

1 **Electrification of Urban Waste Collection: Introducing a Simulation-Based Methodology**
2 **for Feasibility, Impact and Cost Analysis**

3
4 **Ricardo Ewert**

5 Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin)
6 Transport Systems Planning and Transport Telematics (VSP)
7 Salzufer 17-19
8 10587 Berlin
9 Germany
10 Telephone: +49 30 314 29592
11 ewert@vsp.tu-berlin.de
12 ORCID: 0000-0002-6973-3099

13
14 **Alexander Grahle (corresponding author)**

15 Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin)
16 Department Methods for Product Development and Mechatronics (MPM)
17 Straße des 17. Juni 135
18 10623 Berlin
19 Germany
20 Telephone: +49 30 314 73600
21 alexander.grahle@tu-berlin.de
22 ORCID: 0000-0003-0851-9133

23
24 **Kai Martins-Turner**

25 Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin)
26 Transport Systems Planning and Transport Telematics (VSP)
27 Salzufer 17-19
28 10587 Berlin
29 Germany
30 Telephone: +49 30 314 29592
31 martins-turner@vsp.tu-berlin.de
32 ORCID: 0000-0002-5597-4430

33
34 **Anne Syré**

35 Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin)
36 Department Methods for Product Development and Mechatronics (MPM)
37 Straße des 17. Juni 135
38 10623 Berlin
39 Germany
40 Telephone: +49 30 314 73599
41 a.syre@tu-berlin.de
42 ORCID: 0000-0003-2555-8601

1 **Kai Nagel**

2 Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin)

3 Transport Systems Planning and Transport Telematics (VSP)

4 Salzufer 17-19

5 10587 Berlin

6 Germany

7 Telephone: +49 30 314 23308

8 nagel@vsp.tu-berlin.de

9 ORCID: 0000-0003-2775-6898

10

11 **Dietmar Göhlich**

12 Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin)

13 Department Methods for Product Development and Mechatronics (MPM)

14 Straße des 17. Juni 135

15 10623 Berlin

16 Germany

17 Telephone: +49 30 314 23341

18 dietmar.goehlich@tu-berlin.de

19 ORCID: 0000-0001-5362-3939

20

21

22 Word Count: 7,136 words + 1 table = 7,386 words

23

24

25 *Submitted [August 01, 2019]*

26

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 We introduce a multi-agent-based simulation methodology to investigate the feasibility and
3 evaluate environmental and economic sustainability of an electrified urban waste collection.
4 Electrification is a potential solution for transport decarbonization and already widely available for
5 individual and public transport. However, the availability of electrified commercial vehicles like waste
6 collection vehicles is still limited, despite their significant contribution to urban emissions. Moreover,
7 there is a lack of clarity whether electric waste collection vehicles can persist in real word conditions and
8 which system design is required. Therefore, we present a synthetic model for waste collection demand on
9 a per-link basis, using open available data. The tour planning is solved by an open-source algorithm as a
10 capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP). This generates tours which sufficiently handle the demand.
11 The generated tours are simulated with an open-source transport simulation (MATSim) for both, the
12 diesel and the electric waste collection vehicles. To compare the life cycle costs, we analyze the data
13 using total cost of ownership (TCO). Environmental impacts are evaluated based on a Well-to-Wheel
14 approach. We present a comparison of the two propulsion types for the exemplary use case of Berlin. And
15 we are able to generate a suitable planning to handle Berlin's waste collection demand using battery
16 electric vehicles only. The TCO calculation reveals that the electrification raises the total operator cost by
17 16-30 %, depending on the scenario and the used battery size with conservative assumptions.
18 Furthermore, the greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced by 60-99%, depending on the electricity
19 source.

20
21 **Keywords:** urban freight transport, multi-agent, traffic simulation, electrification, decarbonization,
22 sustainability, waste collection, vehicle routing problem

1 INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

2 The European Union and many other countries have set ambitious targets for reducing
3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions progressively until 2050 (1). Germany has committed itself to reduce
4 GHG emissions by 55% by 2030 compared to 1990 (2). To achieve this goal, transformation in all sectors
5 is required. The aim for the transportation sector is a reduction of 42% by 2030 compared to 1990 (2).
6 Besides climate action, the necessity to find alternate solutions for transportation is particularly
7 pronounced in urban areas, due to the harmful effects of air pollution and noise (3).

8 The electrification of the transport system is a promising approach to tackle the above mentioned
9 challenges. In contrast to passenger cars and buses, the prevalence and availability of electrified
10 commercial vehicles is still limited (4). This is especially true for municipal vehicles such as waste
11 collection vehicles. Despite their small overall quantity, they contribute significantly to the emissions of
12 the urban traffic system (5) and thus offer a great GHG and pollutant emission saving potential.

13 Until recently, European companies presented few prototypes for electric municipal vehicles,
14 which do not yet meet market requirements (5). According to our own market analysis, this is about to
15 change. Chinese manufacturers already produce electric municipal vehicles (6). European manufacturers
16 such as Volvo, Daimler and MAN plan to introduce heavy electric urban trucks, suitable for municipal
17 vehicle chassis, in the near future. Furthermore, specialized manufacturers of municipal vehicles, e.g.
18 Faun, Geesinknorba, and Zöller have presented electric prototypes, and the European market launch of
19 these vehicles is imminent (further information is available on manufacturers websites).

20 However, there is still a lack of clarity whether these vehicles can persist in real working
21 conditions, and which system design (battery size, battery type, charging technology etc.) is required.
22 Besides the technical feasibility, the changes in operating cost and the environmental impact of electric
23 vehicles (EVs) compared to today's internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs) remains an important
24 issue. Especially the battery size is a critical parameter, providing higher ranges but also increasing total
25 cost and decreasing payload. The technology selection of electric municipal vehicles must take energy
26 consumption into account. While driving consumption can be quantified by standardized driving cycles,
27 the energy consumption of the auxiliaries, which can account for a large proportion of the overall
28 consumption (7), depends on the specific working conditions.

29 Therefore, this paper introduces a multi-agent-based simulation methodology to investigate the
30 feasibility as well as the possible economic and environmental consequences of a completely electrified
31 urban waste collection. The presented methodology is applied to the city of Berlin, which serves as a use
32 case.

33 Since the real-world vehicle trajectories are not available in many cases, we develop a synthetic
34 model for waste collection demand on a per-link basis. Afterwards trajectories from the vehicle depots via
35 collection points and dump back to the depot have to be generated. This can be solved by a tour planning
36 algorithm as a capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP). The generated tours are routed and simulated
37 on the network of the MATSim Open Berlin Scenario (8, 9).

38 The procedure is carried out for both a diesel and an electric waste collection vehicle which are
39 fully specified for example in terms of consumption, gross vehicle weight and payload. To compare the
40 ICEV and the EV in terms of life cycle costs and environmental impact during the use phase, we analyse
41 the data using the total cost of ownership (TOC) and the Well-to-Wheel (WTW) methods.

42 We thrive to answer questions such as: How will fixed and variable costs differ between the fossil
43 and the electric approach? How will tour structure and lengths as well as fleet size change? And more in
44 general: How can urban waste collection be realistically modelled and simulated in order to assess the
45 costs and environmental impacts of different propulsion types?

46 STATE OF THE ART

47 As stated, in the present study we are interested in the consequences of a full electrification of
48 waste collection in Berlin, while at the same time developing a method that can be used for arbitrary
49 regions. In the following we investigate the state of the art in four different fields:

- 50 1. Generation of demand for pickups

2. Generation of pickup tours
3. Cost matrix for the pickup tours
4. Technology and operational parameters of waste collection vehicles

Demand Generation for Waste Collection

Waste management is a well-researched subject. Typical approaches couple demographic properties to waste generation per person or household, and then use the spatial layout of the region to obtain amounts of waste per road link or block (10–12). Willemse (13) uses GPS tracks to identify the collection area during the tour, but then generates pickup locations from census data. Others (e.g. (14, 15)) rely entirely on GPS tracks, i.e. slowly traversed links indicate pickup locations together with the time to serve them.

Tour Generation

Once the demand is known, vehicle tours need to be found that start at the vehicle depot, iterate between pickups and delivery at the dump, and eventually return to the depot. Since the capacity-limited vehicles need to unload during the tour and resume waste collection afterwards, these are capacitated vehicle routing problems (CVRPs). Many algorithms are discussed to solve problems such as CVRPs (16) or arc algorithms (17). Other approaches use particle swarm optimization (18) or Boolean optimization problems (19). Ignoring the unload and resume collection capability simplifies the problem, but leads to too many and too short tours with too many vehicles (20).

Cost Matrix/Road Network

Vehicle routing problems (VRPs) are often defined on cost matrices, which specify the cost between each pair of locations (16). Clearly, for waste collection such a matrix would be cumbersome to use, since its size would be the number of pickup locations squared. For a region with, say, 100,000 pickup locations, the matrix would be of size 10^{10} . This implies 40 GB of memory footprint, already too large for typical desktop computers. An alternative is to derive the cost from one location to another by a call to a routing algorithm based on a network graph. As usual, this trades memory for computing time.

Urban Electric Commercial Vehicles

As stated in section *Introduction and Motivation*, technology development for electric municipal vehicles is still premature. However, some research concerning the topic has been done. To adequately specify the waste collection EV, the current development state of battery cost and lifetime and driving consumption is reviewed.

Battery price

A recent publication predicts a price range for passenger car battery packs from 150-180 \$/kWh in 2019 (21). The Bloomberg 2019 EV Outlook identifies the current specific prices for car battery packs at 174 \$/kWh in 2018 (22). With the average exchange rate in 2018 of 1,18 \$/€, this is equivalent to about 147 €/kWh. A study from 2015 predicts a specific price range for commercial vehicle battery packs from 378-770 €/kWh in 2020 (23). The price gap between commercial vehicle and passenger car batteries can be explained with stricter quality requirements and lower quantities (23). Nevertheless, the identified price ranges for passenger car batteries point out the future development potential for commercial vehicle battery prices.

Battery lifetime

The second important parameter is the possible life time of the battery, typically measured in charging cycles until a remaining capacity of 80% is reached (24, 25). This parameter has a high impact on the TCO since it determines whether a battery replacement is necessary within the lifetime of the vehicle. The possible real-life cycles are strongly influenced by charging rate and charging temperature. Maddi et al. show that Lithium Nickel Manganese Cobalt Oxide (NMC) cells can perform up to 4,000 cycles at 45 °C before reaching end of life (EOL). This value drops to 50 cycles at 5 °C (26). In 2018, a study was

1 published which showed that temperature controlled NMC cells can perform up to 4,500 cycles at 0 °C
2 ambient temperature with 3.5 C (27).

3 4 *Driving consumption*

5 Gao, Lin et al. use real world driving cycles for a simulation based consumption estimation. For a class
6 eight waste collection vehicle a consumption of 2 kWh/km is calculated (3.2 kWh/mile) (4). Based on
7 their maximum driving length and maximum speed, we assume that a rural cycle is used. Sripad and
8 Visvanathan deal with uncertain input parameters by using a Monte Carlo simulation to calculate a
9 consumption in a range from 1.38-1.81 kWh/km (2.2-2.9 kWh/mile) for a 36 t class 8 truck. The
10 underlying driving profile remains unclear but based on the covered range, a highway profile can be
11 assumed (28). Urban electric buses seem to have a comparable driving profile to the considered urban
12 waste collection vehicles. Kievekas, Vepsalainen et al. use real driving data and a stochastic approach to
13 calculate an average driving consumption of 0.914 kWh/km on a suburban bus route (29). It must be
14 noted that their empty vehicle mass is about 3 t less compared to the vehicle type considered in this paper.
15

16 **METHODOLOGY**

17 The presented methodology combines three elements: A transport simulation, a TCO and a WTW
18 analysis. The transport simulation in combination with the tour planning algorithm is used to generate a
19 possible solution for waste collection in a given geographical region. Thereby it yields the necessary fleet
20 size, distances driven and energy used for a specific vehicle type. We compare different propulsion
21 systems using the TCO and WTW methods to investigate economic and environmental implications.
22

23 **MATSim and Jsprit**

24 The Multi-Agent Transport Simulation (MATSim) (30–32) approach builds microscopic models of the
25 transport phenomena under investigation. “Microscopic” means that the relevant entities of the system are
26 individually resolved. The approach, as in any economic assessment exercise, is:

- 27 1. Building a model of the base case (ICEV)
- 28 2. Building a model of the investigation case
- 29 3. Comparing costs and benefits

30 Here, the model of the base case is a model of urban waste collection with ICEVs. For a
31 microscopic approach, this entails (a) a model of the demand for each day of the week, and (b) a method
32 to generate plausible vehicle tours that serve that demand. The demand generation is done synthetically,
33 based on available average numbers, plausible assumptions and spatial information, in particular locations
34 of vehicle depots, dumps, and the street network. This is similar to the non-GPS based methods described
35 earlier (see section *Demand Generation for Waste Collection*), albeit simpler.

36 Afterwards, trajectories from the vehicle depots, iterating between collection points and dump
37 and finally back to the depot have to be generated. We will model this as a shipment problem, where each
38 shipment is modelled from the pickup location to the dump. Vehicles are capacity (here in terms of
39 payload) constrained, leading to multiple trips to the dump during a tour (20). Also, tours are time
40 constrained, which leads to multiple tours run simultaneously. Our approach uses the software jsprit (33),
41 which is already integrated with MATSim, and which is indeed able to provide heuristic solutions for
42 such shipment problems. For this study, vehicle depots are assumed to provide an unconstrained number
43 of identical vehicles.

44 The investigation case is generated similarly. While an equal demand is assumed, the EVs have
45 different payloads and a range constraint. Evidently, the resulting tours may be different.
46

47 **Total Cost of Ownership**

48 The TCO analysis is a commonly accepted method in strategic cost management. It is used to calculate
49 the financial impact of procurement decisions regarding not only purchase but also variable costs over the
50 products lifetime (34, 35). Therefore, it is a useful method for comparing possible procurement
51 alternatives as intended in this work. Our approach is based on (36).

1 We assume a product lifetime of 10 years for vehicles and 20 years for charging infrastructure
2 and annualize the capital expenditure using an average interest rate of 4% according to (36). The
3 operational costs are calculated exemplarily for two significant work days based on simulation results.

4 Research concerning electric passenger cars shows less maintenance effort compared to ICEVs
5 (37). However, the resulting change in maintenance costs has not yet been quantified reliably for the
6 considered vehicle type. Therefore, we assume the maintenance costs for the EVs using the same costs as
7 for the ICEVs, despite the presumed savings for EVs.

9 **Well to Wheel**

10 To analyze the environmental impact of the simulated waste collection scenarios, GHG emissions from
11 the production of diesel and electricity as well as from their use in the vehicles are estimated following
12 the WTW methodology (38).

13 In contrast to a life cycle assessment (LCA) over the whole life cycle of a product (39), this
14 approach focuses on the comparison of GHG emissions from the use phase of the ICEV and the EV (38).
15 Nonetheless, the whole upstream chains of diesel and electricity, including extraction, production and
16 distribution are considered (40).

17 For the WTW analysis we choose the tool openLCA 1.8.0 (41) with the database Ecoinvent v3.5
18 (42) We use the IPCC 2013 (43) method to calculate GHG emissions. As the electricity data in Ecoinvent
19 v3.5 is collected for the year 2014, we will calculate the GHG emissions assuming 473 gCO₂eq/kWh for
20 Germany in 2018 (43, 44).

21 To take the German climate goals for the year 2030 into account, we will calculate GHG
22 emissions from electricity production assuming 347 gCO₂eq/kWh and assuming only renewable energies
23 for electricity production, concluding in 25 gCO₂eq/kWh (45).

25 **CASE STUDY**

26 This case study is located in Berlin, the largest city and capital of Germany. The city of Berlin has
27 approx. 3.75 million inhabitants (46) living in an area of 891 km² (47).

29 **Road Network**

30 For the present investigation, we use a road network consisting of links and nodes, link-based demands
31 for waste collection, individually modelled synthetic vehicles, and individual vehicle depots and dumps.
32 The road network is the regular network of the public available MATSim Open Berlin Scenario (8),
33 where the network is originally derived from OpenStreetMap (48).

35 **Generating a Synthetic Demand for Waste Collection**

36 What now follows is a model to synthetically generate a plausible spatially resolved demand for waste
37 collection. According to the annual report of the Berlin waste management company (49), the overall
38 amount of waste from households and small businesses in 2018 is 813,495 t/a. With the assumption that
39 all 3.75 million inhabitants (46) generate this amount equally, this results in an average of 217
40 kg/(a*person). This number, multiplied by the number of inhabitants per district and divided by the
41 number of weeks per year, results in the typical weekly amount per district. Each of the 96 districts has a
42 fixed assignment to one of the four vehicle depots; this effectively decomposes the problem into four
43 independent sub-problems.

44 Real-world pickup schedules for Berlin are not publicly accessible. Therefore, it is necessary to
45 synthetically generate a plausible collection schedule. In Berlin, some areas are served once per week,
46 some twice. For each vehicle depot sub-problem, the districts with the lowest waste density are identified,
47 and assumed to be served once per week, on Wednesdays. All other districts are assumed to be served
48 twice: on Mondays and Thursdays or on Tuesdays and Fridays. These subgroups are combined such that
49 the waste amounts are approximately equal between depots.

50 Since we assume an equal generated waste amount per day, Mondays and Tuesdays will have
51 more waste than Thursdays and Fridays. For balancing purposes, some districts were moved into the “low

1 density” group, and then some of the “low density” districts were moved to Thursday or Friday
2 collections while maintaining the once-per-week frequency. The waste is transported to five dumps where
3 the delivered amounts are known (49); therefore, each district is assigned to a dump for each collection
4 day so that the spatial layout is plausible, and the resulting weekly waste amounts per dump are realistic.
5 The result of this process is a synthetic collection schedule which assigns a depot and a dump as well as
6 one or more collection days to each district.

7 The link-based demand for collection is now created at each link of the network depending on the
8 free speed, length and the district where the road is located. In general, all roads with a free speed higher
9 than 50 km/h are excluded, so that no collection will be created on motorways. The demand for collection
10 is then distributed to the remaining links, proportionally to their length, which reflects the assumption that
11 in each district the population is distributed equally along the remaining links. The number of waste bins
12 per link is then obtained by dividing this amount by the bin size. For the VRP, each demand per link is
13 encoded as one *shipment*, regardless of the length and the amount of waste, which needs to go from the
14 collection point to the disposal station. The number of bins per shipment is only relevant for the necessary
15 time per pickup.

16 The objective function consists of the costs, defined as the sum of fixed costs for each employed
17 vehicle and variable costs per km. The fixed costs include depreciation, insurance and the personnel
18 costs of the crew, where it is assumed that the crew is paid for the full day no matter how long the tour.
19 The variable costs are the costs for the energy (e.g. fuel or electric power). Additionally, there are the
20 following constraints:

- 21 • All collection vehicles have capacity (payload) constraints and thus have to unload at the
22 dumps. Each disposal of a fully loaded vehicle is assumed to take 45 minutes, which is
23 also assumed to be used as the legally required break of the vehicle crew.
- 24 • All collection vehicles have time constraints. They need to be back at the depot after 8
25 hours and the earliest departure is 6am.

26 A *vehicle tour* as heuristical solution of the VRP thus starts at the depot, then iterates between
27 multiple waste collections and the dump, and returns to the depot. The solution consists of individually
28 specified trajectories for all the vehicles necessary for fulfilling the complete demand of each specific
29 collection day.

30 **Vehicle Parameters**

31 Realistic parameters for both the diesel and the electric waste collection vehicle are defined in order to
32 quantify the results of the simulation in terms of energy consumption, WTW emissions and TCO.

33 An ICEV with Euro 6 emission standards is chosen for the base case. It represents the newest
34 vehicle generations currently in service, in order to show the present-day potential of combustion engines.
35 The specifications of the vehicle are received from personal interviews with a large German waste
36 management authority.

37 For the investigation case, a commercially available, small-scale-produced electric waste
38 collection vehicle is chosen to reflect the current market situation and to get reliable price information.
39 While vehicle and battery specifications and driving consumption are available online (50), price
40 information and consumption for waste collection were received from personal encounter with the vehicle
41 (50) and collector (51) manufacturers.

42 In electric powertrains, the battery is one of the main cost drivers. Furthermore, the weight of the
43 battery has a considerable impact on the possible payload. Therefore, two different batteries are selected.
44 The bigger battery enables longer ranges but also causes a reduced payload and a higher purchase price.
45 The small battery allows for an equal payload compared to the ICEV. The specifications of the ICEV and
46 both EVs can be seen in Table 1.
47

1 **Table 1: Vehicle Type Specifications**

	ICEV	EV1 (large battery)	EV2 (small battery)
GVW [kg]	26,000	26,000	26,000
Payload [kg]	11,500	10,500	11,500
Capacity [m ³]	22	22	22
Average fuel consumption [l/100km]	73	-	
Fuel consumption driving [l/100km]	60	100	
Fuel consumption collecting [l/1000kg]	0.5	1.4	
Purchase Price Chassis and Collector [€]	210,000	452,250	
Battery Capacity (usable) [kWh]	-	310	155
Battery weight [kg]	-	2,940	1,470
Battery price [€]	-	234,000	126,000
Cycles to 80% remaining capacity [-]	-	4,000	4,000
Cell chemistry	-	NMC	

2
3 To assess the reliability of the parameters stated by the manufacturer, the specific battery price,
4 the possible charging cycles and the driving consumption are compared to the state of the art (see section
5 *Urban Electric Commercial Vehicles*).

6 Since the usable capacity is given, the installed capacity has to be calculated. Latest battery
7 technology allows for 80-85% usable SOC (52, 53). Assuming 80%, the specific prices are 604 €/kWh
8 for the large and 650 €/kWh for the small battery. These values are on the high end of the identified price
9 range (see section *Urban Electric Commercial Vehicles*) thus can be considered as a conservative choice.

10 The selected NMC battery is equipped with a water based temperature control system (50).
11 Consequently the results of (27) can be applied. As the proposed charging rate is significantly lower than
12 3.5 C and 4,000 instead of 4,500 cycles are stated, the dimensioning appears viable.

13 The range for the driving consumption specified by the manufacturer (0.8-1.2 kWh/km) is
14 significantly lower than reported in studies dealing with similar trucks. This could be the result of
15 fundamentally different driving profiles. Nevertheless, the mean of the range given by the manufacturer is
16 chosen: 1 kWh/ km. This value is slightly higher than the consumption of the lighter electric bus with a
17 comparable driving profile reported in (29).

18 19 **Charging Infrastructure Parameters**

20 In the presented use case, a single shift operation of eight hours daily is assumed. This leads to up to 16
21 hours of dwell time which can be used for charging. Therefore, one 22 kW charger for every vehicle is
22 suitable even for the 310 kWh battery. The cost for hardware, grid connection, approval, and setup for
23 one charger is set to 10,000 € (54).


24 25 **RESULTS**

26 For the case study we investigate two different synthetically generated weekdays for the waste
27 collection in the city of Berlin: Monday as representing the collection days of the districts with higher
28 demand density and Wednesday as the day collecting the waste in the districts with lower demand
29 density. The collection with ICEVs (base case) is compared to the collection with EVs (investigation
30 cases).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Vehicle Trajectories and Base Case: Collection with Diesel Vehicles

Different waste collection areas for a typical synthetic weekday are depicted in **Figure 1**. As stated earlier, this is then solved as a pickup-and-delivery VRP, where all vehicles are originally located at their depots. In operation they alternate between waste collection and disposal (dump) until all waste is removed and then return to their depots. The number of necessary vehicles is an output of the algorithm. For computational reasons, this is solved separately for each district; each district is denoted by a polygon in **Figure 1**.




10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Figure 1: Simulated waste collection on a typical synthetic weekday (Different colors refer to districts served by different vehicle depots)

Important properties of the problem for a typical synthetic weekday are as follows:

- Volume of each waste bin: 1,100 l
- Service time per waste bin: 41 s
- Number of shipments: 12,113 (Monday), 17,808 (Wednesday)
- Waste to collect: 3,123 t (Monday), 3,100 t (Wednesday)

The solution algorithm, jsprit, is run for 100 iterations. A typical route is shown in **Figure 2**. Clearly, the result of this will not be optimal; rather, it has to be interpreted as a “feasible solution”. Because the optimization problem is different for each synthetic weekday, the results are also different. The necessary number of vehicles runs between 198 and 218; the total distance is between 10,535 and 14,225 km; the longest tour for a single vehicle is 112 km.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Figure 2: Typical trajectory of one waste collection vehicle

As a sensitivity test, the same optimizations were run with much smaller bin sizes of 240 l, where the service time per bin is 20 s. The necessary number of vehicles runs between 233 and 256; the total distance is between 11,863 and 14,733 km; the longest tour for a single vehicle is 108 km. The collection profile on Wednesday differs from the other weekdays. Therefore, we will present results for Monday as a typical day and Wednesday as the exceptional day. **Figure 3** shows the distribution of the tour length for the different simulation setups.




Figure 3: Distribution of tour length for the different simulation setups

Investigation Case: Collection with Electric Vehicles

As a first investigation, the above study is re-run with the waste collection EV with a 310 kWh battery and a reduced payload of 10.5 t. Nevertheless, under the same conditions as in section *Vehicle Trajectories and Base Case: Collection with Diesel Vehicles*, the results end up in the same range, sometimes even with fewer vehicles or kilometers. At the same time, the battery capacity of 310 kWh is by far not exhausted: the most energy-intensive tour demands 142 kWh (Wednesday, large bins).

Due to the large unused battery capacity, a second electric vehicle is set up (cf. Table 1). It has a smaller battery with 155 kWh. Because of the reduced battery weight it has the same payload as the ICEV (11.5 tons). These trucks can replace the ICEVs one by one. The most energy-intensive tour consumes 139 kWh (Wednesday, large bins), which is feasible with this battery. As a result, one overnight charging cycle per day is sufficient for every individual tour. During the assumed 10-year lifetime of the vehicles (250 workdays/a), the 4,000 possible cycles are by far not reached. Thus, no battery change is required.

Figure 4 shows the distribution of energy consumption for each tour in the different model setups. The energy consumption for waste lifting and compactification is included and comes out as about 30% of the energy consumption.




Figure 4: Distribution of energy consumption per tour and vehicle for the different simulation setups

Discussion of Tour Optimization Results

To get insight on the impact of the number of jsprit iterations, the optimizations for one district (644 collections, 1,100 l bins, ICEVs) were run for 50, 500, 4,000 and 12,000 iterations. Those 12,000 iterations took 15 hours of computing time, while 50 iterations took 25 minutes. The results were as follows:

- The number of vehicles went down as 14, 14, 13, 12.
- The average kilometers per vehicle went as 68, 67, 72, 81.
- The maximum number of kilometers of any vehicle went as 101, 99, 99, 98.

Evidently, the algorithm strives to reduce the number of vehicles because of their high fixed costs. The average number of kilometers in consequence increases. In contrast, the maximum number of kilometers of any vehicle does *not* increase, which is good news with respect to electrification and specification of battery size.


Operator Costs

Figure 5 shows the total operator cost on fleet level for two synthetic weekdays with different collection profiles and the influence of the two considered bin sizes for both days. The cost is split into its most relevant shares.

The simulation runs with the assumption that staff always works full time. As a result, shortening vehicle tours has no staff cost consequences. When reducing the number of vehicles, we assume that the staff size can be reduced in the long run. With these assumptions we find that the electrification causes an increase in operating cost of 29.4% with the large (EV1) and 17.5% with the small battery (EV2) in the worst case. The high impact of staff cost is with up to 71.4% of the base case's costs well visible. This value drops slightly for the EVs but with 57.7% and 60.7% still is the main factor. Simultaneously the share of vehicle purchase price increases from 11.8% of the operating cost for the ICEV to 31.5% for

1 EV1 and 27.9% for EV2. This is countered by a reduction of energy cost share by about 3.7% for both
 2 EVs. Generally, it is noticeable that energy costs have a minor impact on total costs.

3 The alteration of cost among the analyzed scenarios (bin size and collection profile) are mainly
 4 due to changes in fleet size.
 5



6
 7
 8 **Figure 5: Total daily operator cost on fleet level**
 9

10 **Well to Wheel**

11 To evaluate the environmental impacts, the four different use cases are analyzed. In order to assume the
 12 same conditions in terms of distances travelled and waste collected, EV2 is used (cf. **Table 1**). **Figure 6**
 13 displays the GHG emissions of the waste collection for both simulated typical synthetic days. Total
 14 CO₂eq emissions for the WTW approach of the ICEV and EVs, both with data from Ecoinvent v3.5 are
 15 displayed (42). Additionally, the CO₂eq emissions for the EVs, using estimations for Germany's
 16 electricity mixes in 2018 and 2030 and emissions from the production of renewable energies are
 17 depicted.

18 Taking a closer look at the results calculated with electricity data from the year 2014, the GHG
 19 emissions caused by the EVs are around 59-63% smaller than the emissions caused by the ICEVs. For
 20 Germany's current electricity mix, EVs' GHG emissions are around 71-74% smaller compared to the
 21 ICEVs' GHG emissions. Taking projected future electricity mixes into account, the GHG emissions by
 22 the EVs are around 79-81% smaller than the GHG emissions caused by ICEVs. If the EVs are powered
 23 only by renewable energies, 98-99% of GHG emissions can be saved compared to the ICEVs. Note that
 24 even with only renewable energies, there are still GHG emissions, caused by the upstream chains of
 25 renewable energy production.
 26




Figure 6: Total GHG emissions on fleet level

CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In contrast to a widespread assumption the electrification of the waste collection in urban areas seems to be technically feasible. As shown above it is possible to configure a waste collection EV with the same payload as the ICEV together with a sufficient range.

The Berlin waste collection vehicles typically perform daily tours of less than 100 km, which can be run by a truck with a fully charged medium sized battery without recharging.

The proposed methodology together with suitable multi-agent transport simulation provides realistic vehicle trajectories for conventional ICEV and BEV. The actual fleet of the Berlin waste operator with approx. 300 vehicles is somewhat larger than our “synthesized fleet” with about 220 vehicles. But firstly we neither consider a vehicle reserve nor extreme waste occurrences (e. g. typically after Christmas). And secondly this difference applies to both the conventional and the electric fleet. Therefore, the relative comparison of life cycle costs and environmental impact of both fleets is valid.

The resulting cost increase will be, depending on the assumptions, between 18 and 30%. The increase of the fees to the population would likely be less, because of additional administrative overheads which would not change under electrification. Since the relatively premature commercial EV technology will probably be able to realize larger efficiency gains over the next few years than the established ICEV technology, the cost gap is likely to shrink over time, especially because the specific battery cost will decrease with mass production analog to passenger cars.

Another important aspect is the assumed consumption of the EVs. Since an average value is chosen, unusual conditions such as cold winter days could cause significant deviations. Furthermore, the aging of the battery lowers its usable capacity, possibly causing the small battery to be insufficient for the longest tours towards the EOL. Also the impact of the uncertainty of the mentioned average consumption as discussed in section *Urban Electric Commercial Vehicles* cannot be ignored. On the contrary, the majority of the vehicles use significantly less than 100 kWh per tour with the made assumptions, leaving a satisfactory safety margin for EV1 (Figure 4). Furthermore, the large battery of EV2 offers a safety margin of 54% for the highest simulated energy demand. Therefore, even a doubling of the consumption could be handled. Consequently, the operator could deploy a fleet of vehicles with small batteries (155 kWh) supplemented by a few vehicles with larger batteries to handle the longest tours, resulting in a cost increase somewhere between the above mentioned 18 and 30%.

To further increase range or decrease battery size, (fast) charging options during dwell times are possible. This would lead to cost savings from smaller batteries, but also entail to additional investment costs for additional chargers. We are planning to address these issues in upcoming publications.

The EVs show fewer GHG emissions in the use phase in comparison to the ICEVs. Additionally, GHG emissions with the predicted electricity mix in 2030, compared to Germany’s nowadays electricity mix, could be lowered by approx. 27% and by approx. 95% using only renewable energies as energy

1 source. Nonetheless, future research should evaluate the whole life cycle of the vehicles, including
2 production (in particular the production of the EVs' battery) (55) and EOL of the vehicles. Furthermore,
3 the use phase could be calculated more precisely, for example with the help of a vehicle simulation, to
4 take use-case dependent conditions such as location-specific topology, weather conditions or actual
5 payload and driver influences into account (56). At the same time, more impact categories should be
6 considered for evaluating the environmental impacts of the ICEVs and EVs, which consider air quality
7 and human toxicity as well.

1 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

2 This work was founded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research
3 Foundation) – project number: 398051144.

4

5 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

6 The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception and design: R.
7 Ewert, A. Grahle, K. Martins-Turner; data collection: R. Ewert, A. Grahle, A. Syré; analysis and
8 interpretation of results: A. Grahle, K. Martins-Turner, A. Syré, K. Nagel, D. Göhlich; draft
9 manuscript preparation: A. Grahle, K. Martins-Turner, A. Syré, K. Nagel, D. Göhlich. All
10 authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. *A Clean Planet for All: A European Strategic Long-Term Vision for a Prosperous, Modern, Competitive and Climate Neutral Economy*. Publication COM(2018) 773 final. European Commission, 2018.
2. *Klimaschutzplan 2050. Klimaschutzpolitische Grundsätze Und Ziele Der Bundesregierung*. Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz Und Nukleare Sicherheit (BMU), 2016.
3. *Review of Evidence on Health Aspects of Air Pollution - REVIHAAP Project: Final Technical Report*. World Health Organization, Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen, 2013.
4. Gao, Z., Z. Lin, S. C. Davis, and A. K. Birky. Quantitative Evaluation of MD/HD Vehicle Electrification Using Statistical Data. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2018. Vol. 2672, No. 24, pp. 109–121.
5. Göhlich, D., and S. Gräbener. Identification of User-Oriented Electric Commercial Vehicle Concepts with a Particular Focus on Auxiliaries. Presented at the 25th Aachen Colloquium Automobile and Engine Technology, Aachen, Germany, 2016.
6. Du, J., and D. Ouyang. Progress of Chinese Electric Vehicles Industrialization in 2015: A Review. *Applied energy*, 2017. Vol. 188, pp. 529–546.
7. Graebener, S., M. Tarnowski, and D. Goehlich. Multi-Dimensional Value-Benefit Analysis for Electrified Commercial Vehicle Concepts. Presented at the Vehicle Power and Propulsion Conference (VPPC), Montreal, QC, Canada, 2015.
8. Ziemke, D., I. Kaddoura, and K. Nagel. The MATSim Open Berlin Scenario: A Multimodal Agent-Based Transport Simulation Scenario Based on Synthetic Demand Modeling and Open Data. *Procedia computer science*, 2019. Vol. 151, pp. 870–877.
9. The MATSim Open Berlin Scenario. <https://github.com/matsim-vsp/matsim-berlin>. Accessed Jul. 31, 2019.
10. Ghose, M. K., A. K. Dikshit, and S. K. Sharma. A GIS Based Transportation Model for Solid Waste Disposal – A Case Study on Asansol Municipality. *Waste Management*, 2006. Vol. 26, No. 11, pp. 1287–1293.
11. Beigl, P., S. Lebersorger, and S. Salhofer. Modelling Municipal Solid Waste Generation: A Review. *Waste Management*, 2008. Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 200–214.
12. Arribas, C. A., C. A. Blazquez, and A. Lamas. Urban Solid Waste Collection System Using Mathematical Modelling and Tools of Geographic Information Systems. *Waste Management & Research*, 2010. Vol. 28, pp. 355–363.
13. Willemse, E. Using Data Science to Analyse Waste Collection Activities. *Research Focus*, 2018. Vol. Innoate 13, pp. 38–40.
14. Ghiani, G., A. Guerrieri, A. Manni, and E. Manni. Estimating Travel and Service Times for Automated Route Planning and Service Certification in Municipal Waste Management. *Waste Management*, 2015. Vol. 46, pp. 40–46.

15. Anghinolfi, D., M. Paolucci, M. Robba, and A. C. Taramasso. A Dynamic Optimization Model for Solid Waste Recycling. *Waste Management*, 2013. Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 287–296.
16. Irnich, S., P. Toth, and D. Vigo. Chapter 1: The Family of Vehicle Routing Problems. In *Vehicle Routing: Problems, Methods, and Applications* (P. Toth and D. Vigo, eds.), Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 1–33.
17. Willemse, E. J. *Heuristics for Large-Scale Capacitated Arc Routing Problems on Mixed Networks*. PhD. University of Pretoria, 2016.
18. Hannan, M. A., M. Akhtar, R. A. Begum, H. Basri, A. Hussain, and E. Scavino. Capacitated Vehicle-Routing Problem Model for Scheduled Solid Waste Collection and Route Optimization Using PSO Algorithm. *Waste Management*, 2018. Vol. 71, pp. 31–41.
19. Laureri, F., R. Minciardi, and M. Robba. An Algorithm for the Optimal Collection of Wet Waste. *Waste Management*, 2016. Vol. 48, pp. 56–63.
20. Martins-Turner, K., and K. Nagel. How Driving Multiple Tours Affects the Results of Last Mile Delivery Vehicle Routing Problems. *Procedia computer science*, 2019. Vol. 151, pp. 840–845.
21. Nykvist, B., F. Sprei, and M. Nilsson. Assessing the Progress toward Lower Priced Long Range Battery Electric Vehicles. *Energy policy*, 2019. Vol. 124, pp. 144–155.
22. Bloomberg New Energy Finance. Electric Vehicle Outlook 2019. <https://about.bnef.com/electric-vehicle-outlook/#toc-download>. Accessed Jul. 31, 2019.
23. Hacker, F., R. von Waldenfels, and M. Mottschall. *Wirtschaftlichkeit von Elektromobilität in Gewerblichen Anwendungen*. IKT für Elektromobilität, 2015.
24. Schimpe, M., M. E. von Kuepach, M. Naumann, H. C. Hesse, K. Smith, and A. Jossen. Comprehensive Modeling of Temperature-Dependent Degradation Mechanisms in Lithium Iron Phosphate Batteries. *Journal of the Electrochemical Society*, 2018. Vol. 165, No. 2, pp. A181–A193.
25. Schmalstieg, J., S. Käbitz, M. Ecker, and D. U. Sauer. A Holistic Aging Model for Li(NiMnCo)O₂ Based 18650 Lithium-Ion Batteries. *Journal of power sources*, 2014. Vol. 257, pp. 325–334.
26. Matadi, B. P., S. Geniès, A. Delaille, C. Chabrol, E. de Vito, M. Bardet, J.-F. Martin, L. Daniel, and Y. Bultel. Irreversible Capacity Loss of Li-Ion Batteries Cycled at Low Temperature Due to an Untypical Layer Hindering Li Diffusion into Graphite Electrode. *Journal of the Electrochemical Society*, 2017. Vol. 164, No. 12, pp. A2374–A2389.
27. Yang, X.-G., G. Zhang, S. Ge, and C.-Y. Wang. Fast Charging of Lithium-Ion Batteries at All Temperatures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2018. Vol. 115, No. 28, pp. 7266–7271.
28. Sripad, S., and V. Viswanathan. Performance Metrics Required of Next-Generation Batteries to Make a Practical Electric Semi Truck. *ACS Energy Letters*, 2017. Vol. 2, No. 7, pp. 1669–1673.
29. Kivekas, K., J. Vepsäläinen, and K. Tammi. Stochastic Driving Cycle Synthesis for Analyzing the Energy Consumption of a Battery Electric Bus. *IEEE Access*, 2018. Vol. 6, pp. 55586–55598.

30. Horni, A., K. Nagel, and K. W. Axhausen, Eds. *The Multi-Agent Transport Simulation MATSim*. Ubiquity Press, 2016.
31. MATSim. www.matsim.org. Accessed Jul. 31, 2019.
32. MATSim. <https://github.com/matsim-org>. Accessed Jul. 31, 2019.
33. Jsprit. *jsprit*. <https://github.com/graphhopper/jsprit>. Accessed Jul. 15, 2019.
34. Götz, U., and T. Weber. ZP-Stichwort: Total Cost of Ownership. *Zeitschrift für Planung & Unternehmenssteuerung*, 2008. Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 249–257.
35. Geissdörfer, K., R. Gleich, and A. Wald. Standardisierungspotentiale Lebenszyklusbasierter Modelle Des Strategischen Kostenmanagements. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft*, 2009. Vol. 79, No. 6, pp. 693–715.
36. Jefferies, D., and D. Göhlich. Integrated TCO Assessment of Bus Network Electrification Considering Rescheduling and Delays: -- Modelling Framework and Case Study --. *EVS 31 & EVTeC 2018*, 2018.
37. Propfe, B., M. Redelbach, D. Santini, and H. Friedrich. Cost Analysis of Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles Including Maintenance & Repair Costs and Resale Values. *World Electric Vehicle Journal*, 2012. Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 886–895.
38. Edwards, R., J.-F. Larivé, D. Rickeard, L. Lonza, and H. Maas. *Well-to-Wheels Report Version 4.a: JEC Well-to-Wheels Analysis : Well-to-Wheels Analysis of Future Automotive Fuels and Powertrains in the European Context*. Publications Office, Luxembourg, 2014.
39. Deutsches Institut für Normung. *Umweltmanagement - Ökobilanz- Grundsätze Und Rahmenbedingungen*. Publication DIN EN ISO 14040:2009-11. Beuth Verlag GmbH, Berlin, 2009.
40. Deutsches Institut für Normung. *Methode Zur Berechnung Und Deklaration Des Energieverbrauchs Und Der Treibhausgasemissionen Bei Transportdienstleistungen (Güter- Und Personenverkehr)*. Publication DIN EN 16258:2013-03. Beuth Verlag GmbH, Berlin, 2013.
41. Greendelta GmbH, Ed. openLCA. <http://www.openlca.org/>.
42. Wernet, G., C. Bauer, B. Steubing, J. Reinhard, E. Moreno-Ruiz, and B. Weidema. The Ecoinvent Database Version 3 (part I): Overview and Methodology. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 2016. Vol. 21, No. 9, pp. 1218–1230.
43. Eggleston, S., L. Buendia, and K. Miwa. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. The Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, 2006.
44. Icha, P., and G. Kuhs. *Entwicklung Der Spezifischen Kohlendioxid-Emissionen Des Deutschen Strommix in Den Jahren 1990 - 2018*. Umweltbundesamt (UBA), 2019.
45. Wietschel, M., M. Kühnbach, and D. Rüdiger. Die Aktuelle Treibhausgasemissionsbilanz von Elektrofahrzeugen in Deutschland: Working Paper Sustainability and Innovation. Fraunhofer ISI, 2019.

46. *Einwohnerinnen Und Einwohner Im Land Berlin Am 31. Dezember 2018*. Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg, 2019.
47. Amt Für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg. <https://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/Statistiken/inhalt-statistiken.asp>. Accessed Jul. 30, 2019.
48. OpenStreetMap. *OpenStreetMap*. <http://www.openstreetmap.org>. Accessed Jul. 15, 2019.
49. *BSR Entsorgungsbilanz 2018*. Berliner Stadtreinigung, 2018.
50. E-Force One AG. www.eforce.ch. Accessed Jul. 31, 2019.
51. Geesinknorba Group. www.geesinknorba.com. Accessed Jul. 31, 2019.
52. Rehman, M. M. U., F. Zhang, M. Evzelman, R. Zane, K. Smith, and D. Maksimovic. Advanced Cell-Level Control for Extending Electric Vehicle Battery Pack Lifetime. Presented at the 2016 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition (ECCE).
53. Sauer, D. U., P. Sinhuber, M. Rogge, W. Rohlf, and M. Winter. *Entwicklungen Im Batteriebereich - Auswirkungen Auf Planung, Betrieb Und Sicherheit von Elektrobussen Und Ladeinfrastruktur.* , 2016. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1848.2329
54. *Ladeinfrastruktur Für Elektrofahrzeuge in Deutschland: Statusbericht Und Handlungsempfehlungen 2015*. Nationale Plattform Elektromobilität, Berlin, 2015.
55. Ellingsen, L. A.-W., B. Singh, and A. H. Strømman. The Size and Range Effect: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Electric Vehicles. *Environmental research letters*, 2016. Vol. 11, No. 5, 2016, p. 054010.
56. Torzynski, S., D. Göhlich, D. Hahn, and M. Bryl-Radziemska. *E-Bus Berlin - Betrieb Der Buslinie 204 (vormals: Buslinie 147) Mit Einer Flotte von Elektrobussen Inklusive Infrastruktur Zur Induktiven Zwischenladung: Abschlussbericht*. Berliner Verkehrsbetriebe (BVG), 2016.