

# **"LET'S CORRECT THE IMAGE OF THE DIESEL AND LET'S GET REAL ABOUT THE NEXT 20 YEARS"**

**T. Vachon  
Caterpillar Inc.**

To appreciate the diesel cycle engine and its future potential, one must first get beyond the traditional image. Societal cost/benefit summaries for the current populations of both gasoline and diesel powered vehicles are given. The benefits in terms of the transportation work performed, and the costs are in terms of the fuel energy consumed plus the emissions of criteria air pollutants, toxins, and greenhouse gases.

Reducing the total societal cost of transportation is an important national need. DOE's OTT understands this and has addressed the problem by helping to set the stage and provide the handwriting on the wall:

The stage is set with the unprecedented industry/government transportation-R&D collaborations managed by OAAT and OHVT.

The handwriting on the wall is the new information that these programs have already produced.

In the big picture, the new information from

OAAT is simply that the longer range technologies are further out than many thought. From OHVT, it is the recognition that development of advanced HSDI (high speed direct injection) diesel engines for light trucks provides the greatest potential for major reductions in fuel use and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In this year of the PNGV technology downselect, and DOE's reorganization to better effect real world change, we must make best use of this valuable new information. Best use is simply accepting all the facts and better predictions we now have regarding new technologies, required infra-structures, market demands, future oil price, tax policy, regulations, etc. This collective new, and better informed, view of the future strongly suggests:

1. We can make a significant impact on the social cost of transportation within the next 20 years.
2. The critical enabler will be a much cleaner and user friendly generation of diesel cycle engines.

**HOW BAD ARE DIESEL EMISSIONS ?**

**WHAT ABOUT THE CO<sub>2</sub>, FUEL EFFICIENCY AND  
FLASHPOINT ADVANTAGE ?**

**WE NEED A FAIR MEANS OF COMPARISON.**

**WE NEED TO GET CALIBRATED.**

**CAN WE ESTIMATE A TOTAL SOCIETAL COST  
WITH A LOGICAL COMMON DENOMINATOR ?**

**COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS ?**

## ON-ROAD VEHICLE EMISSIONS

### DIESEL VS. GASOLINE

Ref.: EPA National Air Pollutant Emission Trends, Oct. 1996, etc.

	GASOLINE % SHARE	DIESEL % SHARE
ENERGY USE		
% Trans. Oil Energy	81	19
TRANS WORK (ton-miles)		
% Trans. Work	45	55
SMOG, O <sub>3</sub>		
% VOC,NMHC, tailpipe+evap.	95 (97)	5 (x 0.56 POCP **) (3)
% NO <sub>x</sub>	73	27
TOXINS (known)		
% CO	98	2
% NH <sub>3</sub>	100	0
% Benzene,	97	3
% 1,3 Butadiene	(95)	(5)***
% Acetaldehyde	(95)	(5)***
% Formaldehyde	(95)	(5)***
GREENHOUSE GASES		
% CO <sub>2</sub>	81	19
% N <sub>2</sub> O	99	1

\* Trans. work = overall average thermal efficiency x fuel energy use

\*\* POCP = photochemical ozone creation potential, R.G. Derwent, Photochemical Ozone Creation Potentials  
....., *Atmospheric Environment*, 30(2): 181-199, 1996.

\*\*\*For lack of data, assumed (as other studies have) that the sourcing of these three toxics is apportioned the same as the VOC's.

emisimag

	GASOLINE VEHICLES %SHARE	DIESEL VEHICLES % SHARE	
<b>PARTICULATES ("probable toxins")</b>			NATL NATL SCAB
<b>DIRECT</b>			
% PM <sub>10</sub> (exhaust + other*)	34	66	62
% PM <sub>10</sub> (exh.+ other weighted at 1/2 of exh.**)	29	71	67
% PM <sub>10</sub> (exh. + other weighted at 1/2 of exh. & catalyst at 3X direct exh.* <sup>3</sup> )	49	51	46
<b>SECONDARY</b>			
<b>Inorganic</b>			
% Nitrate PM <sub>10</sub> (NO <sub>x</sub> +NH <sub>3</sub> )	73	27	26
% Sulfate PM <sub>10</sub> (SO <sub>x</sub> +NH <sub>3</sub> )	74	26	43
<b>Organic</b>			
% PM <sub>10</sub> Org. Aerosols (tailpipe+evap.)	95	5	4
Overall weighted* <sup>4</sup> secondary PM <sub>10</sub>	78	22	27
<b>TOTAL (contribution weighted*<sup>4</sup> for worst areas, 2/3 secondary, 1/3 direct; exh. + other)</b>			
	63	37	39
(2/3 secondary, 1/3 direct, exh. + other weighted at 1/2 exh.)	62	38	40
(2/3 secondary, 1/3 direct; exh. + other weighted at 1/2 of exh.; catalyst at 3X direct exh.)	68	32	33

\* other = tire, brake and road dust

\*\* assuming 50% of gasoline vehicle PM<sub>10</sub> is exhaust & 50% tire, brake and road dust  
" 85% " diesel " " " " 15% " " " " "

" other PM<sub>10</sub> is 1/2 as harmful as exhaust PM<sub>10</sub>

\*<sup>3</sup> " PM10 from catalyst equipped gasoline vehicles has 3 times the unit risk of PM10  
from non-catalyst equipped gasoline or diesel vehicles. EPA 420-R-93-005

\*<sup>4</sup> contribution allocation as given in "The Social Cost of the Health Effects of  
Motor Vehicle Air Pollution", Report # 11, UC Davis, pg. 246.

**TABLE S.1 Estimated Emission Values for 17 U.S. Regions**

Area	Emission Value (\$/ton, 1989 dollars)				
	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	PM <sub>10</sub>	SO <sub>x</sub>	CO
Damage-Based					
Atlanta	4,330	2,150	5,170	2,720	N/A
Baltimore	4,430	2,210	4,520	2,620	N/A
Boston	4,120	2,030	5,090	2,820	N/A
Chicago	5,380	2,700	10,840	3,600	N/A
Denver	2,840	1,350	3,390	2,330	N/A
Houston	6,890	3,540	5,190	2,910	N/A
Las Vegas	910	320	2,450	N/A <sup>a</sup>	N/A
Los Angeles	9,800	5,110	17,200	3,970	N/A
Milwaukee	3,890	1,930	2,960	2,210	N/A
New Orleans	3,880	1,910	3,600	2,471	N/A
New York	7,130	3,650	15,130	4,030	N/A
Philadelphia	5,940	3,010	8,360	3,340	N/A
Sacramento	3,870	1,920	3,150	2,190	N/A
San Diego	5,510	2,800	4,800	2,600	N/A
San Francisco Area	3,730	1,810	5,970	2,970	N/A
San Joaquin Valley	4,490	2,240	6,550	2,610	N/A
Wash., D.C.	4,900	2,450	6,260	3,070	N/A
Control-Cost-Based					
Atlanta	9,190	8,780	3,460	6,420	2,280
Baltimore	10,310	9,620	3,170	5,600	2,490
Boston	7,980	7,850	3,120	5,060	1,610
Chicago	7,990	8,150	4,660	9,120	2,440
Denver	6,660	6,590	2,790	4,900	2,960
Houston	17,150	15,160	2,780	3,590	2,680
Las Vegas	5,220	5,100	4,190	11,650	2,770
Los Angeles	21,850	19,250	6,060	13,480	4,840
Milwaukee	11,350	10,250	2,560	4,380	1,590
New Orleans	9,190	8,670	2,400	3,130	1,410
New York	12,340	11,720	5,390	11,090	3,910
Philadelphia	11,360	10,730	4,040	7,330	3,160
Sacramento	11,350	10,240	2,950	5,800	3,040
San Diego	14,110	12,630	3,460	6,640	2,740
San Francisco Area	5,230	5,760	3,200	4,900	2,460
San Joaquin Valley	10,310	9,630	5,110	12,480	2,750
Wash., D.C.	9,190	8,910	3,340	5,320	3010

<sup>a</sup> N/A = not available.



**PRELIMINARY EFFORT AT DETERMINING  
THE SOCIAL COST PER TON-MILE  
OF ON-ROAD GASOLINE AND DIESEL VEHICLES**

Vehicle Plus Upstream Emissions, Health Risk Cost, \$'s/1000 mi.  
Criteria pollutant cost as per UC Davis Report #11 (high emphasis  
on PM, low emphasis on CO)  
CO<sub>2</sub> @ \$15 / short ton  
Gasoline/Diesel @ \$1.25/gal. and \$1.15/gal.

	LDGC	LDDC	LDGT	<i>LDDT*</i>	HDGT	HDDT
Criteria Emis. \$/1000 mi.	8.26	19.35	13.93	<i>13.93</i>	29.46	65.00
CO <sub>2</sub> \$/1000 mi.	6.5	6.3	8.7	<i>5.2</i>	22.9	25.3
	(28mpg)	(28mpg)	(21mpg)	<i>(31mpg)</i>	(8mpg)	(7mpg)
Fuel \$/1000 mi.	45	41	60	<i>37</i>	156	164
Ton Miles/ 1000 mi.	1580	1800	2100	<i>2100</i>	8000	30000
<hr/>						
Emis. Cost \$/Ton Mile	.009	.014	.011	<i>.009</i>	.007	.003
Social Cost (Emis. + Fuel) \$/Ton Mile	.038	.037	.039	<i>.027</i>	.026	.008

\* Potential commercial result of DOE's "Light Truck Clean Diesel" technology development program.