

# Anatomy of an Energy Efficient Electric Motor Rewind

**Key Words:** Stripping, insulation, mechanical, testing, quality, reliability

by  
**HOWARD W. PENROSE**  
Dreisilker Electric Motors, Inc.

---

*A motor repair customer must work closely with a motor repair center to ensure that the equipment sent out for rewind repair is handled in a manner that does not reduce efficiency or reliability.*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Until recently, the subject of ac induction motor rewind has been carefully skirted. However, with the advent of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPACT), the subject has been thrust forward. Discussion of repair versus replace has increased dramatically, especially when determining if efficiency is reduced through electric motor rewind.

In several studies, most notably one conducted by the Canadian Electrical Association (CEA) at the LTEE Hydro Quebec Laboratories, the effects of electric motor rewind have been examined. Previous studies, completed by BC Hydro and Ontario Hydro, have produced interesting results, also. It is important to note that in all of these Canadian studies, the standard used for efficiency testing is the CSA 390, which is similar to the IEEE Std. 112-1991 Test Method B.

In this paper, we shall first discuss these results, then review methods for properly rewinding and testing failed electric motors to retain original motor efficiency. The motors that will be focused on are those motors outlined as energy efficient in accordance with NEMA MG 1-1993 Table 12-10, Design A and B, horizontal foot-mounted, ball-bearing, 230/460 V ac electric motors.

## ONTARIO HYDRO REWIND STUDY

This study was published in November 1991. It consisted of an experiment in which nine of 10 identical 20-horsepower, standard efficiency electric motors were rewound. The nine motors were identically failed and sent, blind, to nine separate electric motor repair facilities. When returned, they were analyzed for efficiency reduction.

It was found that the average loss of efficiency was in the area of 1.1%, with the greatest reduction around 3.4%. The increase in losses averaged 2.2%, with a maximum of 46%. Although the numbers do not appear to be large, when considered in an operating cost formula, they become significant (Formula 1). This may be termed as the post-repair cost of an electric motor.

## BC HYDRO REWIND STUDY

The BC Hydro study was published in April 1993. The significant difference between the two studies was that, while the Ontario Hydro study used standard efficiency motors, the BC Hydro study used the "new" energy efficient electric motors (motors that meet the efficiency for NEMA MG1-1993 Table 12-10). Similarly to the first study, 11 20-horsepower electric motors were used, with 10 being failed and sent for repair. They were returned for analysis.

Unlike the Ontario Hydro study, the average decrease in efficiency was 0.5%, with the most significant reduction being due to friction and windage. As it turns out, this was due to improper bearing replacement and not core and I<sup>2</sup>R stator winding losses, as predicted.

## HYDRO QUEBEC REWIND STUDY

Of the three studies, the one performed for the CEA was performed by LTEE Hydro Quebec and compiled by Demand Side Research of Vancouver, BC. At the time of this paper, the *Evaluation of Electric Motor Repair Procedures Guidebook* (CEA 9205 U 984) has not been published. However, most of the work has been completed.

In this study, the coils of a number of energy efficient motors were removed by several different methods (burnout oven and mechanical stripping) and were rewound. This process was repeated three times, per motor, with a CSA 390

test performed after each rewind. It was shown that no significant loss in efficiency was detected through all three rewinds (less than 0.2%).

#### Formula 1: Operating Cost

$$\text{Cost} = .746 * \text{hp} * \text{L} * \$ * \text{Hr} * (100/\text{Ei} - 100/\text{Ef})$$

where: hp = horsepower; L = load; \$ = cost per kWhr; Hr = hours of operation per year; Ei = initial motor efficiency; Ef = final motor efficiency.

## SUMMARY OF STUDIES

By using "identical" motors in the Ontario and BC Hydro studies, it should be apparent that one manufacturer was used for each, whereas several motor manufacturers were used for the Hydro Quebec study. This may have some bearing on the results.

One main difference between "standard efficient" motors (SEM) and "energy efficient" motors (EEM) is the core material. SEMs tend to use older core steels (i.e., C-3 annealed steel) while EEMs use newer core steels (i.e., C-4 or 5 silicone steel). The older core steels are more susceptible to temperature and environmental conditions, while the newer core steels are harder and more able to withstand higher temperatures.

In all, the most significant result is that, if an electric motor is economical to rewind versus replace, the electric motor shop must have the appropriate equipment and some type of recognized quality control plan. It should also be noted that the owner of the electric motor should have repair versus replace plan and repair recommendations in place. In this author's opinion, IEEE Std. 1068-1990, "IEEE Recommended Practice for the Repair and Rewinding of Motors for the Petroleum and Chemical Industry," is an excellent standard for both electric motor owners and repair centers.

## MOTOR LOSSES

There are several types of ac induction motor losses that affect efficiency (Formula 2). Following is a brief description of each:

1. Core losses (15-25%): consist of eddy-current and hysteresis losses. Eddy currents are stray currents found in ferromagnetic materials as magnetic fields are induced into them. They are reduced by using thin core materials insulated from each other. Hysteresis is the energy necessary to change the direction of the magnetic fields. This is reduced by creating a core material that is low in carbon, or by using silicone steel. These combined losses show as heat and are part of a motor's temperature rise.
2. Windage and friction (5-15%): caused by air density, fans, turbulence within the stator, bearings, and anything else that may cause a friction force on the shaft.
3. Stator losses (25-40%): caused by current flow through the stator winding ( $I^2R$ ).
4. Rotor losses (15-25%): caused by heating in the rotor bars (windings) ( $I^2R$ ).

5. Stray load losses (10-20%): leakage losses and other losses not previously accounted for.

These losses are important when considering the effects of electric motor rewind.

#### Formula 2: Efficiency Formula

$$\% \text{eff} = ((\text{Input} - \text{Losses})/\text{Input}) * 100$$

## MECHANICAL TESTS

All of the mechanical fits on the motor must be tested using calibrated outside and inside micrometers. The critical areas that affect efficiency include the bearing journals and housings. If the fits are too loose or tight, both the efficiency and the bearing life will be reduced.

There are several ways to return bearing fits, which include:

1. Peening: the practice of punching or marring mechanical fits to create a tighter fit. This practice is not recommended for repair, as it is "uncontrolled."
2. Metallizing: consists of a one- or two-part spray process that requires metal to be removed first. This process is susceptible to separation from the material to which it is attached in instances of non-symmetrical pressure or when the surfaces have not been properly prepared. This practice should not be used for world-class energy efficient motor repair.
3. Welding: similar to metallizing; however, it creates a stronger metal-to-metal bond, when properly applied. If a repair requires adding metal, this is the preferred method.
4. Sleeving: the process of returning fits by machining and sleeving a motor shaft or housing. This is the recommended method of motor repair, as it is more controlled.
5. Refabrication: While expensive, this method is the best for machining severely worn motor parts, shafts in particular.

It is also highly recommended that motor bearings are replaced during each repair. They should also be replaced with the original class of bearing. Internal bearing fits and friction can have a large effect on motor efficiency. Fan replacement should also be considered when the original fan has been damaged. The replacement fan should be original, as well. If a fan is replaced by a larger fan, or one with more fins, the motor efficiency will be reduced. If a fan is replaced by a smaller fan, or one with fewer fins, cooling will be reduced, reducing the life of the motor.

## INITIAL WINDING TESTS

Upon receipt of a motor by an electric motor shop, certain tests should be performed, at a minimum. For the motors within the scope of this paper (220/440 V ac), the tests are normally less stringent than those performed on medium voltage, or form-wound, motors.

The first test is a Megger test, which measures leakage to ground. For the low voltage motors, 500 V dc is the acceptable limit, with a reading of 1.5 megohms as the absolute lowest reading [1]. However, a reading below several hun-

dred megohms should indicate some type of problem. A reading of zero indicates a direct short to ground.

In many cases, a motor repair shop will test the phase-to-phase resistance of the electric motor with a milli-ohmmeter, or wheatstone bridge, then attempt to operate the electric motor before disassembly (assuming the motor passes the incoming tests). This is done to indicate what types of defects are within the motor. For electrical testing, the phase current is taken at full voltage, no load, and both noted for later use and compared to ensure that one phase is not drawing more current than the others.

If the motor passes these tests, it is disassembled and cleaned using solvent, hot soap and water, steam, or some other accepted method. If the stator has been cleaned with soap and water, it must be dried before further testing in an oven set for a temperature of around 196° F (90° C) [2]. If damage occurs to the insulation as a result of cleaning, or if the insulation appears to have minor defects, it may be dipped and baked in a Class F, or better, insulation varnish.

Once cleaned, the windings should have an ac or dc hi-potential test performed at a voltage figured in Formula 3. The ac hi-pot is a pass/fail test, because if it arcs to ground, the insulation will be damaged beyond repair. The dc hi-pot is more forgiving, especially if the leakage can be monitored. Any sudden increase indicates that the insulation has failed. If it is below the calculated voltage value when it fails, then the winding should be rewound.

Formula 3: Test Voltage

$$V_{ac} = 0.65 * (2E_m + 1000 V)$$

$$V_{dc} = 0.65 * (2E_m + 1000 V) * 1.7$$

where  $E_m$  = the motor nameplate voltage.

If the motor completes this test successfully, it should be surge comparison tested. The voltage value limit for this test is the same as that determined in Formula 3. In this test, however, wire insulation is being compared. This test is meant to detect shorts within the windings themselves. It is normally done by setting the comparison tester to a value of zero volts and bringing it up, slowly, to the calculated value. The tester sends a high frequency surge to the windings and the results are read on an oscilloscope, comparing at least two of the windings at a time. Once properly set, any deviation in the scope wave forms indicate a defect.

There are no reasons why non-destructive tests, above and beyond these, may not be performed. A world-class quality repair shop will do whatever is necessary to ensure that no surprises occur during the motor repair process.

## COIL REMOVAL PRACTICES

At this point, and for the purpose of this paper, it is assumed that the motor has failed at least one of the tests outlined above. The stator will have to be "stripped," meaning that the copper windings will have to be removed, before re-insulating and rewinding the motor. The best practice is to perform a core test before and after the stator is stripped.

The wattage per pound losses should be recorded and should be found not to increase.

In all the motor stripping practices, one end of the coil winding is removed. The length of the end-turns must be measured first and any connection and/or other information collected and recorded. Then one of the following methods are used for removing the remaining wire:

1. Direct flame: A flame from a torch or other source is directed onto the core and winding. In some cases, the stator is physically placed in a bonfire! The temperature is uncontrolled and severe damage to the core will occur. The winding is reduced to ash, and the windings removed.
2. Chemical stripping: The core is lowered into a chlorinated solvent bath and kept submerged until the varnish is dissolved enough for coil removal. Chemical stripping is ineffective in many cases, such as overloaded stators. The chlorinated solvent presents potential health, environmental, and disposal problems. In some cases, the solvent is not completely removed when the stator is rewound, and the solvent works against the new motor insulation.
3. Burnout: The stator is placed into a burnout oven that is set for a recommended temperature of 650° F (345° C). It is kept at this temperature until all of the varnish and insulating materials are turned to ash (eight hours or more). If the temperature exceeds this, damage to the stator core and frame may result, reducing motor efficiency and mechanical reliability. Gasses and other byproducts, are exhausted through a "smoke stack" into the atmosphere.
4. Mechanical stripping (Dreisilker/Thumm method): Using a heat source, such as gas jets, a distance away from the core, the back iron and insulation is warmed until the windings become soft and pliable (approximately 10° C above the insulation class of the varnish insulation). The coils and insulation are removed using a slow, steady hydraulic pull. Temperatures remain low, stripping times extremely fast (i.e., 2.5 hours for a 350hp motor), and there are no airborne byproducts or disposal problems. Attempts at duplicating this process using pneumatic pulling methods have resulted in core laminations being pulled apart. Therefore, pneumatic machines of this type should be avoided.
5. Mechanical stripping (water blasting): A high-pressure stream of water is used to blast the coils out of the stator slots. This is a fast method of coil removal. Personal injury due to high water pressure and mechanical damage can be avoided by experienced personnel and safety devices.
6. Mechanical stripping (hot vapor process chemical stripping): A stator is submerged in a bath of non-chlorinated petroleum-based solvent at a temperature of 370° F (190° C) for a short period of time. It is then removed and the coils are removed with high-pressure air. The solvent has an oily smell, which must be masked, and is difficult to dispose of. Personal injury and mechanical damage can be avoided by experienced personnel and safety devices.

Once the windings have been removed, the stator may have to be cleaned. This may be done by steam cleaning and baking, bead or cob blasting, or low pressure air. In some cases, additional copper that may have fused to the core at the time of motor failure will have to be removed. This is done with a small air grinder or jewelers' files.

The stator should then receive a loop test, which is performed to check for "hot-spots" within the stator core caused by shorted laminations. If these are found, they may be removed by separating the effected laminations and insulating them, then pressing them back together. Other methods include a dip and bake before rewinding, or VPIing the stator core. In some cases, the core losses or hot-spots may be excessive, requiring that the stator core be re-stacked or the motor replaced.

## STATOR WINDING

Common rewind practice dictates that the paper insulation inserted into the stator slots be of Class F insulating material or better. The most common is Class H. This is to allow the motor insulation to survive any hot-spots that may have been missed during the loop or core loss tests. This also has the effect of potentially increasing the insulation life of the motor beyond the original design and allowing some "forgiveness" if the original cause of insulation failure has not been corrected when the motor is returned to service.

It is "best practice" to rewind the motor with the same wire size and type of coil winding method (lap or concentric). In some cases this is not possible. If the wire size must change, it must maintain the same cross-sectional area. A general rule of thumb is, for every three wire sizes smaller, two wires will be the same. For instance, if one number 15 wire is required, two number 18 wires may have to suffice. If the wire size is made smaller, the  $I^2R$  losses will increase, decreasing motor efficiency; if it is made much larger, there is the chance of over-filling the stator slots or increasing the motor's inrush current. It is best to create a sample coil to ensure that the coil ends are the correct length and the coils will fit in the stator slots.

There are several coil winding methods:

1. Hand-Winding: performed with a "tower-type" winding machine and mechanical counter. The winding technician must try to maintain correct tension and layering of the coils, or the coils will be difficult to lay in the stator slots. In the worst-case, there will be wires crossing, which will increase the turn-to-turn potential in the wire, creating an area that may short under certain operating conditions. Improper tensioning of the coils may cause more wire per phase, changing the impedance balance of the motor windings.
2. Automatic coil winding machines: maintain constant tension and proper count of the coils. Still require a technician to observe operation, but still succeed in reducing labor time.

3. Computerized coil winding machines: The technician is free to perform other tasks while the machine winds the stator coils. Proper tension and turn count are maintained.

The coils are then inserted by hand or machine. It is important to include phase insulation and "in-betweens" in order to avoid phase-to-phase or coil-to-coil shorts when the motor is returned to operation.

Once the coils have been inserted, the coil ends are insulated and connected. The stator connection must be the same as the original and the coil ends crimped, silver-soldered, or braized. The lead wire must be of the correct size and type for the motor current and application. After this phase, the coil ends are tied down for mechanical strength. The ties should pass between each coil slot and be tied. Care should be taken not to pull up the phase insulation.

## POST WINDING TESTS

A Megger test should be performed on the rewound stator of 500 V dc. The windings should show a resistance of better than 1000 megohms (based upon experience).

A hi-potential test should be performed at a value calculated in Formula 4. Passing results and methods are outlined in the initial winding tests. The surge comparison test should be the same as in the initial winding tests, except at the Formula 4 value.

Formula 4: Test Voltage

$$V_{ac} = 2E_m + 1000V$$

$$V_{dc} = (2E_m + 1000) * 1.7$$

where  $E_m$  = the motor nameplate voltage.

Additional tests include an impedance test and a spin test. The impedance test is a comparison among all three phases. The difference should not be more than +/- 3%. The spin test consists of placing 10% of the nameplate three-phase voltage across three of the stator lead wires. A current reading is taken and compared. Then a ball bearing or test rotor is inserted into the stator core. If the windings are correct, the bearing should rotate within the stator core, or the test rotor will operate in the same direction as it is brought around the inside of the stator core.

All test results should be recorded for future reference.

## VARNISH INSULATION

The final step in the rewind process is to varnish the stator. The purpose of varnish is to increase the mechanical and electrical strength of the stator windings. As with the slot insulation, it is common practice to use Class F or H varnish on the stators. There are several basic methods for insulating rewound stators:

1. Dip and bake: The stator is pre-heated, then dipped into a tank full of insulating varnish. This is normally done a minimum of two times to ensure a full coat of varnish. Care must be taken as voids, which may collect moisture or other contaminants, may be left within the stator coils. Additionally, all of the surfaces, including machined areas, are covered with varnish, which must

be removed (and constitutes wasted varnish material). While the slots are receiving a reasonable amount of varnish to allow for heat conduction, a blanket of varnish collects on the outer surfaces of the motor, reducing its ability to cool itself.

2. **Trickle varnishing:** The stator is placed on a turntable and connected to three-phase power. This both serves as a heating source for the windings and as an additional powered test (the coils should heat evenly). The stator is heated horizontally and monitored with an infrared sensor. Once the windings have reached a pre-determined temperature, the turntable is tilted to 35 to 45 degrees and varnish is trickled onto the windings through several tubes. The varnish is drawn through the slots by gravity and capillary action, creating a solid slot fill. The varnish also collects on the end turns. In considerably less time than two dips and bakes, the stator windings will have the equivalent of three dips and bakes (1 to 2.5 hours as opposed to 16 to 20 hours). There is no excessive varnish, decreasing cleaning time and varnish waste.
3. **Vacuum Pressure Impregnation (VPI):** Due to expense, this process is not recommended for low voltage stators but is a must for medium voltage, form wound cores. It consists of a voidless slot fill (as the trickle varnish method), but wastes varnish (as does the dip and bake). The stator is warmed in an oven, then placed in a VPI tank. A vacuum is drawn within the tank, then varnish is flushed in from a holding tank. Pressure is then applied to the tank, forcing varnish into all existing voids. The stator must then be placed in a baking oven to cure the varnish.

## FINAL TESTS

Once the stator has been varnished and cleaned, noting that abrasives on the stator laminations may cause shorting between laminations, the motor is assembled. (In world-class repair centers, the stator is re-tested before assembly.) A Megger test is performed once the motor has been assembled and should measure at least 1000 M-ohms. The electric motor is then tested at no load and all rated voltages for 30 minutes. The current and voltage are measured and recorded; if the motor had been tested during the disassembly phase of the repair, the final results are compared with the first. Also, the temperature of the stator is checked and should remain cool to the touch, when operated at no load (also assuming the motor is not an "air-over" motor).

The measured current readings are compared, and, if found to be in excess of 5% of each other, the phases are rotated. For example: Phase A is rotated to the Phase B location, B to C, and C to A. If the unbalance remains the same and is found to follow the line leads, then the power supply is unbalanced. If the unbalanced current remains on the motor leads, then the rewind repair is suspect, and the motor should be disassembled to have the stator re-tested and repaired.

Motor current should also not exceed the nameplate rating during a no-load test. The rule of thumb for two-,

four-, and six-pole motors is that the no-load current will be in the area of 25 to 50% of nameplate.

Once all the running tests are complete and acceptable, the motor is electrically suitable for operation. In a few cases, the customer may require additional tests.

## CONCLUSIONS

As shown, there is more to an electric motor repair than a good-looking paint job. The type and quality of work required for returning a "good-as-new" electric motor following a rewind repair is extensive. It is now apparent that a motor repair customer must work closely with a motor repair center to ensure that the equipment that is sent out for rewind repair is handled in a manner that does not reduce efficiency or reliability.

End-users should have pre-qualified an electric motor repair shop to ensure that their equipment will be repaired to their expectations. This pre-qualification should include a review of capabilities, equipment, a recognized quality control program (ISO 9002 is recommended), and a method for handling warranties or concerns. The end-user should ensure that all billing, terms and conditions, and reporting are understood by both parties in advance. It is also recommended that the end-user have a method for contacting the motor repair center at any time.

The motor repair center should have the following capabilities in place:

1. ISO 9000 quality control program.
2. Lifting equipment capable of handling the equipment the end-user wishes to have repaired.
3. Field repair and testing capabilities to include field balancing, vibration analysis, infrared testing, installation and removal, control and drive test and repair capabilities.
4. Dedicated customer service representatives and in-house engineering staff.
5. A repair versus replace policy agreed to between repair shop and end-user.
6. In-house, calibrated test equipment suitable to perform all previously outlined testing.
7. In-house machine tooling and balancing capabilities to handle the equipment. Machining should include policies not topeen or metallize journals and housings.
8. In-house ability to test motors at full voltage.
9. A mechanical stripping process.
10. Automatic or computer controlled winding equipment.
11. Utilize class F or better insulation materials to include phase insulation and in-betweens for all horsepower repairs.
12. Trickle varnish machines, dip and bake capabilities, and Vacuum Pressure Impregnation (VPI) equipment.
13. Access to the appropriate NEMA and IEEE standards governing repair of electric motors.

The purpose of in-house field repair, testing, and engineering is to assist the end-user when failures occur consistently or the end-user requires assistance with field repair. It

is also recommended that the end-user have a predictive (PdM) or preventive (PM) maintenance program in place.

By following these simple recommendations, the end-user should have trouble-free repairs and electric motor operation. Also, the nuisance of increased operating cost (post repair cost) after motor repair can be avoided.





HOWARD W. PENROSE is the director of Field Service and Research and Development for Dreisilker Electric Motors, Inc. in Glen Ellyn, Illinois. He is responsible for electrical and electronic testing of electric motor systems and predictive/preventive maintenance programs for Dreisilker customers and is consulted by the Canadian Electrical Association (CEA) and the US Department of Energy (US DOE) in matters of energy efficient motor systems and repair. Mr. Penrose conducts seminars in energy efficient electric motor systems, maintenance, repair, and testing for utilities, professional organizations, and Dreisilker customers. He is presently the chair of the IEEE Chicago section chapters of the Dielectrics and Electrical Insulation Society and the Power Electronics Society,

secretary of both the Chicago section and the Fox Valley subsection, and the Region 4 representative to the USAB Energy Committee. He may be reached by e-mail at [h.penrose@ieec.org](mailto:h.penrose@ieec.org), or in care of: Dreisilker Electric Motors, Inc., 352 Roosevelt Rd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137.

## REFERENCES

1. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., *Electric Machinery*, 1995 edition, New York, 1995.
2. IEEE, *IEEE Std. 1068-1990: IEEE Recommended Practice for the Repair and Rewinding of Motors for the Petroleum and Chemical Industry*, New York, 1990.
3. NEMA, *NEMA MG 1-1993: Motors and Generators*, District of Columbia, 1993.
4. L.J. Rejda and K. Neville, *Industrial Motor Users' Handbook of Insulation for Rewinds*, New York, 1977.
5. T. Litman, *Efficient Electric Motor Systems Handbook*, Georgia, 1995.
6. Bonneville Power Administration, *Industrial Motor Repair in the United States*, Washington, 1995.
7. BC Hydro, *Rewound High Efficiency Motor Performance*, M101. British Columbia, 1993.
8. Ontario Hydro, *Rewound Motor Efficiency*, TP-91-125, Ontario, 1991.
9. Demand Side Energy, *Evaluation of Electric Motor Repair Procedures Guidebook*, British Columbia, not yet published.
10. E-Source, *Drivepower*, "Motor Repair," Colorado, 1993.



## For Electrical Cable and Motor Insulations

GARWARE POLYESTER FILM with its excellent electrical and mechanical strength, backed up by high thermal and flex crack resistance is an effective barrier to moisture, solvents and plasticisers. With such versatility, Garfilm is a natural choice for insulation in motors, electrical systems, cables, capacitors, etc.

GARWARE POLYESTER FILM milky white Type EM6\* has been specially developed for slot, phase insulation and slot liner in electrical motors and generators. In addition to excellent electrical, mechanical and thermal properties, Garfilm has improved toughness and opacity.

\* Tested & approved by Underwriters Laboratories Inc., U.S.A.

**For more information contact:**

**INTERMAX TRADING CORP.**  
2079 WANTAGH AVENUE,  
WANTAGH, N.Y. 11793.  
Tel : 516-785-0235  
Fax : 516-785-0547

Reader Service Number 6