



CFIRE

Assessment of Biodiesel Scenarios for Midwest Freight Transport Emission Reduction

CFIRE 02-10
April 2010

National Center for Freight & Infrastructure Research & Education
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
College of Engineering
University of Wisconsin–Madison



Authors:

Anjali P. Sauthoff, Paul J. Meier, and Tracey A. Holloway
Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment
Gaylord Nelson for Environmental Studies
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Principal Investigator:

Paul J. Meier
Energy Institute
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Technical Report Documentation

1. Report No. CFIRE 02-10		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No. CFDA 20.701	
4. Title and Subtitle Assessment of Biodiesel Scenarios for Midwest Freight Transport Emission Reduction				5. Report Date April 2010	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author/s Anjali P. Sauthoff, Paul J. Meier, and Tracey A. Holloway				8. Performing Organization Report No. CFIRE 02-10	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education (CFIRE) University of Wisconsin-Madison 1415 Engineering Drive, 2205 EH Madison, WI 53706				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. T002688 DTRT06-G-0020	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address Research and Innovative Technology Administration U.S. Department of Transportation 1200 New Jersey Ave, SE Washington, DC 20590				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report [9/1/2008-5/30/2010]	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Project completed by CFIRE for the RITA of the US Department of Transportation.					
16. Abstract There are trade-offs when attempting to reduce both greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutants for freight transport, as the control strategies are not necessarily complimentary. While emission controls can remove ozone precursors and particulate from vehicle exhaust streams, greenhouse gas emission can only be mitigated by either reducing fuel consumption or switching to lower carbon-content fuel. One near-term alternative that can readily reduce fuel consumption is the reduction of freight vehicle speed. To lower the carbon-content of freight transportation fuel, the primary near-term alternative is to increase blending of biodiesel. The cost-effectiveness of the emission reduction strategy will be characterized from the freight carriers viewpoint, by comparing the direct costs to estimates of indirect costs and fuel savings. Multiple scenarios will be modeled using EPA's MARKAL model to simulate implementation of the proposed measures. MARKAL will be used to quantify the system-wide effects of changes in resource supply, technology availability, and account for CO2, SO2, NOX, PM, and VOC emissions.					
17. Key Words Freight, emissions, biodiesel, environment, sustainability, diesel, trucks, greenhouse gases			18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This report is available through the Transportation Research Information Services of the National Transportation Library.		
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classification (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 25	22. Price -0-

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72) Reproduction of form and completed page is authorized.

DISCLAIMER

This research was funded by the National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education. The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program, in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the National Center for Freight and Infrastructure Research and Education, the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, or the USDOT's RITA at the time of publication.

The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade and manufacturers names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the object of the document.

Table of Contents

Technical Report Documentation	3
Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	8
1.1 Air Quality and Climate Impacts of Freight Transportation Emissions	8
1.2 Biodiesel Alternative	9
2. Biodiesel Scenario Assessment.....	11
2.1 U.S. EPA 9R MARKAL Model	11
2.2 Characterization of Freight Activity	12
3. Evaluating the Emissions Impacts of Biodiesel Blending Scenarios.....	15
3.1 Effect of Biodiesel Blending on PM ₁₀ and NOx Emissions	15
3.2 Effect of Biodiesel Blending on GHG Emissions	19
4. Discussion and Implications.....	21
References	24

Tables

Table 1: Sub-sector projected fuel use and VMT.....	14
Table 2: MARKAL emission factors for all heavy-duty diesel vehicle technologies..	16
Table 3: Percent emission change of biodiesel blend relative to petroleum-based diesel.....	16
Table 4: Total NOx emissions (kt) of biodiesel blend scenarios relative to reference-case scenario (100 percent petroleum-based diesel).	18
Table 5: Total PM10 emissions (kt) of biodiesel blend scenarios relative to reference-case scenario (100% petroleum-based diesel).	18
Table 6: Life-cycle greenhouse gas emission factors based on GREET model.	20
Table 7: Life-cycle greenhouse gas emission factors for biodiesel blends.	20

Figures

Figure 1: EPA US 9R regions. (15).....	12
Figure 2: Projected heavy duty vehicle VMT, region 3.....	13
Figure 3: Projected heavy-duty vehicle fuel use in region 3, 2010-2020.	13
Figure 4: Projected NOx emissions from region 3 heavy-duty diesel vehicle fleet reflecting a decrease in total emissions from 2010 to 2025.....	17
Figure 5: Projected PM10 emissions from region 3 heavy-duty diesel vehicle fleet reflecting a decrease in total emissions from 2010 to 2025.....	17
Figure 6: Sub-sector contribution to NOx on-road transportation emissions, reference case (Petroleum-based diesel).	19
Figure 7: Sub-sector contribution to PM10 on-road transportation emissions, reference case (Petroleum-based diesel).	19
Figure 8: Projected GHG emissions from region 3 heavy-duty diesel vehicle fleet reflecting an increase in total emissions from 2010 to 2025.....	21
Figure 9: Sub-sector contribution to GHG on-road transportation emissions, reference case (Petroleum-based diesel).	21

Executive Summary

In 2007, petroleum-based fuel products supplied more than 95 percent of US transportation energy (1). Driven largely by concerns over energy security, increased global demand, as well as air quality and climate change mitigation, state and federal policies are being developed and implemented to promote greater utilization of biofuels, which may offer benefits over petroleum-based fuels including opportunities for rural economic development. This study addresses the potential emissions benefits of biodiesel blending for use in heavy-duty diesel vehicles (HDDVs) in the Upper Midwestern United States (Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin), a region of highly concentrated freight activity. The US EPA's 9 Region Market Allocation Model (MARKAL), a state-of-the-art model that allows for regional-scale evaluation of transportation end-use emissions, is used to quantify particulate matter (PM) and nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions from HDDVs using biodiesel blends as a replacement for petroleum-based diesel. To evaluate effects of blending on greenhouse gas emissions, the Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) Model is used for lifecycle analysis of greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). In this study, four alternative scenarios of HDDV biodiesel blend percentages, ranging from 20 percent (B20) to 2 percent (B2) biodiesel blends, are evaluated for their effects on HDDV emissions. These blends may be effectively used in current, unmodified diesel engines without maintenance and performance issues, thus offering a potential short-term, low-cost approach to reducing freight-related emissions.

Modeling results for all scenarios reflect an overall decline in PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions from heavy duty vehicles between 2010 and 2025 in the region, with a concurrent increase in greenhouse gases. Furthermore, results demonstrate that the use of biodiesel blends, especially at higher blend levels, may further diminish GHG and PM₁₀ emissions, while slightly increasing NO_x emissions from heavy duty vehicles. However, at blend levels that require no modification to diesel engines (B20 and lower), the effect of biodiesel blending on NO_x and PM emissions appear to be outweighed by major reductions in emission rates occurring as a result of improvements to vehicle exhaust controls, vehicle efficiency and fuel modifications over time.

1. Introduction

In 2007, petroleum-based fuel products supplied more than 95 percent of US transportation energy (1). Driven largely by concerns over energy security, increased global demand, as well as air quality and climate change mitigation, state and federal policies are being developed and implemented to promote much greater utilization of biofuels, which may offer benefits over petroleum-based fuels. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 was created in part to promote petroleum independence and greater utilization of alternative forms of energy. In March 2010, the US EPA published the Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2) Final Rule, requiring 36 billion gallons of renewable fuel to be blended into transportation fuel by 2022, of which 1 billion gallons are designated from biodiesel. This study addresses the potential emissions benefits of biodiesel blending for use in heavy-duty diesel vehicles (HDDVs) in the Upper Midwestern United States (Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin), a region of highly concentrated freight activity. A state-of-the-art integrated assessment model for energy, cost, and emissions was used, and we focus on criteria pollutants for which freight emissions are important, including particulate matter (PM) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), as well as greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). We evaluate four alternative scenarios of HDDV biodiesel blend percentages, ranging from 20 percent (B20) to 2 percent (B2) biodiesel blends. These blends may be effectively used in current, unmodified diesel engines without maintenance and performance issues, thus offering a potential short-term, low-cost approach to reducing freight-related emissions. Beyond their potential environmental benefits, many in the Upper Midwest view biofuels as supporting local farmers, reducing dependence on foreign oil, and strengthening the economies of these agricultural and manufacturing states.

1.1 Air Quality and Climate Impacts of Freight Transportation Emissions

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics has reported a steadily rising demand for freight transportation in the US, with a 2 percent annual increase in ton-miles of freight movement between 1990 and 2001 and forecasts of continued growth over the next several decades (2). In a study to examine the links between regional air quality and freight in the US, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) chose six extensive metropolitan areas (Los Angeles, Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston, Chicago, Detroit, and Baltimore) to serve as representative major multi-modal freight centers (3). Though trucking is the dominant freight mode in each of the centers, as a percentage of total on-road vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the Detroit region ranked first among the six centers, with 12.7 percent of total on-road VMT attributable to heavy-duty trucks, followed by Chicago (11.1 percent). Driving these high proportions of heavy-duty truck traffic in the Midwest are the large volumes of long-distance trucks passing into and out of the region, particularly across the U.S.-Canada border (3).

Though the reliable and efficient movement of freight is vital to the economic well being of the region, freight-related emissions pose a major challenge to public health and the environment. Heavy-duty vehicles are the largest contributors to US freight-related NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions, emitting approximately 33 percent and 25 percent of all mobile source NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions, respectively (3). The above-mentioned FHWA study reported that among the six major metropolitan regions, freight trucks in the Detroit region contributed to the high of 63 percent of total on-road NO_x emissions, while freight trucks from the Chicago area contributed the high of 63 percent of total on-road PM₁₀ emissions (3). In addition to direct health effects, NO_x reacts with volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to form ozone (O₃), which as been found to trigger asthma, reduced lung capacity, and increased susceptibility to respiratory illnesses (4, 5, 6). Furthermore, NO_x is a major contributor to wintertime fine PM_{2.5}, via the formation of nitrate particles. The total contribution of PM_{2.5} from freight thus results from the secondary aerosols formed from NO_x and to a lesser extent sulfur dioxide and VOC emissions, as well as from primary PM_{2.5} emissions (e.g., exhaust smoke, dust released by brakes, etc.). This PM_{2.5} has been found to be associated with

asthma, difficult breathing, chronic bronchitis, myocardial infarction (heart attacks), and premature death (7). Both PM_{2.5} and O₃ pose major challenges for regulators and public health officials in the Midwestern US, where over 28 million people live in areas not meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for these two pollutants (8).

In addition to regulated pollutants with direct health impacts, greenhouse gases (GHGs) from trucking contribute significantly to total US climate-related emissions. During the past few decades, vehicle efficiency improvements in the trucking sector have not kept pace with growth in demand, resulting in GHG emissions from trucking increasing by 80 percent between 1990 and 2007, while only increasing by 29 percent from all transportation activities during the same period (9). Growth in freight demand, coupled with an overall decline in energy efficiency within the freight sector, is believed to have driven these trends. GHG emissions from freight trucks increased by 69 percent between 1990 and 2005, and accounted for almost 90 percent of the increase in freight GHGs, while vehicle efficiency declined between 1990 and 2005 (9). Climate policies are under discussion at local, state, and national levels, so any assessment of freight-related emission reduction options must consider GHGs along with currently regulated compounds.

While current environmental regulations are expected to significantly curtail freight truck PM and NO_x emissions, they are not expected to strongly impact GHG emissions (9). There are trade-offs when attempting to reduce both GHG and criteria air pollutants, as the control strategies are not necessarily complimentary. While emission controls can remove O₃ precursors and PM from vehicle exhaust streams, these controls lower the vehicle fuel efficiency, thereby increasing the rate of CO₂ emission.

Unlike other compounds, CO₂ is relatively inert and cannot be readily separated or captured. In the absence of control technology for CO₂ exhaust, improving engine efficiency/reducing fuel consumption or switching to lower carbon-content alternative fuel can only mitigate freight transport emissions. To achieve reductions in fuel consumption within the next decade, the scope of alternatives is further narrowed. Improvements in engine efficiency can reduce fuel use through multiple technology pathways. The slow rate of vehicle turnover, however, limits the penetration of new technology measures in the near-term. To lower the carbon-content of freight transportation fuel, one seemingly viable near-term alternative is to increase blending of biodiesel. Replacing pure petroleum diesel with blends of biodiesel and petroleum diesel would potentially yield reductions in GHGs, as well as PM and O₃ precursors.

1.2 Biodiesel Alternative

The use of biodiesel as a fuel option has emerged as a potential alternative to petroleum-based diesel in HDDVs. Biodiesel is produced from the base-catalyzed transesterification of vegetable oil, animal fat/oil, tallow, or waste oil. Soybean (US) and rapeseed (Europe) oils are the most common feedstocks for biodiesel production. In addition to domestic production, advantages of biodiesel include higher combustion efficiency, lower sulfur and aromatic content (10, 11), and a higher cetane number, as well as a higher level of biodegradability (12). Additionally, engine dynamometer tests of tailpipe emissions have shown decreased hydrocarbon, carbon monoxide, and particulate emissions from biodiesel relative to petroleum-based diesel (13). Furthermore, because the CO₂ emitted from biodiesel combustion is off-set by the CO₂ absorbed during plant growth, biodiesel may reduce GHG emissions relative to petroleum-based fuels, depending on the life-cycle emissions associated with feedstock production, transport, and refining. (14).

In this study, we address the question of whether substituting biodiesel for petroleum-based diesel in Midwestern HDDVs may affect criteria pollutant and GHG emissions. When evaluating a potential emissions effect, it is important to consider the temporal and spatial scales upon which specific pollutants act. Greenhouse gases and air pollutants such as NO_x and PM act on different time as well as spatial scales. While the atmospheric lifetime of CO₂ is 50-200 years (9), PM and NO_x are much shorter-lived pollutants and have an atmospheric lifetime on the order of days. This

temporal difference also impacts the spatial scale upon which these pollutants act; GHGs impact the global atmosphere, while NO_x and PM generally act at a smaller spatial scale.

This study relied on leading tools for emissions quantification from regional energy systems. The US EPA's 9 Region Market Allocation Model (MARKAL) is a state-of-the-art model that allows for regional-scale evaluation of PM and NO_x emissions from transportation end-use, while the Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) Model is used for lifecycle analysis of US transportation fuels. We use these models (described in more detail below) to evaluate four different biodiesel blends that may be used in current, unmodified HDDV engines.

Section 2 of this report describes model features of EPA's 9R MARKAL model, as well as MARKAL-generated freight activity trends in the Midwest, upon which the model calculates emission projections.

Section 3 reports on the blending scenarios tested in this study and their effect on PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions. Application of the GREET model and evaluation of GHG emissions are also described in section 3.

Section 4 presents a discussion and derives conclusions and implications of the use of biodiesel blend in HDDVs in the Midwest.

2. Biodiesel Scenario Assessment

2.1 U.S. EPA 9R MARKAL Model

The US EPA 9 Region MARKAL (MARKet ALlocation) model was used to develop Midwest energy scenarios, which formed the basis for evaluating the potential emission abatement effect of different biodiesel blends for heavy-duty diesel vehicles. MARKAL, an economic optimization model, offers a complete model representation of the US energy sector, from resource to end-use demand, and calculates, using straightforward linear and mixed-integer linear programming techniques, the least-cost set of technologies over time to satisfy the specified demands, subject to various user-defined constraints. Model output includes a projection of the technological mix at five-year projected intervals to 2050, estimates of total system cost, energy services (by type and quantity), criteria and GHG emissions, and energy commodity prices (15).

The MARKAL 9r database represents the major sectors in the US energy system, including the commercial, industrial, residential, transportation, and electricity generation sectors. The primary sources of data populating the MARKAL database are the U.S. Department of Energy's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) and National Energy Modeling System (NEMS), which were used to construct the energy supply, demand, and technology characterizations. National end-use demand (vehicle miles traveled, or VMT) for HDDVs was based on a linear extrapolation of AEO data and distributed regionally based on available state-level data (15). Projections and statistics for light duty vehicles (passenger cars and trucks) were extracted from AEO forecasts and from light-duty vehicle technology assumptions provided by the US EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality's Transportation and Climate Division (15). Data for heavy trucks and buses were carried over from the US EPA MARKAL National Model database (18). Information for technologies not represented in the AEO and NEMS were derived from other widely recognized authoritative sources such as the Department of Energy Office of Transportation Technology's Quality Metrics report and the EPA's Air Quality and Emissions Trends Report (15, 16, 17). For this analysis, an updated version of the MARKAL model was used which included the renewable fuels mandate of the Energy Information and Security Act of 2007. This modified version incorporated changes to the biodiesel sector, allowing for biodiesel blend constraints to be applied to specific end-use heavy-duty vehicle categories.

MARKAL models are widely used for energy-environmental analysis. The model flexibility has allowed for applications from energy planning to policy analysis at the regional, national and even global level (19). The US EPA 9R version of MARKAL model divides the United States into nine regions, based upon the nine US census divisions, which are also used by the US Department of Energy's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) (Figure 1). These boundaries allow for model representation of inter-regional trade, such that a fuel or energy carrier produced in one region can be used in a different region. Such a framework yields insight into the entire system response to important drivers and provides an ability to characterize scenarios at a regional level, which is critical for many air pollutants that act at a regional scale such as PM and NOx.




Figure 1: EPA US 9R regions. (15)

2.2 Characterization of Freight Activity

The reference scenario, or baseline, anticipates that VMT will increase by approximately 38 percent between 2010 and 2015 in the “East North Central” (region 3, or R3) model domain corresponding to the Upper Midwest focus of our analysis (Figure 2). Likewise, fuel use among heavy-duty vehicles is assumed to increase by 18 percent (Figure 3). These assumptions are based on AEO fuel consumption estimates, which are used as inputs to MARKAL 9R. AEO projections are based on regionally reported fuel use from the State Energy Data Report, and growth in VMT is based upon projections of dollars of industrial output (20), and largely driven by growing international trade, and modern manufacturing and distribution supply chain practices such as express delivery.




Figure 2: Projected heavy duty vehicle VMT, region 3.




Figure 3: Projected heavy-duty vehicle fuel use in region 3, 2010-2020.

During the same time period, VMT demand from light duty vehicles and buses is expected to grow, although less-so, by 20 percent and 10 percent, respectively. Overall, the reference scenario projection for total on-road transportation increases by approximately 22 percent between 2010 and 2025 in region 3. Relative to total on-road transportation VMT, the heavy-duty vehicle sub-sector constitutes 10-11.5 percent of total VMT, while light duty vehicles make up 88-90 percent and buses contribute less than 0.25 percent to total demand.

The US EPA 9R MARKAL model further classifies each transportation sub-sector, allowing for the effect of vehicle technology to be considered. Vehicle miles traveled and fuel use in Table 1 reflects the phase-out of current technologies and the concurrent build-up of future heavy-duty vehicles.

Transport Mode	2010	2015	2020	2025
	Fuel Use (petajoules)			
Buses	26.7	27.5	28.4	29.2
Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles	1046	1127.7	1180.3	1235
Light Duty Vehicles	2665.3	2703.5	2669.3	2709.7
Total	3738	3858.7	3878	3973.9
HDDV Percentage of Total	27.98%	29.22%	30.44%	31.08%
	Billion Vehicle Miles Traveled			
Buses	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicles	51.6	58.2	64.6	71.2
Light Duty Vehicles	453.4	482.4	513.4	544.9
Total	506.2	541.9	579.3	617.4
HDDV Percentage of Total	10.19%	10.75%	11.16%	11.53%

Table 1: Sub-sector projected fuel use and VMT.

Fuel economy standards for light duty vehicles reflect current law through model year 2010. For model years 2011 through 2015, fuel economy standards reflect National Highway Transportation Safety Administration’s proposed standards. For model years 2016 through 2020, the standards reflect the US Energy Information Administration’s assumed increases that ensure a light vehicle combined fuel economy of 35 mpg is achieved by model 2020. For model years 2021 through 2030, fuel economy standards are held constant at model year 2020 levels (20). Vehicle efficiencies, fuels and emissions for various transportation sub-sectors are largely driven by national-scale regulations. The Energy Bill passed by the Senate in 2007 included a provision that increased the average new car efficiency to 35 miles per gallon by 2020, an increase of approximately 40 percent over the existing CAFE standards (15). Efficiency standards are represented in the MARKAL database as added constraints that specify minimum fleet efficiencies. In addition, “degradation factors” are used to convert new vehicle tested fuel economy values to “on-road” fuel economy values, which serve to adjust tested fuel economy values to account for the difference experienced between fuel economy performance realized in the CAFE test procedure compared fuel economy realized under normal driving conditions (20). In the reference scenario, the HDDV fleet averaged fuel efficiency increases from 6.6 miles per gallon in 2010 to 7.7 miles per gallon in 2025 based on the adoption of newer high efficiency vehicles over time.

3. Evaluating the Emissions Impacts of Biodiesel Blending Scenarios

The emissions reduction potential from increasing blend levels of biodiesel for HDDVs was analyzed by comparing a reference scenario of petroleum-based diesel to four alternative scenarios where HDDV biodiesel blend percentage changed as follows:

- Scenario 1: 100 percent of Region 3 HDDV fuel using a 20 percent biodiesel – 80 percent petroleum diesel blend (B20)
- Scenario 2: 100 percent of Region 3 HDDV fuel using a 10 percent biodiesel – 90 percent petroleum diesel blend (B10)
- Scenario 3: 100 percent of Region 3 HDDV fuel using a 4 percent biodiesel – 96 percent petroleum diesel blend (B4)
- Scenario 4: 100 percent of Region 3 HDDV fuel using a 2 percent biodiesel – 98 percent petroleum diesel blend (B2)

Blends of 20 percent biodiesel and lower were considered in the analysis, as these levels can be effectively used in current, unmodified diesel engines without maintenance and performance issues such as cold weather gelling.

3.1 Effect of Biodiesel Blending on PM₁₀ and NOx Emissions

Vehicle emissions generally depend upon the type and quantity of fuel consumed, and quantity is a function of travel demand (VMT), vehicle choice, and associated engine efficiency. However, emission drivers are also pollutant-dependent. While carbon and sulfur emissions are more fuel-dependent, NOx emissions are generated by heat in the combustion process, resulting in the widespread use of catalytic converters due to regulations limiting NOx emissions. In MARKAL, the vehicles' NOx emissions rates are based largely on regulations. Total NOx emissions are driven by vehicle choice, as projected by MARKAL, and the resulting quantity of fuel required to satisfy VMT demand (15). Table 2 displays MARKAL petroleum-based diesel emission factors for PM₁₀ and NOx for all HDDV technologies.

MARKAL emission factors take into consideration AEO projections of freight transportation energy use, which assume vehicle efficiencies improve based largely on federal regulations, including the EPA's heavy duty highway vehicle emissions rules that took effect in 2007 affecting PM and NOx emissions (15). Though PM_{2.5} is more relevant from a health perspective than PM₁₀, we were not able to evaluate the effects of biodiesel blending on PM_{2.5}, as the current version of MARKAL provides more detailed analysis of PM₁₀. The MARKAL model calculates emissions from HDDVs based upon emissions factors for HDDVs operating with petroleum-based diesel, however, though PM₁₀ and NOx emissions factors vary with the biodiesel blend level, the MARKAL database currently does not have representative emission factors for HDDVs operating on various biodiesel blends. Therefore, blend-specific emission factor adjustments for NOx and PM₁₀ were generated as described below, and used to adjust model emission results.

Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicle Technology*	Pollutant Emission Factors (kt/petajoule)	
	NOx	PM ₁₀
HDDVs, 2000	0.661	0.013
HDDVs + 20% miles per gallon, 2010	0.023	0.001
HDDVs + 40% miles per gallon, 2020	0.029	0.001
Existing Fleet of HDDVs	0.734	0.024

Table 2: MARKAL emission factors for all heavy-duty diesel vehicle technologies.

*Percent efficiency improvement, model year.

Particulate matter and NOx emissions were adjusted according to biodiesel blend level by applying the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Predicted change in emissions of biodiesel blend} \\ &\text{relative to petroleum-based diesel} \\ &= \{ \exp[a \times (\text{vol\% biodiesel})] - 1 \} \times 100\% \text{ (eq 1),} \end{aligned}$$

where the coefficient $a = 0.0009794$ for NOx and -0.006384 for PM₁₀. These equations, taken from the EPA's *Comprehensive Analysis of the Emissions Impacts of Biodiesel*, were based on a statistical regression analysis which correlated the concentration of biodiesel in conventional diesel fuel with changes in regulated and unregulated pollutants in heavy duty highway engines (13), and can be used to predict the percent change in emissions, given the concentration of biodiesel blend.

Equation 1 was used to calculate biodiesel blend adjustment factors for PM₁₀ and NOx (Table 3). As a result, NOx emission factors for B20 were 2 percent higher than petroleum-based diesel, while PM₁₀ emission factors for B20 were 12 percent lower than petroleum-based diesel (Table 3).

	PM ₁₀	NOx
B20	- 11.99%	1.98%
B10	- 6.18%	0.98%
B4	- 2.52%	0.39%
B2	- 1.27%	0.20%

Table 3: Percent emission change of biodiesel blend relative to petroleum-based diesel.

PM₁₀ and NOx emissions for petroleum-based diesel for all heavy-duty diesel vehicle technologies were calculated based on reference scenario projections for fuel use and VMT. Results of the reference scenario (assuming 100 percent petroleum-based diesel) project an approximately two-fold decrease in NOx as well as PM₁₀ from total HDDVs in region 3 between 2010 and 2025, reflecting federal regulations and advanced emission control technologies such as particle filter traps (Figures 4 and 5).




Figure 4: Projected NOx emissions from region 3 heavy-duty diesel vehicle fleet reflecting a decrease in total emissions from 2010 to 2025.




Figure 5: Projected PM10 emissions from region 3 heavy-duty diesel vehicle fleet reflecting a decrease in total emissions from 2010 to 2025.

To estimate emissions for the B2, B4, B10 and B20 biodiesel blend scenarios, emission factors were adjusted and applied to calculate the effect of biodiesel blend on emissions from the total heavy duty diesel vehicle fleet as described above. Overall, biodiesel has a small linear effect on NOx emissions, increasing NOx by approximately 0.2-2.0 percent between 2010 and 2025, and a more moderate impact on PM₁₀, decreasing these emissions by 1.25-12 percent (Tables 4 and 5).

Due to the approximately linear emission factor adjustment, higher blend levels (B20, B10) affect emission rates more dramatically than do lower blend levels (B2, B4), with limited influence on NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions relative to petroleum-based diesel at these blend levels.

	2010	2015	2020	2025
Petroleum-Based Diesel	565.0	475.6	386.3	296.4
B2	566.1	476.5	387.0	296.9
B4	567.2	477.4	387.8	297.5
B10	570.6	480.3	390.1	299.3
B20	576.2	485.0	393.9	302.2

Table 4: Total NO_x emissions (kt) of biodiesel blend scenarios relative to reference-case scenario (100 percent petroleum-based diesel).

	2010	2015	2020	2025
Petroleum-Based Diesel	15.9	13.1	10.2	7.4
B2	15.7	12.9	10.1	7.3
B4	15.5	12.7	10.0	7.2
B10	14.9	12.2	9.6	7.0
B20	14.0	11.5	9.0	6.5

Table 5: Total PM₁₀ emissions (kt) of biodiesel blend scenarios relative to reference-case scenario (100% petroleum-based diesel).

Overall NO_x emissions are projected to decrease over time. When total on-road transportation emissions are broken down by sub-sector, it is apparent that an increasing *proportion* of the total on-road NO_x emissions will be from heavy duty vehicles, as the contribution from light-duty vehicles are expected to decrease from approximately 28 percent to 14 percent of total on-road NO_x emissions. Buses are projected to emit a minor and declining proportion (Figure 6). Though NO_x emissions are expected to decrease across all vehicle sub-classes, light-duty vehicle emissions are projected to decrease more rapidly due to regulations on NO_x emission limits as well as incorporation of advanced engine technologies such as hybrid power. Hybrid and plug-in hybrid vehicles are modeled as emitting below the regulated amount since these vehicles are assumed to be operated in electric mode for some fraction of their operating cycle, emitting no NO_x (15).




Figure 6: Sub-sector contribution to NOx on-road transportation emissions, reference case (Petroleum-based diesel).

In contrast to NOx, emission projections indicate the contribution from heavy-duty diesel vehicles to PM₁₀ will decline between 2010 and 2025 (Figure 7). Between 2010 and 2015, the proportion of PM₁₀ from light duty vehicles will grow from approximately 47 percent to 69 percent. Heavy-duty vehicle PM₁₀ contributions are expected to decrease from 52 percent to 31 percent, and bus emissions from 1% to 0.08 percent in 2025. In addition to the implementation of cleaner diesel fuel regulations, the reduction in PM₁₀ emissions from heavy duty vehicles relative to other sub-classes likely reflects the effectiveness of diesel engine retrofit control devices such as diesel particle filters, which work most effectively on engines built after 1995 and have been shown to have a PM emissions reduction potential of 90 percent (21).




Figure 7: Sub-sector contribution to PM10 on-road transportation emissions, reference case (Petroleum-based diesel).

3.2 Effect of Biodiesel Blending on GHG Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions were evaluated from a lifecycle perspective, as is appropriate for biofuels where the majority of greenhouse gas impact occurs as a result of feedstock production and fuel refining. Though the MARKAL model can be considered a “lifecycle model” in the respect that emissions can be considered from production through end-use, the Greenhouse Gases,

Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) model is more comprehensive for generating life-cycle GHG emission factors for both biodiesel and petroleum diesel (14). While GREET emission factors are typically reported in grams per mile for passenger cars and light duty trucks, the underlying assumptions were used to create fuel-based emission factors which could be applied to heavy duty freight transport. Emission factors in Table 6 are expressed in terms of grams per mega-joule (gCO₂-eq./MJ) and include CO₂-equivalent contributions from CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, VOC, and CO.

Process Step	Soy Biodiesel g CO₂-eq./MJ	Low Sulfur Diesel g CO₂-eq./MJ
Feedstock Production	10.4	7.0
Fuel refining	12.3	10.3
Vehicle Operation	1.6	75.8
Total	24.3	93.0

Table 6: Life-cycle greenhouse gas emission factors based on GREET model.

Heavy-duty vehicle GHG emissions were estimated by multiplying MARKAL end-use fuel consumption (Table 1) by the GREET greenhouse gas emission factors for evaluated blends, listed in Table 7.

Fuel Blend	g CO₂-eq./MJ
100% Petroleum Diesel	93.0
2% Biodiesel Blend	91.6
4% Biodiesel Blend	90.3
10% Biodiesel Blend	86.2
20% Biodiesel Blend	79.3

Table 7: Life-cycle greenhouse gas emission factors for biodiesel blends.

Results reflect an overall increase in GHG emissions from total HDDVs through 2025, with biodiesel blends decreasing emissions by 1.5-14.7 percent (Figure 8). GHG emissions are closely tied to freight energy use, both of which are increasing due to an increase in demand outpacing improvements in energy efficiency in the trucking sector. The EPA’s inventory of Greenhouse Gases and Sinks reports that while total transportation is responsible for 28 percent of GHG emissions, 21 percent of those emissions are from freight trucks (9). Energy use and GHG emissions from freight transportation have grown at approximately twice the rate of light duty transportation emissions over the last 15 years. The overall decline in energy efficiency within the freight sector, along with prosperous growth in freight demand, reflects a growing reliance on freight transport with faster and more reliable service but higher energy intensity. Though the bulk of on-road GHG emissions are from light duty vehicles, the proportion of emissions from this sub-class declines by 3.5 percent between 2010 and 2025 in the reference case, while the proportion

of emissions from heavy duty vehicles increase 3 percent during the same period. Emissions from buses are relatively slight and are projected to remain roughly constant (Figure 9).




Figure 8: Projected GHG emissions from region 3 heavy-duty diesel vehicle fleet reflecting an increase in total emissions from 2010 to 2025.




Figure 9: Sub-sector contribution to GHG on-road transportation emissions, reference case (Petroleum-based diesel).

4. Discussion and Implications

The overall aim of this project was to clarify whether the use of biodiesel blends in heavy-duty diesel vehicles might aid in the reduction of freight-related emissions in the Midwest. The reference case scenario reflects an overall decline in PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions from heavy duty vehicles

between 2010 and 2025 in the region, with a concurrent increase in GHGs. Our modeling results suggest that the use of biodiesel blends, especially at higher blend levels, may diminish GHG and PM₁₀ emissions relative to the reference scenario, though NO_x emissions from heavy duty vehicles could increase slightly. At blend levels that require no modification to diesel engines (B20 and lower), the estimated impact of biodiesel on NO_x and PM emissions appear to be largely outweighed by major emission reductions resulting from improvements to vehicle exhaust controls, vehicle efficiency and perhaps fuel modifications over time, as discussed in Section 2.

The long-term regional availability of soy-based biodiesel is dependent on many factors and presents some uncertainty in the magnitude of potential biodiesel deployment. The MARKAL 9R database relies upon data from the US Department of Agriculture (22, 23, 24) to inform the potential current production of biodiesel feedstocks. The model's baseline assumptions would limit the availability of soybean oil-based biodiesel that could be uniformly used in 100 percent of heavy-duty diesel vehicles in region 3, effectively capping the blend at 4 percent. It has been noted (26) that US resources are available to produce about 1.7 billion gallons of biodiesel annually, though in 2008 production reached 682 million gallons of B100, a significant fraction of which was exported (27). Several sources of additional feedstock could be developed in the near term, including corn oil recovered from dry-mill ethanol production, aquaculture of algae, and a number of other terrestrial crops such as camelina, pennycress, canola rotation with wheat, and jatropha. Furthermore, future increases in soybean yields and oil content could also increase feedstock oil production (28), potentially allowing for higher blend levels to be spread across larger regions.

Regardless of the uncertainty in total biodiesel production potential, the possibility exists to concentrate higher blend levels within smaller regions, such as in urban areas that may be out of compliance with National Ambient Air Quality standards. For example, given MARKAL's baseline assumptions of soy biodiesel availability, roughly 13 percent of HDDVs in region 3 could run on B20 by 2025. In this instance, our regional estimates of emissions mitigation would be the same because the emission factor adjustment is linear, however, any corresponding air quality impacts could potentially be localized. The results of this study do not suggest that such an urban biodiesel concentration is warranted, given the currently limited understanding of associated HDDV emission rates. Biodiesel blend level was negatively correlated with PM₁₀. So while concentrating biodiesel blends in PM₁₀ non-attainment areas may be justifiable, PM₁₀ is not a critical concern in the Midwest.¹ PM_{2.5} is of greater concern, and therefore a better understanding of biodiesel's impact on fine particulate is needed.

While the projected influence on HDDV NO_x emission was limited, increasing biodiesel blend levels could potentially lead to slightly higher NO_x emissions and ozone formation. Currently, numerous areas in the Midwest are designated non-attainment areas for the 2008 ozone standards, including the Chicago metro area, Northern, Central and Southern regions in Indiana, several regions in Michigan including the Flint metropolitan area and the Southeastern region, many counties in Ohio as well as portions of Eastern Wisconsin. Ozone is formed when NO_x reacts with volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in the presence of sunlight in the atmosphere. Studies have shown that in urban areas, ozone formation is rate-limited by VOCs, while in lower-NO_x emitting rural areas, formation is mostly rate-limited by the presence of NO_x, depending upon meteorological conditions (25).

Our analysis considered end-use emissions at the regional scale, but did not consider resulting air pollution concentrations. Air quality analysis would be necessary to evaluate pollutant-specific implications of localizing biodiesel use. Such an assessment would require allocating emissions at a finer spatial scale and subsequent pollutant fate and transport modeling. This type of study would require consideration of local meteorology, and would preferably incorporate vehicle-specific emission factors that consider anticipated driving conditions.

¹ Michigan and Illinois have PM₁₀ maintenance areas.

Results of this study were highly dependent upon emission factor adjustments developed for biodiesel blends. Studies in published literature have reflected significant variation in emissions from biodiesel use, particularly for NO_x. Factors that have been observed to affect NO_x emissions from biodiesel include source of biodiesel feedstock material (i.e., soybean oil, rapeseed oil, and animal fats) (13), engine design (29), driving cycle (30) and average load (31). Furthermore, engines equipped with adsorbent and catalyst systems to achieve a NO_x standard of 0.2 g/bhp-h by 2010 are currently being phased in, and there are limited data demonstrating how the catalyst may behave with biodiesel blends. Likewise, data are limited on the emissions performance of heavy duty diesel engines equipped with diesel particle filters, use of which is enabled by the 2006 phasing-in of ultra low sulfur diesel. Therefore, many of these factors will need to be re-evaluated with these emergent technologies (28).

While the GREET model provides well-accepted representative emission factor values, there is considerable uncertainty associated with life-cycle greenhouse gas emission estimates for biodiesel. The life-cycle greenhouse gas emission factor estimates could vary substantially, based on the assumptions used for the feedstock production scenarios. For example, the GREET model does not endogenously model the flux of carbon and nitrogen from soil, but rather uses a single exogenously modeled value for a representative production scenario. These terms are highly sensitive to crop rotation and fertilizer application and are the subject of considerable ongoing research. Further, the direct and indirect conversion of non-agricultural lands for crop production is not included in the estimates used in this report. The importance of land use change emissions has received considerable attention during the development of California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard (32). This is a valid consideration, particularly for scenarios requiring dramatic increases in biodiesel from current production levels.

The reduction of emissions from on-road transportation has been one of the drivers for biodiesel development in recent years. Our results show that using biodiesel blends in heavy-duty diesel vehicles in the Midwest region have the potential to decrease GHG and PM₁₀ emissions, but could potentially increase NO_x emissions. Overall, the estimated effect of biodiesel blends was limited relative to the larger emissions-reductions anticipated from technology and mandates in transportation sub-sectors. Many of the newly emerging heavy-duty vehicle technologies have yet to be tested in the context of biodiesel blend use, which is an important factor that requires further research attention. Further, alternative policies such as imposing greenhouse gas regulation, improving trucking fleet fuel efficiency, reducing freight idling, switching to more fuel efficient modes of freight movement, or analyzing combinations of such alternatives merit additional research.

References

1. Energy Information Administration (2008) Monthly Energy Review (U.S. Department of Energy, Washington DC), DOE/EIA-0035 (2008/03).
2. Bureau of Transportation Statistics, National Transportation Statistics 2004.
3. *Assessing the Effects of Freight Movement on Air Quality at the National and Regional Level*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Final Report. April 2005.
4. Franchini M, Mannucci PM. Short-term effects of air pollution on cardiovascular diseases: outcomes and mechanisms. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2007 Nov 5(11):2169-74. Review.
5. Gauderman WJ, Gilliland GF, Vora H, Avol E, Stram D, McConnell R, Thomas D, Lurmann F, Margolis HG, Rappaport EB, Berhane K, Peters JM. Association between air pollution and lung function growth in southern California children: results from a second cohort. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2002 Jul 1;166(1):76-84.
6. Ciencewicki J, Jaspers I. Air pollution and respiratory viral infection. *Inhal Toxicol*. 2007 Nov;19(14):1135-46.
7. Pope CA 3rd. Mortality effects of longer term exposures to fine particulate air pollution: review of recent epidemiological evidence. *Inhal Toxicol*. 2007;19 Suppl 1:33-8. Review.
8. Midwest Clean Diesel Initiative. <http://www.epa.gov/midwestcleandiesel/concerns.html#airquality>
9. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2007, EPA 430-R-09-004 (2009).
10. Ma, F., Hanna, M.A., 1999. Biodiesel production: a review. *Bioresource Technology* 70, 1–15.
11. Knothe, G, Sharp, CA, Ryan, TW, 2006. Exhaust emissions of biodiesel, petrodiesel, neat methyl esters, and alkanes in a new technology engine. *Energy and Fuels* 20: 403–408.
12. Speidel, H.K., Lightner, R.L., Ahmed, I., 2000. Biodegradability of new engineered fuels compared to conventional petroleum fuels and alternative fuels in current use. *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology* 84–86: 879–897.
13. U.S. EPA. A Comprehensive Analysis of Biodiesel Impacts on Exhaust Emissions. EPA420-P-02-001. October 2002.
14. Wang, M., 2009. The Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) Model (Version 1.8c). Center for Transportation Research; Energy Systems Division, Argonne National Laboratory/Department of Energy: Argonne, IL.
15. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2009. U.S. EPA MARKAL 9-Region Model and Database (version 1.1); U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development: Research Triangle, NC.
16. Zhang Y, Dube M, McLean D, Kates M., 2003. Biodiesel production from waste cooking oil: 1. Process design and technological assessment, *Bioresource Technology* 89, 1-16.
17. Zhang Y, Dube M, McLean D, Kates M., (2003. Biodiesel production from waste cooking oil: 2. Economic assessment and sensitivity analysis, *Bioresource Technology* 90 (2003) 229-240.
18. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2006). EPA U.S. National MARKAL Database: Database Documentation. Shay, C.L., J.F. DeCarolus, D.H. Loughlin, C.L. Gage, S. Yeh, S. Vijay, E.L. Wright. Feb 2006
19. Energy Policy and Systems Analysis Project, 8-country (3.5 year) capability building undertaking sponsored by AusAID under Phase III of the ASEAN-Australia Economic Cooperation Programme, <http://www.epsapforum.com>.

20. U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. Assumptions to the Annual Energy Outlook. Report #:DOE/EIA-0554 (2009).
21. Bagley ST, Gratz LD, Johnson JH, Leddy DG. Final Report: Particle Trap Effects on Heavy Duty Diesel Engines. Health Effects Institute (1996).
22. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (2008). Data Sets: Commodity Costs and Returns. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/CostsAndReturns/FuelbyState.xls>.
23. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (2008). USDA Long Term Projection Tables, Table 13: Soybean and products long-term projections.
24. U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agriculture Statistics Service (2007). QuickStats. http://www.nass.usda.gov/Data_and_Statistics/Quick_Stats/index.asp.
25. Song J, Lei W, Bei N, Zavala M, de Foy B, Volkamer R, Cardenas B, Zheng J, Zhang R, Molina LT. Ozone response to emission changes: a modeling study during the MCMA-2006/MILAGRO campaign. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 9, 23419–23463, 2009.
26. Tyson, K.S., Bozell, J., Wallace, R., Petersen, E. and Moens, L. Biomass Oil Analysis: Research Needs and Recommendations; NREL Technical Report No. TP-510-34796, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2004.
27. Energy Information Administration, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/mer/renew.html>.
26. McCormick RL, Alleman T, Williams A, Coy Y, Hudgins A, Dafoe W. Status and Issues for Biodiesel in the United States: A Discussion Paper for Clean Cities Coalitions and Stakeholders to Develop Strategies for the Future. Draft Report. National Renewable Energy Laboratory. August 2009.
28. McCormick RL, Alleman T, Williams A, Coy Y, Hudgins A, Dafoe W. (2009) Status and Issues for Biodiesel in the United States: A Discussion Paper for Clean Cities Coalitions and Stakeholders to Develop Strategies for the Future. Draft Report. National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
29. Curt Robbins, S. Kent Hoekman, Alan Gertler, and Amber Broch. Biodistillate Transportation Fuels 2. – Emissions Impacts. SAE Tech. Pap. No. 2009-01-2724.
30. Yanowitz , McCormick RL. Effect of biodiesel blends on North American heavy-duty diesel engine emissions. *Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol.* 2009, 111, 763 – 772.
31. Sze, C., Whinihan, J., Olson, B.A., Schenk, C.R. and Sobotowski, R. Impact of Test Cycle and Biodiesel Concentration on Emissions. SAE Tech. Pap. No. 2007-01-4040, 2007.
32. California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board (CARB). Proposed regulation to implement the low carbon fuel standard: vol. 1; CARB: Sacramento, CA,2009; Accessed November 2009: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2009/lcfs09/lcfsisor1.pdf>.