Integrated Travels

Comparative Analysis of Hydrogen Fuel Cell and Battery Hybrid Retrofitting for Diesel Locomotives: Design, Performance, and Economic Feasibility

Shivangi Sharma

Junior Mechanical Engineer

Abstract

This research focuses on the pressing need to decarbonize diesel locomotives by examining the viability and performance of retrofitting them with hybrid systems that combine hydrogen fuel cells and batteries. Drawing from almost 50 peer-reviewed articles, technical reports, and industry analyses, we investigate the design requirements for these systems, as well as technologies for battery and hydrogen storage, regenerative braking methods, and cost estimates. The results reveal important trade-offs between fuel cell and battery technologies, limitations related to thermal and spatial integration, and the best configurations for routes such as Calgary to Edmonton. We determined that a hybrid setup using modular battery packs and PEM fuel cells provides the optimal balance of emission reduction, operational efficiency, and ease of retrofitting. The main goals are to create efficient, safe, and modular battery packs that can work alongside hydrogen fuel cells for both propulsion and regenerative braking. These battery packs need to effectively store energy to capture braking energy from frequent stops, especially on routes with up to 20 stops over 324 km, thereby improving overall efficiency. Furthermore, the design should prioritize modularity for easy maintenance and scalability based on the train configuration.

Key limitations include the maximum train length of about 200 meters, the space available on each locomotive (approximately 22 meters), weight restrictions, challenges in thermal management due to high power density, energy density needs for long-distance travel, and overall system costs. The decision to use one or two locomotives for housing hydrogen tanks, fuel cells, and batteries is significantly influenced by these constraints.

An analysis of hydrogen fuel cell systems in locomotives indicates that models like the P42, Siemens Charger, and Alstom ALP45DP are promising candidates for retrofitting, as they possess adequate structural capacity and have been modified for hybrid systems in North America. Existing hydrogen-powered trains, such as CPKC freight locomotives and the Stadler FLIRT units in California, offer valuable lessons regarding system integration, storage, and operational efficiency

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Diesel locomotives continue to be the primary choice for regional passenger rail systems in North America, but increasing regulatory and environmental demands are pushing for reduced emissions and improved efficiency. As hydrogen fuel cell technology becomes more popular in both rail and automotive industries, retrofitting current diesel-electric locomotives is emerging as a feasible option for achieving sustainable rail transport. This research intends to assess and compare hydrogen-battery hybrid solutions in terms of energy performance, integration challenges, and specific route requirements, particularly focusing on routes with limitations, such as Calgary to Edmonton.

The study addresses the need to retrofit existing diesel locomotives with hydrogen fuel cell systems for lower carbon emissions and move towards sustainable rail transport. Current diesel locomotives, commonly used on routes like Calgary to Edmonton, require reducing greenhouse gas emissions and enhancing energy efficiency. Retrofitting hydrogen fuel cells and battery hybrid systems presents a promising solution, but it also introduces design challenges related to space limitations, weight restrictions, and the integration of complex energy systems into existing locomotive designs.

The objectives of this study are to:

- Retrofit diesel-electric locomotives to decrease CO_2 and NOx emissions.
- Create safe, modular battery packs tailored for hydrogen-battery hybrid powertrains.
- Identify system constraints, including space, thermal load, and cost considerations.
- Assess hybrid sizing and battery management for routes that utilize regenerative braking.
- Ensure all designs comply with current standards for hydrogen fuel cell locomotives.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Hydrogen Fuel Cell Technologies for Rail

Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) fuel cells are currently the predominant technology utilized in rail applications, attributed to their high efficiency, rapid response capabilities, and compatibility with modular designs. Research [3], [1] highlights the benefits of employing PEM fuel cells in conjunction with compressed hydrogen storage, particularly for systems such as the Alstom Coradia iLint and CPKC's hydrogen freight locomotives. Fuel cell trains are characterized by reduced emissions and lower noise levels, particularly on routes that are not electrified. Nevertheless, challenges related to hydrogen storage capacity and safety considerations remain significant obstacles to widespread adoption.

2.2 Battery Technologies and Integration

A comprehensive examination of various lithium-ion chemistries, notably lithium iron phosphate (LFP) and nickel manganese cobalt (NMC), reveals their distinct energy density, cycle life, and thermal management properties. LFP is characterized by its exceptional thermal stability and lifecycle cost benefits, while NMC is recognized for its higher energy density, albeit with associated cost and safety challenges [27], [30], [32]. The design of modular battery packs, in conjunction with sophisticated battery management systems (BMS), is essential for ensuring safety, performance, and maintainability [19], [20], [31]. The utilization of simulation tools such as MATLAB/Simulink enhances the optimization of cell balancing and the management of overall energy throughput.

The unique attributes, advantages, and limitations of LFP and NMC lithium-ion battery chemistries are evident across various applications. LFP batteries are frequently acknowledged for their superior thermal stability, extended cycle life, and safety, rendering them suitable for commercial, industrial, and transportation applications where durability and reliability are paramount. Conversely, NMC batteries provide higher energy density, which is particularly beneficial in environments with space constraints or those requiring high performance.

Numerous studies have underscored the significance of semi-empirical aging models and equivalent circuit models in predicting battery performance and degradation over time, which is vital for effective battery management and system design. Comparative analyses have also highlighted the trade-offs related to cost, environmental impact, raw material sourcing, and charging behavior, thereby informing optimal battery selection for specific applications. Notably, the sustainability, safety, and cost-effectiveness of LFP make it increasingly advantageous for large-scale and rail propulsion systems, while NMC continues to be a strong option for applications that necessitate high energy output. Overall, the research provides a comprehensive perspective on the technical, economic, and environmental considerations that influence contemporary lithium-ion battery selection, thereby facilitating informed decision-making.

2.3 Regenerative Braking and Energy Capture

Routes characterized by frequent stops, exemplified by the Calgary–Edmonton corridor, which includes approximately 20 stops over a distance of 324 kilometers, require the implementation of efficient regenerative braking systems to recover kinetic energy effectively. Studies have demonstrated that optimized regenerative braking strategies can yield energy savings of up to 30%, thereby significantly decreasing overall fuel consumption and emissions [17], [18]. Furthermore, hybrid storage systems that integrate batteries and supercapacitors exhibit superior performance in managing frequent braking cycles, which enhances energy recovery and minimizes mechanical wear [21], [22], [23].

2.4 Retrofit Case Studies and Industry Standards

Practical retrofitting initiatives involving locomotives such as the Siemens Charger, ALP45DP, and P42 illustrate that dual-locomotive configurations possess adequate spatial and weight capacity to accommodate hydrogen tanks, fuel cell stacks, battery packs, and the requisite control and safety systems [5], [6]. Adherence to the guidelines set forth by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) is essential to ensure fire safety, electromagnetic compatibility (EMC), and structural integrity in retrofitted rolling stock [3], [6]. Recent research utilizing simulation techniques has underscored the significance of precise hydrogen dispersion modeling in the event of leaks during refueling or operational phases. Advanced models developed offer critical insights into safety system planning, particularly in the context of retrofitting aging diesel platforms with high-pressure hydrogen tanks [7], [8]. Furthermore, investigations into hybrid configurations that integrate hydrogen and battery systems for both propulsion and emergency backup in electric trains reveal important parallels for dual-mode retrofitted locomotives [9].

In relation to industry standards and empirical case studies, the research conducted on freight rail conversion in Australia demonstrates how route-specific load profiles influence the sizing and modularity of hybrid systems [10]. Additionally, practical experiences derived from Alstom's FLIRT H2 units and the Stadler rail retrofit substantiate the efficacy of modular retrofitting as a viable approach for mixed-consist train operations [11], [12]. Further insights from the U.S. Department of Transportation report [13] and the California Air Resources Board's Technical Support Document [14] provide regulatory and cost-compliance frameworks that inform the practical implementation of these technologies.

Consideration of battery aging and maintenance costs is also imperative. Semi-empirical models of battery degradation enable system designers to project long-term energy efficiency and the necessity for pack replacements [15], [16]. The optimization of hybrid energy management, particularly the equilibrium between hydrogen fuel cells and battery size, has been examined within the context of heavy-haul locomotives, facilitating enhanced efficiency without the risk of oversizing [17]. Simulations [18] and feasibility assessments in research papers [19] further illustrate the potential for real-world braking energy recovery on long-haul rail routes.

Previous investigations into battery pack configurations for hybrid and electric rail vehicles underscore the critical role of high voltage. These substantial battery packs are capable of managing power surges during acceleration and capturing energy during regenerative braking. The adoption of modular designs facilitates adaptability in sizing to accommodate spatial limitations inherent in locomotives. Research highlights the necessity for sophisticated Battery Management Systems (BMS) to ensure operational safety, optimize charging cycles, and balance the performance of individual cells. Additionally, effective cooling systems are essential for maintaining thermal stability, particularly under the heavy load conditions characteristic of heavy-haul locomotives.

An analysis of the energy and power requirements for a hydrogen fuel cell hybrid locomotive operating between Calgary and Edmonton can utilize models that account for train mass, typical operating speeds (up to 160 kph), and frequent stops. The potential for regenerative braking at 160 kph to recover a substantial portion of kinetic energy is significant; findings indicate that capturing 30-40% of energy lost during braking is achievable, thereby informing the optimal battery capacity necessary for energy storage and reuse. Battery capacities in the range of several hundred kWh are recommended to effectively support peak power demands and energy recovery cycles.

The examination of hydrogen fuel cell systems within the reviewed literature reveals that the sizing of fuel cell stacks must be coordinated with battery capacity to accommodate continuous propulsion power and peak loads without jeopardizing system longevity. The research advocates for a hybrid system wherein fuel cells deliver consistent power while batteries manage transient loads and energy from regenerative braking.

To address challenges related to space and weight constraints, modular battery pack designs utilizing high energy density chemistries, such as lithium-ion pouch cells, can be successfully integrated into locomotive platforms with limited spatial availability. Thermal management strategies that employ liquid cooling are favored for maintaining optimal battery temperatures and ensuring safety during heavy-duty operational cycles. Economic analyses indicate that hybrid systems can be financially viable by decreasing fuel consumption and maintenance costs in comparison to traditional diesel engines.

Collectively, these findings inform design considerations regarding the requisite number of locomotives to accommodate fuel cells, batteries, and hydrogen storage. Based on energy and spatial requirements, dual-locomotive configurations offer flexibility for housing larger energy storage systems, although single-locomotive solutions remain feasible with optimized integration of modular batteries and fuel cells.

Factor	**One Locomotive**	**Two Locomotives**
Space for fuel cells + H_2 tanks	Limited; tight packaging needed	Doubled space for systems

Redundancy & Reliability	Single point of failure	Redundant systems improve uptime
Power output (for acceleration, grades)	May require compact high-output modules	Power can be split between units
Train control complexity	Simpler	More complex coordination
Maintenance overhead	Lower	Higher
Cost	Cheaper upfront	Higher capex and opex

3. Comparative Analysis

Hydrogen fuel cell systems are characterized by their extended operational range and rapid refueling capabilities; however, they necessitate substantial investments in hydrogen infrastructure. In contrast, battery-electric systems demonstrate advantages in regenerative braking and energy efficiency, particularly for shorter routes, yet they encounter constraints related to range and charging duration. Hybrid configurations that integrate proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells with modular lithium iron phosphate (LFP) battery packs present a viable compromise, effectively balancing range, efficiency, and system adaptability, making them well-suited for routes that involve frequent stops and diverse train compositions.

Criteria	***Hydrogen Fuel Cell***	***Battery-Electric Only***	***Hybrid System***
Energy Density (Storage)	High (120 MJ/kg H_2)	Medium (100–250Wh/kg)	Combined Moderate
Emissions	Zero (with green H_2)	Zero	Zero
Retrofit Complexity	Medium-High	High	High
Range per Refuel/Charge	600–800 km	100–250 km	400–600 km
Regenerative Braking Efficiency	Moderate	High	High
System Cost	High	Medium	Medium-High
Thermal Management Needs	Medium	High	High
Scalability/Modularity	Medium	High	High
Infrastructure Dependency	High (H_2 refueling)	Medium (Grid/Charging)	High

Technical Tradeoffs: One vs Two Locomotives

The deployment of two locomotives can be executed in either a push-pull configuration or as distributed power units, necessitating the synchronization of regenerative braking forces from both units.

Simulations can be conducted on two-locomotive systems tasked with transporting trains exceeding 3000 tonnes, with dynamic and regenerative braking methodologies that must consider the positioning of locomotives and the coordination of traction control to mitigate the risks of wheel slip or imbalance.

The Green Goat hybrid switcher, an early example of this technology, demonstrated that energy recovered during braking can be effectively utilized to enhance the output of the fuel cell, contingent upon the appropriate engineering of thermal management and energy storage system (ESS) sizing.

In conclusion, the design of regenerative braking systems for dual hydrogen fuel cell (HFC) locomotives should encompass the following considerations:

- Integration of a hybrid energy storage system (ESS) comprising batteries and supercapacitors with fuel cells.
- Employment of advanced braking control strategies, such as those based on Pontryagin's principles.
- Synchronization of braking efforts across the locomotives.
- Establishment of a centralized energy management system (EMS) for load distribution and safety.
- Conducting comprehensive simulations to assess dynamic forces and energy recovery potential.

4. System Design Challenges and Considerations

4.1 Spatial Constraints and Modular Architecture

Locomotives, including the Siemens Charger and ALP45DP, possess approximately 22 meters of usable space per unit. In the context of a standard 200-meter train, the utilization of dual locomotives facilitates the integration of high-pressure hydrogen tanks (operating at 350–700 bar), fuel cell stacks, battery packs, thermal management systems, and control electronics. The implementation of modular designs allows for adaptable retrofitting and maintenance, with the potential to designate one locomotive primarily for hydrogen propulsion while the other serves to support energy storage and regenerative braking systems [5], [6].

4.1.1 System Requirements Specification

An effective hybrid retrofit necessitates a powertrain that harmonizes the steady-state output of the fuel cell with the dynamic response characteristics of the battery. The battery pack accommodates transient load fluctuations, captures energy from regenerative braking, and offers redundancy in the system.

- Voltage Range: 700–1000 VDC, aligning with high-power PEM fuel cells [13].
- Peak Current Demand: Estimated at 500–800 A for dual-motor assist and regen capture.
- Charging Strategy:
  - Hydrogen tanks: trackside refueling (compressed H_2 at 350–700 bar).
  - Battery charging: regenerative braking + onboard FC boost during low loads.
- Thermal Management Need: Maintain cell temps between 20–40°C during peak braking [43].
- Power Output Target: 400–600 kW continuous, >800 kW peak for high acceleration demand.

This specification serves as the baseline for battery and cooling system design downstream.

4.2 Weight Distribution and Axle Load Limits

The augmentation of mass due to the incorporation of batteries and hydrogen storage systems affects axle load restrictions and the overall distribution of weight within trains. The utilization of lightweight structural materials, including aluminum honeycomb panels and composite reinforcements [33], has the potential to decrease structural mass by as much as 20% without compromising safety standards. Optimizing weight is essential for compliance with regulatory requirements and for enhancing the efficiency of train operation and fuel consumption.

Battery Module Design

The battery system is constructed utilizing modular lithium iron phosphate (LFP) packs, which have been chosen for their superior thermal stability and extended cycle life. Each module is configured in a series-parallel arrangement, typically comprising 96 series and 4 parallel cells, resulting in an approximate voltage of 307 V per module with a capacity of 250 Ah.

Design Considerations:

- Cell Format: Prismatic cells are employed to enhance compactness and structural integrity.
- Casing: The casing is made from aluminum or composite materials, incorporating vibration isolators.
- Electrical Layout:
  - A busbar that will be utilized for efficient high-current distribution.
  - Fuse protection is implemented at both the string and module levels.
- Mechanical Integration: The modules are mounted in shock-resistant trays and can be stacked in vertical configurations.

  Each module is connected to the Battery Management System (BMS), which is responsible for monitoring temperature, state of charge (SOC), and the health of each individual cell within the series. MATLAB/Simulink models can be employed to simulate the response of the pack and to assess thermal propagation limits [15], [16], [31].

4.3 Thermal Management Strategies

Thermal regulation is essential for ensuring the durability and efficacy of batteries and fuel cells. Battery modules necessitate consistent operating temperatures ranging from 15°C to 35°C, which requires the implementation of active liquid cooling systems, heat exchangers, and real-time thermal monitoring. The utilization of sophisticated twin models is suggested for predictive thermal management, facilitating proactive measures to avert overheating and optimize operational efficiency [43].

4.4 Safety and Risk Management

The flammability of hydrogen and the necessity for high-pressure storage necessitate the implementation of rigorous safety protocols. These protocols should encompass multi-tiered leak detection systems, pressure relief mechanisms, venting systems, fire-resistant enclosures, and strategically positioned crashworthy components. Additionally, battery packs must be equipped with comprehensive short-circuit protection, mechanisms to prevent overcharging, and fail-safe disconnects [3], [7]. Compliance with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and international safety standards is essential for obtaining certification and operational authorization.

Feature	***Purpose***
Pressure Relief Vent	Prevent internal overpressure & thermal runaway
Thermal Fuse	Disconnect high current if temperature spikes
Cell Monitoring BMS	Tracks overcharge, undervoltage, SOC imbalance
Short-Circuit Breaker	Isolates the faulty pack from the locomotive bus
Flame Barrier Foam	Limits fire propagation between modules

5. Economic Feasibility and Lifecycle Cost Analysis

5.1 Capital Expenditure (CAPEX)

The expenses associated with retrofitting locomotives are estimated to be between $6 million and $10 million, primarily attributed to the costs of fuel cell stacks, hydrogen storage systems, battery modules, and the associated integration efforts. In contrast, battery-electric retrofits present lower initial costs; however, they may require more frequent investments in charging infrastructure and are subject to limitations regarding operational range [35], [36].

5.2 Operating Costs (OPEX) and Fuel Savings

Hybrid hydrogen-battery systems achieve operational efficiencies by leveraging regenerative braking energy recovery, minimizing maintenance requirements, and qualifying for zero-emission incentives. Annual fuel savings ranging from 15% to 25% can be attained, contingent upon specific duty cycles and route characteristics. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the cost of hydrogen production will decline to approximately $3 per kilogram by the year 2030, thereby improving the economic feasibility of these systems [36], [39].

5.3 Emission Reductions and Environmental ROI

The transition from diesel to hydrogen hybrid locomotives has the potential to decrease carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions by as much as 90%, thereby providing significant environmental advantages. According to estimates from the California Air Resources Board, zero-emission locomotives can avert approximately 3,000 metric tons of CO_2 annually per unit when operating on similar routes [41].

5.4 Financing Models and Policy Support

Government subsidies, green bonds, carbon credit trading, and public-private partnerships are essential mechanisms for mitigating initial expenses and promoting the rapid adoption of sustainable practices. Initiatives such as the United States Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and Canada's Zero-Emission Transit Fund (ZETF) offer significant financial support and policy structures that facilitate these efforts [41].

6. Conclusion

The retrofitting of diesel locomotives with hydrogen fuel cell and battery hybrid systems represents a promising and efficient approach to achieving decarbonization. This method effectively balances energy efficiency, operational range, and the complexity of retrofitting. Specifically, modular battery packs utilizing lithium iron phosphate (LFP) chemistry, in conjunction with proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells configured in dual-locomotive setups, are particularly well-suited for mid-distance routes characterized by frequent stops, such as the route between Calgary and Edmonton.

Future research endeavors should prioritize pilot demonstrations, life cycle cost analyses, and the establishment of hydrogen infrastructure. Additionally, it is essential to foster coordinated engagement among stakeholders, including original equipment manufacturers (OEMs), transit agencies, and energy providers.

Key Design Parameters of Selected Fuel Cell Systems

Manufacturer	System Type	Max Output	H2 Storage Pressure	Approx. Range
Ballard	PEM FCmove	100 kW–200 kW	350–700 bar	600–800 km
Alstom	Coradia iLint	200 kW per car	350 bar	~1000 km
Wabtec	H2 FLXdrive	Up to 1 MW	350 bar	~550 km (freight)

Battery Chemistry Comparison Table

Chemistry	Energy Density (Wh/kg)	Cycle Life	Thermal Stability	Cost ($/kWh)	Best Use Case
LFP	80–150	2500–3500	Excellent	$75–120	Regenerative braking, high-temperature zones
NMC	150–250	1000–2000	Moderate	$100–130	Long distance, high energy demand
LTO	70–90	>5000	Excellent	$200–300	Rapid charging, high safety needs

Thermal Management Approaches for Battery Modules

- Liquid Cooling: cold plate with pump and heat exchanger [49]
- Air Cooling: Forced airflow using ducts and fans; less efficient in tight spaces
- Phase Change Materials (PCM): Absorb peak loads without active cooling
- Simulation Models: Predict thermal response and prevent overheating

Emission Comparison for Calgary–Edmonton Route (324 km)

Train Type	CO2 Emissions per Trip	Annual Emissions (250 trips/year)

Diesel	~5.5 tons	~1375 tons
H2 Hybrid	~0.5 tons	~125 tons
Battery-Electric	0 tons (w/ clean grid)	0 tons

Funding and Incentive Programs for Zero-Emission Locomotives

- US Federal: Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), DOE’s Hydrogen Shot initiative
- Canada: Zero-Emission Transit Fund (ZETF), Clean Fuel Regulations

References

[1] M. Kumar et al., “Advances in Hydrogen-Powered Trains: A Brief Report,” Energies, vol. 16, no. 18, 2023.

[2] W. Ahluwalia et al., “Fuel Cell System Optimization for Rail and Maritime Applications,” *U.S. Department of Energy Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program Review*, 2020.

[3] U.S. Department of Transportation, “Study of Hydrogen Fuel Cell Technology for Rail Propulsion,” FRA, 2021.

[4] G. Train, “Battery Locomotives: Debate Continues,” *Railway Age*, 2022.

[5] C. Smith et al., “Hydrogen Fuel Cell Locomotive Retrofit Feasibility Study,” 2022.

[6] J. Lee, “A H2 Based Retrofit of Diesel Locomotives for CO2 Emission Reductions,” 2023.

[7] A. Khan et al., “Real-Time Hydrogen Release and Dispersion Modeling,” 2022.

[8] B. Melideo et al., “Hydrogen release and dispersion modelling: State-of-the-art and future perspective,” International Journal of Hydrogen Energy, vol. 46, no. 67, pp. 33759–33782, 2021.

[9] A. Jasiūnas, M. Streimikiene, and A. Dedinas, “Integrated hydrogen and battery energy systems as emergency backup in electric trains,” Energy Reports, vol. 9, pp. 171–184, 2023.

[10] J. Soriano et al., “Application and limitations of batteries and hydrogen in heavy haul rail using Australian case studies,” eTransportation, vol. 12, pp. 100180, 2022.

[11] M. A. Delpero et al., “Hydrogen fuel cell electric trains: Technologies, current status, and future,” eTransportation, vol. 14, 2024.

[12] “Advances in Hydrogen-Powered Trains: A Brief Report,” Energies, vol. 16, no. 18, 2023.

[13] U.S. Department of Transportation, Study of Hydrogen Fuel Cell Technology for Rail Propulsion and Review of Relevant Industry Standards, Federal Railroad Administration, 2021.

[14] California Air Resources Board, Technical Support Document: Zero Emission Locomotive Conversion, 2023.

[15] R. Chen, “Semi-empirical ageing model for LFP and NMC Li-ion battery chemistries,” eTransportation, vol. 14, pp. 100155, 2023.

[16] “Designing High-Voltage and Large-Capacity Battery Packs for Fuel-Cell Hybrid Railroad Propulsion System,” Internal Report, 2024.

[17] M. Pereira et al., “Regenerative Braking for Energy Recovering in Diesel-Electric Freight Trains,” Energies, vol. 13, no. 4, 2020.

[18] C. Van Rensburg, “Feasibility of Braking Energy Utilisation,” ResearchGate, 2022.

[19] Z. Zhang et al., “Modular Design and Validation for Battery Management Systems,” Energy Reports, 2022.

[20] Neural Concept, “Battery Pack Design: Maximizing Performance and Efficiency,” 2023.

[21] Y. Liu et al., “Regenerative Braking Using Fuel Cell and Supercapacitor Hybrid,” International Journal of Hydrogen Energy, 2020.

[22] A. Ahmed et al., “Feasibility of Regenerative Braking in South African Duty Cycles,” ResearchGate, 2022.

[23] D. Wang et al., “Energy Recovery Strategy Based on Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle,” International Journal of Hydrogen Energy, 2019.

[24] M. K. Sen et al., “Design Approaches for Li-Ion Battery Packs: A Review,” *eTransportation*, vol. 12, pp. 100259, 2023.

[25] R. Chen, “Battery Pack Design of Cylindrical Lithium-Ion Cells and Modelling of Prismatic Lithium-Ion Battery Based on Characterization Tests,” *MASc Thesis*, McMaster University, 2022.

[26] D. Korkmaz and A. Özdemir, “Modeling and Simulation of a Series and Parallel Battery Pack Model in MATLAB/Simulink,” *TEPES Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 8–18, 2024.

[27] S. Chen, “Semi-Empirical Ageing Model for LFP and NMC Chemistries,” Energy Reports, 2023.

[28] K. Bhosale and A. Gupta, “Application of Robust Design Methodology to Battery Packs,” *Batteries*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2018.

[29] F. Ahmed et al., “How to Design a Battery Management System (BMS),” *TEPES Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 8–18, 2024.

[30] Battery University, “BU-205: Types of Lithium-ion,” 2024.

[31] TEPES Journal, “Modeling and Simulation of Battery Packs,” 2024.

[32] Mayfield Energy, “Comparing NMC and LFP Batteries for C&I Applications,” 2024.

[33] Springer, “High Potential Lightweight Design for Rail Vehicles,” 2024.

[34] M. T. Javed et al., “Flow Batteries with Solid Energy Boosters: A Review,” *International Journal of Energy Research*, vol. 46, no. 13, pp. 17345–17371, 2022.

[35] InsightAce, “LFP Battery Market Trends Report,” 2024.

[36] Argonne National Lab, “Modeling Performance and Cost of Lithium-Ion Batteries,” 2024.

[37] S. Venkat and B. S. Pillai, “The Iron Age of Automotive Batteries: Techno-Economic Assessment of Batteries with Lithium Metal Anodes Paired with Iron Phosphate Cathodes,” *Internal Working Paper*, 2024.

[38] A. Mahadevan et al., “Modeling the Performance and Cost of Lithium-Ion Batteries for Electric-Drive Vehicles,” *Argonne National Laboratory*, 2011.

[39] ANL, “Cost Analysis of US-Made Automotive Lithium-Ion Batteries,” 2024.

[40] Ufine Battery Co., “NMC vs. LFP vs. LTO Batteries: A Complete Comparison Guide,” 2023.

[41] California Air Resources Board, “Technical Support Document: Zero Emission Locomotive Conversion,” 2023.

[42] ZVEI, “Voltage Classes for Electric Mobility,” *ZVEI eMobility Publications*, 2014.

[43] MDPI, “Electric Vehicle Thermal System Concept Development,” Processes, vol. 12, no. 11, 2024.

[44] Y. Zhang, J. Li, and X. Chen, "A Comprehensive Analysis of Thermal Heat Dissipation for Lithium-Ion Battery Packs," Energies, vol. 18, no. 9, p. 2234, May 2023.

[45] MIKURA International, "5 Tips for Optimizing Train Regenerative Braking Systems," 2023.

[46] Y. He, X. Li, and Z. Huang, "Energy-efficient train control using nonlinear bounded regenerative braking," Control Engineering Practice, vol. 100, 104415, Dec. 2020.

[47] T. Arshad, M. K. Shahzad, and A. A. Khan, "THERMAL SIMULATION OF LFP BATTERY MODULE DURING CHARGING AND DISCHARGING CYCLES USING CFD," ResearchGate, 2023.

[48] A. Singh, P. Kumar, and S. Gupta, "Thermal Behavior Modeling of Lithium-Ion Batteries: A Comprehensive Review," Symmetry, vol. 15, no. 8, p. 1597, Aug. 2023.

[49] Congressional Research Service, "Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and DOE’s Hydrogen Shot Initiative," *U.S. Federal Policy Brief*, 2023.