

Experience with Hydro Generator Stator Noise due to Air Gap Harmonic Forcing

Thomas J Cunningham, P. E. Fellow Engineer ElectroMechanical Engineering Associates, Inc. Pittsburgh, PA USA

OWNED & PRODUCED BY:

PennWell



OFFICIAL PUBLICATION:

HydroWorld.com.

MEDIA PARTNERS:

ring WaterWorld





Problem:

- Nice, new, continuously stacked Stator
- New coils & winding configuration
- Often, higher power output
- And it screams like a Banshee!

What Happened?



Slot passing frequency harmonics

- Inherent to fractional slot windings
- Not always audible
- Frequencies at multiples of 2x synchronous speed
 - *Typically 8x, 10x, 12x, 14x*
- Not just annoying often require **full-time hearing protection**
 - Author encountered <u>117 dB</u> in generator barrel (between "rock band" and "Police siren" on the charts!)



Second problem – 2x line frequency pulsations

- Same scenario new core/winding
- Also inherent to fractional slot windings
- Not always audible
- *Result of multiple waves at 2x line frequency*
 - *Recent case > 107 dB in generator vicinity*



OEM Generator Construction

- Stators factory built 3 or 4 pieces
- Shipped to site wound
- Final connections in field
- Frame joined stator iron not
- Machines often 40 80 years old (or more!)





Pressures and Opportunities

• Power needs increasing steadily

BUT...

- Coil Insulation Improved
 - More copper in slot
 - Higher temperatures allowed
- CFD improves turbine efficiencies

RESULT – <u>UPRATES!</u>



Some or all of these:

- Changes to # of Stator Slots
- Multi-turn > Single turn Roebel
- Segmented > Continuous Stator Core

And definitely these:

- Higher Field Current & Flux
- More Torque

Ok... So where's the problem? (warning – math ahead)



So what happens? (Examples easiest)

360 slots	_ 45 <i>slots</i>
56 poles	7 poles

Pattern of 45 slots repeats over 7 poles ($6^{3}/_{7}$ slots/pole)



Slot passing (high frequency) harmonics:

$$\frac{360 \ slots}{56 \ poles} = \frac{45 \ slots}{7 \ poles} = 6\frac{3}{7}$$

Fraction – 3/7 < 1/2 so 6^{th} harmonic predominates: $6 \times 2 \times 60 Hz = 720 Hz$

Fraction x no. of poles = waves:

$$\frac{3}{7} \times 56 = 24$$
 waves



Electrical (2x Line Frequency) Pulsations:

360 <i>slots</i>	45 slots
56 poles	⁼ 7 poles
# of poles	$-\frac{56}{-9}$
ooles in repeating pat	$\frac{1}{tern} - \frac{1}{7} - 6$ waves

Both this and the 720 Hz AND a smaller 840 Hz wave exist

Slot Frequency Noise



But here's what we heard:



This is machine "B" in the paper.

Vibration (Sound) Spectrum





Stator Construction





Lamination – Building Bolt Clearance





- Socket diameter 2.009 in.
- Min. throat opening 1.979 in.
- Building Bolt diameter min 1.970"

Each lamination can only make point contact with the building bolt.

Building Bolt Contact





• Contact with building bolt is at best a point contact.

• Cannot prevent rotation of stator cross section.

Building Bolt & Frame Influence





- Building Bolts or Keybars welded to frame rings
- Relatively soft between frame rings
- Do little to restrain core radial movement between Frame rings.



- ODS Tests clearly showed 24 waves at 720 Hz
- Resonance was painfully obvious
- "Thin Ring" Natural Frequency Calculation of core iron *alone*:

n = 24 at <u>880 Hz</u>



Stator Cores are DEFINITELY "Thin Rings"





 $\frac{Mean \ Radius}{Back \ Iron} = 22.1$

"Thin ring" vibration calculation first published by R. Hoppe, 1888

$$\omega_n = \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{\sqrt{n^2 + 1}} \sqrt{\frac{EI}{\rho A R^4}}$$

Calculates two wave (n=2) at 5.81 Hz FEA model at right - 5.56 Hz

Except when they aren't!



OEME

"Thin ring" vibration calculation first published by R. Hoppe, 1888

$$\omega_n = \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{\sqrt{n^2 + 1}} \sqrt{\frac{EI}{\rho A R^4}}$$

Calculates twenty wave (n=20) at 863 Hz FEA model at right – **667 Hz**

n = 2
$$\frac{5.81 \, Hz}{5.56 \, Hz} = 1.044$$

n = 20
$$\frac{863 Hz}{667 Hz} = 1.294$$

Mass/stiffness ratio difference - 1.64!

Except when they aren't!





L/D here is 3.47

Variances from "Thin Ring" formulation

Consider ½ wavelength of stator bending as simply supported beam:



- Wavelength too short
 - Shear deflection
 - Mass rotational inertia
 - Offset mass and inertia of teeth
 - Extension/compression of neutral axis



Timoshenko formulation vs. Hoppe "Thin Ring"

$$\omega_n = \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{\sqrt{n^2 + 1}} \sqrt{\frac{EI}{\rho A R^4}}$$

$$\omega_n = n^2 \sqrt{\frac{EI}{\rho A R^4}} \left[1 - \frac{n^2}{2} \frac{I}{A R^2} \left(1 + \frac{E}{k'G} \right) \right]$$

And it got us closer, but...

Timoshenko Beam Formulation - modified



- Timoshenko formulation uniform cross section
- Actual slots cause offset center of mass/inertia
- Nodal positions move closer to neutral axis as wavelength decreases

EME Modification:

$$\omega_n = n^2 \sqrt{\frac{EI}{\rho A R^4}} \left[1 - \frac{n^2}{2} \frac{I}{A R^2} \left(\frac{56}{n} + \frac{E}{k'G} \right) \right]$$

Comparison of Results





- Close correspondence to FEA
- Close correspondence to known
 resonance cases
- Physically defensible if not mathematically rigorous
- Investigation continuing



Thank you for your time and attention!

Thomas J Cunningham, P. E. EME Associates, Inc. 150 Seco Road Monroeville, PA 15146 412-351-0290 <u>www.emeassociates.com</u> tcunningham@emeassociates.com

For further info, come see us at Booth #1149