

Section 5

Conclusions

In this study, 11 fuels (RFG, RFD, DME, methanol, ethanol, LPG, CNG, LNG, F-T50, B20, and hydrogen) that are candidates for use in 3X vehicles were evaluated in three power system applications (SIDI engine, CIDI engine, or fuel cell) for a total of 13 propulsion system/fuel combinations. Two scenarios depicting alternative levels of 3X market penetration of light-duty-vehicle sales were developed and used to estimate the fuel production and distribution infrastructure needed to satisfy the fuel demands of 3X vehicles and the fuel-cycle energy and emissions impacts of the 13 potential propulsion system/fuel combinations. Capital needs and impacts were generated for each year from market introduction (2007 in the high-market-share scenario and 2013 in the low-market-share scenario) to 2030 for each of the propulsion system/fuel combinations.

As expected, cumulative capital needs were found to vary by technology and scenario. Of particular interest, though, is that supplying the low-market-share scenario's gasoline-equivalent demand requires capital investment of less than \$50 billion for all fuels except hydrogen, which is estimated to require a total cumulative investment of \$128–146 billion. By contrast, production and distribution facilities with gasoline-equivalent capacity of 1.6 MMBD (which is equivalent to 3X fuel demand in the high-market-share scenario) requires cumulative capital investments of \$51 billion for LNG, \$88 billion for ethanol, \$101 billion for methanol, \$123–164 billion for CNG, \$162 billion for DME, and \$478–559 billion for hydrogen. Although these substantial capital requirements are spread over many years, their sheer magnitude could pose a challenge to the widespread introduction of 3X vehicles.

Petroleum displacement will occur if substantial numbers of 3X vehicles enter the fleet, and adverse impacts on refineries are inevitable. However, the commitment of time and resources to 3X technology development should provide ample economic signals and sufficient lead time for refinery operators to adjust their business to accommodate different fuel demands, including, perhaps, lower gasoline demand. Such an economic restructuring would be considerably less severe than the industry consolidations that occurred during the 1970s and 1980s.

Energy and emissions impacts of 3X vehicles are highly dependent on market penetration and thus differ dramatically between the two scenarios examined in this study. Because impacts are relatively small under the low-market-share scenario, most of the discussion presented here focused on the more significant results obtained for the high-market-share scenario. For all 3X propulsion system/fuel technologies, total energy and fossil fuel use by U.S. light-duty vehicles decline significantly under the high-market-share scenario relative to reference scenario estimates for 2030. Fuel savings occur as a result of fuel-efficiency improvements, which apply to all 3X technologies and reduce LDV energy use by more than 25%, as well as a result of fuel substitution, which



applies to the nonpetroleum-fueled alternatives studied. Together, the two effects reduce LDV petroleum use in 2030 by as much as 45% relative to the reference scenario. GHG emissions follow a similar pattern. Total GHG emissions decline by 25–30% with most of the propulsion system/fuel alternatives. For those using renewable fuels (i.e., ethanol from biomass and hydrogen from solar energy), GHG emissions drop by 33% (hydrogen) and 45% (ethanol) relative to the level estimated for the reference scenario.

Among the five criteria pollutants, urban NO_x emissions decline slightly for 3X vehicles using CIDI and SIDI engines and drop substantially for fuel-cell vehicles (FCVs). Urban CO emissions decline for CIDI and FCV alternatives, while VOC emissions drop significantly for all alternatives except RFG-, MeOH- and EtOH-fueled SIDI engines. With the exception of CIDI engines using RFD, F-T50, or B20 (which increase urban PM_{10} emissions by over 30% in the high scenario), all propulsion system/fuel alternatives reduce urban PM_{10} emissions. Reductions are approximately 15–20% for fuel cells and methanol ethanol-, CNG-, or LPG-fueled SIDI engines (RFG- and LNG-fueled SIDI engines and DME-fueled CIDI engines have only very slight reductions). Although urban SO_x emissions declined for all of the alternatives, SO_x emissions resulting from the use of LNG were higher than those resulting from the use of hydrogen, LPG, and CNG.

Table 5.1 qualitatively summarizes impacts of the 13 alternatives on capital requirements and on energy use and emissions relative to the reference scenario. The table clearly shows the trade-off between costs and benefits. For example, while hydrogen FCVs have the greatest incremental capital needs, they offer the largest energy and emissions benefits. On the basis of the cost and benefit changes shown, methanol and gasoline FCVs appear to have particularly promising benefits-to-costs ratios. As stated in the beginning of this report, all 3X technologies were assumed to become an engineering reality. This is speculative, particularly for some less mature technologies, such as fuel cells and DME fuel. By its very nature, the assumption of technological readiness should be a subject of continued reexamination.

The air quality implications of these emissions results should be interpreted cautiously. Changes in emissions of the five criteria pollutants (as presented in Table 5.1) do not necessarily translate into similar changes in air quality, simply because emissions from different fuels and upstream fuel-production activities occur in different locations and at different times and are dependent on atmospheric processes. Generally speaking, upstream emissions occur outside urban areas, while vehicular emissions occur within urban areas. Because of high population exposure (especially where mortality effects exist), emissions in urban areas generate far greater damage than those outside urban areas. That is why urban emissions have been estimated in this analysis. However, as discussed in Section 4.3.3, those estimates are based on broad, categorical data that may not be representative of all urban areas and that do not take into account the effects of varying local climatic conditions. Moreover, because methanol, DME, and much of LPG were assumed to be produced in foreign countries, some of the emissions from their production are not included in the estimates shown here.



Table 5.1 Impacts of Propulsion System/Fuel Alternatives for 3X Vehicles Relative to the Reference Scenario

Parameter	RFG ^a	MeOH ^a	EtOH ^a	LPG ^a	CNG ^a	LNG ^a	RFD ^a	DME ^a	F-T50 ^a	B20 ^a	GFCV ^a	MFCV ^a	HFCV ^a
Cost of fuel production	0 ^b	--	--	-	-	-	0	---	-	0	0	--	---
Cost of fuel distribution	0	-	-	-	---	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	---
Total energy use	+++	++	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	++	+++	+++	++	+
Fossil energy use	++	++	+++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+++
Petroleum use	+	+++	+++	++	+++	+++	+	+++	++	+	+	+++	+++
GHG emissions	++	++	+++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+++
VOC emissions ^c	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	+++	+++
CO emissions ^c	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++	++	++	+++	+++	+++
NO _x emissions ^c	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+++	+++	+++
PM ₁₀ emissions ^c	0	++	++	++	++	0	---	0	---	---	++	++	++
SO _x emissions ^c	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	+	+	+++	++	+	+	+++	+++

^a RFG: reformulated gasoline
 MeOH: methanol
 EtOH: ethanol
 LPG: liquefied petroleum gas
 CNG: compressed natural gas
 LNG: liquefied natural gas
 RFD: reformulated diesel

DME: dimethyl ether
 F-T50: 50% Fischer-Tropsch diesel and 50% conventional diesel
 HFCV: hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles
 B20: 20% biodiesel and 80% conventional diesel
 GFCV: gasoline fuel-cell vehicles
 MFCV: methanol fuel-cell vehicles

^b Key:
 0: no change
 -: a little worse
 --: worse
 ---: worst
 +: a little better
 ++: better
 +++: best

^c Urban emissions

As shown in Table 5.1, urban PM₁₀ emissions from ethanol-fueled 3X vehicles are less than those from most of the alternatives examined. In marked contrast, the Phase 1 results did not disaggregate criteria emissions into urban and nonurban components. PM₁₀ emissions from ethanol occur largely upstream (from farming and ethanol production) and outside urban areas, while PM₁₀ emissions from the diesel-like fuels (RFD, F-T50 and B20) occur during vehicle operation, most of which is inside urban areas. Beyond the qualitative comparison of totals shown in Table 5.1, increased urban PM₁₀ emissions from RFD and, to a lesser extent, from F-T50 and B20 may also produce worse health effects because diesel PM₁₀ emissions, much of which is fine particulate matter of 2.5 μm or less (PM_{2.5}), may have much greater damage per unit than ethanol PM₁₀ emissions, which tend to be in the 2.5–10 μm range and to be removed from urban populations. Full assessment of the damage caused by emissions from each fuel requires air quality modeling and risk assessment beyond the scope of this analysis.

References

Acurex Environmental Corporation, 1992, *A White Paper: Preliminary Assessment of LNG Vehicle Technology, Economics, and Safety Issues*, Revision 1, prepared for Gas Research Institute, Chicago, Ill., Jan.

Acurex Environmental Corporation, 1994, *LNG Vehicle Technology, Economics, and Safety Assessment*, prepared for Gas Research Institute, Chicago, Ill., Feb.

API: American Petroleum Institute.

API, 1990, *Gasoline Distribution and Service Station Margins: An Assessment of EPA Assumptions and Implications for Methanol*, Research Study #055, Washington, D.C., Sept.

API, 1995, *Basic Petroleum Data Book: Petroleum Industry Statistics*, Vol. XV, No. 2, Washington, D.C., July.

API, 1996, *How Much We Pay for Gasoline: The Cost of Motor Gasoline to Consumers 1995, Annual Review*, Washington, D.C., April.

Automotive Engineering, 1996, "Alternative Fuels in Future Vehicles," pp. 39-43, Jan.

Berry, G.B., et al., 1995, *A Smooth Transition to Hydrogen Transportation Fuel*, U.S. Department of Energy Hydrogen Program Review, Coral Gables, Fla., April.

Blok, K., et al., 1996, "Hydrogen Production from Natural Gas, Sequestration of Recovered CO₂ in Depleted Gas Wells and Enhanced Natural Gas Recovery," *Energy* 22 (2/3):161-168.

Booz-Allen and Hamilton, Inc., 1994, *Technical and Economic Assessment of Biodiesel for Vehicular Fuel Use*, prepared for the National Soydiesel Development Board.

CARB: California Air Resources Board

CARB, 1997, *Proposed Amendments to California's Low-Emission Vehicle Regulations "LEV II,"* draft preliminary staff report, State of California Air Resources Board, Mobile Source Control Division, El Monte, Calif.

Chemical Market Associates, Inc. (CMAI), 1996, *World Methanol Analysis: An International Supply/Demand Study and Marketing Guide*, Houston.



Chien, D., 1996, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, personal communication, Jan.

Chien, D., 1997, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, personal communication, Jan.

Choi, G.N., et al., 1996, "Design/Economics of a Natural Gas Based Fischer-Tropsch Plant," presented at the American Institute of Chemical Engineers Spring National Meeting, Houston, March 9–13, 1997.

Davis, S.C., 1997, *Transportation Energy Data Book: Edition 17*, ORNL-6919, Center for Transportation Analysis, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn., Aug.

DOE: U.S. Department of Energy.

DOE, 1989, *Assessment of the Costs and Benefits of Flexible and Alternative Fuel Use in the U.S. Transportation Sector, Technical Report Three: Methanol Production and Transportation Costs*, DOE/PE-0093, Washington, D.C., Nov.

DOE, 1990, *Assessment of the Costs and Benefits of Flexible and Alternative Fuel Use in the U.S. Transportation Sector, Technical Report Four: Vehicle and Fuel Distribution Requirements*, DOE/PE-0095P, Washington, D.C., Aug.

DOE, 1991, *Assessment of Costs and Benefits of Flexible and Alternative Fuel Use in the U.S. Transportation Sector, Technical Report Six: Costs of Producing Methanol from Unutilized Domestic Natural Gas*, DOE/PE-0098P, Washington, D.C., July.

DOE, 1996, *Assessment of Costs and Benefits of Flexible and Alternative Fuel Use in the U.S. Transportation Sector, Technical Report Fourteen: Market Potential and Impacts of Alternative Fuel Use in Light-Duty Vehicles: A 2000/2010 Analysis*, DOE/PO-0042, Washington, D.C., Jan.

Donnelly, B.E., 1997, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, personal communication, Dec.

EA Energy Technologies Group, 1991, *Assessment of Ethanol Infrastructure for Transportation Use*, prepared for National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colo., April.

EA Energy Technologies Group, 1992, *Assessment of LPG Infrastructure for Transportation Use*, prepared for Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn., Sept.

EA Mueller, 1991, *Assessment of Natural Gas Infrastructure for Transportation Use*, prepared for Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn., March.



EEA: Energy and Environmental Analysis, Inc.

EEA, 1990, *Blending, Transport, and Distribution of Gasoline in California*, prepared for Western States Petroleum Association, Los Angeles, Calif., Sept.

EEA, 1995, *Suggested Methodology for Alternative Fuels Retailing and AFV Supply within the Transition Model*, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., Jan.

EIA: Energy Information Administration.

EIA, 1995, *Energy Policy Act Transportation Study: Interim Report on Natural Gas Flows and Rates*, DOE/EIA-0602 (95), U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., Oct.

EIA, 1996a, *Annual Energy Outlook 1997 with Projections to 2015*, DOE/EIA-0383(97), U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., Dec.

EIA, 1996b, *Annual Energy Outlook 1996 with Projections to 2015*, DOE/EIA-0383(96), U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., Jan.

EIA, 1997a, *Petroleum Supply Annual 1996, Vol. 1*, DOE/EIA-0340 (96)/1, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., May.

EIA, 1997b, *1997 Performance Profiles of Major Energy Producers 1995*, DOE/EIA-0206 (95), U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., Jan.

EIA, 1997c, *Natural Gas Annual 1996*, DOE/EIA-0131 (96), U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., Sept.

Energy Statistics Sourcebook, 1995, 10th Edition, PennWell Publishing Company, Tulsa, Okla., p. 466.

EPA: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

EPA, 1998, "Control of Air Pollution from New Motor Vehicles and New Motor Vehicle Engines: State Commitments to National Law Emission Vehicle Program"
[URL:<http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>(as of July 15, 1998)]

FHWA: Federal Highway Administration.

FHWA, 1992, *1990 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey*, public use tape, Washington, D.C.

Flechtner, M.K., and D.E. Gushee, 1993, *Biodiesel Fuel: What Is It? Can It Compete?*, 93-1027S, Congressional Research Service, Washington, D.C., Dec.



Fleisch, T.H., and P.C. Meurer, 1995, "DME: The Diesel Fuel for the 21st Century?" presented at the 1995 AVL Conference on Engine and Environment, Graz, Austria.

Frank, M.E., 1997, "Comparison of Gas Conversion Technologies," presented at Energy Frontiers International Quarterly Workshop Gas Conversion: Strategies, Technologies & Activities, Girdwood, Alaska, July 16-17.

Gavett, E.E., 1995, "The Economics of Biodiesel," in *Renewable Energy in Agriculture and Forestry*, International Energy Agency, Paris, France.

Greene, D., 1992, "Vehicle Use and Fuel Economy: How Big is the Rebound Effect?" *Energy*, 13(1):117-143.

Hansen, J.B., et al., 1995, "Large Scale Manufacture of Dimethyl Ether — a New Alternative Diesel Fuel from Natural Gas," SAE technical paper 950063, Society of Automotive Engineers International, Warrendale, Penn., Feb.

Hu, P., and J. Young, 1993, *1990 NPTS Databook*, Vol. II, U, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C., Nov.

Knott, D., 1997, "Gas-to-Liquids Projects Gaining Momentum as Process List Grows," *Oil & Gas Journal*, June 23, pp.16-21.

Kramer, S., 1997, Bechtel Corporation, personal communication, April.

Liegeois, W., 1997, Stanley Consultants, personal communication, Oct. & Dec.

McKetta, J.J., 1992, *Petroleum Processing Handbook*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.

McNutt, B. et al., 1978, "A Comparison of Fuel Economy Results from EPA Tests and Actual In-Use Experience, 1974-1977 Model Year Cars," SAE Paper 780037, Society of Automotive Engineers.

Maples, J., 1992, "The Light Duty MPG Gap: Its Size Today and Potential Impacts in the Future," SAE Government/Industry Meeting, Washington, D.C., May.

Mintz, M., et al., 1993, "Differences Between EPA-Test and In-Use Fuel Economy: Are the Correction Factors Correct?" *Transportation Research Record* 1416, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C.

Mintz, M., et al., 1994, *The IMPACTT Model: Structure and Technical Description*, ANL/ESD/TM-93, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill.

Morris, D., and I. Ahmed, 1992, *How Much Energy Does It Take to Make a Gallon of Ethanol?*, Institute for Local Self Reliance, Minneapolis, Minn., Dec.



Murrell, J.D., et al., 1993, *Light-Duty Automotive Technology and Fuel Economy Trends through 1993*, EPA/AA/TDG/93-01, Ann Arbor, Mich., May

NRC: National Research Council.

NRC, 1994, *Review of the Research Program of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

NRC, 1996, *Review of the Research Program of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, Second Report*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

NRC, 1997, *Review of the Research Program of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, Third Report*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

NRC, 1998, *Review of the Research Program of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, Fourth Report*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

Nepywoda, J., 1997, Amoco Oil Company, personal communication, Aug. and Oct.

Ogden, J., et al., 1997, "Hydrogen as a Fuel for Fuel Cell Vehicles: A Technical and Economic Comparison," presented at the National Hydrogen Association's 8th Annual Conference, Arlington, Va., March.

Ogden, J.M., and M.A. Delucchi, 1993, "Solar Hydrogen Transportation Fuels," in *Transportation and Global Climate Change*, ed. D.L. Greene and D.J. Santini, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, Washington, D.C.

Oil and Gas Journal, 1996, "Worldwide Construction Update," April 8, pp. 53-89.

Oil and Gas Journal, 1997, "Capital Spending Outlook," Feb. 17, p. 35.

R.F. Webb Corporation, 1992, *Investigation Regarding Federal Policy Actions for Encouraging Use of Compressed Natural Gas as a Motor Vehicle Fuel*, prepared for Congressional Research Service, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., April.

R.S. Means Company, Inc., 1996, *Building Construction Cost Data*, 54th Annual Edition, Kingston, Mass.

Resolve, Inc., 1995, *Policy Dialogue Advisory Committee to Develop Options for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Personal Motor Vehicles*, draft, Washington, D.C., Aug.

Singleton, A.H., 1997, "Advances Make Gas-to-Liquids Process Competitive for Remote Locations," *Oil and Gas Journal*, Aug. 4, pp. 68-72.



Stanley Consultants, 1996, *Comprehensive Assessment of the Ten Highest Priority Ethanol Research Areas*, prepared for Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Edwardsville, Ill., Sept.

True, W.R., 1996, "World's LPG Supply Picture Will Change by 2000," *Oil and Gas Journal*, Nov. 6, 1995, pp. 32-35.

Wang, M., 1996, *GREET 1.0 — Transportation Fuel Cycles Model: Methodology and Use*, ANL/ESD-33, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill.

Wang, M., et al., 1997a, *Assessment of PNGV Fuels Infrastructure Phase 1 Report: Additional Capital Needs and Fuel-Cycle Energy and Emissions Impacts*, ANL/ESD/TM-140, Center for Transportation Research, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill., Jan.

Wang, M., et al., 1997b, *Fuel-Cycle Fossil Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Fuel Ethanol Produced from U.S. Midwest Corn*, Center for Transportation Research, Argonne National Laboratory, prepared for Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, Springfield, Ill., Dec.

Wang, M.Q., and L.R. Johnson, 1996, "Potential Transportation Infrastructure Changes Resulting from Commercialization of 80 mpg Vehicles," *Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on Automotive Technology and Automation*, held at Florence, Italy, June 3-6, 1996, pp. 433-441.

Westbrook, F., and P. Patterson, 1989, "Changing Driving Patterns and their Effect on Fuel Economy," SAE Government/Industry Meeting, Washington, D.C., May.

Williams, R.H., 1996, *Fuel Decarbonization for Fuel Cell Applications and Sequestration of the Separated CO₂*, Princeton University, PU/CEES Report No. 295, Princeton, N.J., Jan.

Wiseloge, A., 1996, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, personal communication, Oct. and Nov.

Zebon, B., 1997, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Maritime Administration, Washington, D.C., personal communication, June.