Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption

Fred Browand
Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
Viterbi School of Engineering
University of Southern California

for

Global Climate and Energy Project
Workshop on Advanced Transportation
October 10-11, Stanford University

USC Viterbi
School of Engineering

Advanced Transportation Workshop
October 10–11, 2005
Frances C. Arrillaga Alumni Center
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

GCEP

Year 2002 statistics for combination trucks (tractor-trailers) on nation's highways *

2.2 million trucks registered

138.6 billion miles on nation's highways, 3-4% increase/yr

26.5 billion gallons diesel fuel consumed, 4-5% increase/yr

5.2 mpg, or 19.1 gallons/100 miles

~ 2.47 million barrels/day **

~ 12-13% of total US petroleum usage (19.7×10^6 bbls/day)

* from DOT, FHA, Highway Statistics, 2002, and US DOT *Transportation Energy Data Book Edition 24*.

**26.5/($365 \times .7 \times 42$)

Contributions to power consumption from drag and rolling resistance for a typical class-8 tractor trailer



Power required to over-come aerodynamic drag is the greater contribution at highway speeds

Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption

Most of the drag (90%, or more) results from pressure differences



Net pressure force

$$D = C_D \times S \times (1/2)\rho U^2$$

drag coefficient, dependent upon shape

cross-sectional area

dynamic pressure

Relationship between changes in drag
and changes in fuel consumption

$$Power = D \times U + RR \times U + AuxP$$

$$Fuel\ Consumption \equiv FC = (bsfc) \times Power$$

$$\frac{\Delta FC}{FC} = \frac{\Delta P}{P} = \eta \times \left(\frac{\Delta C_D}{C_D} + \frac{\Delta S}{S} + \frac{3\Delta U}{U} \right)$$

η: property of the driving cycle
$\eta \approx$ 0.5-0.7 for a car or truck
at highway speeds

$\Delta C_D / C_D$: Make changes in shape
to improve aerodynamics

$\Delta S / S$: make the car/truck
cross-section smaller

$3\Delta U / U$: reduce highway
speeds—very
effective!

Improved fuel economy from close-following

At large spacing, close-following results in drag saving (fuel saving) for the trail vehicle…

…because the trail vehicle experiences a diminished dynamic pressure in the wake. The two vehicles collectively have less drag than the two in isolation. This can be regarded as a decrease in drag coefficient. It is well understood.

At sufficiently close spacing—less than one vehicle length in the case of a car, or one vehicle height in the case of a truck—the interaction is stronger.



Pressure is higher in the “cavity”
than would be experienced
by a vehicle in isolation.

The drag of each vehicle is less than the corresponding drag in isolation. Both vehicles save fuel in the “strong interaction” regime.

Wind tunnel tests

Two van-shaped vehicles, drag ratio versus spacing



Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption

Measuring fuel consumption directly using instantaneous outputs from engine map. Three Buick LeSabres under computer control, traveling in HOV lanes I-15, San Diego. PATH Program, UC Berkeley, California DOT

Results from test.

Average fuel consumption saving for three-vehicles at 0.8 car length spacing is ≈ 6-7%.



The site at Crows Landing



Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption



Single truck: southbound (red)
northbound (blue)

Two century-class Freightliner trucks under computer control at 4-meter spacing.

Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption

Two class-8 trucks close-following

3.2 liters/100 km

1.36 gal/100 mi



Improved fuel economy from other shape changes

*The DOE effort to reduce truck aerodynamic drag**

The DOE Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Office of FreedomCAR & Vehicle Technologies, supports a collaborative effort of 9 organizations: LLNL, SNL, ANL,NASA Ames, USC, Caltech, UTC, Auburn, GTRI

*see, for example, The Aerodynamics of Heavy Vehicles: Trucks, Buses, and Trains, eds., R.McCallen, F.Browand, J.Ross, Lecture Notes in Applied and Computational Mechanics, Springer-Verlag, 2004

Early 1990's

No aero shield

Huge radiator

Many corners

Protruding lamps, tanks, pipes, etc.

Model year 2000

Built-in aero shield

Small radiator

Rounded corners

Recessed lamps, tanks, etc.

Areas of possible improvement

Gap
- cab extenders
- splitter plate

Wheels & underbody
- skirts
- underbody wedge

Trailer base
- boat-tail plates
- flaps

Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption

Wheels & underbody

Skirts:



Wind tunnel model, full scale conditions, $Re = 5\times10^6$

$\Delta C_D \approx 0.05$

Wedge:



Wind tunnel model, $Re = 3\times10^5$

$\Delta C_D \approx 0.01$

DOE's Effort to Reduce Truck Aerodynamic Drag through Joint Experiments and Computations Leading to Intelligent Design, R. McCallen et al., *Proc. of the 2005 SAE Commercial Vehicle Engineering Conference*, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 1-3, 2005

Trailer base

Base flaps:

Wind tunnel model, full scale conditions, $Re = 5\times10^6$

$\Delta C_D \approx 0.08$



DOE's Effort to Reduce Truck Aerodynamic Drag through Joint Experiments and Computations Leading to Intelligent Design, R. McCallen et al., *Proc. of the 2005 SAE Commercial Vehicle Engineering Conference*, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 1-3, 2005

Reducing Aerodynamic Drag and Fuel Consumption

Gap

Cab extenders or trailer splitter plate

RANS computation Re = 3×10^5



$\Delta C_D \approx 0.01 - 0.03$



Computational Simulation of Tractor-Trailer Gap Flow with Drag-Reducing Aerodynamic Devices, P. Castellucci & K. Salari, *Proc. Of the 2005 SAE Commercial Vehicle Engineering Conference*, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 1-3, 2005

The summary of improvements

Add–ons:

Base flaps, skirts, gap control, $\Delta C_D \approx 0.13\text{-}0.15$

For $C_D \approx 0.6$, $\Delta C_D/C_D \approx 0.22$, implies $\Delta FC/FC \approx 11\%$

Close-following:

Field tests demonstrate $\Delta FC \approx 1.36$ gal/100 mi

$\Delta FC/FC \approx 7\%$

Add–ons *plus* close following may not be additive gains!
Probably a portion is, $\Delta FC/FC \approx 15\%$

If fully implemented, would result in reduction in current usage of 0.37 Mbbls/d = 135 Mbbls/yr, and a reduction of 60 Mtonnes CO_2 released.

Hastening the adoption of improvements

Incentives for adoption of add-ons by trucking companies

$$Incentive = \frac{Cost\ of\ \ fuel\ saved\ (250{,}000\ mi)}{Capital\ Cost\ of\ add-on}$$

For base-flaps & skirts

CC = $1800

Incentive $\approx$ *2.5*$\times$*($ per gal diesel)*

*At $3.00 /gal, the saving would be 7.5*$\times$*cost of add on, or $13,500*

For base flaps, skirts & close-follow

CC = $4800

Incentive $\approx$ *1.5*$\times$*($ per gal diesel)*

*At $3.00 /gal, the saving would be 4.5*$\times$*cost of add on, or $21,600*

Encourage research in CFD

National Labs have the computing capabilities

Universities have expertise in new code development

University support particularly needed



Computational Simulation of Tractor-Trailer Gap Flow with Drag-Reducing Aerodynamic Devices, P. Castellucci & K. Salari, *Proc. Of the 2005 SAE Commercial Vehicle Engineering Conference*, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 1-3, 2005

Encourage field test experiments

Trucking companies are besieged with ideas for fuel saving add-ons

Type II SAE sanctioned tests take place, but usually results are not made public

Close-following geometries have not been explored systematically

Need field tests under controlled conditions (such as Crows Landing) to isolate the most promising technology