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ABSTRACT

This study uses real driving cycles of a city bus and a standard driving cycle “WLTP” to implement a full comparison for energy demand and fuel consumption for different propulsion systems (i.e., Diesel ICE, Fuel cell and Electric engines). These results were obtained by simulating each propulsion system in MATLAB, SIMULINK and EES. To better understand the comparison, a life cycle assessment is conducted using “GREET” and “GHGenius” software, which represents a clear demonstration of side effects and emissions of each engine on the environment. The results show that for “WLTP” cycle the bus needs 2423kJ energy for traveling each kilometer while the averaged amount of energy for traveling one kilometer of real driving cycle reaches to 1708kJ, the difference is due to speed range difference and number of stop/start points. In both cycles inertia force consumes the most used energy portion of the bus. By computing total energy use of an electric bus we conclude, electric buses use almost 58% of electric energy for driving and the rest is lost. Then fuel cell and internal combustion engine buses have energy efficiency of 36% and 24% respectively. Concerning LCA analysis, it becomes apparent that unlike efficiency, electric buses are not environmentally benign as fuel cell buses. LCA analysis showed that fuel cell buses that use steam reforming hydrogen production process are a cleaner option than electric buses, for instance a fuel cell bus emit 90 (g/100km) CO, 140 (g/100km) SOx and 67 (g/100km) NOx while an electric bus emit 110 (g/100km), 220 (g/100km) and 99 (g/100km) respectively which in all cases the fuel cell bus is more environment friendly than the electric bus. Finally, since diesel buses produce the most emission, especially CO2, and consume the most energy in the total life cycle, they have no advantage for public transportation fleet.

1. Introduction

The major concerns that human face nowadays can be summarized in two subjects, energy, and environment. According to Suganthi et. al [1] energy consumption during the last decade has increased drastically, so energy management is crucial for future economic prosperity and environmental security, as it is evident, transportation accounts for about 30% of the total global GHG emission. Reducing emissions from transportation requires substantial efforts from various disciplines. Reducing the weight of vehicles, improving the efficiency of vehicles, reducing the driving dependency, switching to more environmentally benign fuels, and using
improving public transportation could be some of the potential options to mitigate the emissions [2, 3]. Lajunen et al. [4] discussed energy consumption and emission of city buses in fleet operation. Their research included two parallel, two series hybrid and one electric city bus and the results showed that plug-in hybrid and electric buses performed the best in terms of energy consumption and emissions. Vepsäläinen et al. [5], in another research, studied the energy demand of electric city buses. The uncertainty of operating conditions such as weather and payload caused variations in the bus energy demand. To predict the energy demand, the writer composed a computationally efficient model that is required for real-time applications. To indicate the importance of using real driving cycles, Gallet et al. [6] used several state-of-the-art approaches to determine the energy requirement of electric buses that use individual-specific energy demand values. Local bus route characteristics, is more beneficial and inclusive than standard cycles. So, their research is done based on the standard driving cycles. In this research we did so and in order to have a realistic conclusion, real driving patterns that there is a chance of occurring any unexpected events or mechanical problems is considered. To decide for the superior fleet, it is needed not only to discuss just one propulsion system but also buses with different engines should be examined. Cubito et al. [7] did almost the same study but it was concluded that the effectiveness of hybrid electric buses strongly depends on energy management and power train efficiency. Also, it was mentioned that real-life results were much closer to worldwide harmonized light-duty test procedures (WLTP) than the new European driving cycle. This study can be implemented as a realistic way of analyzing the impact of different driving cycles and operating conditions on energy demand and CO2 emissions through the limited information available from chassis dyno tests.

Another factor in deciding premier and the cleanest fleet, is to calculate the environmental impacts of all processes which include from the beginning of the product (i.e., fuel production) to vehicle assembly and disposal. A tool that can do this is called life cycle assessment. LCA methods consist of different approaches, for instance considering fuel life cycle, vehicle life cycle, operating life cycle or total life cycle will lead to various results, these variations can be explained by figure 1.

![Figure 1: Different LCA methods](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544214008573)

According to Jonker et al. [13] calculating lifetime environmental impact is a multi-step procedure, and its complete analysis consists of raw material acquisition, transportation, and processing, as well as product manufacturing, distribution, use, and disposal (or recycling process). LCA of fuel production is known as fuel-cycle analysis or WTP analysis (if the fuel is consumed in transportation applications, it is considered as WTW), while LCA of vehicle manufacturing is known as vehicle-cycle analysis. Correa et al. [14] did so and found that electric vehicles are markedly superior in the tank to wheel step, nevertheless actions should be done to generate and store electric energy with lower environmental effect. Ally et al. [15] performed the LCA analysis for buses with three different power sources, including a hydrogen fuel-cell bus. The lifecycle assessment of the fuel cell bus in this study determines the overall environmental footprint and energy demand, by studying all phases of the transportation system, including the hydrogen infrastructure, bus manufacturing, operation, and end-of-life disposal. The LCAs of the existing diesel and natural gas transportation systems developed in parallel. Ahmadi et al. [16] studied the fuel consumption and life cycle assessment of a fuel cell vehicle. In their study, the effects of fuel cell degradation and vehicle regenerative braking on the lifecycle metrics of the vehicle were investigated. The results showed that fuel cell degradation has a significant effect.
on the vehicle fuel economy, which eventually results in a reduction of 21% in the fuel economy. As Granovskii et al. [17] studied, it is a need to compare different power sources to achieve reliable results. They compared vehicles running by gasoline ICE and hydrogen fuel cell and the results indicate that, when taking into account fossil fuel energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, the efficiency of the fuel cell vehicle employing hydrogen from natural gas should be at least 25-30% higher than a gasoline one, and only in this way, they could be considered competitive.

2. Method

2.1. Real driving pattern data acquisition

There are many researches that use every-day driving condition in order to achieve realistic results [6,18], for using real driving cycle in this study “speedometer GPS” app was used to record velocity, altitude, and geographical location of city buses during their ride. These data were recorded in Tehran and totally, more than 80 sets of data gathered in four different routes, one set of this data record which consist of bus driving route, speed and elevation profile are demonstrated in figure 3 and 4. To overcome human and GPS errors in data acquisition process, inaccurate data corrected by plotting the drive pattern and making minor changes to bus stop locations. To achieve realistic, practical, and comprehensive driving patterns, the writer used four different routes, which include city traffic, cruising area, altitude difference and sudden acceleration and deceleration which are characteristics of real driving nature. A set of data records is available in Fig 2,3 and 4.

![Figure 2: East-west route of real driving cycle records including bus stations](image-url)
2.2. Vehicle dynamic model

The first step in modeling buses with different propulsion systems is to attain the energy demand of each driving cycle. The longitudinal model of a bus is used to calculate the energy demand since IC vehicles do not benefit from the regenerative braking system, just the acceleration and gradeability of a vehicle is simulated in this model. In electric and fuel cell buses, regenerative braking is used, so in addition to acceleration and gradeability, the regenerative braking energy source is simulated too.

For the simulation, some dynamic relations are used, which are presented below [19] these formulas simulated in MATLAB/SIMULINK in order to obtain energy consumption.

\[ T_C = T_e - I_e \alpha_e \]  
(1)

\[ T_d = (T_c - I_T \alpha_e) \times N_T \]  
(2)

\[ T_a = F_x r + I_w \alpha_w = (T_d - I_d \alpha_d) \times N_{dif} \]  
(3)

\[ \alpha_d = N_{dif} \alpha_w \]  
(4)

\[ \alpha_c = N_T \alpha_d = N_T N_{dif} \alpha_w \]  
(5)

\[ F_x = \frac{(T_e \times N_{T,dif} \times \eta_{T,dif})}{r} \times \frac{\alpha_x}{r^2} - \left\{ (I_e + I_T)N_{T,dif}^2 + I_d N_f^2 + I_w \right\} \frac{\alpha_x}{r^2} \]  
(6)

\[ \alpha_c = N_T \alpha_d = N_T N_{dif} \alpha_w \]  
(5)

\[ D_A = \frac{1}{2} C_D \rho V^2 A \]  
(7)

\[ R_x = C_R Mg \cos \theta \]  
(8)

\[ C_R = (0.0041 + 0.0000018 \times V)C_h \]  
(9)

\[ C_h = 1.5 \text{ (for worn asphalt)} \]  
(10)

\[ M \times \alpha_x = F_x - R_x - D_A - R_{nx} - W \times \sin \theta \]  
(11)
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\[ \frac{(M + M_r) \alpha}{r} = \frac{(I_e \times N_{T,dtf} \times \eta_{T,dtf})}{r^2} - M g \cos \theta (0.0041 + 0.0000018 \times v) 1.5 \]
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\[
M_r = \frac{(I_e + I_T) N_{T,dtf}^2 + I_d N_d^2 + I_w}{r^2}
\]

By using these formulas in the backward modeling approach, there is no need to model driver, and it directly uses velocity versus time data to obtain required torque and, therefore, energy demand of the vehicle in each cycle.

\[ \eta = \frac{1}{2} C_d \rho V^2 A - R_{\text{hx}} - W \sin \theta \]

2.3. Internal combustion engine

Internal combustion engine modeled in this research is a diesel engine (i.e., diesel fuel chemical formula is C_{23}H_{30}), this fuel has higher and lower heating values of 45.6 and 42.6 (MJ/kg) respectively. In this model, the combustion takes place with stoichiometric fuel/air ratio, so the chemical combustion equation is [20,21]:

\[ \text{C}_{12}\text{H}_{23}(g) + 17.75(\text{O}_2 + 3.76\text{N}_2) \rightarrow 11.5\text{H}_2\text{O}(g) + 12\text{CO}_2(g) + 66.74\text{N}_2(g) + 7114\text{kJ} \]

The conventional diesel engine in this research is assumed to have an energy efficiency of 35 percent and it works in ambient condition (298k for temperature and 101.325kPa for pressure).

2.4. PEM fuel cell

Proton-exchange membrane fuel cell is a type of fuel cell, being developed mainly for transport applications. Its distinguishing feature is low temperature and pressure range (50 to 100 °C). The governing reactions taking place in a conventional PEMFC is as follow:

anode reaction: \[ 2\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 4\text{H}^+ + 4e^- \]

cathode reaction: \[ \text{O}_2 + 4\text{H}^+ + 4e^- \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \]

overall \[ 2\text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} \]

2.4.1. Thermodynamic modeling of PEMFC

In a PEM fuel cell, actual cell potential \( E(i) \) is lower than equilibrium potential \( E_{\text{Nernst}} \) due to irreversible losses, when the current flows in the circuit, a departure from the thermodynamic potential occurs corresponding to the cell electrical work [22–24]. This departure is called overpotential (\( \eta \)), and it mainly consists of three different terms, activation, ohmic and concentration overpotential.

So, the net voltage of a single cell is expressed as\[25–27]:

\[ E(i) = E_{\text{Nernst}} + \eta_{\text{act}} + \eta_{\text{ohmic}} + \eta_{\text{conc}} \]

Nernst equation (or reversible voltage) of water electrolysis reaction is:

\[ E_{\text{Nernst}} = 1.229 - 8.5 \times 10^{-4}(T - 298.15) + 4.3085 \times 10^{-5}T \ln \left( \frac{p_{\text{H}_2}}{p_{\text{O}_2}} \right) + 0.5 \ln \left( \frac{p_{\text{H}_2}}{p_{\text{O}_2}} \right) \]

Where \( p_{\text{H}_2} \) and \( p_{\text{O}_2} \) are the hydrogen and oxygen partial gas pressure at anode and cathode, respectively and they are calculated as:
\[ p_{H_2} = (0.5p_{H_2O}^{sat}) \left( \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{1.653i}{T^{1.334}}x_{H_2O}^{sat}\right) - 1} \right) \]  
\( p_{O_2} = P\left[1 - x_{H_2O}^{sat} \right] 
- x_{channel} \times x_{other\gases}^{0.29i/T^{0.832}} \]  

Here \( x_{H_2O}^{sat} \) is the molar fraction of water in the gas stream at saturation for specified temperature, and \( x_{channel} \) is the molar fraction of other gases (except oxygen) in the air stream, they are described according to the formulas below:

\[ x_{H_2O}^{sat} = \frac{P_{H_2O}^{sat}}{P} \]  
\[ x_{channel} = \frac{x_{in\,hum}^{other\gases} \times x_{out\,hum}^{other\gases}}{\ln\left(\frac{x_{in\,hum}^{other\gases} \times x_{out\,hum}^{other\gases}}{x_{in\,hum}^{other\gases} \times x_{out\,hum}^{other\gases}}\right)} \]

Where

\[ \log(P_{H_2O}^{sat}) = -2.1794 + 0.2953(T - 273.15) - (9.183 \times 10^{-5}) \times (T - 273.15)^2 + (1.454 \times 10^{-7})(T - 273.15)^3 \]

\[ x_{other\gases}^{in\,hum} = 0.79(1 - x_{H_2O}^{sat}) \]
\[ x_{other\gases}^{out\,hum} = 1 - x_{H_2O}^{sat} \]
\[ = 1 + ((\lambda_{air} + 1)/\lambda_{air})(0.21/0.79) \]

Activation overpotential is calculated by an empirical expression as [28]:

\[ \eta_{act} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 T + \beta_3 T \ln(C_{O_2}) + \beta_4 T \ln(I) \]

\[ \beta_1 = -0.9514, \beta_2 = 3.12 \times 10^3 \]
\[ \beta_3 = 7.4 \times 10^{-5}, \beta_4 = -1.87 \times 10^{-4} \]

Where

\[ C_{O_2}^{interface} = \frac{P_{O_2}^*}{5.08 \times 10^6 \exp(-498/T)} \]

For calculating ohmic overpotential, we can employ ohm’s law, as:

\[ \eta_{ohmic} = -iR_{internal} \]  

The internal resistance \( (R_{internal}) \) is calculated using the general equation:

\[ R_{internal} = \frac{\eta_{m}}{A_{cell}} \]

"\( \eta_m \)" is Nafion membrane specific resistivity, and it is proposed according to the experimental relation given as:

\[ \eta_m = 181.6 \left[ 1 + 0.03(i) + 0.062 \left( \frac{T}{303} \right)^2 \right] \]
\[ = \left[ 13.366 - 3i \exp(4.18(T - 303/T)) \right] \]

Concentration losses occur in both electrodes, this loss is the effect of mass transfer limitation at high current densities, and it is readily calculated with expression:

\[ \eta_{conc} = \frac{RT_{FC}^2}{2F} \ln\left(1 - \frac{i}{i_{L,an}}\right) \]
\[ - \frac{RT_{FC}^2}{4F} \ln\left(1 - \frac{i}{i_{L,ca}}\right) \]
\[ + \frac{RT_{FC}^2}{2F} \ln\left(1 + \frac{P_{H_2}^*}{P_{H_2O}^* i_{L,an}}\right) \]

In this expression "\( F \)" is faraday’s constant, "\( R \)" is the universal gas constant, "\( T_{FC} \)" is fuel cell operating temperature, "\( i_{L,an} \)" and "\( i_{L,ca} \)" are limiting current density of anode and cathode respectively and "\( i \)" is fuel cell current density.

Fuel cell power produced for FC stack containing "\( n_{FC} \)" cells is determined as [29]:

\[ W_{stack} = n_{FC} \times i \times E(i) \times A_{cell} \]

Here, \( A_{cell} \) is the cell area.

2.5. Electric motor

For modeling an electric bus, we use some parameters that were introduced in the vehicle dynamic section. Common parameters in this part include the rolling resistance "\( C_{RR} \)" the grade angle of the road (grade angle is accounted by calculation of elevation differences between points of travel), and inertia force which is calculated using vehicle’s acceleration. The vehicle parameters in this simulation are frontal area "\( A_f \)" drag coefficient "\( C_d \)" wheel radius "\( r \)" and loaded mass of bus "\( m \)". The motor parameters include motor loss constants, "\( k_i \)" "\( k_c \)" "\( k_w \)" and the final gear drive ratio "\( G \)" the maximum power "\( P_{Max} \)" and maximum torque "\( T_{Max} \" [30,31]. The electric motors are assumed to be in-wheel hub synchronous motor and they are modeled with constant torque/rotation speed relation, the storage component is a battery with "\( C \)" capacity and auxiliary power demand of ventilation, cooling and heating is counted as "\( P_{aux} \). other electric motor essential simulation properties such as voltage of open battery circuit and its internal resistance are mentioned in table 1.
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2.6. Life cycle assessment

LCA software is categorized as data record sets of emissions, carbon intensity, and greenhouse gases emitted in the life cycle of a product. In this research total life cycle of a vehicle is considered, which consists of vehicle cycle, operation cycle, and fuel cycle. Vehicle cycle includes material production, vehicle assembly and vehicle disposal; fuel cycle consists of processes of well exploration, oil extraction, refinery, transportation of fuel to fuel station and combustion process. In order to ensure the quality of output data, in this research, two well-known software are used, “GREET” and “GHGenious”[15,16,32].

GREET model uses a comprehensive lifecycle-based approach to compare the energy use and emission spread of conventional and advanced vehicle technologies, for example, hybrid electric vehicles and fuel cell vehicles. Different pathways of each component are available in this software. The criteria for choosing the selected pathways in this research is abundance, and availability of each pathway in the target area. Probable pathway alternatives are considered in this discussion based on its environmental effect and deployment cost.

2.7. General assumptions and specification

For conducting results, it is compulsory to determine some assumptions, so table 1 states all needed data to simulate models used in this research.

Table 1: assumptions and system specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision parameter</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curb mass/Bus full Load</td>
<td>11380/5100 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal area (A)</td>
<td>8.2 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of gravity height</td>
<td>1.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission efficiency (N₁)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential efficiency (N₁)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air density (ρ)</td>
<td>1.22 kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag coefficient (C₀)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient temperature</td>
<td>298 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient pressure</td>
<td>101,325 kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faraday constant (F)</td>
<td>96485.33 A/mol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas constant (R)</td>
<td>8.314 J/mol.K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Results

3.1. Energy demand

For conducting standard and comprehensive results, as mentioned before, four different routes used. Consequently, results contain all aspects of the real driving condition (e.g., unexpected start/stop, road elevation change and the city traffic), in this part besides energy demand calculation in each segment (elevation, inertia, drag and rolling resistance), some specifications of these four routes (e.g., total travel length, travel duration, and average speed) are mentioned (table 2) to give a tangible understanding of routes, to the reader.

To represents energy demand results, it is a customary method to standardize results. This methodology expresses the amount of energy needed to travel one kilometer (kJ/km). To do that, we sum up all the energy demand segments, then divide it by total travel length.

For the first part, the results of real driving cycles are presented according to the route and energy segment. From table 2, it is understood that north and south routes have an average slope of +2.5% and -2.5%, respectively, which is a considerable amount of elevation. As it is expected, these two routes, have considerable
elevation energy demand, while east and west routes have venial elevation energy demand.

Table 2: Four routes energy consumption considering different sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Travel length (m)</th>
<th>Travel duration (min)</th>
<th>Average Elevation</th>
<th>ED of elevation (kJ/km)</th>
<th>ED of Drag force (kJ/km)</th>
<th>ED of Rolling resistance (kJ/km)</th>
<th>ED of Acceleration force (kJ/km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>11609.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
<td>1454.861</td>
<td>129.2117</td>
<td>513.33</td>
<td>1259.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>12746.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>-1411.09</td>
<td>137.7093</td>
<td>513.2676</td>
<td>1333.1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>18002</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>+0.4%</td>
<td>+132.768</td>
<td>136.5686</td>
<td>522.819</td>
<td>901.9275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>14612.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-164.238</td>
<td>121.7179</td>
<td>465.2829</td>
<td>786.7291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results presented in Table 2, indicate that the main difference between different routes is mainly in the energy demand of elevation and inertia force. The road slope and travel length are the most effective parameters on these values, and also it can be helpful to mention that rolling resistance and drag force energy losses in all routes are almost the same, and this fact can verify our calculations.

Another critical discussion is about the comparison of the standard and real driving cycles. Results obtained from WLTP cycle and real driving cycle are presented and compared in figure 5, and the figure states each driving cycle energy demand segment separately.

Figure 6: WLTP and real driving cycle energy demand comparison

The main deviation of energy demand between WLTP and the real driving cycle is due to the characteristic of each driving pattern, for instance, WLTP cycle features a higher speed profile than a real driving pattern, and higher average speed causes a higher amount of drag losses in WLTP cycle. On the other hand, numerous stops in city bus driving pattern, cause more inertia energy use in order to supply enough energy for acceleration after each stop, which is evident in figure 6.

3.2. Propulsion systems comparison
In this part, efficiency and fuel consumption of buses using different engines (or motor) are calculated. The aforementioned assumptions are employed in this part to simulate internal combustion, fuel cell and electric buses.

### 3.2.1. Fuel cell bus

For fuel cell buses we obtain the energy demand of each recorded real driving pattern. Then we standardize it by calculating the average amount of energy that is needed for travelling one-kilometer. Afterwards, from the results of previous part (energy demand of each cycle) we distinguish the energy efficiency (first law’s efficiency) of this engine type.

In Fig. 7, we observe the effects of different strategies on fuel economy of our real driving cycle. In this figure, we conclude that vehicles have better fuel economy, and consume one kilogram of hydrogen in two kilometer (approximately 14% more) considering the regenerative braking system. Also, if the engine do not have degradation, vehicle will travel three kilometer, with consuming one kilogram of hydrogen more (approximately 21% more) [16].

---

**Table 3: Electric bus real simulation of energy demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus alternative</th>
<th>Standard energy consumption (kWh/Km)</th>
<th>Consum ed energy</th>
<th>RB energy</th>
<th>Energy of auxiliary devices</th>
<th>Tractor energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BYD E-12(2*90 KW)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>363.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>200.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley BK-321(180 KW)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this research two electric buses, one of them using regenerative braking and the other one not using this technology, are considered. The results may also vary slightly due to engines efficiencies and arrangements, for instance in BYD-E12 model, two separate electric motors are used which may be the reason of less electricity consumption of this model.

### 3.2.3. Diesel engine bus

Results for a bus that is powered by internal combustion engine obtained, considering the fact that the IC engine uses diesel fuel ($C_{12}H_{23}$) with first-law efficiency of 35%, also it is necessary to note that power train efficiency and losses due to drag force, rolling resistance and elevation is considered in IC engine simulation. The data for fuel consumption of this bus is presented below:

---

**Table 4: Diesel engine simulation values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy consumption</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kW.h/km</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/100km</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2. Electric bus

According to the electric motor modeling method mentioned before and the research conducted by Misanovi et. al [33], two electric buses simulated, and the results of energy consumption are given as:

**Figure 7:** New York and real driving cycles fuel economy considering RB and degradation

---

### 3.3. Life cycle assessment

Life cycle assessment measures the impact of a product manufacturing process on the environment, from the materials used to make it to its ultimate disposal. This intention to decide for production of technology or device based on its impact on the environment from different aspects, make this part of research substantial, in this part well to wheel (WTW) stage, and operation stage, or th summation of these two stages, called well to pump (WTP) stage is considered, in addition, vehicle cycle which determines components and devices used for the production of each type of bus is provided separately. Summation of these cycles form total life cycle assessment of the vehicle
Data given in figure 7 is related to the total life cycle of each bus alternative. As it is understood from the data, in the fuel production process (WLP), buses featuring fuel cell and electric technology consume almost the same amount of energy whereas diesel bus use truly less energy. In operation cycle, which is related to the time the vehicle is being used in the transportation system till disposal, diesel bus consumes more energy than fuel cell and electric buses, in this stage, both electric and fuel cell buses consume almost the same amount of energy. Finally, the vehicle cycle, that includes LCA of components used in each bus alternative, indicate an obvious difference in terms of energy consumption, in this cycle electric buses due to use of high capacity lithium-ion batteries and fuel cell buses for utilizing Ni-MH batteries as temporary energy saving device, use the most amount of energy respectively. At last, conventional diesel engines use the least energy amount in vehicle cycle.

This comparison can be conducted in terms of CO₂ emission production rate, which is presented in figure 9. In the operation stage, undoubtedly electric bus emits the least emission because of not using any combustion or reaction, then the fuel cell buses emit the least amount of emissions, and as we expected, the diesel engine produces the most CO₂ in the operation cycle. For a reliable deduction, total life cycle must be considered, in this case diesel engine is the worst alternative among all choices the reason is huge amount of CO₂ emission produced in operation stage. In terms of other emissions such as CO, SOx, NOx, PM10 and PM2.5 in total life cycle, electric buses emit SOx, CO and PM10 more than other choices, and diesel engine produces NOx the most. For PM2.5 emission, all alternatives emit almost the same amount of it, and there is no significant difference between different engines. The statistics of emission production can be seen schematically in figure 9.
To evaluate and compare different bus alternatives in terms of LCA, it is good to focus on each engine type separately, next three figures give extensive information about each one, and says in detail that which process (producing vehicle components, fluids, batteries, operation or fuel cycle) has how much share in each emission release or energy consumption. For example, fuel cell bus is considered to be emission producing, mostly in the fuel cycle, and in case of energy consumption, it is operation stage that has the most significant portion. For electric buses we can see the same trend as fuel cell buses but diesel buses produce most of the emission in the operation stage; besides that, this stage has a pivotal role in total life cycle energy usage too.
Figure 11: Emission and energy consumed of fuel cell bus cycle

Figure 12: Emission and energy consumed of electric bus cycle
3. Discussion

What mentioned and discussed in results consist of energy demand calculation based on real and standard driving cycles, different bus alternatives simulated and their fuel or electricity consumption obtained. Finally, LCA analysis for target buses conducted. To verify our results in this part, the efficiency of each instance is calculated, these results can be compared to submitted manuscripts. These calculations are done just for real driving patterns.

For simulated diesel IC engine and electric bus we calculated $4.42 \text{kW.h/km}$ and $1.12 \text{kW.h/km}$ energy usage respectively, this computation for fuel cell buses conducted and four strategies were considered here we assume to have degradation and no regenerative braking for considered alternative, the fuel consumption for this choice is $10.5 \frac{\text{km}}{\text{kg H}_2}$. By noting hydrogen Lower heating value $(119 \text{MJ/kg})$ we obtain $3.14 \text{kW.h/km}$ for the fuel cell bus.

Back to the energy demand section, for real driving cycles, the average amount of energy demand calculated about $0.49 \text{kW.h/km}$, which yield to efficiency results below.

\[
\eta_{ICE} = \frac{0.49}{(2.46 - 0.4)} = 23.8\%
\]

\[
\eta_{FC} = \frac{0.49}{(1.79 - 0.4)} = 35.5\%
\]

\[
\eta_{electric} = \frac{0.49}{(1.24 - 0.4)} = 58.3\%
\]

This calculation presents a generalized understanding of the huge amount of energy loss in FC and ICE buses, another important point is the environmental effect of vehicle cycle, as said in LCA part, producing components related to batteries (especially high capacity lithium-ion batteries) which are widely used in electric vehicles has much more side effects than other two alternatives, so considering all aspects of this issue, it seems the best to put our effort on using optimized FC or ICE engines till achieving less harmful manufacturing methods of producing lithium-ion or using its more environmentally friendly substitutes.

4. Conclusions

This paper examines buses utilizing three different power sources, for each case we
derived fuel consumption and LCA analysis, more over the energy demand is calculated using real and standard driving cycles, real driving cycles are acquired from inner-city buses which face many starts and stops, due to that the energy demand of different sections may vary in comparison to standard driving cycles, for instance, inertia energy use in a real driving pattern is more than standard driving cycle, while energy use of rolling resistance and drag force is considerably less, this difference appears because of higher average velocity in WLTP cycle and other differences in each driving pattern characteristic.

The research concluded that in terms of energy, electric, fuel cell and diesel IC buses are the most efficient fleet respectively.

To consider each substitute advantages and disadvantages from another point of view, LCA analysis performed next. Results showed that although electric buses were the most efficient, and they had the least amount of energy loss in operation cycle, but in the manufacturing process they are more devastative by consuming almost twice energy than other alternatives. However they consume energy in total life cycle with just 5% difference than fuel cell and diesel buses. Concerning CO\textsubscript{2} emission, diesel IC buses emit 201 (kg/100km) which almost 85% of this emission is produced in operation stage, for fuel cell buses that totally emit 130 (kg/100km), the well to pump stage portion is about 82% and in operation stage no CO\textsubscript{2} is emitted. Finally electric buses produce 78 (kg/100km) in well to pump stage and 121 (kg/100km) totally. As a result, it is understood from the results that although conventional diesel engine buses have economic justification, they emit the most emissions, which brings a superficial disadvantage for this kind of economic bus fleet.

### List of symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>Vehicle frontal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{cell}$</td>
<td>Cell area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_x$</td>
<td>Acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_D$</td>
<td>Drag coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_A$</td>
<td>Drag force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{rr}$</td>
<td>Energy of rolling resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E(i)$</td>
<td>Fuel cell voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_x$</td>
<td>Force of acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{trac}$</td>
<td>Traction force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{grade}$</td>
<td>Elevation force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{roll}$ or $F_{RR}$</td>
<td>Rolling resistance force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>Current density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{L,cat}$</td>
<td>Cathode limiting current density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{L,an}$</td>
<td>Anode limiting current density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_d$</td>
<td>Drive train inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_w$</td>
<td>Wheel inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_t$</td>
<td>Transmission inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_m$</td>
<td>Membrane thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>Mass of vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_r$</td>
<td>Equivalence mass of rotating parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_T$</td>
<td>Transmission ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{diff}$</td>
<td>Differential ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{T,diff}$</td>
<td>Transmission and differential ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_{FC}$</td>
<td>Cell number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{FC}$</td>
<td>Fuel cell pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_x$</td>
<td>Rolling resistance force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{hx}$</td>
<td>Carrier force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>Tire radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_a$</td>
<td>Axle torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_c$</td>
<td>Clutch torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_e$</td>
<td>Engine torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{FC}$</td>
<td>Fuel cell temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Angular velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>Angular velocity of wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>Air density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{T,diff}$</td>
<td>Transmission and differential efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_{air}$</td>
<td>Air stochiometric ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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