



Improving Petroleum Displacement Potential of PHEVs Using Enhanced Charging Scenarios

Preprint

T. Markel, K. Smith, and A.A. Pesaran

*Presented at EVS-24 International Battery, Hybrid and Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle Symposium
Stavanger, Norway
May 13-16, 2009*

Conference Paper
NREL/CP-540-45730
May 2009

NREL is operated for DOE by the Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC

Contract No. DE-AC36-08-GO28308



NOTICE

The submitted manuscript has been offered by an employee of the Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC (ASE), a contractor of the US Government under Contract No. DE-AC36-08-GO28308. Accordingly, the US Government and ASE retain a nonexclusive royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or allow others to do so, for US Government purposes.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal 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 privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or any agency thereof.

Available electronically at <http://www.osti.gov/bridge>

Available for a processing fee to U.S. Department of Energy and its contractors, in paper, from:

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0062
phone: 865.576.8401
fax: 865.576.5728
email: <mailto:reports@adonis.osti.gov>

Available for sale to the public, in paper, from:

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
phone: 800.553.6847
fax: 703.605.6900
email: orders@ntis.fedworld.gov
online ordering: <http://www.ntis.gov/ordering.htm>



EVS24
Stavanger, Norway, May 13-16, 2009

Improving Petroleum Displacement Potential of PHEVs Using Enhanced Charging Scenarios

Tony Markel, Kandler Smith, and Ahmad A. Pesaran¹

*National Renewable Energy Laboratory
1617 Cole Blvd., Golden, CO 80401 USA*

¹*Tel: +1 303 275-4441; Fax: +1 303 275-4415; Email: ahmad_pesaran@nrel.gov*

Abstract

Plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs) have the potential to displace a significant amount of petroleum relative to conventional vehicles. It is anticipated that home charging at night (roughly once a day) would be the usual mode of operation for PHEVs. Opportunity charging could provide additional electric range. Our analysis has shown that a PHEV-20 with opportunity charging during the day would reduce fuel consumption by 71%, whereas a PHEV-40 with only night charging reduces fuel use by 66% relative to a conventional vehicle. A PHEV-20 with smaller battery reduces the initial purchase cost; however, our analysis shows that charging more frequently could reduce the life of the battery.

Keywords: Battery, charging, cycle life, electricity, PHEV (plug-in hybrid electric vehicle)

1 Introduction

The United States faces a serious transportation energy problem. The transportation sector depends almost entirely on a single fuel—petroleum. The future of the petroleum supply and its use as the primary transportation fuel threaten both personal mobility and economic stability. For example, the United States currently imports nearly 60% of the petroleum it consumes and dedicates more than 60% of its petroleum consumption to transportation [1]. As U.S. petroleum consumption continues to climb despite steadily declining domestic production, the percentage of petroleum imports will grow. Also, international pressures continue to increase as the growing economies of China and India consume petroleum at rapidly increasing rates. Many experts now predict that world petroleum production will peak within the next 5 to 10 years, greatly straining the petroleum supply and demand balance in the international market [2].

Hybrid electric vehicle (HEV) technology presents an excellent way to reduce petroleum consumption through efficiency improvements. HEVs use energy storage systems (ESS) combined with electric motors to improve vehicle efficiency by enabling the use of smaller-sized engines and by recapturing energy normally lost during braking events. A typical HEV can reduce gasoline consumption by about 30%-45% over that of a comparable conventional vehicle [3]. However, even aggressive introductions of efficient and affordable HEVs to the market will only slow the increase in petroleum demand due to vehicle life and annual travel trends. Reducing U.S. petroleum dependence below current levels requires vehicle innovations beyond today's HEV technology.

Plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV) technology provides the potential to displace a significant portion of transportation petroleum consumption by using electricity for portions of trips. A PHEV is an HEV with the ability to “plug-in” so as to recharge its ESS with electricity from the utility

grid. With a fully charged ESS, the vehicle will tend to use electricity rather than liquid fuels. A key benefit of plug-in hybrid technology is that the vehicle no longer depends on a single fuel source. The primary energy carrier would be electricity generated from a diverse mix of domestic resources, including coal, nuclear, natural gas, wind, hydroelectric, and solar energy. The secondary energy carrier would be a chemical fuel stored on the vehicle (e.g., gasoline, diesel, ethanol, or even hydrogen). Although PHEVs must still overcome technical challenges related to ESS cost, size, and life, the technology nevertheless provides a relatively near-term petroleum displacement option [4]. The combination of fuel savings potential, consumer usage patterns, charging scenarios, battery life attributes, and battery costs all need to be balanced and optimized to find the best low-cost solution for displacing fuel using PHEV technology. This paper integrates a recently developed battery life assessment method into sets of PHEV simulations to better understand the impacts of charge management scenario options and the potential to reduce battery size while providing equivalent or greater fuel savings.

NREL is involved in significant PHEV-related research and development, including PHEV batteries and their interactions with the electricity grid. NREL has simulated the performance of PHEVs, performed cost/benefit analyses, developed PHEV batteries requirements for the U.S. Department of Energy and the United States Advanced Battery Consortium, performed thermal testing of PHEV batteries, used its PHEV test bed (a Prius converted to a plug-in with EnergyCS or Hymotion conversion kits) for field testing, studied grid interaction with PHEVs, and developed models for PHEV battery cost, life, and performance trade-off studies. This paper uses the results and insights from these parallel studies to explore charging scenarios and environmental conditions that strike a balance among cost, life, and fuel savings.

1.1 Review of Previous Results

Markel and Simpson [9] presented the cost/benefit ratio of several PHEV design scenarios relative to conventional and hybrid vehicles, and Gonder et al. [6] have presented a comparison of the fuel savings benefit variability over real-world driving profiles. ADVISOR™, a vehicle systems simulation package, was used

along with 227 unique real-world driving profiles to demonstrate the spectrum of fuel savings benefits that result from a broad distribution of driving behaviors. Although differences exist across driving profiles, when evaluated as a fleet, the simulations showed a savings of ~0.9 gallons of gasoline per day per vehicle, or 66% for the PHEV-40 and 55% for the PHEV-20 design. Under long-term cost assumptions, the PHEV-20 was estimated to cost ~\$3,000 less than the PHEV-40 design scenario. [9]

In a study conducted in collaboration with Xcel Energy, the real-world simulation results [6] were used to generate estimates of the utility load profile from charging PHEVs under several scenarios [5]. The utility integration study included four scenarios: “baseline,” with one unmanaged charge per day; “delayed,” with all charging delayed until after 10 p.m.; “utility load valley filling,” in which all charging is optimally controlled to occur during the lowest utility demand period; and “opportunity,” in which charging occurs anytime the vehicle is parked. In recent publications, the expected performance of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles over real driving profiles based on travel survey data were presented (Figure 1), and they show that, although consumer driving is more aggressive than standard test and design profiles, there is still significant potential for fuel savings with plug-in hybrid technology.




Figure 1: Plug-in hybrid simulations compared with real driving profiles lead to greater than 50% petroleum displacement

The opportunity charge scenario proved to provide the greatest vehicle petroleum displacement, while

other scenarios provided a potentially more desirable scenario from a utility operations perspective because of lower operating costs and emissions impacts. The vehicle energy storage system encounters very different operating characteristics under each scenario. The battery life impacts of differences in usage profiles were not quantified. Research now focuses on the impact factors and opportunities for cost reduction of the plug-in hybrid system.

1.2 Review of Battery Life Modelling

Battery life modelling is complicated, because life is affected by many factors, including the temperature and state of charge (SOC) during storage, the depth of each discharge cycle, the frequency of cycling, and the rate of cycling. For automotive applications, the battery is often deemed to be at the end of its useful life when it has degraded to 80% of its original power or energy capacity [11]. The PHEV duty cycle may be the most difficult that a battery may see. In HEV usage, the ESS is maintained in a medium to high SOC level, and cycling is quite shallow. In electric vehicle (EV) applications, the ESS is cycled deeply; however, this cycling may occur only every few days rather than daily, as it does in a PHEV. If a PHEV is charged more than once a day, the duty cycle may be even more severe. Battery life modelling coupled with vehicle systems simulations provide an opportunity for quantifying these differences.

Most commonly, battery cycle life is projected by extrapolating degradation-per-cycle data measured during accelerated cycling tests [20]. Battery calendar life, or years in life, is projected by extrapolating a model fit to degradation measured with time during storage at normal and elevated temperatures [18]. True battery life, however, is dependent upon both storage and cycling, and it is important when exploring real-world scenarios that the battery aging model combine both cycling and storage effects.

Hall et al. [14] recently demonstrated the importance of collecting real-time cycling data as well as accelerated cycling data for a lithium ion battery with a nickel-cobalt-aluminium (NCA) cathode. They found that accelerated cycling results (4 cycles/day) tended to overpredict actual NCA battery life when compared with 5 years of real-time cycling data (1 cycle/day) for a geosynchronous orbit satellite application. Differences between accelerated cycling and

real-time cycling degradation could not be wholly explained by correcting for calendar effects.

2 Approach

Vehicle systems simulation enables the rapid exploration of vehicle design and control options. Battery life models provide the ability to quantify differences in battery usage scenarios. Real-world driving profiles are extremely valuable for understanding both the real fuel savings potential of PHEVs and highlighting the design challenges of incorporating sufficient power capability, energy storage sizing, and fleet charging strategies. This study uses all three modelling and data resources to compare two PHEV scenarios:

- a. PHEV-40 with a single evening charge, and
- b. PHEV-20 with opportunity charging throughout the day.

2.1 Vehicle Simulation Model

Vehicle system simulation enables modelling and evaluation of many vehicle powertrain and control scenarios. ADVISOR was used to simulate the operation of conventional, hybrid, and plug-in hybrid electric vehicle options for this study. Inputs to this model include details about the powertrain components, the vehicle attributes, the control strategy, and the driving profile. Results provide detailed information on the time-dependent operation of all of the components and the overall performance of the vehicle. For this study, of primary interest are the fuel consumption and the energy storage system operational details. Table 1 shows the attributes of the vehicle simulated.

Table 1: Simulated Vehicle Attributes

	Units	Conventional	Hybrid	PHEV20	PHEV40
Engine Power	<i>kW</i>	121.7	82	79.4	81.9
Motor Power	<i>kW</i>	n/a	39	43.6	48
ESS Power	<i>kW</i>	n/a	50	47	51.8
ESS Energy (total)	<i>kWh</i>	n/a	1.9	9.4	18.5
Curb Mass	<i>kg</i>	1429	1399	1488	1567
Fuel Economy (urban/highway)	<i>mpg</i>	26	39.2	54	67.4
Electric Consumption (urban/highway)	<i>Wh/mi</i>	n/a	n/a	95	157
All Electric Range (urban)	<i>miles</i>	n/a	n/a	22.3	35.8

Key assumptions were as follows:

- The baseline vehicle is based on a Malibu/Camry-like mid-size vehicle,

- The PHEV has ability to operate on the electric drivetrain alone during urban driving,
- Controls operate the PHEV in charge-depletion mode between 95% and 30% SOC,
- The strategy implements a charge sustaining operation between 25% and 35%,
- The baseline scenario begins to recharge the battery after the end of the last driving trip,
- The opportunity scenario begins recharge any time the vehicle key is turned off, and
- The battery is recharged at a constant 1.4 kW utility load with an 85% efficient charger.

The battery life impacts of two PHEV scenarios were considered: one with 40 miles of range and a single daily charge and one with 20 miles of range and the ability to charge at all parked times. A PHEV-40 is designed to provide ~40 miles of electric drive capability on an urban driving profile. On driving profiles requiring more power than that encountered in urban driving or for distances longer than 40 miles, the petroleum-fueled engine supplements the battery power and energy capability. Likewise, the PHEV-20 has ~20 miles of urban electric drive capability. Based on an assessment of 2001 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data, a 40-mile vehicle satisfies 68% of consumers' daily driving needs with a single daily charge. A 20-mile range would cover 42% of consumers' daily needs [22]. With additional recharge opportunities, the 20-mile PHEV should provide equal or greater fuel displacement, depending on the driving profile attributes.

2.2 Driving Profile Database

The driving profile database for this study includes one full day of driving data for 227 unique vehicles that were collected using GPS data loggers as part of a metropolitan travel survey in St. Louis, Missouri, in 2002. Expansion factors to weight these cycles to be representative of the entire survey population were not applied. A typical driving profile includes several individual driving trips defined by elapsed time and vehicle speed. Parked times and durations are also included. Figure 2 shows the distribution of daily distances in this data set.




Figure 2: St. Louis driving profile data set daily driving distance distribution

2.3 Battery Aging Model

Battery performance degradation has been shown to be dependent on a number of operational parameters, including number of cycles N_i at a given state of charge swing ΔSOC_i , time t , voltage exposure $V(t)$, temperature exposure $T(t)$, and charge current rate $I(t)$. With sufficient data, the dependency of capacity fade and resistance growth on each operational parameter can be established. Physical or empirical models can be fit to data to interpolate/extrapolate results for different scenarios.

In order to explore the impact of PHEV consumer use scenarios on battery performance degradation, the present work uses an empirical model [12] fit to data from Hall et al. for a Saft VES-140 Li ion cell with carbon/NCA chemistry [14-16]. Operational parameters explored in that study included end of charge voltage, depth of discharge, temperature, and number of cycles per day. Cycling conditions included the aforementioned real-time and accelerated cycling conditions as well as storage.

Hall et al. found that storage degradation time dependency could be well described by a $t^{1/2}$ model, consistent with a diffusion-limited corrosion reaction mechanism that builds a film layer at the electrode surface. They also found that small ΔSOC cycles tended to suppress the film layer growth somewhat, while large ΔSOC cycles tended to degrade the positive electrode active material and cause additional resistance growth and capacity loss. The addition of cycling degradation was well correlated by adding a t or N dependency to the $t^{1/2}$ storage model.

Full details of the present carbon/NCA chemistry degradation model may be found in [12]. The model captures both storage- and cycling-induced resistance growth with

$$R = a_1 t^{1/2} + a_{2,t} t + a_{2,N} N. \quad (1)$$

Results of various storage and cycling tests were used to fit coefficients $a_1(\Delta SOC, T, V)$ and $a_2(\Delta SOC, T, V)$ and capture ΔSOC , $T(t)$ and $V(t)$ dependencies. Depth of discharge dependency was fit using empirical formulas. Temperature and voltage dependencies were fit with physically justifiable Arrhenius and Tafel relationships, respectively. Separate t - and N -dependent terms (rather than t -only or N -only) in (1) are necessary to describe degradation under both real-time and accelerated cycling conditions.

To describe capacity fade, the model assumes Li loss to be the dominant mechanism on storage, and active site loss to be the dominant mechanism on cycling [17]. Available Li capacity C_{Li} is described as

$$C_{Li} = d_0 + d_1 a_1 t^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

while active site capacity is described as

$$C_{sites} = e_0 + e_1 (a_{2,t} t + a_{2,N} N). \quad (3)$$

Actual measured or usable capacity is taken as the lesser of (2) or (3),

$$C = \min(C_{Li}, C_{sites}). \quad (4)$$

The VES-140 cells [14-16] are nearly a decade old and might not reflect the life capability of present-day PHEV battery technology. It is also possible that these cells, intended for aerospace application, use more expensive materials and last longer than present-day PHEV cells. In order to account for both of these possibilities, several battery degradation model parameters were adjusted to match recent published data for vehicle electric drive batteries also with carbon/NCA chemistry.

The model used for scenario analysis matches the following actual measured aging results. After 4.5 years of storage at 40°C and 50% SOC, the battery will have lost 10% capacity [18]. After

13.7 years at 35°C, the resistance will have grown 110% [19]. Following 2700 PHEV power profile cycles consisting of $\Delta SOC = 75\%$ deep discharge and numerous shallow cycles at 25°C, the battery resistance will have grown 50% and capacity will have faded 8% [20 and 21].

3 Results

Vehicle simulations were conducted for five vehicles and charge scenarios. These included conventional, HEV, PHEV-20 baseline charge, PHEV-40 baseline charge, and PHEV-20 opportunity charge. The total fleet fuel savings relative to the conventional case are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Fuel displacement potential of various hybrid scenarios over the fuel use of the conventional vehicle

3.1 Driving Profile Impact

The driving profile characteristics can affect the relative benefits of the PHEV-20 opportunity charging scenario in comparison to the PHEV-40 baseline charge scenario. Cycles with more short trips and parked time between trips provide more opportunity for recharging the depleted battery, while cycles with only a few long trips provide less overall benefit of opportunity charging.

Figure 4 provides an example of the simulation details for a single driving profile simulation. The chart shows the vehicle speed profile, the cumulative fuel consumption, and the varying battery state of charge for each of the vehicle and charge scenarios. This specific vehicle travelled ~55 miles over the course of one day. The opportunity charge capability extended the electric-only range on this driving profile by over 30 miles for the PHEV-20. Fuel savings relative to the HEV for the opportunity charge case were 1.5 gallons, while the fuel savings for the single

charge per day PHEV-40 case were ~ 1 gallon. The ESS SOC history for each of the three scenarios is also provided. The HEV SOC scenario varies along a very narrow range. The PHEV-40 with a single evening charge incurs a single full discharge and charge. The PHEV-20 with opportunity charge capability incurs multiple cycles. These cycling scenarios will have very different impacts on battery life. In addition, this is only a sample, a single cycle selected from the 227 unique driving profiles. Relative benefits will vary with driving profile attributes.




Figure 4: Gasoline consumption and state-of-charge behavior greatly impacted by battery size and charging scenario

The SOC characteristics of the entire fleet can also be assessed. Figure 5 shows the ESS SOC information for all of the vehicle driving profiles in the data set. The amount of time spent in each SOC range is compared for each charge scenario. The opportunity charge scenario results in more time in the highest SOC range of any of the scenarios. The PHEV-40 baseline spends time in both low SOC and high SOC ranges. The battery in the HEV scenario spends nearly all of its time in the mid-range SOC. The battery operating characteristics resulting from these simulations provide input information for the evaluation of the cycling impacts on battery life.




Figure 5: SOC for several PHEV and charge scenarios

3.2 Battery Aging with Different Charging Scenarios

The battery aging model is used to simulate resistance growth and capacity fade for the 227 different one-day vehicle driving profiles. Vehicle simulations were performed for the two different vehicle/charging scenarios to generate battery cycling profiles:

- PHEV-40 with a single evening charge, and
- PHEV-20 with opportunity charging throughout the day.

For a given vehicle driving profile, cases (a) and (b) impose very different cycles on the battery. The PHEV-20 battery is quickly cycled to its maximum ΔSOC depth because of its smaller capacity. Under the opportunity charging scenario, it is also charged/discharged with more cycles per day. A constant temperature of 30°C is used for all simulations. Previous work [12] found that this condition closely matches ambient temperature fluctuations in Phoenix, Arizona, commonly used as a worst-case climate for vehicle design.

It is important to note that all Li ion batteries have different characteristics and will degrade differently depending on chemistry, materials, and manufacturing techniques. Furthermore, the 15-year scenarios explored using the model are significantly extrapolated forward in time compared with datasets used to fit the model. The present battery degradation projections are not meant to represent definitive outcomes for a particular Li ion battery, but instead are intended to illustrate differences between the two different charging scenarios and demonstrate a variety of possible end-of-life outcomes. The results may aid

the interpretation of battery degradation measured for actual vehicle fleets.

Figure 6 shows the model-projected battery resistance growth and capacity fade at the end of 15 years of cycling for the 227 different vehicle driving profiles. Resistance growth generally exceeds 100%, consistent with the model parameter assumptions discussed in Section 2.3. The large resistance growth indicates that these batteries would need to be sized with substantial excess power at the beginning of life in order to maintain usable energy and thus electric driving range for 15 years at this high-temperature condition of 30°C. Capacity fade ranges from 10% to 15% in most cases. Approximately 25% of the PHEV-20/opportunity charge cases experience severe capacity fade, greater than 13.5%. These most severe PHEV cases, however, encounter two to three deep discharges per day and over the 15 years accumulate far more cycles than the typical goal of 5000 deep discharge cycles for PHEV batteries [11].




Figure 6: Capacity fade and resistance growth for PHEV-20 opportunity charging (left column) and PHEV-40 nightly charging (right column) scenarios for various vehicle driving cycles. Results are at the end of 15 years at 30°C (comparable to Phoenix, Arizona, conditions) for each of the 227 different drive cycle profiles.

Figure 7 shows battery degradation versus average daily SOC. All results are at the end of 15 years of cycling per each of 227 different vehicle driving cycles. A generally increasing trend in degradation is observed with average SOC, consistent with the increased voltage exposure for those batteries. For both the PHEV-20/opportunity charge and PHEV-40/nightly charge cases, a minimum line of degradation with average SOC is observed. This line corresponds to shallowly or infrequently cycled batteries in which the storage degradation effect dominates. For the PHEV-40, the dominant cycle is once per day. This cycling is benign enough so that, in all but one PHEV-40 case, Li loss at 30°C controls capacity fade (2) rather than active site loss (3). For the PHEV-20, with much more frequent daily cycling, capacity fade is more often controlled by active site loss, indicated by the large variability in the possible capacity fade outcomes.




Figure 7: Resistance growth and capacity fade at the end of 15 years at 30°C for 227 different vehicle driving cycles. The increasing trend with average SOC is due to the generally higher voltage exposure for those cases.

Resistance growth, rather than being controlled by either storage or cycling, is affected by both storage and cycling. In Figure 7, a minimum line of resistance growth versus average SOC is again observed in the 227 different vehicle driving profiles. These are all cases in which storage effects dominate. For both PHEV-20/opportunity charge and PHEV-40/nightly charge cases, cycling further increases resistance growth in comparison to the storage-dominated cases. The PHEV-20 case, with more frequent daily cycling, shows roughly double the variability in resistance growth

at the end of 15 years when compared with the PHEV-40 case.

Figure 8 displays resistance growth and capacity fade at the end of 15 years at 30°C versus the maximum daily ΔSOC , that is, the deepest discharge encountered each day for the 227 different cycles. Figure 8 shows that both resistance growth and capacity fade can either increase or decrease with maximum daily ΔSOC swing, depending on the severity of the cycling. The increasing trend is due to the higher severity of cycling degradation caused by increasing ΔSOC . This cycling-dominated degradation is much more common for the PHEV-20/opportunity charge case in comparison to the PHEV-40/nightly charge case. The decreasing trend with ΔSOC seen for other simulation results is due to the higher voltage exposure experienced by batteries that are cycled very little and instead spend much of their life near full charge. For these cycles, degradation is largely storage-dominated.




Figure 8: Resistance growth and capacity fade at the end of 15 years at 30°C for 227 different vehicle driving cycles. Resistance growth and capacity fade can either increase or decrease with maximum daily ΔSOC swing because of competing degradation mechanisms of voltage exposure and cycling stress.

4 Conclusions

The PHEV duty cycle of a full discharge on a daily basis for 10-15 years in an automotive

environment may be one of the most difficult life performance challenges for batteries. Both cycling and calendar aging affect the power and capacity fade rates of a battery. A model has been developed to estimate the combined impacts of cycling and calendar aging influences, including time spent at high SOC, time spent at high temperature, and depth of discharge and frequency of cycling.

Batteries account for a significant portion of the initial cost of a PHEV. The long-term manufacturing cost of a PHEV-20 is expected to be on the order of \$3000 less than that of a PHEV-40 because of its smaller battery. While a PHEV-20 may seem to have less potential for petroleum displacement as a result of its smaller electric range, recharging between trips can enable greater utilization of its smaller battery. Vehicle simulations for 227 different real-world driving profiles find that a PHEV-20, charged at every opportunity, can displace 5% more fuel than a PHEV-40 that is charged only once each night. This PHEV-20 opportunity charging scenario, however, places more frequent deep discharge cycles on the battery in comparison to the PHEV-40 nightly charging scenario and can be expected to degrade the PHEV-20 battery at a faster rate.

Simulations of battery aging for PHEV-20 opportunity-charge and PHEV-40 nightly-charge scenarios for 227 driving cycles illustrate a large variety of possible outcomes, depending on the manner in which a battery is cycled and stored. With more severe cycling, 25% of the simulated PHEV-20 opportunity-charged fleet experiences substantially greater degradation than the PHEV-40 nightly-charged fleet after 15 years of cycling at 30°C (NCA chemistry). In some situations, cycling can reduce degradation by reducing time spent at high SOC; however, this effect is generally small when compared with the cumulative stress of multiple deep discharge cycles per day. Both storage- and cycling-dominated degradation outcomes are possible, depending on how the battery is used.

Acknowledgments

This work was sponsored by the United States Department of Energy, Office of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, Vehicle Technologies Program. We would like to thank David Howell of Energy Storage for his support.

References

- [1] U.S. Energy Information Administration. (2006) <http://www.eia.doe.gov>. Accessed July 10, 2006.
- [2] Hirsch, R., Bezdek, R., and Wendling, R. (2005) Peaking of World Oil Production: Impacts, Risks, and Mitigation. U.S. Department of Energy. http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/Oil_Peaking_NETL.pdf.
- [3] Markel, T. (2007) "Platform Engineering Applied to Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles." 2007 SAE Congress. SAE International. Detroit, MI.
- [4] Markel, T., O'Keefe, M., Simpson, A., Gonder, J., and Brooker, A. (2005) Plug-In HEVs: A Near-Term Option to Reduce Petroleum Consumption, NREL/540-MP-39415. Golden, CO: NREL.
- [5] Parks, K., Denholm, P., and Markel, T. (2007) "Costs and Emissions Associated with Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Charging in the Xcel Energy Colorado." NREL/TP-640-41410.
- [6] Gonder, J., Markel, T., Simpson, A., and Thornton, M. (2007). "Using GPS Travel Data to Assess the Real World Driving Energy Use of Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEVs)." NREL Report No. CP-540-40858.
- [7] Markel, T., and Pesaran, A. (2007). "PHEV Energy Storage and Drive Cycle Impacts." NREL Report No. PR-540-42026.
- [8] Rosenkrantz, K. (2003). "Deep-Cycle Batteries for Plug-In Hybrid Application." EVS20 Plug-In Hybrid Vehicle Workshop, Long Beach, CA.
- [9] Markel, T., and Simpson, A. (2006) "Cost-Benefit Analysis of Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Technology." Proceedings of the 22nd Electric Vehicle Symposium, Yokohama, Japan.
- [10] Chu, A. (2008). "Nanophosphate Technology for PHEV, Extended-Range EV, and Other Automotive Applications." Advanced Automotive Battery Conference, Tampa, FL.
- [11] Pesaran, A., and Markel, T. (2007) "Battery Requirements for Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicles: Analysis and Rationale." Proceedings of 23rd International Electric Vehicles Symposium (EVS 23), Anaheim, California.
- [12] Pesaran, A., Markel, T., and Smith, K. (2009). "PHEV Battery Trade-off Study and Standby Thermal Control." Proceedings 26th International Battery Seminar, Fort Lauderdale, FL.
- [13] Morrow, K., Karner, D., and Francfort, J. (2008). "Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Review." INL/EXT-08-15058.
- [14] Hall, J.C., Lin, T., and Brown, G. (2006). "Decay Processes and Life Predictions for Lithium Ion Satellite Cells." 4th International Energy Conversion Engineering Conference and Exhibit, San Diego, CA.
- [15] Hall, J.C., Schoen, A., Powers, A., Liu, P., and Kirby, K. (2005). "Resistance growth in lithium ion satellite cells. I. Non destructive data analysis." 208th Electrochemical Society Meeting, Los Angeles, CA.
- [16] Hall, J.C., Schoen, A., Powers, A., Liu, P., and Kirby, K., Biensan, P., and Bonhomme, F. (2005). "Resistance growth in lithium ion satellite cells. II. Electrode characterization after cell wear out." 208th Electrochemical Society Meeting, Los Angeles, CA.
- [17] Spotnitz, R. (2008). Symposium on Large Lithium Ion Battery Technology at 8th Advanced Automotive Battery Conference, Tampa, FL.
- [18] Smart, M., et. al., (2006). "Storage characteristics of Li-ion batteries," NASA Aerospace Battery Workshop, Huntsville, AL.
- [19] Biensan, P., and Borthomieu, Y. (2007). "Soft Li-ion space batteries roadmap." NASA Aerospace Battery Workshop, Huntsville, AL.
- [20] Gaillac, L. (2007). Proceedings of the 23rd International Electric Vehicle Symposium and Exposition, Anaheim, CA.
- [21] Markel, T., Smith, K., and Pesaran, A. (2008). "PHEV energy storage performance/life/cost tradeoff analysis." 8th Advanced Automotive Battery Conference, Tampa, FL.
- [22] Vyas, A.D., Santini, D.J., and Johnson, L.R. (2009). "Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicles' Potential for Petroleum Use Reduction," Transportation Research Board 88th Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Authors



Tony Markel is a Senior Engineer at NREL and applies computer modeling and simulation to the evaluation of advanced automotive systems. He is currently researching several innovative technologies for hybrid electric vehicles and enjoys applying optimization tools to real world analysis problems. He holds a M.S. in mechanical engineering from the University of Colorado.



Kandler Smith is a Senior Engineer at NREL, working in the areas of battery thermal management and electrochemical modelling. He holds a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from Penn State. His Ph.D. research developed electrochemistry-based real-time algorithms that enable expanded battery power and energy capability.



Ahmad Pesaran is a Principal Engineer at NREL and leads the energy storage team. He manages several projects for Department of Energy and industrial partners, which include thermal characterization and analysis of batteries, modelling and simulation for hybrid and plug-in hybrids. He received his Ph.D. in thermal engineering from UCLA.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Executive Services and Communications Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) May 2009		2. REPORT TYPE Conference Paper		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Improving Petroleum Displacement Potential of PHEVs Using Enhanced Charging Scenarios: Preprint				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER DE-AC36-08-GO28308		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) T. Markel, K. Smith, and A.A. Pesaran				5d. PROJECT NUMBER NREL/CP-540-45730		
				5e. TASK NUMBER FC08.6200		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Renewable Energy Laboratory 1617 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401-3393				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NREL/CP-540-45730		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) NREL		
				11. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER		
12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT National Technical Information Service U.S. Department of Commerce 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, VA 22161						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 Words) Plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs) have the potential to displace a significant amount of petroleum relative to conventional vehicles. It is anticipated that home charging at night (roughly once a day) would be the usual mode of operation for PHEVs. Opportunity charging could provide additional electric range. Our analysis has shown that a PHEV-20 with opportunity charging during the day would reduce fuel consumption by 71%, whereas a PHEV-40 with only night charging reduces fuel use by 66% relative to a conventional vehicle. A PHEV-20 with smaller battery reduces the initial purchase cost; however, our analysis shows that charging more frequently could reduce the life of the battery.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS fuel savings; hybrid vehicles; plug-in hybrid electric vehicles; PHEVs ; vehicle battery charging stations						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)	