



# **Collegiate Wind Competition Market Team Final Proposal**

**Alana Benson**

**Anthony Cheslic**

**Craig Collins**

**Michael Vogelsang**

**Leo Segura De Niz**

**Mitchell Green**

**2017-2018**

**Project Sponsor:** U.S. Department of Energy

**Faculty Advisor:** David Willy

**Sponsor Mentors:** Bethany Straw, Elise DeGeorge

**Instructor:** Dr. Sarah Oman

## **DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared by students as part of a university course requirement. While considerable effort has been put into the project, it is not the work of licensed engineers and has not undergone the extensive verification that is common in the profession. The information, data, conclusions, and content of this report should not be relied on or utilized without thorough, independent testing and verification. University faculty members may have been associated with this project as advisors, sponsors, or course instructors, but as such they are not responsible for the accuracy of results or conclusions.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2008, the Department of Energy (DOE) published a report called *20% Wind Energy by 2030: Increasing Wind Energy's Contribution to U.S. Electricity Supply*, which detailed the predicted growth of the wind energy industry. The Collegiate Wind Competition 2018 was created by the DOE and the National Renewable Energy Lab to give undergraduates experience in this rapidly expanding industry.

The competition has multiple parts, including building and testing a prototype wind turbine, generating a business plan for a deployable wind turbine, and completing a bonus wind farm siting project. The CWC18 Market team must design a theoretical wind turbine that matches the business plan and meets the requirements of the competition.

This report describes the Market team's process in designing the wind turbine. First, the team researched various existing wind turbine technologies to better understand the current market. Next, the team generated customer and engineering requirements from the research, given completion information, and help from the faculty advisors. Then the team generated 11 wind turbine concepts. The concepts were narrowed down using the customer and engineering requirements as judging criteria. The final concept is a utility-scale, direct-drive, horizontal axis wind turbine with active pitch and yaw systems.

The first iterations of the tower, blade, yaw, shaft, and nacelle designs are described in further detail in the report. The team will continue with more in-depth analysis of these components, as well as research others such as the pitch system and the power electronics system. Certain components, such as the tower base, and blade design, depend on the location of the wind turbine. Since the business plan is yet to be chosen, those components will be finalized when the application of the turbine is determined.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
1 BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Project Description	1
1.3 Original System	1
1.3.1 Original System Structure	1
1.3.2 Original System Operation	3
1.3.3 Original System Performance	3
1.3.4 Original System Deficiencies	4
2 REQUIREMENTS	4
2.1 Customer Requirements (CRs)	4
2.2 Engineering Requirements (ERs)	5
2.3 Testing Procedures (TPs)	7
2.3.1 Matlab	7
2.3.2 QBlade Analysis	7
2.3.3 Solidworks	7
2.3.4 NREL's System Advisory Model	7
2.4 House of Quality (HoQ)	7
3 EXISTING DESIGNS	8
3.1 Design Research	9
3.2 System Level	9
3.2.1 Existing Design #1: Siemens Gamesa 3.3 MW	10
3.2.2 Existing Design #2: Vestas V-126-3.45 MW	10
3.2.3 Existing Design #3: Enivision 3.0-120	11
3.3 Functional Decomposition	11
3.3.1 Black Box Model	11
3.3.2 Functional Model	11
	4

3.4	Subsystem Level	12
3.4.1	Subsystem #1: Blades	12
3.4.1.1	Existing Design #1: Siemens' Dinotail	13
3.4.1.2	Existing Design #2: WhalePower	13
3.4.1.3	Existing Design #3: LM 88.4 P	13
3.4.2	Subsystem #2: Tower	13
3.4.2.1	Existing Design #1: MARS	13
3.4.2.2	Existing Design #2: Hexagonal Tower System	14
3.4.2.3	Existing Design #3: Reinforced Wind Tower	14
3.4.3	Subsystem #3: Drivetrain/ Generator	14
3.4.3.1	Existing Design #1: Direct Drive Generator with gearbox	14
3.4.3.2	Existing Design #2: Generator without Gearbox	14
3.4.3.3	Existing Design #3: Superconducting Generator	14
4	DESIGNS CONSIDERED	15
4.1	Design #1: Downwind with Shroud	15
4.2	Design #2: Two Blade with Passive Yaw	16
4.3	Design #5: Three Blade Turbine with Planetary Gearbox	17
4.4	Design #6: Three Blade Direct Drive Wind Turbine	18
4.5	Design #11: Down-Wind HAWT with Truss tower	19
4.6	Design #3: Upwind HAWT with Shroud	19
4.7	Design #4: Eight Bladed Downwind Turbine	20
4.8	Design #7: HAWT with Vertical Axis Wind Turbine	20
4.9	Design #8: Floating Turbine	21
4.10	Design #9: Horizontal Axis, 3-Blade Upwind, Guyed Tower	21
4.11	Design #10: Vertical Axis, 2-Blade, Multi-generator	21
5	DESIGN SELECTED	22
5.1	Rationale for Design Selection	22
5.2	Design Description	23
5.2.1	Tower Design Description	23
5.2.2	Blade Design Description	30
5.2.3	Hub Design Description	32
5.2.4	Yaw Design Description	33

5.2.5	Shaft Design Description	33
5.2.6	Nacelle Design Description	34
6	PROPOSED DESIGN	36
6.1	Schedule and Budget	37
7	REFERENCES	40
8	APPENDIX: Designs considered figures	41

# **1 BACKGROUND**

## **1.1 Introduction**

Northern Arizona University (NAU), along with twelve other schools, has been chosen to compete in the Collegiate Wind Competition 2018 (CWC18) held by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). The competition has three parts: A small scale turbine to be tested in a wind tunnel, a business marketing plan and a technical design for a large-scale wind turbine, and a siting challenge. The Market Team is a group of six mechanical engineers working on the technical design of the large-scale wind turbine. This report focuses on the objectives, research and design of the Market Team’s turbine.

The team must fully design a hypothetical large-scale wind turbine and all of its subcomponents. We will be working in tangent with a team of students from the W.A. Franke College of Business, to create a business plan for the turbine. This design and business plan will compete at the CWC18 in May.

## **1.2 Project Description**

The project description is given by the CWC18 Rules and Requirements:

*“Teams participating in the 2018 Collegiate Wind Competition will be expected to research and design a turbine for a grid scenario with a high contribution of renewables. The turbine should be able to operate in islanded mode.” [1].*

The Collegiate Wind Competition Market Team is responsible for creating a wind turbine design for a market plan developed by four students from the W.A. Franke College of Business at Northern Arizona University. The business plan and technical design will be compiled into a report that will be judged at the competition in May.

## 1.3 Original System

Wind turbines take the kinetic energy in the wind and convert it to rotational energy. Early windmills converted this rotational energy directly into mechanical energy, while modern day turbines produce electricity through a generator.

### 1.3.1 Original System Structure

There are several important components on a utility scale wind turbine (Figure 1). These main components include: blades, hub, drive shaft, generator, braking system, yawing system, and tower [2].




Figure 1: Components of a utility-scale wind turbine [3]

*Blades* – The blades are the main that interfaces with the wind. Lift based blades turn in a circular motion when the wind hits them and are often made with a mild steel beam frame and a glass-fiber and epoxy combination.

*Hub* – The hub is the cone-shaped piece in the middle of the rotor that holds the blades on the drive shaft. It is typically made of a polyester cone and a steel frame.

*Drive Shaft* – The drive shaft is a spinning circular rod attached to the rotor that connects to the gearbox or generator and is typically made of rolled steel.

*Braking System* – The braking system is a disk brake connected to the drive shaft. The brakes are used to stop the turbine when it is under maintenance, or when wind speeds reach the cut-out wind speed of the turbine.

*Generator* – The generator converts the rotational mechanical energy from the drive shaft into AC or DC

current depending on the size and use of the turbine.

*Yawing System* – The yawing system is used to keep the rotor in the direction of the wind. In an active yawing system, a wind vane determines the direction of the wind and sends a signal to the computer controls, which send a signal to the yawing gear in the nacelle to turn the turbine in that direction. In a passive yawing system, a tail on the back of a turbine is pushed in the wind direction using skin drag.

*Tower* – The tower is the structure that the nacelle rests on. Typically, it is mounted to the ground using a concrete foundation and the tower is made of steel to withstand the moment and torque that is created from capturing the wind energy.

### 1.3.2 Original System Operation

A wind turbine can integrate its energy with a grid, micro-grid, or energy storage system. A turbine can only produce power at certain speeds. The “cut-in speed” is the value at which a turbine starts spinning. The power then increases as the wind velocity increases at a cubic rate. At a certain velocity called the “rated wind speed” the turbine reaches its “rated power.” It maintains this power over a range of wind speeds until it reaches the “cut-out speed” where the braking system activates and stops the blades from spinning. This is so the high wind velocities won’t spin the blades too fast and produce enough force to break the turbine. An anemometer is used to detect the speed of the wind and relay the information to the braking and pitching systems. These areas of function are shown on a basic power curve of a wind turbine (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Basic power-curve for a utility-scale wind turbine [4]

A wind vane is used to determine the direction of the wind [3]. This information is transferred to the yawing system (in an active yawing system) which will then rotate the turbine, so it is facing the wind for maximum performance.



### **1.3.3 Original System Performance**

The performance of a wind turbine is dependent on several factors including the coefficient of performance, power curve, and the amount of wind. These factors often depend on, the hub height, rotor diameter, and the generator.

In this section, the team looked at the GE 3.2-103 Wind Turbine [5]. This is a 3.2 MW turbine with a hub height of 85-98 meters. The blade diameter is 120 meters with each blade being 60 meters long. These will be comparable specifications to the design market teams design.

### **1.3.4 Original System Deficiencies**

The original system did not meet the customer requirements because the competition requires an original system. Although the GE 3.2-103 Wind Turbine met the right size, and power output, the project needs to be original. The team will use designs deficiencies such as the gearbox to reduce maintenance and cost in the long run. This turbine also may not match the business plan made by the business team.

## 2 REQUIREMENTS

It is the Market team’s responsibility to communicate with testing teams and the business team to design a full size marketable turbine that meets the requirements of the competition. To accomplish this, we must identify the customer requirements and generate a set of measurable engineering requirements. Both these requirements are placed in a House of Quality matrix to rank which requirements are of the highest importance.

### 2.1 Customer Requirements (CRs)

The market team generated seven CR’s (Table 1) through interpreting the CWC18 challenge statement, and interviews with David Willy and Karin Wadsack. These requirements are awarded weights regarding their importance relative to the success of the project. These weights are used in the House of Quality, which can be observed in Section 2.3 of this report.

Table 1: CR’s

<b>Customer Requirement</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Competitive Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE)	This requirement ensures the project is financially feasible by evaluating the system’s costs in a life time divided by a system’s total energy production over the lifetime.	15%
Wind focused power system	From the CWC18 Rules and Regulations regarding the development of a power system composed of multiple generation methods including wind power.	20%
Grid connected	Turbine must be connected to the grid as per the competition guidelines. This could either be a large city based electrical grid or a micro-grid scenario.	10%
High Renewable Energy Penetration	Power system must encompass a high percentage of renewable energy in its total power production.	15%
Operate in islanded mode	A system operating in islanded mode must supply power to a micro-grid while disconnected from the larger grid, and thus will require an energy storage component.	20%
Comparable to test turbine	Compare the designed turbine with the test turbine, and explain all discrepancies between designs.	10%

Complement the business plan	Turbine design must complement the business proposal, and its associated market.	10%
------------------------------	--	-----

## 2.2 Engineering Requirements (ERs)

ER's compliment the CR's, and offer the team measurable parameters to judge the generated concepts. The Market team developed a total of nine ER's (Table 2).

Table 2: ER's

Importance	ER	Target Tolerance
1	Placed within an area with a minimum wind speed average of 6.5m/s.	Between 5 and 8 m/s.
2	Located within 20 miles of grid tie-ins.	± 10 miles.
3	Minimum power coefficient of 0.35.	≤ 0.59.
4	Able to provide power in islanded mode for 4 hours.	≥ 4 hours.
5	1MW Rated Power	± 25%.
6	Withstand wind speeds of 20 m/s.	≥ 20 m/s.
7	Wind energy accounts for 30% of total power output.	± 10%.
8	3 Blade Turbine	± 1
9	Tower height of 100m.	± 20%.

Implementing a system in an area which has a mean wind speed of 6.5 m/s has earned the top ranking among the team's ER's. This is because the efficiency and LCOE values will suffer greatly if the turbine is not placed in an area with appropriate resources. Through interviews with David Willy, the team decided 6.5m/s was the minimum average wind speed for optimal performance. Having the turbine within 20 miles of grid tie ins reduces capital costs relating to infrastructure and results in a lower LCOE. A minimum power coefficient of 0.35 is in place to vet out any poorly performing concepts. The system's ability to operate a minimum of four hours in islanded mode using an energy storage system meets the islanded mode customer requirement. A turbine with a 1MW rated power will complement the current state of the business plan which requires a utility scale power system. A power system where wind energy accounts for 30% of the total power production fills the CR's for a wind focused power system and high renewable energy penetration. The value of 30% insures a large amount of the energy in the system is

from a renewable source. The system must make an impact on the percentage of power coming from renewable sources to have high renewable energy penetration, and have a competitive LCOE; these are met by a turbine with a power coefficient at or higher than 0.35. A system which operates with three blades will make this power coefficient an achievable goal. Creating a tower with a height of 100m will place the blades of the turbine into an optimal wind resource, and be rigid enough to not be concerned with reliability and durability issues. Durability is a key factor in designing a turbine that can withstand wind speeds of 20m/s. The team's success relies heavily upon following these ER's during concept evaluation and selection.

## **2.3 Testing Procedures (TPs)**

To thoroughly test each engineering requirement, the below testing procedures were developed, and implemented. Mathematical, Visual, and Financial software packages make up the entirety of the team's testing procedures because this project is entirely theoretical, and we will not be building a functioning physical prototype.

### **2.3.1 Matlab**

Utilizing Matlab the team developed several code blocks to test certain engineering requirements. The largest of them being Blade Element Momentum iterator which allows the team to test the performance characteristics of turbine blade systems. This code allows the team to see what kind of coefficient of performance their design is operating in, and to choose the best airfoil for their design. This allows the team to meet the engineering requirement of having a minimum coefficient of performance of 0.35. Other code blocks include analysis of the design's shaft, mainframe, yawing system and tower. These alternate code blocks help to insure the durability of the team's design by allowing the team to experiment with different material properties within their design parameters. Utilizing these results the team is able to meet the engineering requirement of withstanding wind speeds of 20 m/s minimum.

### **2.3.2 QBlade Analysis**

Once the team is confident in the outputs of their Matlab BEM iterator, that code will then be imported into QBlade. QBlade will allow the team to further test the capabilities of their selected airfoils, and then generate an overall blade model. QBlade looks at the overall power curve of the team's proposed blade, and gives the team a look into the cut-in, cut-out, and rated power of the blade. QBlade is used to test the engineering requirement of a 1MW rated power system. The number of blades will also be tested within QBlade to appease the engineering requirement of having a three blade system. Once this blade is operating within an acceptable range the team can then export this information for further testing in other programs.

### **2.3.3 Solidworks**

All major components generated up to this point, and any components generated in the future will undergo an Finite Element Analysis (FEA) in Solidworks. This includes the blade, which with the data generated in QBlade will be fully developed and tested in Solidworks. The tower, shaft, and mainframe

are all currently drawn up in Solidworks, and will undergo an FEA analysis as well. Through this FEA the team will test the engineering requirement of being able to withstand minimum wind speeds of 20 m/s. A tower height of 100m will also be tested using Solidworks FEA to see the effects of the forces present on the tower and whether or not the system will be able to withstand such heights. Once all other major components have been generated in Solidworks, the assembly itself will undergo the same analysis.

### **2.3.4 NREL's System Advisory Model**

Siting decisions will be made with the input of NREL's System Advisory Model (SAM). SAM will allow the team to see what kind of renewable impact their design will have, as well as what wind speeds the possible area is dealing with. SAM allows the team to properly test the engineering requirement of being located within 20 miles of major grid tie-ins, as well as the engineering requirement of implementing our system in an area with a wind resource of 6.5m/s. This aids in the capacity decisions of the project, as well as insuring the lowest LCOE possible. The team will need a green light from their business student counterparts prior to any work being done regarding possible placement areas.

## **2.4 House of Quality (HoQ)**

The team's HoQ uses the CR's to determine which ER's have the highest technical importance (Table 3). This helps guide the team in further research, concept generation, and design selection. The team rated these requirements using values of either 3,6, or 9, and these values were then multiplied to the weight of their corresponding CR's and summed to get the requirements Absolute Technical Importance (ATI). Once all ATIs were tabulated the requirements were then ranked 1-9 in order of Relative Technical Importance (RTI). All ER's will be verified through testing procedures one through four, which are discussed in detail in section 2.3.

Table 3: HoQ

Customer Requirement	Weight	Engineering Requirement	Located within 20 miles of grid tie-ins.	An area with a minimum wind speed average of 6.5m/s.	Able to operate in islanded mode for 4 hours.	Wind energy must account for 60% of total power out.	Minimum power coefficient of 0.35.	Withstand wind speeds between 0-20m/s.	1MW Rated Power	Tower Height of 100m	Number of Blades
1. Wind focused power system	0.20		9	9	3	9	9	9	9	0	6
2. Competitive LCOE	0.15		9	9	0	3	3	3	6	6	6
3. Must be grid connected	0.10		9	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
4. High renewable energy penetration	0.15		6	9	6	3	9	3	6	0	0
5. Must operate in islanded mode	0.20		0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Comparable to the testing turbine	0.10		0	6	0	0	9	9	0	0	9
7. Complement the business plan	0.10		6	6	9	6	3	3	9	9	0
<b>Absolute Technical Importance (ATI)</b>			5.55	5.7	4.5	3.6	4.8	3.9	4.5	1.8	3
<b>Relative Technical Importance (RTI)</b>			2	1	4	7	3	6	5	9	8
<b>Target ER values</b>			20 miles	6.5 m/s	4 hrs.	60%	0.35	20 m/s	1MW	100m	3
<b>Tolerances of Ers</b>			±10miles	5-8m/s	≥4hrs.	±10%	≤0.59	≥20m/s	±25%	±20%	±1
<b>Testing Procedure (TP#)</b>			4	4	4	4	1,2	1,2,3	1,2	1,2,3	1,2

### **3 EXISTING DESIGNS**

An increased demand for renewable energy solutions has created a market for the design and manufacture of utility-scale wind turbines. Most of wind power generation is produced by commercial horizontal axis wind turbines (HAWT) in wind farms [6]. We focused our research and concept generation on these turbines because they are manufactured nationally and advertise high reliability and performance. Various subsystem components including turbine blades, towers, generators, and drivetrains were researched to aid in the development of a wind turbine that best fits the ER's.

Existing designs were analyzed by benchmarking commercial HAWT's. This model has a high efficiency or coefficient of performance ( $C_p$ ) making it a promising solution to meet the design goal [6]. The manufacturer specifications of three distinct wind turbines are compared in Section 3.2. Individual turbine subsystems were researched to further analyze wind turbine options that meet the ER's.

Even though HAWT's are promising due to the high efficiency and ability to produce power, there are opportunities for improvement. Some problems are related to the foundation, grid connection, and maintenance. Usually, direct drive generators are preferred because failure and maintenance of the gearbox is avoided [7]. A direct drive generator substitutes the need for a gearbox in the nacelle of the turbine. Avoiding a gearbox not only results in improved reliability (assuming the generator is reliable) but improved performance due to a decrease in frictional losses in the gearbox. Another system component crucial to the power produced by the turbine is the blades. Blade design is a critical area of research due to the significant impact on wind turbine performance.

#### **3.1 Design Research**

The team assigned individual areas of research to each team member. The areas explored included a full design comparison, blade research, tower research, and powertrain/generator comparison. The system level research was performed by finding turbine specifications from official sites of the turbine manufactures (Siemens, Vestas and Envision), see References [8] through [10]. Blades were researched by use of an article released by Siemens, an online blade comparison from [popularmechanics.com](http://popularmechanics.com), a report from [windsystemsmag.com](http://windsystemsmag.com), and information from LM Wind Power, a GE Renewable Energy Business. For blade research resources see References [11] through [14]. Turbine towers were researched by use of online sources and two US patents related to turbine tower geometry, see References [15] through [17]. Generators and turbine drivetrain was researched by use of sources from the IEEE online library. The articles used to research drivetrain components were published documents from credible sources such as IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, and IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity, see References [18] through [20].

#### **3.2 System Level**

This section benchmarks existing wind turbines of similar rated powers and wind classes (Table 2).

Table 4: Benchmarking of three existing HAWT systems

Company	Siemens Gamesa [8]	Vestas [9]	Envision [10]
<b>Product Name</b>	Gamesa 3.3 MW	V126-3.45 MW	3.0-120
<b>Rated Power (MW)</b>	3.3	3.45	3
<b>Cut-in Wind speed (m/s)</b>	2	3	3
<b>Cut-out wind speed (m/s)</b>	25	22.5	25
<b>Rated wind speed (m/s)</b>	11	20	11
<b>IEC Wind Class</b>	IIA, IIB	IIA, IIB	IIA
<b>Rotor Diameter (m)</b>	132	126	120
<b>Hub heights (m)</b>	84, 94, 114, 134, and site specific	87, 117, 137, 147, 149, 166	90
<b>Gear box</b>	3 stages	Two planetary stages and one helical stage	Directly driven

All compared turbines have a rated power between 3 and 3.45 MW, and all are in IEC Wind Classification II. This rated power was chosen because this is the average value of most utility scale turbines being produced today. The specifications for the Siemens Gamesa, Vestas, and Envision wind turbines were found at the company websites.

### 3.2.1 Existing Design #1: Siemens Gamesa 3.3 MW

The Gamesa 3.3 MW wind turbine was first deployed in 2016 [8]. Its rated power is 3.45 MW, and is built for both IIA and IIB LEC wind classifications. It has the lowest cut-in wind speed of 2 m/s, a cut-out wind speed of 25 m/s, and a rated wind speed of 11 m/s. The rotor diameter is 132 m, and the hub heights range from 84 to 134 m. According to the company, the Gamesa 3.3 MW turbine is optimized for low LCOE and noise emission levels [8].



### 3.2.2 Existing Design #2: Vestas V-126-3.45 MW

The Vestas V-126-3.45 MW Wind turbine has the highest rated power and is also for LEC wind class IIA and IIB winds. It's cut-in wind speed is 3 m/s, cut-out wind speed is 22.5, and rated wind speed is 20 m/s. The hub heights range from 87 to 166 m, and the rotor diameter is 126. Vestas claims that this turbine produces “exceptional profitability in areas with low wind” [9].

### 3.2.3 Existing Design #3: Envision 3.0-120

The Envision 3.0-120 is designed for IIA wind class, and was first released in 2015 [10]. This turbine has a cut-in speed of 3 m/s, a cut-out speed of 25 m/s and a rated wind speed of 11 m/s. It has a 120 m rotor diameter and a 90 m hub height. This is the only turbine out of the three compared, that is directly driven.

## 3.3 Functional Decomposition

The design function tells the team what the product must do; and through what paths energy, material, and information must flow. Understanding these steps, and their interfaces, aids the design team in identifying design problems during concept generation.

### 3.3.1 Black Box Model

The black box model (Figure 3) simplifies the function of the wind turbine. The model assumes that matter, energy, and signals flow in and out of a black box. In this instance, the inputs include air, kinetic energy of wind, and orientation of the turbine relative to the wind. The outputs include air, electricity, and proper alignment of the rotor.



Figure 3: Black Box Model

### 3.3.2 Functional Model

The primary function of a wind turbine is to transform wind energy into useable electrical energy. Wind incident upon the rotor is converted to rotational energy. This rotational energy is transmitted by a low speed shaft, into a gearbox. A high-speed shaft out of the gearbox, is connected to an induction generator where the rotational energy is converted to electricity. The electricity can be transmitted to the grid or an

energy storage system. Figure 4 shows the functional decomposition of a downwind lift-based HAWT, with an active yaw, a gearbox, and an induction generator.




Figure 4: Functional Decomposition Model

Energy from the wind not transmitted through the rotor shaft is dissipated in the rotor wake, or converted to bending and torsional stress in the tower and its linkages. Energy that is lost between the rotor shaft and gearbox output shaft dissipates thermally through friction and hysteretic damping. Energy lost in the generator dissipates thermally. Energy lost in transmission lines dissipates thermally, and is proportional to the square of the current multiplied by the resistance.

### 3.4 Subsystem Level

This section analyzes current wind turbine designs on a subsystem level. The subsystems researched were blades, towers, and generators.

#### 3.4.1 Subsystem #1: Blades

Blades are an important and unique aspect of wind turbine design. The blades collect power from the wind, and have the largest impact on total turbine efficiency. Since the goal of this design is to have a high efficiency, it is important to know what is being done with current blades in order to produce the

highest efficiencies for modern turbines.

#### **3.4.1.1 Existing Design #1: Siemens' Dinotail**

The DinoTail is a blade add-on device designed to reduce noise of wind turbines. The design was inspired by the jagged edge of an owl's wing and uses a serrated design to create wind vortices which reduce the noise generated by airflow [11]. Test results of the product show that the design reduces noise emissions of wind turbines at all wind speeds without affecting annual energy production. Adding a design such as this can allow the blade design to focus more heavily on capturing wind power without worry of local noise restrictions. This would be advantageous for a turbine that would be close to populated areas.

#### **3.4.1.2 Existing Design #2: WhalePower**

The company, WhalePower, has created a new fin design for turbine blades that uses a series of ridges to increase annual electrical production by as much as 20% [12]. The design is based on bumps on the fins of humpback whales called tubercles. This fin design prevents stalling and allows for steeper angles on blades, increasing the amount of wind power the blade can capture. Test results show that this design can help push back the stall angle by as much as 40% [12]. This would be a very beneficial design for any utility scale turbine and possibly any small-wind turbine as well, seeing that it adds an overall increase to the turbine efficiency by allowing it to collect more power from the wind.

#### **3.4.1.3 Existing Design #3: LM 88.4 P**

The LM 88.4 P is the world's longest blade at 88.4 m in length [13]. The blade is primarily designed for offshore wind turbines with an expected life of 25 years. Due to its immense size, the amount of power it can collect is much larger than most turbine blades, capable of producing 8 MW. One method the company used to create such a large and economical design was using a "Pre-Bend" design. This design uses a ductile blade material and applies a stress hardening process during manufacturing for higher strength at a cheaper cost [14]. Applying this manufacturing method could possibly allow the design to use cheaper material without losing strength or efficiency.

### **3.4.2 Subsystem #2: Tower**

The tower is the structure that raises the turbine above the ground into higher wind speeds. Since wind speed increases with height, it is important to find a tower design capable of lifting a wind turbine as high off the ground as possible. It is also important that the tower is strong and sturdy enough to support a heavy wind turbine in harsh weather conditions such as thunderstorms, heatwaves, and extreme wind speeds. A strong tower with a large height would be very beneficial to this design in terms of increasing the overall wind speed and, henceforth, power output of the design,

### **3.4.2.1 Existing Design #1: MARS**

The Mageen Air Rotor System (MARS) is a unique turbine design that has no tower. Instead, the turbine system is lifted off the ground with helium gas and tethered with power lines. This unique design allows the turbine to reach heights up to 1000 m. This design is still in the prototype stage, however Magenn has 10 to 25 kW turbine designs and plans to pursue a 100 kW model in the future [15].

### **3.4.2.2 Existing Design #2: Hexagonal Tower System**

This patented tower design from Iowa State University uses a hexagonal shaped tower structure assembled from a series of concrete columns and panels. The columns and panels, made from high performance concrete, can be assembled together to create a tower ranging from 80 to 100 m high while withstanding all necessary loads including heavy winds and earthquakes. This tower has many advantages over the conventional steel tower, from cheaper material costs to easier transportation and to easier assembly [16]. Applying this to the design would be greatly beneficial in terms of manufacturing cost.

### **3.4.2.3 Existing Design #3: Reinforced Wind Tower**

This patented design from Gamesa innovation & Technologies is a structural support system for the interior of a cylindrical tower. The design uses a series of longitudinal reinforcement elements attached to the inner surface of the tower's hollow body. The result is a taller tower with a smaller diameter, and cuts in material and manufacturing costs [17].

## **3.4.3 Subsystem #3: Drivetrain/ Generator**

The drivetrain and generator of HAWT's have a significant impact on the performance and reliability of the system. Therefore, a turbine design must have an appropriate drivetrain and generator to reduce maintenance costs and improve the overall system performance.

### **3.4.3.1 Existing Design #1: Direct Drive Generator with gearbox**

The wind turbine gearbox transmits mechanical energy into the generator at a high speed. The gearbox suffers heavy loads, transient impulses of brakes, and dust corrosions; and accounts for about 59% of total wind turbine failures [19]. It is important to design a gearbox with easily replaceable parts, and carefully considered factors of safety because of the frequency of failure.

### **3.4.3.2 Existing Design #2: Generator without Gearbox**

Direct drive systems are beneficial because they lower the maintenance costs of replacing gear boxes, however the required generators can be expensive because they must function at a range of low angular speeds. This system is particularly suitable for installations where minimized maintenance is a crucial

requirement [18].

### 3.4.3.3 Existing Design #3: Superconducting Generator

The superconducting generator is a type of direct drive generator that is smaller and lighter than other direct-drive generators. Superconducting generator technology is developing rapidly due to its promising attributes [20]. This type of generator is relevant to wind turbine design because it would reduce the weight and size of the nacelle, and decrease surface drag. A decrease in weight would also lessen the loads on the yawing system and tower, and aid in easier installation.

## 4 DESIGNS CONSIDERED

The team generated 11 wind turbine designs. The top five designs from the Pugh Chart are shown in Figures 5-10, the rest of the designs are described in the Appendix.

### 4.1 Design #1: Downwind with Shroud

Design 1 (Figure 5) is a downwind, three bladed turbine with a shroud. The design has a 40m hub with a direct drive shaft to a generator providing 500kW power. The shroud provides a passive yawing system, and a low-pressure area behind the turbine which accelerates the flow of the wind through the blades.



Figure 5: Downwind Turbine with Shroud to increase flow velocity through blades.

**Pros:**

- High efficiency
- Always in the optimal direction for wind capture
- No gearbox

**Cons:**

- Complex design
- Better for small-scale systems
- Not aesthetically pleasing
- Low durability

## 4.2 Design #2: Two Blade with Passive Yaw

Design 2 (Figure 6) is a two blade, variable pitch, 30m wind turbine. The variable pitching allows for lower cut-in speeds and able to stall at cut-out speeds. The low speed shaft goes into a planetary gear box which allows for a cheaper generator that spins at a high speed. The fin acts as a passive yawing system and the turbine can always be pointed in the direction of the wind.




Figure 6: Two bladed small-scale wind turbine with passive yawing system

**Pros:**

- High efficiency
- Always in the optimal direction of wind capture

- Low generator cost

**Cons:**

- Gearbox will need maintenance
- Complex design
- Low durability
- Not aesthetically pleasing

### 4.3 Design #5: Three Blade Turbine with Planetary Gearbox

Design 5 (Figure 7) includes three blades, a pitching blade mechanism, a software controlled yaw system, a planetary gearbox, and a power generator. The turbine is intended for an IEC wind class level II. There are preferred features with this design that correlate with the identified ER's but there is also room for improvement.




Figure 7: Utility scale turbine with planetary gearbox

**Pros:**

- Moderate efficiency
- Designed for utility scale systems
- Aesthetically pleasing

- High durability/ longevity
- Low generator cost

**Cons:**

- High maintenance costs due to the gearbox
- Frictional losses due to the gearbox
- High number of components to maintain

#### 4.4 Design #6: Three Blade Direct Drive Wind Turbine

Design 6 (Figure 8) includes three blades, a pitching blade mechanism, a software controlled yaw system, and a direct drive power generator. The turbine is intended for an IEC wind class level II. There are preferred features with this design that correlate with the identified ER's but there is also room for improvement.




Figure 8: Utility-scale turbine with direct drive

**Pros:**

- High efficiency
- Reduced frictional losses due to elimination of the gearbox



- Designed for utility scale systems
- Reduced number of components to manufacture and assemble
- Smaller nacelle (Aesthetically pleasing)
- High durability

**Cons:**

- Complex design
- High generator cost

#### 4.5 Design #11: Down-Wind HAWT with Truss tower

Design 11 is a HAWT and down-wind configured turbine, see Figure 9. The turbine's tower is constructed from a series of faired trusses. The generator is a direct drive permanent magnet system. The rotor blades are composed of composite material, and are shaped as an S800 series, and include vortex fences to mitigate span wise blade flows. This turbine is stall regulated.




Figure 9: Downwind turbine with truss tower and vortex fenced blades

**Pros:**

- No gearbox
- Always in the optimal direction for wind capture
- No gearbox
- High durability

**Cons:**

- Low efficiency
- Complex design

- Better for small-scale systems
- Not aesthetically pleasing
- High generator cost

#### **4.6 Design #3: Upwind HAWT with Shroud**

Design 3 (Figure 19 in Appendix) is HAWT, upwind, four bladed turbine with a wind shroud. The system is also directly driven. The wind shroud acts as a passive yawing system.

**Pros:**

- High efficiency
- Always in the optimal direction of wind capture
- No gearbox

**Cons:**

- Complex design
- Better for small-scale systems
- Not aesthetically pleasing
- Low durability
- High generator cost

#### **4.7 Design #4: Eight Bladed Downwind Turbine**

Design 4 (Figure 20 in Appendix) is a small-scale, eight bladed, downwind turbine. It has a 3-stage gearbox and is stall regulated.

**Pros:**

- Always in the optimal direction of wind capture
- Simple design
- Better for large-scale systems
- Low generator cost

**Cons:**

- Low efficiency
- Gearbox will need maintenance
- Not aesthetically pleasing
- Low durability

#### **4.8 Design #7: HAWT with Vertical Axis Wind Turbine**

Design 7 (Figure 21 in Appendix) is a combination of a HAWT and a vertical axis wind turbine. The HAWT is an up-wind system with a passive yawing, and 3-stage gearbox. The vertical axis turbine is integrated into the tower to provide additional power generation from the wind passing below the top

turbine.

**Pros:**

- High efficiency
- Low generator cost
- Aesthetically pleasing

**Cons:**

- Gearbox will require maintenance
- Complex design
- Low durability

## **4.9 Design #8: Floating Turbine**

Design 8 (Figure 22 in Appendix) is a floating wind turbine tethered to the ground using power cables. The funnel-style kite design, accompanied by helium filled sacks on the outside would keep the turbine afloat while forcing it to face the direction of the wind. Serrated edges on the backs of the blades would help to prevent stalling of the turbine and allow it to capture more energy.

**Pros:**

- High efficiency
- Aesthetically pleasing

**Cons:**

- Complex design
- Low durability
- Better for small-scale systems

## **4.10 Design #9: Horizontal Axis, 3-Blade Upwind, Guyed Tower**

Design 9 (Figure 23 in Appendix) is a three blade, upwind HAWT. The uniqueness of this design comes from its telescoping guyed tower which would allow for easy transport and implementation. This design has a tower height of 40 meters a blade length of 17 m, and a rated capacity of 300kw.

**Pros:**

- High efficiency

**Cons:**

- Better for small-scale
- Complex design
- Low durability
- Not aesthetically pleasing

## **4.11 Design #10: Vertical Axis, 2-Blade, Multi-generator**

Design 10 (Figure 24 in Appendix) is a 40 m tall, vertical axis, multi-generator wind turbine which has varying blade lengths at each 2-blade subsystem. Due to the nature of this design all control and power electronics would have to be encased in a separate area near the turbine structure.

### **Pros:**

- Always in the optimal direction for wind capture
- Simple design
- Aesthetically pleasing

### **Cons:**

- Low durability
- Low efficiency
- Better for small-scale systems

## 5 DESIGN SELECTED

This section contains the rationale for the selection of Design #6. This design was the highest ranked in a decision matrix due to its preferred characteristics that meet the engineering design requirements.

### 5.1 Rationale for Design Selection

All 11 generated concepts were qualitatively ranked in a Pugh chart (Table 5). The datum for the Pugh chart is the Siemens Gamesa 3.3 MW wind turbine. This turbine is a common off the shelf turbine intended for utility scale wind power plants.

Table 5: All Designs Pugh Chart

Selection Criteria	Wind Turbine Concepts												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Datum	7	8	9	10	11	12
Cost	+	+	-	-	0	-			-	-	-	-	+
Simplicity	-	+	-	-	0	+		-	-	0	-	0	0
Efficiency	+	-	+	0	0	+		+	-	+	-	0	0
Aesthetic	+	0	+	+	+	0		+	+	-	+	-	0
Safety	-	+	-	-	0	0		-	-	-	-	0	0
Durability	-	-	-	-	+	+		-	-	-	-	+	0
Eco. Impact	+	0	-	+	0	0		+	-	0	-	0	0
Sum +'s	4	3	2	2	2	3		3	1	1	1	2	0
Sum 0's	0	2	0	1	5	3		0	0	2	0	4	7
Sum -'s	3	2	5	4	0	1		4	6	4	6	1	0
Net Score	1	1	-3	-2	2	2		-1	-5	-3	-5	1	0
Rank	2	2	6	5	1	1		4	7	6	7	2	3

The top five designs from the Pugh chart entered a decision matrix with weighted criteria, (Table 6). Designs #5 and #6 were the highest ranked due to their preferred attributes to meet or exceed the predetermined ER's. Efficiency, energy output, cost, and durability are important requirements that the system must meet or exceed.

Table 6: Top Five Designs Decision Matrix

Decision Matrix for Top Five Wind Turbine Designs											
Criteria	Weight	Design 1		Design 2		Design 5		Design 6		Design 11	
		Score (1-5)	W-Score	Score (1-5)	W-Score	Score (1-5)	W-Score	Score (1-5)	W-Score	Score (1-5)	W-Score
Efficiency	0.2	4	0.8	2	0.4	4	0.8	5	1	4	0.8
Asthetics	0.05	3	0.15	2	0.1	3	0.15	3	0.15	1	0.05
Durability/Maint.	0.35	2	0.7	1	0.35	3	1.05	5	1.75	2	0.7
Energy Output	0.2	4	0.8	3	0.6	4	0.8	4	0.8	4	0.8
Cost/Material	0.2	3	0.6	4	0.8	4	0.8	3	0.6	2	0.4
Total	1		3.05		2.25		3.6		4.3		2.75

Based on the criteria designs #5 and #6 are competitive with current wind turbine technologies. Design #6

ranked higher than others because of the lack of gearbox. As previously discussed, the gearbox accounts for most failures and maintenance required for wind turbines. Therefore, eliminating the gearbox reduces the energy losses (due to friction) within the system, and lowers the maintenance costs. Design #6 is the best fit to meet the customer needs and ER's due to its reliable and efficient, low cost design.

## 5.2 Design Description

The final design for the project was recently chosen due to the recent agreement on scale and ability to start designing from the business team. The design is focused on a full mechanical system, where power electronics will be incorporated next semester. This mechanical design is composed of blades, a hub, a pitching system, a low speed drive shaft, nacelle, yawing system, and a tower (Figure 10).



Figure 10: Solidworks model of the design

This is the first iteration of the 1MW wind turbine mechanical design. The next iteration will be changed to 3.5MW due to recent business decisions. It will also include a more in depth analysis on each of the components with more complete designs. The following sections provide further detail on the select

components and their analysis for the current 1MW turbine design. .

### 5.2.1 Tower Design Description

The final tower design selection is a tapered steel tower (Figure 11). This design was chosen over a concrete tower due to cost and tower height. The tower height will be within 60-80 meters and the steel design was chosen because concrete is only cost effective past 100 meters in height. For ease of transportation and cost of manufacturing, the tower is divided into 15-20 meter sections. These sections have flanges at each section break that have 80 holes for bolts. The bolt analysis is yet to be done, but the bolts will be at least 0.2m in depth to go through the flanges and receive a bolt. The width of the bolts will be dependent on a finite element analysis to be able to withstand extreme conditions.




Figure 11: Base section of the tower design

The base of the tower also has a flange at the bottom that will allow for it to be bolted down the foundation. This will have 120 bolts since there isn't a space or access like the flanges within the tower. As with the bolts within the tower, the length and width required has yet to be determined. The hole in the base will be a door that allows access to the control systems within and a ladder that will go up to the nacelle. The material used for this tower design will be S500 Grade Structural Steel. This is a material used in most modern skyscrapers. This material is expensive, but when used in a large structure such as this turbine, it is cost effective and can use less material.

## 5.2.2 Blade Design Description

The selected blade is composed of extruded profiles of S811, S809, and S810 series airfoils (Figures 11-13). The profile of the S811 airfoil will be used to design the blade section near the root of the blade. Note that this profile shows a larger blade thickness as compared to the S809 and S810 airfoils. The larger blade thickness at the root is necessary to provide sufficient structural support for the large blade.




Figure 11: S811 Airfoil Profile (Blade Root) [21]

The blade length was calculated to be 30-35m. This creates a 60-70m diameter rotor with sufficient swept area for a 1MW turbine. The primary length of the blade will be design from the profile of an S809 airfoil (Figure 12). The S809 airfoil has a smaller thickness than the S811 airfoil for improved performance along the primary length of the blade. Also, the stress concentrations will be larger at the root of the blade therefore requiring it to be larger at root. The stresses along the rest of the blade are not as large so the primary concern is performance.




Figure 12: S809 Airfoil Profile (Primary Blade Length) [21]

The blade section near the tip of the blade will be designed from the profile of an S810 airfoil (Figure 13). Note that the left edge of this profile is thinner than the previous two profiles. The thinner profile allows for better performance at the tip of the blade. Also, the tip of the blade carries little load for which structural strength is not a concern.






Figure 13: S810 Airfoil Profile (Blade Tip) [21]

To withstand blade stress concentrations which result from bending and centrifugal forces, the root section of the blade's length is lofted from a root circle to an S810 airfoil. An analysis based on Blade Element Momentum (B.E.M.) theory was implemented and performed in the MatLab programming environment. The initial blade iteration is estimated to have a power coefficient of 0.1881. Utility scale turbines possess power coefficients that range from 0.4-0.5. Therefore, we recalculated blade parameters, resulting in changes of chord length, twist angle, and length of cylindrical root loft. The revised blade design possesses a power coefficient of 0.4771, well within the expected range of a utility scale blade design.

Finite Element Analysis (F.E.A.) was performed in the Solidworks CAD environment. We estimate thrust on each blade at wind speeds of 24 meters per second to be approximately 9500 newtons.

$$T = \frac{1}{2} \rho AV^2$$

*where T = Thrust,  $\rho$  = density, A = area, and V = wind speed*

Assuming the blade is composed of a Derlin 2700 NC010 acetal copolymer composite, the maximum von Mises stress is 142 KPa, well within the material's yield strength of 63 MPa.




Figure X: 1 MW Blade Drawing-Version 2




Figure X: 1 MW-von Mises Stress Concentrations

Many adjustments to design parameters remain to be determined. For example, we have yet to decide on the geographic setting in which this turbine will operate, and hence are not familiar with the design wind regime. As more business and siting decisions are made, we will have more information upon which to make blade design decisions. The aforementioned decisions may affect the dimensioning of turbine components. When the geometry of our blade design is set, we will conduct another F.E.A., which will account for centrifugal as well as expected thrust loads.

### 5.2.3 Hub Design Description

The hub was designed to accommodate three blades of diameter 2 meters at the root, reference Figure 14. The hub-blade attachment dimensions were driven by the designed blade. The hub will be secured by used of 50 large bolts. The hub also allows for the shaft to be attached at a 1.5 meter diameter, reference Figure 15. The attachment to the shaft will also consist of 50 large bolts. The material selected for the hub is AISI 4130 Steel, annealed at 865 degrees Celsius. This material was selected based on its desired yield strength of 460 *mpa* and relatively low mass density of 7850 *kg/m<sup>3</sup>* as compared to other steels of similar yield strength. It is essential for the hub to be able to withstand the loads from the blades and also the shaft; Therefore, a high yield strength material is required for this part. The mass density is also

important since this part will need to be delivered to the top of the turbine tower via a crane.




Figure 14: Hub-Blade Attachment





Figure 15: Hub-Shaft Attachment

#### **5.2.4 Yaw Design Description**

An active yawing mechanism was determined to be the best fit for the selected scale. A slewing ring bearing with an internal gear will be attached to the nacelle base and mounted to the tower tip mounting station. Four motor gears will be attached to the nacelle and link up with the teeth along the inside of the bearing. The wind direction will be tracked using a wind vane sensor. Every ten minutes, a circuit board will analyse the wind direction data of the wind vane and determine the average direction of the wind. The circuit board will then turn the motors linking the nacelle to the bearing and turn the turbine to that direction



**Figure X1: Tower Tip Mounting Station**

The tip of the tower will have a plate extended along the interior to act as a mounting station for the slewing ring bearing. The inner ring of the bearing will be mounted along the bars of the tower mounting station while the external ring will be bolted to the nacelle.

**Figure X2: Top Level Yaw Bearing**

The bearing displayed in figure X2 is a crude mock-up of what the bearing for the yaw system will look like. The real bearing for the system will be a single-row spherical type ball bearing purchased from an outside vendor.

### **5.2.5 Shaft Design Description**

A wind turbine's shaft transmits the torque generated from the blades to the generator. There are two ways to transmit this torque, through a gearbox, which converts the torque into a higher speed, and through a directly driven system. We chose a direct drive system because of the high maintenance costs associated with gearbox replacements (Figure 17).




Figure 17: Shaft Design

This first iteration design is made from AISI 1040 steel because of its desired properties. This design has a fatigue factor of safety of 1.03, and a yield factor of safety of 1.29, where these values were found in an excel algorithmic workbook. The exact dimensions of the groove thicknesses and bolt holes will be finalized with a FEA in SolidWorks. This will also help improve the factors of safety of the final shaft design.

### 5.2.6 Nacelle Design Description

The nacelle main frame is the backbone of the full design. The mainframe will be constructed from AISI 1020 plate steel. This material was chosen utilizing the mainframe analysis conducted using Matlab. The analysis allowed the team to adjust material, as well as dimensions to review maximum shear and bending moments on the mainframe. Through this analysis the team found that the AISI steels yield strength of 352 MPa performed best, while still keeping cost low. AISI 1020 can be ordered as sheet steel with the appropriate thickness for both base plate as well as the ribs. This allows for the team to keep manufacturing cost low as well. The mainframe has a length of 10 meters, and is 7 meters at its widest part, and features a series of 0.4 meter tall ribs on the bottom to increase strength with minimal material (Figure 18). This current design also incorporates a single mount for the shaft's support bearings, in order to accommodate the system's direct drive set-up. The mainframe attaches to the yawing system via forty M30 bolts to minimize structural deformation from the forces exhibited on the component. Moving forward with the development of the nacelle, a cover will be modeled to protect mounted components, and improve aerodynamic efficiency of the system.




Figure 18: Mainframe Design

## 6 PROPOSED DESIGN

The market team is designing a utility scale turbine that meets the needs of a market. The proposed design is a 1MW turbine to be deployed in a ski resort market. With this conceptual design, a scaled prototype will be created showing the primary mechanical components of the design. Components that will be modeled include the blades, hub, nacelle, tower and yawing mechanism. The prototype will be used as display during the competition in Chicago, and will look similar to the first iteration design (Figure 19). Depth analysis of the primary mechanical components will be performed to ensure viability of the designed turbine. Analyses to be completed include FEA for mechanical components and performance analysis of the blades by use of a BEM analysis.



Figure 19: Prototype of the scale model

The prototype model will not be functional, but instead be a physical representation of the mechanical components as viewed from the outside of the turbine. This model will be made of four components: The blades, hub, nacelle, and tower (Figure 20).






Figure 20: Exploded View of Prototype Assembly

Once the prototype is finalized, the team will begin to work on material and manufacturing selection for the small-scale display. This will most likely be made by 3D printing the parts and gluing them together. If possible, other options will be chosen to make the parts move. The 3D printing process will take place at the Cline Library’s MakerBot studio which charges \$0.10 per gram of filament used. The total price of the prototype will be dependent on the volume and scale decided next semester. The team will also start to research and design the electrical components and power electronic equipment needed to use a utility scale wind turbine. These electronics will allow the pitching and yaw systems to move as well as turning the mechanical rotation to usable electricity. The power electronics will also allow the electricity to be put into the grid and the decided storage component for the competition.

## 6.1 Schedule and Budget


A schedule for implementation has been created with the ultimate goal being the CWC2018 competition and the final report to be delivered to the Department of Energy. The Gantt Chart in Tables 7 and 8 give details regarding all tasks that will need to be completed to accomplish the main deliverables for the

project.

Table 7: Gantt Chart for Spring 2018 (part 1)

Task Name	Durat	Start	Finish	Resource Names
<b>▲ CWC Market Design</b>	<b>83 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Wed 5/9/18</b>	
<b>▲ Business and Design Written Report</b>	<b>71 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Mon 4/23/18</b>	
Cover Sheet	5 days	Mon 1/15/18	Fri 1/19/18	BUS Market Team
Executive Summary	5 days	Mon 1/22/18	Fri 1/26/18	BUS Market Team
Business Plan	66 days	Mon 1/22/18	Mon 4/23/18	BUS Market Team
Report Due Date	0 days	Mon 4/23/18	Mon 4/23/18	
Technical Design	20 days	Mon 1/22/18	Fri 2/16/18	ENG Market Team
<b>▲ Siting Challenge</b>	<b>71 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Mon 4/23/18</b>	<b>Alana</b>
Site selection (3) with 100 miles	10 days	Mon 1/15/18	Fri 1/26/18	
<b>▲ Select Site (1) and develop wind farm</b>	<b>40 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>	
Draft Prelim Design	10 days	Mon 1/29/18	Fri 2/9/18	9
Conduct Site Visit	10 days	Mon 2/12/18	Fri 2/23/18	11
Research Peermitting (local ordinance)	10 days	Mon 2/26/18	Fri 3/9/18	12
<b>▲ Finalize wind farm design</b>	<b>35 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/2/18</b>	
Wind resource assessment	15 days	Mon 1/15/18	Fri 2/2/18	
Select Turbine Locations	10 days	Mon 2/5/18	Fri 2/16/18	15
Site planning	10 days	Mon 2/19/18	Fri 3/2/18	16
Community Education and Outreach	15 days	Mon 3/5/18	Fri 3/23/18	17
Support Test Teams	40 days	Thu 3/15/18	Wed 5/9/18	ENG Market Team
Support Business Team	83 days	Mon 1/15/18	Wed 5/9/18	ENG Market Team
Comp. Day 1	0 days	Tue 5/8/18	Tue 5/8/18	
Comp. Day 2	0 days	Wed 5/9/18	Wed 5/9/18	

Table 8: Gantt Chart for Spring 2018 (part 2)



A budget has also been created for the market team. The major expense for the team will be the 3D printing of a scaled prototype, reference Table 9. The scale prototype will be used for demonstration purposes at the competition in Chicago.

Table 9: Market Team Prototype Expense

3D Print Model Costs		
ABS (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )		1.05
Print Cost (\$/gram)		0.10
<b>Volumes</b>		<b>Units</b>
Blades (3)	600	cm <sup>3</sup>
Nacelle	200	cm <sup>3</sup>
Tower	628.32	cm <sup>3</sup>
Base Plate	96	cm <sup>3</sup>
Hub	62.83	cm <sup>3</sup>
<b>Total Volume</b>	<b>1587.15</b>	<b>cm<sup>3</sup></b>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>166.65</b>	<b>\$</b>

The overall cost of the prototype is anticipated to be \$166.65. The team has allocated money that will cover this expense, reference Table 10.

Table 10: Market Team Budget

<b>CWC Market Team Budget</b>			
			<b>\$</b>
DOE Fund			2400
Fundraising			0
Gore Fund			3000
Market Team			400
Test Team A			1300
Test Team B			1300
<b>MARKET TEAM</b>			
<b>Anticipated Expenses</b>			
3D Prototype			-166.65
Travel Expenses			(TBD)
<b>Current Available Dolars</b>			400
<b>Expenses to Date</b>			0
<b>Current Balance</b>			400

## 7 REFERENCES

- [1] U.S. Department of Energy, "CWC Rules and Regulations," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://energy.gov/eere/collegiatewindcompetition/about-collegiate-wind-competition>. [Accessed 26 September 2017].
- [3] Horizon Energy (2017). <https://www.horizoncurriculum.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/TurbineParts-300x239.gif?cf89e9>. [image].
- [2] Energy.gov. (2017). The Inside of a Wind Turbine | Department of Energy. [online] Available at: <https://energy.gov/eere/wind/inside-wind-turbine-0> [Accessed 25 Sep. 2017].
- [4] Y. Wan *et al.*, "Development of an Equivalent Wind Plant Power-Curve," in *WindPower 2010*, Dallas, TX, 2010. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/48146.pdf>
- [5] [Gerenewableenergy.com](http://www.gerenewableenergy.com). (2017). 3.2-103 Wind Turbine | GE Renewable Energy. [online] Available at: <https://www.gerenewableenergy.com/wind-energy/turbines/32-103> [Accessed 25 Sep. 2017].
- [6] Yadav, A, et al. "Design, development and fabrication of horizontal axis wind turbine." 2016. IEEE Students' Conference on Electrical, Electronics and Computer Science, 2016, pp. 1–4. [Online]. Available: [ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?queryText=Design,%20Development%20and%20Fabrication%20of%20Horizontal%20Axis%20Wind%20Turbine&newsearch=true](http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?queryText=Design,%20Development%20and%20Fabrication%20of%20Horizontal%20Axis%20Wind%20Turbine&newsearch=true). [Accessed 17 September 2017].
- [7] Guan, Y, et al. "Comparison of Electromagnetic Performance of 10-MW Superconducting Generators With Different Topologies for Offshore Direct-Drive Wind Turbines" *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON APPLIED SUPERCONDUCTIVITY*, October 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/document/7993070/>. [Accessed 23 September 2017].
- [8] Siemens Gamesa (2016). "Gamesa 3.3 MW Optimum CoE", <http://www.gamesacorp.com/recursos/doc/productos-servicios/aerogeneradores/catalogo-gamesa/esp-tecnicas-33mw-eng.pdf>
- [9] Vestas (2016), "V126-3.45 MW at a Glance", [https://www.vestas.com/en/products/turbines/v126-3\\_3\\_mw#!facts](https://www.vestas.com/en/products/turbines/v126-3_3_mw#!facts)
- [10] Envision (2016), "Envision 3.0-120", <https://en.wind-turbine-models.com/turbines/1280-envision-3.0-120>
- [11] Hamburg. (2016, Sep. 27). Siemens low noise wind turbine blades inspired by silent flight of the owl [Online] Available: [www.siemens.com/press/en/pressrelease/?press=/en/pressrelease/2016/windpower-rene](http://www.siemens.com/press/en/pressrelease/?press=/en/pressrelease/2016/windpower-rene)

wables/pr2016090418wpen.htm

- [12] L. Merolla. (2009, Dec. 17). 10 Wind Turbines That Push the Limits of Design [Online]. Available: <http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/energy/a4428/4324331/>
- [13] K. Carter, "LM Wind Power," Giving Wind Direction: Wind Systems, no. 262 641 9101, p. 28-31, 2016. <http://www.windsystemsmag.com/article/detail/1309/profile-lm-wind-power>
- [14] L. M. von Raepke, C. S. Springham, (2016, June 21). *Adwen and LM Wind Power Partner to Present the Longest Blade in the World* [Online]. Available: <https://www.lmwindpower.com/en/products-and-services/blade-types/longest-blade-in-the-world>
- [15] J. Horton. *How the MARS Turbine Will Work* [Online]. Available: <http://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/green-science/mars-turbine3.htm>
- [16] S. Sritharan, T. J. Lewin, G. M. Schmitz, "Wind Turbine Tower System," US Patent 14 267633, May 13, 2014, <https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=patentimages.storage.googleapis.com/pdfs/US20140245671.pdf>
- [17] P. Unanua Hermoso De Mendoza, "Wind Turbine Tower System," U.S. Patent 15 423 203, Feb. 2, 2017, <http://www.freshpatents.com/-dt20170824ptan20170241152.php>
- [18] Tessarolo, A, et al. "Design for Manufacturability of an Off-Shore Direct-Drive Wind Generator: An Insight Into Additional Loss Prediction and Mitigation." *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INDUSTRY APPLICATIONS*, vol. 53, no. 5, Sept. 2017, pp. 4831–4842. [Online]. Available: [ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?queryText=Design%20for%20Manufacturability%20of%20an%20Off-Shore%20Direct-Drive%20Wind%20Generator:%20An%20Insight%20Into%20Additional%20Loss%20Prediction%20and%20Mitigation&newsearch=true](http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?queryText=Design%20for%20Manufacturability%20of%20an%20Off-Shore%20Direct-Drive%20Wind%20Generator:%20An%20Insight%20Into%20Additional%20Loss%20Prediction%20and%20Mitigation&newsearch=true). [Accessed 16 September 2017].
- [19] Wong, L, et al. "Wind Turbine Gearbox Failure Identification With Deep Neural Networks." *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INDUSTRIAL INFORMATICS*, vol. 13, no. 3, June 2017, pp. 1360–1368. [Online] . Available: [ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?newsearch=true&queryText=Wind%20Turbine%20Gearbox%20Failure%20Identification%20%20With%20Deep%20Neural%20Networks&fname=&lname=&title=&volume=&issue=&spage=](http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?newsearch=true&queryText=Wind%20Turbine%20Gearbox%20Failure%20Identification%20%20With%20Deep%20Neural%20Networks&fname=&lname=&title=&volume=&issue=&spage=). [Accessed 15 September 2017].
- [20] Liu, D, et al. "Potential of Partially Superconducting Generators for Large Direct-Drive Wind Turbines." *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON APPLIED SUPERCONDUCTIVITY*, vol. 27, no. 5, Aug. 2017 [Online]. Available: [ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?newsearch=true&queryText=Potenti](http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.libproxy.nau.edu/search/searchresult.jsp?newsearch=true&queryText=Potenti)

al%20of%20Partially%20Superconducting%20Generators%20for%20Large%20Direct-Drive%20Wind%20Turbines. [Accessed 16 September 2017].

[21] U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, "Airfoil Tools," *National Renewable Energy Laboratory*, 2012.

## 8 APPENDIX: Designs considered figures




Figure 21: Upwind HAWT with wind shroud




Figure 22: Eight blades, downwind, with 3-stage gearbox




Figure 23: HAWT with Vertical Axis Wind Turbine






Figure 24: Floating Turbine

HAWT 3-Blade Upwind w/ Telescoping Tower:




Figure 25: Horizontal Axis, 3-Blade Upwind, Guyed Tower




Figure 26: Vertical Axis, 2-Blade, Multi-generator