\nabla \underline{\underline{u}})^T] \tag{5}$$

170

$$\underline{\underline{\sigma}} = \underline{\underline{Q}\underline{\epsilon}}_{\underline{\underline{\Xi}}} \tag{6}$$

where $\underline{\underline{\epsilon}}$ is the strain tensor, $\underline{\underline{u}}$ is the displacement vector and $\underline{\underline{Q}}$ is the stiffness tensor. The above relations are expressed in the cylindrical coordinate system, and the assumptions of plane stress and axisymmetry are used to obtain the second order equation:

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{Q_{11}}{Q_{33}} \frac{u_r}{r^2} = -\frac{\rho \omega^2}{Q_{33}} r \tag{7}$$

Here, u_r is the radial displacement, Q_{11}, Q_{33} are stiffness matrix components, ω is the operating speed and ρ is the density of the material. The derivation and solution of this equation can be found in [1].

2.2. Boundary conditions

The radial stresses at the interface of the hub and the rotor, or between rims for multi-rim rotors, are continuous. Thus, the following compatibility condition is applied on the radial stresses at the interfaces:

$$\sigma_{r_i}^{j+1} = \sigma_{r_o}^j \tag{8}$$

where j = 1, 2, ..., (n - 1)

The radial displacements are continuous, but with an interference δ^{j} , which

results from the press-fitting of the rims during assembly. This results in the displacement related compatibility condition:

$$u_{r_i}^{j+1} = u_{r_o}^j + \delta^j \tag{9}$$

where j = 1, 2, ..., (n - 1)

The stresses at the rotor outer surface are assumed to be 0, and the stresses due to the hub, at the inner surface of the rotor, can be expressed using the model from [21]. Thus, the boundary conditions which are applied on the stresses are:

$$\sigma_{r_i}^1 = p_i = \frac{\rho_{hub}\omega^2(r_i^3 - r_{hub}^3)}{3r_i}$$
(10)

$$\sigma_{r_o}^{Nrim} = 0 \tag{11}$$

2.3. Implementation

190

The above model is implemented and solved in Python. The numpy.linalg.solve solver, which utilizes the LAPACK routine 'dgesv', is used. The average sim-¹⁹⁵ ulation time for the analysis model is < 10 ms, on a 64-bit 4-core, 3.3 GHz processor.

3. Optimization problem

3.1. Formulation

From the discussion in Section 1 it is clear that there is a need to formulate the optimization problem in a way that allows a meaningful comparison of the rotor materials. This means that the optimization formulation needs to have enough flexibility to find the true optimal rotor that can be made using any type of material. For example, the optimal composite rotor might have multiple thin rings press fitted together to form a high speed composite rotor, whereas the optimal metal rotor might be a single thick disk rotating at much lower speeds. Also, the performance index used to compare the optimal rotor materials might In order to compare the energy content of flywheel rotors made of different ²¹⁰ materials, a rotor of the type shown in Figure 1 is used, where the rotor height is assumed to be constant, since a thick rotor would violate the plane-stress assumption and necessitate the use of FEA simulations. The optimization problem can thus be formulated as:

max: $f(\mathbf{x})$

where the objective $f(\mathbf{x})$ may be one of the following:

 $\frac{1}{2}I\omega^2, \quad \text{kinetic energy } (KE)$ $\frac{KE}{Cost}, \quad \text{energy per cost}$ $\frac{KE}{Mass}, \quad \text{specific energy}$

w.r.t: $\mathbf{x} = \{\omega, n, \{r_{out}^1, r_{out}^2, ..., r_{out}^{n-1}\}, \{material_1, material_2, ..., material_n\} \}$ subject to: $\frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma^{ult}} < 1$, material failure constraint

and $\sigma_{r_{in}}^{j+1} = \sigma_{r_{out}}^j \leq 0$, rim detachment failure constraint

where,

j = 1, 2, ..., (n - 1); $i = (r, \theta, z)$

225

230

235

 ω : rotor speed, rpm n: number of rims

 r_{out}^{j} : outer radius of rim $j,\,\mathrm{m}$

 $material_j$: material used in rim j

 σ_i : stress in direction i ($i = r, \theta, z$)

 σ_i^{ult} : ultimate strength in direction i $(i = r, \theta, z)$

```
\sigma_{r_{in}}^{j}, \sigma_{r_{out}}^{j} : radial stress at inner and outer radii of rim j.
```

For the material failure constraint, the yield strengths of the metals are used to compute the strength ratio for the material failure constraint, to avoid plastic deformation. For composite materials, the ultimate strengths of the composite

laminates are used for their strength ratios. The maximum stress failure theory (MSFT) is used to indicate failure.

There is a constraint on the maximum radial tensile stress between the pressfitted rims of a multi-rim composite rotor. The rim detachment constraint used in this study is a novel one, which can allow the optimization routine to yield better results that in the past. Previous research conducting optimization of press-fitted multi-rim flywheels used a constraint which restricted the radial stresses in the flywheel to compressive (negative) values at all points along the

- radius [21]. The new rim-detachment constraint only restricts the radial stresses to compressive values at the interface between rims, where the load cannot be transferred in the radial direction. Thus, other regions in the flywheel may be subjected to radial tensile stresses within the material elastic limits, which further increases the energy capacity of the optimal FESS. The number of rims
- ²⁵⁰ in multi-rim composite rotors has been limited to two in this study, since it has been demonstrated by previous researchers [23], that a further increase in the number of rims results in a limited improvement in the performance of the flywheel.



Figure 1: Block diagram of flywheel rotor

3.2. Implementation

The optimization problem is solved using DAKOTA toolbox [24], which allows the use of its optimization algorithms as a black box, using a script interface. A schematic of the interface between DAKOTA, and the analysis code, implemented in Python is shown in Figure 2. A MADS algorithm is used to solve this non-linear constrained optimization problem, as it is a local, gradient free method, and is more reliable than local gradient-based methods, while being faster than global methods such as genetic algorithms. It has minimal

dependence on the initial guess of the design variables. Also, this method can reliably solve non-convex problems, which can prove challenging for gradientbased methods because of their tendency to get stuck in local optima when the optimization problem is non-convex.



Figure 2: Schematic of the Python-DAKOTA interface

265

3.3. Model Validation

The flywheel mathematical model used in this study was validated against the results published by Krack et al. [1]. A 2-rim composite rotor consisting of an inner glass-epoxy rim and an outer carbon-epoxy rim was simulated. The ²⁷⁰ composite material properties and flywheel dimensions from [1] were used. The radial and hoop stresses developed in the flywheel rotating at 30,000 rpm were then plotted, and compared with the stresses developed in a single rim rotor made from either of the 2 composite materials. It was found that the radial stresses developed in the rotor were reduced by introducing an extra rim. The stress distributions in the 1-rim and 2-rim composite flywheel rotors, obtained from the Python model described in Section 2 are shown in Figure 3. The re-

sults were in agreement with the previous publication.

275



Figure 3: Comparison of simulated and literature results [1] for a) Radial and b) Hoop stress distributions in 2-rim and 1-rim composite flywheels

In order to validate the optimization framework, the design problem in [1] was also solved. The energy per unit cost of materials, for the 2-rim glass-epoxy and carbon-epoxy composite flywheel, was maximized by varying the operating speed and the relative thickness of the 2 composite rims. The optimal solution was obtained for 4 different cost ratios of the materials used in the rims. Table 2 shows a comparison of the optimal solution with the proposed framework and the solution obtained in [1]. The simulated results were within $\pm 0.3\%$ of the literature results, which could be due to the use of different optimization algorithms.

The proposed optimization formulation discussed in Section 3, introduced an

Optimization framework	$rac{\mathrm{d_{carbon}}}{\mathrm{d_{glass}}}$	E^{opt} , MJ	ω , rpm	r_{out}^1 , mm
Literature Data [1]	$[11.3684$ - $\infty)$	2.205	18,661	240.0
	[2.3271 - 11.3684)	11.387	$45,\!363$	187.18
	[0.1712 - 2.3271)	12.459	48,219	166.51
	[0.0 - 0.1712)	4.672	$30,\!137$	120.0
Simulation	20	2.212	$18,\!692$	239.99
	5	11.396	$45,\!381$	187.18
	1	12.487	$48,\!278$	166.39
	0.1	4.670	$30,\!134$	120.01

Table 2: Optimal glass/epoxy and carbon/epoxy composite rotors for varying cost ratios.

²⁹⁰ additional constraint on the radial stress developed at the interface of press-fit rims in multi-rim rotors. This constraint was necessary to ensure that there are no radial tensile stresses at the rim interfaces, which could result in failure due to detachment of the rims. The necessity and significance of this new constraint was investigated. This constraint was not used in [1] because the radial

- stress at the rim interface became more compressive at higher speeds, and there was no need of checking for the rim detachment constraint. This is because the ratio of the specific stiffnesses of the composite materials used in the study were very similar. Figure 4(a) shows the feasible range of designs for the glass-epoxy and carbon-epoxy rotor used in [1]. It can be seen that the material
- failure constraint is the binding constraint, and the rim detachment constraint is non-binding. However, when there is a large difference in the specific stiffness of the 2 rims, the rim detachment constraint also tends to become a binding constraint. Figure 4(b) shows the feasible range of designs using a kevlar-epoxy and carbon-epoxy rotor, with a press-fit interference of 0.4 mm between the
- rims. It is clear that there is a need to check for both constraints in the latter case. The focus of this study is to select the best flywheel materials for various performance criteria. Hence, the addition of the rim detachment constraint is important, in order to evaluate all the materials and their combinations. The

Table 3: Optimal composite rotors with different binding constraints

Flywheel	δ^1,mm	E^{opt}, MJ	ω,rpm	r_{out}^1,mm	Binding Constraint
Glass-Epoxy, Carbon-Epoxy	0	12.486	$48,\!278$	166.39	Material failure
Kevlar49-Epoxy, Carbon-Epoxy	0.4	6.39	$35,\!477$	149.04	Material failure, Interface Stress

optimal designs for the two flywheels evaluated in this study are also depicted in Table 3.



Figure 4: Rim detachment failure as a a) non-binding constraint, and b) binding constraint.

4. Results and discussion

310

The optimization problems formulated in Section 3 were solved using a set of 18 high strength metals and composites whose material properties are in Tables A.5 and A.6. The 3D material properties of the composite laminates ³¹⁵ were computed using the properties of some typical laminae in Autodesk Helius Composite software [25]. The costs of the metals were based on current wholesale market prices. The costs of the composites were calculated using the volume fraction of the composite, along with market prices of the composite fiber rovings, and prices of the matrix materials such as resin and hardener. ³²⁰ The cost of a rotor can depend on factors such as manufacturing process and

complexity of design. However, this study only used the cost of the material,

and did not account for manufacturing and other costs. To alleviate the impact of the uncertainty in costs on the results, all material costs were normalized before use in the optimization problem.

325

330

The performance criterion, or the objective function was maximized by varying a combination of the following design variables: rpm ω , and relative rim thickness, which depend on r_{out}^1 . The choice of optimization objective, which was used as a performance index to compare the rotor materials, was seen to affect the optimal flywheel design. A parametric study was then conducted by varying the number of press-fit rims n and the materials used in the rims $material_j$. The number of press-fit rims, n, was limited to a maximum of 2, and a fixed rotor height of 50 mm, inner radius of 110 mm and outer radius of 200 mm were used for the study. For multi-rim rotors, the press-fit interference was fixed at

335 0.4 mm.

The optimization convergence criterion was defined by the DAKOTA parameters 'function precision' and 'maximum number of black-box evaluations'. The 'function precision' parameter, which defines the resolution or accuracy of the objectives and constraints was set to $1.e^{-10}$, and the 'maximum number of

³⁴⁰ objectives and constraints was set to $1.e^{-10}$, and the 'maximum number of black-box evaluations' parameter was set to 1000. The DAKOTA parameter 'variable neighborhood search' was used to escape local optima.

4.1. Optimal flywheels using maximum kinetic energy criterion

The kinetic energy of the flywheel was maximized and the performance of the various rotor designs is presented in Table 4. The stress distributions in the optimal 1-rim metal, 1-rim composite, 2-rim composite and 2-rim hybrid flywheels are shown in Figure 5. The material failure constraint is a binding constraint in all the optimal designs. However, in some 2-rim rotor designs, the rim-detachment constraint also becomes a binding constraint. Some optimal 2 rim composite rotors where the rim-detachment is a binding constraint are

Kevlar 49-Epoxy/AS4-3501-6, AS4-8552/IM7-8551-7 and T300-BSL914C/T300-



Figure 5: Maximum kinetic energy criterion : Radial (top) and hoop (bottom) stress distributions for optimal a) 1-rim metal, b) 1-rim composite, c) 2-rim composite, d) 2-rim hybrid rotors

The following observations can be made from the study:

355

 The average kinetic energy of optimal 1-rim flywheels made from composite was around 1.5 times that of metal 1-rim flywheels. The kinetic energy was maximized by allowing the operating speed and inner radius of the rotor to vary. It was found that metal flywheels were around 3.7 times heavier than composites. However, composite flywheels were 4 times costlier and operated at 2.3 times the speed of metal flywheels

Flywheel	Material	Kinetic energy, kJ	Speed, rpm	Rim radii, mm	Mass, kg	Relative Cost
Metal, 1-rim	Al-6061-T6	418.86	15,713	(110 - 200)	11.87	27.31
Metal, 1-rim	Al-2024	637.04	19,167	(110 - 200)	12.13	46.61
Metal, 1-rim	Carbon-Steel-1020	685.47	11,818	(110 - 200)	34.35	60.47
Metal, 1-rim	Al-7075-T6	709.56	20,156	(110 - 200)	12.22	37.53
Metal, 1-rim	Steel-4340	749.61	12,351	(110 - 200)	34.40	34.40
Metal, 1-rim	Stainless-Steel-15-7	1180.80	$15,\!682$	(110 - 200)	33.61	90.42
Metal, 1-rim	Steel-18Ni-300	1203.03	15,460	(110 - 200)	35.23	53.91
Metal, 1-rim	Stainless-Steel-440C	1947.44	20,100	(110 - 200)	33.74	42.51
Metal, 1-rim	Stainless-Steel-455	2369.82	22,087	(110 - 200)	34.00	78.21
Composite, 1-rim	T300-BSL914C	786.48	28,388	(110 - 200)	6.83	216.65
Composite, 1-rim	Kevlar49-Epoxy	885.49	31,970	(110 - 200)	6.06	164.37
${\rm Composite, \ 1-rim}$	E-Glass-Epoxy	1060.36	28,565	(110 - 200)	9.09	170.31
Composite, 1-rim	S2-Glass-Epoxy	1355.19	32,958	(110 - 200)	8.73	269.97
Composite, 1-rim	AS4-3501-6	1360.29	36,957	(110 - 200)	6.97	185.68
Composite, 1-rim	T300-PR319	1403.14	37,877	(110 - 200)	6.84	217.12
Composite, 1-rim	AS4-8552	2404.63	49,343	(110 - 200)	6.91	184.54
Composite, 1-rim	IM7-8551-7	2452.16	49,883	(110 - 200)	6.89	246.78
${\rm Composite, \ 1-rim}$	IM7-8552	3150.50	56,292	(110 - 200)	6.96	248.98
Composite, 2-rim	EGlass-Epoxy, IM7-8551-7	3154.54	56,263	(110 - 119.32 - 200)	7.06	240.92
Composite, 2-rim	EGlass-Epoxy, AS4-8552	3224.14	56,740	(110 - 120.48 - 200)	7.10	183.31
Composite, 2-rim	Kevlar49-Epoxy, T300-BSL914C	2213.79	$48,\!459$	(110 - 155.64 - 200)	6.49	193.93
Composite, 2-rim	Kevlar49-Epoxy, AS4-3501-6	2532.95	51,162	(110 - 146.72 - 200)	6.66	178.48
Composite, 2-rim	Kevlar49-Epoxy, IM7-8551-7	3716.71	61,814	(110 - 134.25 - 200)	6.72	229.28
Composite, 2-rim	S2-Glass-Epoxy, AS4-3501-6	2798.60	52,233	(110 - 133.60 - 200)	7.33	203.05
Composite, 2-rim	S2-Glass-Epoxy, IM7-8552	4072.10	$63,\!650$	(110 - 120.22 - 200)	7.11	250.75
Composite, 2-rim	AS4-8552, IM7-8551-7	3302.65	57,882	(110 - 137.42 - 200)	6.90	231.64
Composite, 2-rim	T300-BSL914C, T300-PR319	1738.68	42,169	(110 - 134.62 - 200)	6.84	217.01
Hybrid, 2-rim	Al-6061-T6, Kevlar49-Epoxy	441.64	17,006	(110 - 190 - 200)	11.06	46.47
Hybrid, 2-rim	Al-2024, IM7-8552	719.87	21,325	(110 - 190 - 200)	11.41	74.90
Hybrid, 2-rim	Steel-4340, IM7-8552	760.70	13,598	(110 - 190 - 200)	30.56	64.39
Hybrid, 2-rim	Stainless-Steel-15-7, T300-PR319	1153.48	16,937	(110 - 190 - 200)	29.87	108.13
Hybrid, 2-rim	Stainless-Steel-440C, Kevlar49-Epoxy	1804.94	21,208	(110 - 190 - 200)	29.87	59.55
Hybrid, 2-rim	Stainless-Steel-455, Kevlar49-Epoxy	2188.32	23,265	(110 - 190 - 200)	30.10	90.26
Hybrid, 2-rim	Stainless-Steel-455, IM7-8552	2274.63	23,644	(110 - 190 - 200)	30.22	102.08

Table 4: Comparison of optimal flywheel designs based on kinetic energy criterion

2. The kinetic energy of composite flywheels could be increased by using 2 press-fit composite rims instead of 1. The rims were chosen in increasing order of stiffness along the radius. This method allowed the kinetic energy to increase by upto 150%, accompanied by an increase in the operating speed. A similar study was conducted by Ha et al. [26], where Graphite/E-poxy rotors with 1 to 5 rims were optimized by varying the thickness and interference of the press-fit rims. It was found that increasing the number of rims from 1 to 2 could increase the specific energy of the rotor by 145%.

365

3. The use of 2 press-fit metal rims resulted in a trivial 1-rim solution.

- 4. The use of more than 2 composite-rim rotors could further improve the kinetic energy, but the increase was not large enough to justify the use of multiple rims, which would need a more complex manufacturing process.
- 5. All the above designs used a constant height rotor, corresponding to a shape factor of 0.5. Practically, metal flywheels can be fabricated with better shape factors, and thus, can store more kinetic energy than projected in these simulation results. Thus the use of rotor shape and topology as a design variable needs to be explored.
- 6. Burst failure is one of the main causes of concern while using metal flywheels, which fail in few, large fragments, whereas; composites fail either by delamination or due to the fibers breaking into small fragments [18]. Thus, the containment structure for composite flywheels must be designed to avoid fragment penetration, whereas, that of metal flywheels must restrict the forces or moments of the flywheel fragments from being transferred outside. To address the concern of burst safety, a hybrid metal-composite press-fit rotor was also optimized in this study. The outer composite rim had a fixed thickness of 10 mm, and was primarily for safety. The flywheel was then optimized, by allowing the rpm of the rotor to vary. It was found that the kinetic energy was nearly the same as that of 1-rim metal flywheels, with a marginal increase in the cost and operating speeds. These hybrid flywheels also provide an opportunity to optimize the shape of the inner metallic rim, which could further increase the kinetic energy and reduce the mass and the cost of the rotor.

4.2. Optimal flywheels using maximum specific energy criterion

The specific energy of the flywheel was maximized, and a comparison of the ³⁹⁵ performance of various rotor designs is presented in Figures 6 and 7. The material failure constraint is a binding constraint in all the optimal designs. However, in some 2-rim rotor designs, the rim-detachment constraint also becomes a binding constraint. Some optimal 2 rim composite rotors where the rim-detachment is a binding constraint are Kevlar49-Epoxy/AS4-3501-6, AS4-8552/IM7-8551-7

375

370

385

380

and T300-BSL914C/T300-PR319.



Figure 6: Comparison of Kinetic Energy and Specific Energy of a) Metal, b)Composite rotor materials



Figure 7: Comparison of kinetic energy and specific energy of optimal 2-rim and 1-rim rotors

The following observations can be made from the study:

1. The average specific energy of optimal 1-rim composite flywheels was 5-6 times that of optimal 1-rim metal flywheels.

405

400

2. The specific energy of rotors made from isotropic metals was in the range 6-19 Wh/kg, and that of composite rotors was in the range 32-126 Wh/kg. The specific energy of composite flywheels was significantly lower than the theoretical maximum specific energy of the materials previously reported in literature. For example, Genta [18] reported the specific strengths of Aluminium Alloy 2024 and unidirectional Kevlar composite as 46 and 240 Wh/kg respectively. Assuming a shape factor of 0.303 corresponding to an annular constant thickness disc, the flywheels made from these materials would have theoretical specific energies of 13.938 and 72.72 Wh/kg respectively. The corresponding optimal flywheels using these materials resulted in specific energies of 14.58 and 37.26 Wh/kg. This justified the need for an optimization formulation and a rotor model that captures the physical and material failure constraints on the rotor.

3. The specific energy of composite rotors could be improved by upto 150 % over 1-rim rotors, by using multiple press-fit rims.

420 4.3. Optimal flywheels using maximum energy per cost criterion

The energy-per-cost of the flywheel was maximized and a comparison of the performance of various rotor designs is presented in Figures 8 and 9. The material failure constraint is a binding constraint in all the optimal designs. However, in some 2-rim rotor designs, the rim-detachment constraint also becomes a binding constraint. Some optimal 2 rim composite rotors where the rim-detachment is a binding constraint are Kevlar49-Epoxy/AS4-3501-6, AS4-8552/IM7-8551-7 and T300-BSL914C/T300-PR319.



Figure 8: Comparison of Kinetic Energy and Specific Energy of a) Metal, b)Composite rotor materials

410



Figure 9: Comparison of kinetic energy and energy per cost of optimal 2-rim and 1-rim rotors

The following observations can be made from this study:

- The average energy-per-cost of optimal 1-rim metal flywheels was 2.7 times that of optimal 1-rim composite flywheels.
 - The use of 2 press-fit composite rims increased the energy-per-cost of the composite rotor, but not enough to be competitive with high strength 1-rim metal rotors of the same dimensions.

435 5. Conclusions

This article optimized 1-rim and 2-rim flywheel rotors made of various metal and composite materials to determine the optimal rotor material. It was found that the choice of optimal material depended on the performance criterion being used. Composite rotors performed better in terms of specific energy, whereas ⁴⁴⁰ metal rotors had a better energy per cost. The total kinetic energy of both composite and metal rotors of a constant thickness were comparable. It was also shown that the specific energy of the composite rotors was significantly lower than the theoretical specific energy of the rotor materials, which only used uniaxial material failure considerations. Thus, the significance of multiaxial material failure and other physical constraints was established. The optimiza-

tion model allowed us to apply constraints on the radial displacement, as well

as direction-dependent failure modes, which limited the practically achievable specific energy of orthotropic materials such as composites used to construct flywheel rotors.

450

The means of improving the performance of the flywheels were studied, and it was shown that press-fitted multi-rim composite rotors with specific material sequences could outperform single rim composite and metal flywheels, in terms of total energy or specific energy. However, when energy-per-cost was used as

the performance criterion, 2-rim rotors offered no significant advantage over 1rim rotors. Further improvements in the performance of metal flywheels can be achieved by optimizing the stress distributions, using variations in the shape or topology of the rotor; however, this analysis would need a 2D or 3D numerical rotor model.

460 6. Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Energy Storage Technology (NEST) Network for financial assistance.

Appendix A. Material Properties

465

The material properties of the metals and composites used in the flywheel rotors designed in this study can be found in Tables A.5 and A.6.

Material	Е	G	ν	ρ	Yield Strength	relative cost
	GPa	GPa		g/cm^3	MPa	$/\mathrm{kg}$
Al-2024	73.1	27.1	0.332	2.77	417.8	3.84
Al-6061-T6	69.6	26.3	0.331	2.71	275	2.30
Al-7075-T6	71.8	26.8	0.33	2.79	465	3.07
Steel-4340	205.0	76.5	0.29	7.85	470	1.0
Steel-18Ni-300	190.0	66.3	0.318	8.04	758	1.53
Stainless-Steel-15-7	201.0	77.9	0.32	7.67	745	2.69
Stainless-Steel-440C	203.0	93.1	0.284	7.7	1220	1.26
Stainless-Steel-455	197.9	75.8	0.3	7.76	1489	2.30
Carbon-Steel-1020	206.2	80.0	0.288	7.84	429.6	1.76

Table A.5: Isotropic material properties [27]

Table A.6: Composite material properties [25]

Material	V_f	E_{θ}	E_r	$G_{\theta r}$	G_{rz}	$\nu_{\theta r}$	ν_{rz}	ρ	$\sigma_{\theta,T}^{ult}$	$\sigma_{\theta,C}^{ult}$	$\sigma_{r,T}^{ult}$	$\sigma_{r,C}^{ult}$	$\tau^{ult}_{\theta r}$	relative cost
		$_{\rm GPa}$	$_{\rm GPa}$	GPa	GPa			g/cm^3	MPa	MPa	MPa	MPa	MPa	/kg
AS4-3501-6	0.6	127	11.15	6.55	3.64	0.27	0.53	1.591	1950	1480	48	200	79	26.63
AS4-8552	0.58	135.1	9.63	4.95	3.35	0.30	0.43	1.577	2206	1531	80	259.9	114.5	26.69
E-Glass Epoxy	0.45	44.81	12.41	5.51	3.59	0.28	0.36	2.076	1035	620	48	137.8	68.9	18.72
IM7-8551-7	0.6	165.8	8.56	5.59	2.94	0.27	0.46	1.574	2560	1590	73	185	90	35.77
IM7-8552	0.57	139.7	11.39	4.75	3.89	0.32	0.46	1.588	2723	1689	111	215.9	119.9	35.77
Kevlar-49 Epoxy	0.45	75.84	5.51	2.06	1.54	0.34	0.47	1.384	1378	275	29	137.8	62	27.10
S-2 Glass Epoxy	0.45	55.84	17.92	6.20	3.89	0.27	0.35	1.993	1999	965	62	155	93	30.91
$\rm T300\text{-}BSL914C$	0.6	138.1	11	5.43	3.57	0.28	0.54	1.559	1500	900	27	200	80.0	31.71
T300-PR319	0.6	128.9	5.706	1.33	1.84	0.32	0.55	1.562	1378	950	40	125	97	31.71

 M. Krack, M. Secanell, P. Mertiny, Cost optimization of hybrid composite flywheel rotors for energy storage, Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization 41 (5) (2010) 779–795.

⁴⁷⁰ [2] H. Silva-Saravia, H. Pulgar-Painemal, J. M. Mauricio, Flywheel energy storage model, control and location for improving stability: The chilean case, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems 32 (4) (2017) 3111–3119.

- [3] R. Cardenas, R. Pena, G. Asher, J. Clare, Control strategies for enhanced power smoothing in wind energy systems using a flywheel driven by a vector-controlled induction machine, IEEE Transactions on industrial electronics 48 (3) (2001) 625–635.
- [4] M. I. Daoud, A. M. Massoud, A. S. Abdel-Khalik, A. Elserougi, S. Ahmed, A flywheel energy storage system for fault ride through support of gridconnected vsc hvdc-based offshore wind farms, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems 31 (3) (2016) 1671–1680.
- [5] A. K. Arani, H. Karami, G. Gharehpetian, M. Hejazi, Review of flywheel energy storage systems structures and applications in power systems and microgrids, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 69 (2017) 9–18.
- [6] Beacon Power webpage, http://beaconpower.com/ carbon-fiber-flywheels/, accessed: 2017-07-07.
 - [7] LEVISYS webpage, http://www.levisys.com/en/technologie.html, accessed: 2017-07-07.
 - [8] Stornetic GmBH webpage, http://stornetic.com/, accessed: 2017-07-07.
- [9] Powerthru webpage, http://www.power-thru.com/, accessed: 2017-07-07.
 - [10] Calnetix webpage, https://www.calnetix.com/, accessed: 2017-07-07.
 - [11] Amber Kinetics webpage, http://amberkinetics.com/, accessed: 2017-07-07.

475

480

[12] Temporal Power webpage, http://temporalpower.com/, accessed: 2017-

495 07-07.

520

- [13] ActivePower webpage, http://www.activepower.com/en-US, accessed: 2017-07-07.
- [14] ABB Powerstore webpage, https://library.e.abb.com/public/ e13f1d26d87e9167c1257c37002e38bf/9AKK100580A2551_Powerstore_

⁵⁰⁰ Brochure_EN_HR_(Dic2013).pdf, accessed: 2017-07-07.

- [15] Piller webpage, http://www.piller.com/en-GB/205/energy-storage, accessed: 2017-07-07.
- [16] Energiestro webpage, http://www.energiestro.net/, accessed: 2017-07-07.
- 505 [17] S. Arnold, A. Saleeb, N. Al-Zoubi, Deformation and life analysis of composite flywheel disk systems, Composites part B: engineering 33 (6) (2002) 433–459.
 - [18] G. Genta, Kinetic energy storage: theory and practice of advanced flywheel systems, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2014.
- ⁵¹⁰ [19] H. Liu, J. Jiang, Flywheel energy storagean upswing technology for energy sustainability, Energy and buildings 39 (5) (2007) 599–604.
 - [20] J. G. Bitterly, Flywheel technology: past, present, and 21st century projections, IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine 13 (8) (1998) 13–16.
- 515 [21] M. Krack, M. Secanell, P. Mertiny, Cost optimization of a hybrid composite flywheel rotor with a split-type hub using combined analytical/numerical models, Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization 44 (1) (2011) 57–73.
 - [22] M. Krack, M. Secanell, P. Mertiny, Rotor design for high-speed flywheel energy storage systems, in: Energy Storage in the Emerging Era of Smart Grids, InTech, 2011.

- [23] G. Ertz, Development, manufacturing and testing of a multi-rim (hybrid) flywheel rotor (2014).
- [24] B. Adam, L. Bauman, W. Bohnhoff, K. Dalbey, M. Ebeida, et al., Dakota, a multilevel parallel object-oriented framework for design optimization, parameter estimation, uncertainty quantification, and sensitivity analysis:

Version 6.0 user manual, Tech. rep., Sandia National Laboratories (2015).

- [25] Autodesk helius composite, https://knowledge. autodesk.com/support/helius-composite/learn-explore/ caas/CloudHelp/cloudhelp/2015/ENU/ACMPDS/files/
- 530 GUID-2B4538D7-227F-4C9F-891F-785F90CA10CA-htm.html, accessed: 2017-11-01.
 - [26] S. K. Ha, H. H. Han, Y. H. Han, Design and manufacture of a composite flywheel press-fit multi-rim rotor, Journal of reinforced plastics and composites 27 (9) (2008) 953–965.
- 535 [27] H. Ledbetter, Physical Properties Data Compilations Relevant to Energy Storage, National Bureau of Standards, 1982.