## **Freight Day V**

Life Cycle Emissions and Life Time Costs of a Medium-duty Diesel and a Battery Electric Truck. A Case Study for Toronto

Taylor Zhou February 26, 2016



UTTRI University of Toronto Transportation Research Institute

## Overview

- Introduction
- Objective
- Method
- Results
- Conclusions







### **Medium-duty Truck (MDT)**

Gross Vehicle Weight Rating : 6,351 – 11,793 kg

- Powered by diesel fuel
- 28 L/100km → 23 L/100km
- 19% increase in energy use in Canada
- 49% increase in sales in Canada



## Introduction



## **Battery-Electric Vehicle**

#### **Advantages**

- Zero emissions
- low maintenance costs
- low fuel cost
- Quiet

### Disadvantages

Higher manufacturing

emissions

- High purchase cost
- Limited range



# Objective

• Determine **fuel consumption** for medium-duty diesel

truck and Battery-electric truck

- Life cycle GHG emissions
- Total cost of ownership (purchase cost, operating cost,

and maintenance cost over the vehicle lifetime)



## **Method – Energy consumption modeling**

#### Simulation Tool: Autonomie

1. Truck fuel type and cargo weight





Diesel Truck: Curb weight: 3774 kg Maximum Payload: 7875 kg

Battery-electric Truck Curb weight: 4432 kg Maximum Payload: 7558 kg



### Energy Consumption Modeling – cont'

2. Drive cycle: Toronto MDT University (city condition) and Freeway (freeway condition)



3. Operating temperatures (-20°C ,-10°C, -5°C, 0°C, 10°C , 20°C, 30°C,40°C)



## Method – Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

 Well-To-Wheel Greenhouse Gas emissions (g CO2e/km metric-tonne) from:

1. Fuel cycle:

• Fuel (diesel/electricity) production

2. Vehicle operation cycle:

• Emissions from using the vehicle

3. Vehicle cycle

Emission from vehicle manufacturing



#### **Results – Energy Consumption Simulations : Diesel Truck**



NIVERSITY OF TORONTO

### **Results – Energy Consumption Simulations : Battery-electric Truck**



Maximum energy increase: Battery- electric Truck	Cold weather	Warm weather
University	91%	8%
Freeway	63%	0%
Civil Engineering UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO		10

# **Results – Energy Consumption: comparison**



 More energy is reduced by the BET in the University drive cycle, especially in warm weather



## **Results - Life cycle GHG emissions**



 The majority of life cycle GHG emissions for the DT comes from the vehicle operation cycle; while that for the BET is from the vehicle cycle



### **Results – Life cycle GHG emissions**



 The BET produces 31 – 82% less lifecycle GHG emissions than the DT on University Drive cycle



### **Results – Life cycle GHG emissions**



Freeway Drive Cycle

- The BET produces -23 68% less lifecycle GHG emissions than the DT on the Freeway Drive cycle
- The GHG emission advantages of the BET decreases as cargo weight increases.



## Results - Lifetime Total Cost of Ownership



 The BET has 10% lower lifetime total cost of ownership than the DT



#### **Results - Lifetime Total Cost of Ownership**



 The BET has 18% higher 5-year total cost of ownership than the DT



#### Sensitivity Analysis – Lifetime cost of ownership



• The cost difference between the BET and the DT is most sensitive to lifetime vehicle kilometers travelled, fuel consumption rate, and discount rate.



#### Sensitivity Analysis – 5-year cost of ownership



• The 5-year cost difference between the BET and the DT is most sensitive to annual vehicle kilometers travelled, battery costs and diesel fuel price.

Civil Engineering UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

#### Conclusions

- The BET has GHG emissions advantages over the DT, especially in the University drive cycle and in warm weather
- The BET has lower life time costs of ownership in most scenarios, even without any government incentives; but it has higher 5-year costs of ownership
- The government could promote the BET by coordinating with local fleet owners and give incentives to purchase to reduce the short-term ownership costs



# Thank You

#### Questions?



UTTRI University of Toronto Transportation Research Institute