### Automotive Technologies and Fuel Economy Policy

Don MacKenzie MIT Engineering Systems Division Sloan Automotive Laboratory November 18, 2010



1

11/18/10

### **Outline**

- Technology overview
- Policy overview

### **Technologies for Higher Fuel Economy**

Credit for slides: Irene Berry SM Mechanical Engineering / Technology and Policy, 2010

### We frame vehicle design in terms of range and performance goals



### Range depends on the energy required at the wheels and vehicle efficiency

2005 3.0-L Toyota Camry over UDDS drive cycle



## Performance depends on the peak power of the vehicle



Image by MIT OpenCourseWare. Adapted from Ehsani, Mehrdad, et al. Modern Electric, Hybrid Electric, and Fuel Cell Vehicles: Fundamentals, Theory, and Design. CRC Press, 2005. ISBN: 9780849331541.

11/18/10

# So, we want to increase efficiency while meeting design goals

- 1. Reduce load (energy required at the wheels)
- 2. Increase powertrain efficiency
  - **1. Increase efficiency of engine**
  - 2. Shift engine operating points
  - 3. Use smaller engine (downsize) ~



Image by MIT OpenCourseWare. Adapted from Ehsani, Mehrdad, et al. *Modern Electric, Hybrid Electric, and Fuel Cell Vehicles: Fundamentals, Theory, and Design*. CRC Press, 2005. ISBN: 9780849331541.



## Reducing the load at the wheels reduces fuel consumption

- Reduce weight
- Reduce aerodynamic drag
- Reduce accessory loads

Please see any description of Volkswagen's 1-Litre concept car and Siuru, Bill. "5 Facts: Vehicle Aerodynamics." GreenCar, October 13, 2008.

V

These reductions also allow for downsizing

## Diesel engines are more efficient, but heavier and more expensive

**Compression Ignition (vs. Spark Ignition)** 

- Only air is compressed
  - Higher compression ratio
- Fuel is injected into the compressed air and self-ignites
  - Direct injection

**Diesel (vs. Gasoline) Fuel** 

- Higher energy content
- Higher emissions from combustion

## These engine technologies increase engine efficiency and/or power

Technology	Mechanism	Efficiency gain
Variable valve timing	Optimizes efficiency for both high and low engine speeds	5%
Cylinder deactivation	Increases low load efficiency	7.5%
Turbo- or super- charge	Increases engine power per size: allows downsizing	7.5%
Direct Injection	More efficient fuel delivery and combustion	5-10%
Advanced after- treatment	Allows engine to produce more emissions	N/A

## These transmission technologies allow better control of engine speed

Technology	Mechanism	Efficiency gain
CV transmission	Optimize engine speed	6%
Dual-clutch transmission	Optimize engine speed	7%

## Different combustion cycles also offer efficiency improvements

Technology	Mechanism	Efficiency gain
Miller cycle	Trade power for efficiency	5%
Atkinson cycle	Trade power for efficiency	5%
HCCI	More efficient at low load	7.5%

## There are additional opportunities for energy savings through hybridization



## Hybrid optimization shifts the engine operating points to higher efficiency



Image by MIT OpenCourseWare. Adapted from Ehsani, Mehrdad, et al. *Modern Electric, Hybrid Electric, and Fuel Cell Vehicles: Fundamentals, Theory, and Design.* CRC Press, 2005. ISBN: 9780849331541.

11/18/10

## Hybrids and electric vehicles are classified by degree of electrification



Electric Energy (watt-hours of battery capacity)

## Hybrids achieve fuel savings through multiple efficiency mechanisms



## Battery electric vehicle are fully electric, which has both pros and cons

#### Advantages

- ✓ Electricity
  - ✓ Any energy source
  - ✓ Potentially less emissions
  - ✓ Single emissions source
- ✓ Electric drive
  - ✓ More energy efficient
  - ✓ Higher low-speed torque
  - ✓ Lower operating costs
  - ✓ Less maintenance

#### **Disadvantages**

- **×** Batteries
  - **×** Long charge times
  - × High cost
  - Low energy content relative to gasoline
  - **×** Limited range
  - **×** Concerns over life
- **×** Electric drive
  - Different operating and driving feel

### To compare different fuels, consider well-towheels energy and emissions



Image from "Getting Around Without Gasoline." Northeast Sustainable Energy Association, 1995.

11/18/10

l li T

# Automotive Fuel Economy Policy in the U.S.



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division Plii

### **Overview of Institutions and Policies**





### Corporate Average Fuel Economy

- Administered by National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA, part of the DOT)
- Sets minimum **average** level of fuel economy that new lightduty\* vehicles sold by each manufacturer must meet each year

$$CAFE = \frac{\sum_{i} Sales_{i}}{\sum_{i} \frac{Sales_{i}}{MPG_{i}}}$$

□ Fuel economy is based on a test procedure from the 1970s
 ~30% higher than real-world values or "window sticker" estimates
 \* Light-Duty means a gross vehicle weight rating ≤ 8,500 lbs.

MIT\_ESD Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division

11/18/10





### Corporate Average Fuel Economy

Separate standards & calculations for cars and "light trucks" Fuel Economy (MPG)



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division



#### The MPG Distortion



Massachusetts Institute of Technolo Engineering Systems Division



#### Some Details

- Electric Vehicle Credited MPG = (Energy-Equivalent MPG) / 0.15
- Credits for overcompliance can be "banked" from past 5 years or "borrowed" from next 3 years
- □ Flexible-fuel and bi-fuel vehicles capable of using alternative fuels earn ~60% bonus credit on fuel economy rating
  - Total benefit capped at 1.2 mpg each year
- Penalty for noncompliance = \$55/mpg/vehicle



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division





25

### Corporate Average Fuel Economy

#### Recent Changes

- □ NHTSA now required to set *attribute-based standards* 
  - Different standards for each manufacturer, based on product mix
  - Intended to reduce equity issues of regulatory cost
  - Effectively negates downsizing as a compliance strategy
- Credits can now be traded between fleets and between manufacturers
  - Subject to certain restrictions



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division

### **Corporate Average Fuel Economy**



Size-Based Standards





#### Federal Register / Vol. 74, No. 186 / Monday, September 28, 2009 / Proposed Rules



11/18/10

Phir 26



Figure I.D.3-2. Final MY 2011 and Proposed MY 2012-2016 Light Truck Fuel Economy Targets

#### Federal Register / Vol. 74, No. 186 / Monday, September 28, 2009 / Proposed Rules



11/18/10



#### How Standards are Set

- Cost-benefit analysis including discounted lifetime fuel expenses, estimated technology costs, monetized values of non-financial costs and benefits
- Applies efficiency-enhancing technologies in order of cost effectiveness, subject to judgment-based constraints
- **Equalizes marginal cost of more technology with marginal benefit**

#### World's biggest black box?



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division





### Vehicle GHG Standards

- □ (2002) "Pavley" GHG standards required by California Assembly Bill 1493, to be implemented by California Air Resources Board
  - 13 other states opt in to California's standards under Clean Air Act provisions
- (2004) Auto manufacturers, trade associations, dealers sue, citing principle that GHG regulation is tantamount to fuel economy regulation, explicitly preempted by CAFE law
- □ (2007) Supreme Court rules in Massachusetts v EPA that GHGs are pollutants under the Clean Air Act
- □ (2007) Bush Administration denies California "waiver" from federal preemption (waiver needed to implement regulations)
- (2009) Obama administration grants waiver, brokers truce between manufacturers and states, announces harmonized state & federal standards. Dealers continue to sue.







### Vehicle GHG Standards





#### **Gasoline Taxes**





#### Gas Guzzler Tax

#### □ Applies only to cars, not light trucks



### **Other Policies**

- **Feebates** 
  - Fee + Rebate, purchase incentive system
  - Greater cost certainty, less emissions certainty relative to CAFE
  - Recently adopted in France, initial results promising
- □ Cap & Trade
  - Would effectively be a gas tax
  - \$10 / tonne CO<sub>2</sub> ~ \$0.10 / gallon
- Cash for Clunkers
  - Not energy/carbon policy
    - □ \$200+ per ton of avoided emissions (Knittel, 2009)
  - More effective if goals are criteria pollutant emissions
  - Maybe effective as economic stimulus



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division

### Advantages and Disadvantages of Policies

	Pros	Cons
Standards	+Emissions certainty +Well-established	<ul> <li>-Rebound effect takes back</li> <li>~10% of benefits, increases other externalities</li> <li>-Uncertain costs</li> <li>-No incentive to exceed standard</li> <li>-Disparate impact on manufacturers</li> </ul>
Incentives	+Cost certainty +Stimulates continuous improvement	-Little experience -Reduced operating cost → rebound effect
Fuel Taxes	+Drives reductions throughout system	-Hits consumers hardest, especially w/ older vehicles -Politically difficult



Engineering Systems Division

#### Current Issues...

#### ...being dealt with

- □ How to include electric vehicles & plug-in hybrids
- □ State versus Federal regulation

#### ... and not being dealt with

- □ How to sustain increases in fuel economy over the long term
- Cost to manufacturers of meeting regulations



Massachusetts Institute of Technology Engineering Systems Division MIT OpenCourseWare http://ocw.mit.edu

#### 22.081J / 2.650J / 10.291J / 1.818J / 2.65J / 10.391J / 11.371J / 22.811J / ESD.166J Introduction to Sustainable Energy Fall 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.