Sustainability Analysis of Electric Cars Versus Conventional Cars

Logan, Julia, Collin, Marcio

ENVS 301: Tools for Sustainability

May 1st, 2017

Outline of Presentation

Background Information

EVs started strong in the early 1900s for urban transit²⁵ With invention of the Model T, EV market destroyed Model T: \$650 Electric Roadster: \$1750 Interest reemerged in the '70s with rising oil prices Still had limited performance- 45 mph and 40 mile range 1990 Clean Air amendment and 1992 Energy Policy Act

Background Information-Rise of Electric Vehicles

Prius released in 1997 in Japan as first mass produced hybrid vehicle Tesla Motors unveiled in 2006 \$465 million loan from the Department of Energy in 2010 Paid back in full 9 years early Tesla's success sparked interest amongst the auto industry Recovery Act installs over 18,000 charging stations nationwide EV Everywhere Grand Challenge As of 2014, 23 EV models

Goals

Analyze the sustainability of driving electric vehicles (EV) versus conventional gas combustion vehicles (CV)

Compare and contrast manufacture, waste, emissions, fuel and other inputs/outputs over life cycle of each vehicle

Determine the consumer and societal costs and benefits and net present value of either product after specific time scale

Scope

Focus on mid-sized sedans (typical four-person household vehicle) Use averages of gas consumption and electricity use 10 Year life span of a vehicle Champaign County energy/gasoline sources Assume car is charged/filled up and driven in Champaign/Urbana area Include non-market costs/benefits such as societal carbon cost and health costs of other emissions

Assumptions

Ignore commonalities

Only compare Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) vs. Lithium-ion Battery (LiB)

Ignore common car components (internal seating, steering column, chassis, wheels, etc.)

Use averages for electricity usage, fuel efficiency, energy inputs, social costs, health costs

Indicators

Cost of Battery Production

Efficiency of Batteries

Availability of raw resources

Life Cycle Analysis

Scope and Functional Unit

Scope

Focused on fuel acquisition, partial material acquisition, manufacturing, & product use

Focused on CO2eq

Kg CO2 eq/mile

Other considerations:

Lb CO2 eq/mile

Tonnes CO2 eq/mile

/km

Material Acquisition

Energy cost of extraction of materials

EV materials more difficult to extract

0.003 kg CO2 eg/mile for EV⁵⁵

Approximately 2.5% of total GWP impact⁵⁵

Extraction of materials for engine/other different parts

Difficulty in finding exact numbers, but the materials are more commonly available

Assumption: impact of CV raw materials is much less

Manufacturing and Processing

Emissions from EVs 15-68% higher than CV¹⁵

15% for 84 miles/charge

68% for 250 miles/charge

Lithium (EV) and iron(conventional)

EV

Contributes 35-41% of GWP

0.056 kg CO2eq/mile (entire EV, but again difference is mostly battery)^{56,15}

Final Assembly and Transportation

Assumed constant for EV and CV

Product Use - Lifespan

CV lifespan is 8-15 years or 150,000- 300,000 miles¹⁸

EV battery¹⁶

5% reduction after 50,000 miles

10% reduction after 200,000 miles

Can essentially ignore lifespan within our scope of 10 years

Product Use - Emissions

EV emissions

Power plants \sim 35% efficient¹⁹

Power Transmission \sim 95% efficient¹⁹

Electric Vehicles \sim 74-94% efficient²⁰

Power Plant-to-Movement efficiency of ~28%

Product Use - Emissions

CV emissions

0.36 kg CO2 eq/mile

14-30% efficient²⁰

Effects

Power plants affect fewer people but more heavily CVs affect cities and therefore more people Less smog than from power plants

Product Use - Emissions

Electricity Production for use in BEV

Average for US electricity production %

Three sources: two government, 1 journal article^{5,57,58}

0.16 kg CO2 eq/mile driven

Average for Illinois

0.11 kg CO2 eq/mile driven

Nuclear

Key assumptions

Fuel Production - Emissions

Gasoline production for use in ICE vehicles

Refining

0.063 kg CO2eq/mile

Transport

0.0033 kg CO2eq/mile

Key assumptions

Refining: 0.13 g/MJ of oil

Issues with current analysis recognized but important, 3rd highest GHG portion of gasoline

Fuel Production - Emissions

Electric vehicles

Burning of the fuel is wrapped up in production of fuel

End of Life

5% of vehicle ends up in landfill³

Non recycling of heavy metals increases environmental impact

80% of a battery can be recycled³

Increase lifespan of lithium resources

Ongoing work to increase the ability to recycle materials¹⁵

Overall Life Cycle Analysis

Final calculation

EV: 0.219 kg CO2 eq/mile

ICEV: 0.452 kg CO2 eq/mile

Difference: EVs produce just under half the emissions of an ICE

Other published LCAs

NREL - $1/3$ rd emissions for EV for low carbon grid, slightly less for fossil heavy⁵⁷

Article in Journal of Industrial Ecology⁵⁹

EVs produce 27-29% fewer emissions over ~124,000 mile life

Union of Concerned scientists: EVs less than half emissions of ICEV15

Takeaways of Life Cycle Analysis

Details matter

Mix of electricity

Most emissions come from electricity for EV, so improving grid improves emissions

Ex: Illinois EVs due to nuclear energy produce about 37% of emissions compared to US avg (our analysis)

More data and larger scope

Beyond our scope: refining processes, waste consequences

Very important: Health impacts

Cancerous, non-cancerous, tropospheric pollution impacts, urban-density impacts,

Cost Benefit Analysis

Cost Benefit Analysis

Consumer Benefits → \$7,500 Federal Tax Credit for purchasing *new* EV³²

Consumer Costs → Year 0: Manufacturer's suggested retail price⁴⁸ Yearly: Repair, Maintenance, Insurance, Fuel³⁴

Social Costs →

Year 0: Indirect CO2 emissions from ICE/LiB manufacture^{44,50} Yearly: CO2 tailpipe emissions, CO emissions, NOx emissions, Indirect CO2 emissions (petroleum production), Indirect social health costs attributable to coal-based power generation8,23,24,27-,33,37,40,41-43,45-48,50-52

2015 Nissan Leaf (EV) Vs.

2015 Toyota Camry (CV)

CBA: Calculations

Annual Consumer Electricity Cost⁵²

Social Cost of Carbon (CO2)

\$35/ton^{26,27,29,30}

Tailpipe emissions Camry42,46,53

Engine/battery manufacture^{44,50,51}

Petroleum production⁴⁵

Social Cost of NOx, CO

\$11,000/ton and \$490/ton⁸

Social Health Costs

Ameren Electric Coal Power (valuation of death, hospitalization from

CBA: Emissions and Pollution Standards

Light-Duty Vehicles and Light-Duty Trucks: Tier 0, Tier 1, National Low Emission Vehicle (NLEV), and Clean Fuel Vehicle (CFV) Exhaust Emission Standards

40

CBA: Social Costs of Electricity Generation

"The "social cost" of carbon dioxide emissions may not be \$37 per ton, as estimated by a recent U.S. government study, but \$220 per ton…" - Stanford News²⁹

CBA: Selecting Discount Rate

CBA: Toyota Camry (CV) (3% discount rate)

CBA: Nissan Leaf (EV) (3% discount rate)

CBA: Net Present Value Comparisons

Results

LCA

EVs produce ½ the total emissions of CVs Likely to improve as technology improves

Leaf is \$5700 cheaper over 10 years Without tax credit, Leaf is \$1700 more expensive over 10 years

CBA

Conclusions

Expect Electric Vehicles to surpass Conventional Vehicles in all regards

Appreciably the same already

Rising costs of carbon and emissions

Improving technologies

Support our indicators

Cost, efficiency, and availability

How to encourage the change

Inequalities of LCA and CBA

Sources

