

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	18-ALT-01
Project Title:	2019-2020 Investment Plan Update for the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program
TN #:	225875
Document Title:	Michael Song Comments Will EVs Save Us from Global Warming Are We on the Right Track
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Michael Song
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	11/9/2018 1:40:22 PM
Docketed Date:	11/9/2018

Comment Received From: Michael Song
Submitted On: 11/9/2018
Docket Number: 18-ALT-01

Will EVs Save Us from Global Warming? Are We on the Right Track?

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

The World's #1 Renewable Energy Network for News, Information, and Companies.




RENEWABLE ENERGY WORLD.

Will EVs Save Us from Global Warming? Are We on the Right Track?

August 30, 2018

By Michael Song



[Figure 1] Power/power electronic components involved in well-to-wheel transmission of electricity.

The power generation sector is no longer the biggest source of CO₂ emissions in US, the transportation sector is. Tesla surpassed 200,000 US EV (electric vehicle) deliveries in July 2018 and GM is supposed to achieve the same within the year. Many people had shifted over to diesel powered vehicles based on the hype of low emissions, but Volkswagen has proven that what glitters isn't always gold. What about other behemoth auto makers? Can we trust EV makers and the PR surrounding them? Does the purchase of an EV contribute in preventing climate change?

Energy Efficiency is All That Counts!

Regarding EVs charged by grid-tied chargers, the electricity comes from a combination of fossil fuel, hydroelectric, nuclear, and renewable energy including solar PV and wind. To transmit electricity from the well (power plants) to the wheels of EVs (WTW), we use various power and power-electronic components between the well and EV wheels, and each component causes a loss in energy efficiency. The components included are shown in the Figure 1. below. Assuming the efficiency of each component is 90%, the well-to-wheel (WTW) efficiency of EVs would be $(0.9)^{10}$, or 35%.

According to US EIA, each US state has a different well makeup. The makeup includes 7 categories of CO₂ generating fuels: coal, natural gas, petroleum, other biomass, wood & wood derived fuels, other gases, and other biomass. In this context, we need to define power mix weighted specific CO₂ emission for each state.

The power mix weighted specific CO₂ emission is determined by the sum (Σ) percentage of power generated by a specific CO₂ generating fuel x specific CO₂ emission of the fuel (g CO₂/kWh). The resulting number may be interpreted as g CO₂/kWh for the given power mix.

WTW efficiency is as important as fuel economy or energy efficiency in ICE vehicles. If we charge our EV batteries with a WTW efficiency of 35%, 65% of the energy is lost in the course of well-to-wheel transmission of electric energy. In this context, the CO₂ multiplication factor is defined as "f = 1/WTW efficiency." In this calculation, $f = 1/0.35 = 2.87$ was used. For an EV to drive km/kWh, power plants must supply 2.87 kWh, and should burn 2.87 times more CO₂ emitting fuels. This is why "f" is interpreted as the CO₂ multiplication factor.

Burden of EV Charging Network to Grid

A recent analysis showed that an EV charging network could **sink the Texas grid** (ERCOT). According to the analysis, the simultaneous charging of 60,000 next-generation EVs (100-kilowatt EV battery with a 5-minute charge time) could one day threaten the ERCOT. According to the report, 60,000 vehicles make up 0.25% of registered vehicles in Texas.

No.	US State	Coal (%)	Natural Gas (%)	Petroleum (%)	Power mix weighted specific CO ₂ emission (g CO ₂ /kWh)	Power mix weighted Emission of Tesla Model 3 (g CO ₂ /km)	Multiplied by GHG multiplication factor f=2.87	Divided by SICEPV emission (128 g CO ₂ /km) (times)
1	Alaska	9.38	47.99	13.80	373	59	170	1.33
2	Alabama	26.38	40.61	0.06	411	65	187	1.46
3	Arkansas	41.45	30.06	0.26	512	81	233	1.82
4	Arizona	28.12	31.43	0.08	391	62	178	1.39
5	California	1.70	50.01	1.57	227	36	103	0.81
6	Colorado	55.19	23.30	0.15	613	97	279	2.18
7	Connecticut	1.14	49.19	1.95	221	35	100	0.78
8	Washington D.C.	0.00	29.69	70.31	593	94	270	2.11
9	Delaware	5.49	92.37	1.50	431	68	196	1.53
10	Florida	17.38	66.52	2.30	445	71	203	1.58
11	Georgia	31.63	39.63	0.36	458	73	209	1.63
12	Hawaii	15.05	0.51	70.36	618	98	282	2.20
13	Iowa	46.33	5.44	0.97	464	74	211	1.65
14	Idaho	2.82	21.21	0.76	116	18	53	0.41
15	Illinois	31.68	9.44	0.29	338	54	154	1.20
16	Indiana	71.28	21.88	1.03	764	121	348	2.72
17	Kansas	48.52	4.26	0.18	474	75	216	1.69
18	Kentucky	83.69	10.25	1.65	839	133	382	2.98
19	Louisiana	13.80	63.93	4.57	416	66	190	1.48
20	Massachusetts	6.27	66.17	4.69	355	56	162	1.26
21	Maryland	37.53	14.59	1.57	422	67	192	1.50
22	Maine	23.21	30.38	2.56	357	57	163	1.27
23	Michigan	37.50	27.57	1.60	474	75	216	1.68
24	Minnesota	41.06	15.01	1.19	454	72	207	1.61
25	Missouri	76.79	7.67	0.22	754	120	343	2.68
26	Mississippi	10.90	79.67	0.05	421	67	192	1.50
27	Montana	51.43	1.74	1.66	502	80	228	1.78
28	North Carolina	30.12	30.01	0.65	408	65	186	1.45
29	North Dakota	70.21	2.94	0.09	672	107	306	2.39
30	Nebraska	59.95	1.47	0.00	569	90	259	2.03
31	New Hampshire	10.30	24.60	0.85	201	32	92	0.71
32	New Jersey	1.69	56.71	1.45	253	40	115	0.90
33	New Mexico	55.80	30.26	0.21	647	103	295	2.30
34	Nevada	5.45	72.69	0.17	343	54	156	1.22
35	New York	1.79	42.25	1.67	197	31	90	0.70
36	Ohio	58.06	24.94	1.37	655	104	298	2.33
37	Oklahoma	24.67	46.44	0.17	419	66	191	1.49
38	Oregon	4.22	25.43	0.60	145	23	66	0.52
39	Pennsylvania	25.66	31.87	1.04	376	60	171	1.34
40	Rhode Island	0.00	95.82	3.52	407	65	185	1.45
41	South Carolina	23.92	16.88	0.30	294	47	134	1.05
42	South Dakota	18.07	7.97	0.02	202	32	92	0.72
43	Tennessee	40.35	14.29	0.27	438	70	199	1.56
44	Texas	26.91	50.32	0.21	456	72	207	1.62
45	Utah	68.02	22.93	0.30	733	116	334	2.61
46	Virginia	21.05	44.20	1.77	387	61	176	1.38
47	Vermont	24.17	0.10	1.03	235	37	107	0.83
48	Washington	5.53	9.98	0.28	94	15	43	0.33
49	Wisconsin	52.71	23.82	1.13	598	95	272	2.13
50	West Virginia	94.17	1.64	0.16	893	142	406	3.18
51	Wyoming	85.79	2.46	0.12	817	130	372	2.91
	US-TOTAL	31.40	34.12	1.13	439	70	200	1.56

[Table 1] CO₂ emission of EVs compared to gasoline ICE passenger vehicle for various electric power mix in US.


Results and Discussion

The Tesla Model 3 wheeling emits less CO₂ than SICEPV in 10 states. In 16 states, the Model 3 generates 1~1.5 times more CO₂ than SICEPV. In 11 states, the Model 3 generates 1.5~2 times more CO₂ than SICEPV. In 8 states, the Model 3 spews 2~2.5 times more CO₂ than SICEPV. In 6 states, driving the Tesla Model 3 emits more than 2.5 times of CO₂ than SICEPV. In West Virginia, the Model 3 charged by grid-tied charging station spews 3.18 times more CO₂ than SICEPV. The Model 3 generate 1.56 times more CO₂ than SICEPV in the US on average.

Based on these calculations, grid-tied EV charging does not reduce but rather amplifies CO₂ emissions. For EVs to be true ZEVs, grid-tied EV charging should be prohibited.

Then, What's the Solution?

The direct use of solar/wind energy for EV charging is the only available path toward ZEVs with no carbon footprint. Solar/wind direct EV charging will provide higher WTW efficiency and zero emission at the same time. As shown in the Figure 2, solar PV direct EV charging process may include 9 power electronic components to have WTW efficiency of (0.9)⁹, or 39%. That is 4% higher than the WTW of EVs charged by grid-tied charging system and also carries no carbon footprint.



Also, the grid will be free from the burden of proliferating demands from EV charging stations, and ERCOT and CAISO would be free from the stress caused by power demand from EV charging networks.

Conclusion

Except in 10 states, EVs charged by grid-tied charging stations act as CO₂ emission amplifiers. Even in California, a Model 3 will spew 103 g CO₂/km into atmosphere. This is 22% less emission than SICEPV. An EV charging network should be completely disconnected from grid. Solar/wind energy should be applied to EV charging network directly to be free of carbon footprint.

For a healthy energy transition in both the power generation sector and transportation sector, policy makers should ban rapid expansion of grid-tied EV charging network.

By disconnecting EV charging networks from grid, the stress to grid caused by EV charging will be removed. Even ERCOT and CAISO would be free from the disruptive stress from the EV charging network.

© Copyright 1999-2018 RenewableEnergyWorld.com - All rights reserved

RenewableEnergyWorld.com - World's #1 Renewable Energy Network for news & information