Biogas from Energy Crops and Biowastes

Charles Banks University of Southampton



Acknowledgements - Current project

Acronym: CROPGEN

Title: Renewable energy from crops and agrowastes

Contract: SES6-CT-2004-502824



Duration:1 March 2004 – 28 February 2007Total cost:2.5 M€ EC funding:2.1 M€website:www.cropgen.soton.ac.uk





Old technology - new application

- The technology of biochemical methane generation is well established
- Traditionally it has been used for waste stabilization
- Current focus is on energy production
- To be cost-effective in this role may require
 - engineering and technical improvements to increase conversion efficiencies
 - Selection and production of biomass feedstocks from a variety of sources
 - including novel and multi-use crops and agro-wastes from integrated farming systems, commercial and industrial wastes and by-products.





Anaerobic digestion in its simplest form

- Closed reactor
- System of gas collection
- Production of biogas
- Production of digestate







Process types

One stage

Wet

Mesophilic



Dry

Multi-stage

Thermophilic



Process differences

Wet Process

- less than 15 % feedstock solids concentration
- one or several stages
- usually operate at 35°C
- requires water addition or recycle
- larger reactor
- proven technology for sewage sludge digestion
- more applicable to codigestion with other waste

Dry Process

- more than 15% feedstock solids concentration
- usually one stage
- can operate at 35°C or 55°C
- minimal water addition
- smaller reactor
- becoming most popular choice for MSW
- more data and reference plants needed



Instantly recognisable!









Biogas as a renewable energy source



cropgen

Results: storage and pretreatment

- Some potential to increase methane production by alkaline and water-based pre-treatments, and certain spoilage organisms.
- More important, poor treatment or storage conditions reduce





biogas yields.



Digestion trials

• Single phase digestion trials on a wide range of substrates at laboratory and large scale providing valuable design data



Pilot plant trials for crops and agro-wastes





Results: single phase digestion trials

• Single phase digestion trials on a wide range of substrates at laboratory and large scale providing valuable design data



Volumetric and specific gas yields per kgVS. Trend lines based on 50-day average.





Permeating bed reactors





- Single bed systems using grass and maize have given poor results even with pH control
- Permeating bed with second stage high rate methanogenic reactors gives greater potential for stable operation and biogas production
- May be some potential for certain crop types but preliminary results indicate that overall process efficiency is likely to be poorer than for single phase mixed reactors
- Potentially an interesting mix of fermentation products





- Result from a high initial loading in the reactor
- Plug flow may limit the overall loading that can be achieved
- Give an interesting gas and acid production profile (H₂)
- May have potential for certain waste types and the concept could be further exploited for refined fuel production and biorefinery intermediates
- Still to explore very high solids systems with high recycle rates



Two phase systems



- Overall performance for the treatment of market wastes at thermophilic temperatures and the loading used shows no advantage in process stability or performance compared to single phase controls
- Uncoupling of solids and liquids retention time in a first phase mixed reactor using maize as a substrate failed to improve rates of hydrolysis and solids destruction



Process modelling

- The anaerobic digestion model 1 (ADM1) has been adopted as a basis for the establishment of:
 - Virtual Laboratory





Results: process modelling



Preliminary results with original ADM1. The model follows the course of the experiment, but the correlation is too low for practical application



Adjusted model after first manual calibration ($k_{hyd} = 1 d^{-1}$)



Energy models

m¥iewCrops : Forr	n						
	Heliar	nthus tuberosus		47			
inglishCommonName:	Jerusalem artichoke	,					
other names:						cropge	n
type: p <mark>erennial</mark>		Legume 🗌	propaga	tion: tubers			
RegoinalDistribution:							_
Most temperate and	boreal regions with a	variety of temperatur	re and rainfall re	gimes. Tolerates			
Growth requirements	:						_
soilType:							
Adapts well to most :	oil types, prefers slig	htly alkaline. Yields po	oor on heavy cla	ys particularly if th	ı	Ν	
fertiliser inputs:	nitrogen:	phosphate (P2C	05):	potash (K2O)		4	
	40-80 kg/ha	90-140 kg/h	na á	240-300 kg/ha	_		
soilpH: 5.5-7	require	dRainfall: <1270 mr	m				
sowingPeriod: tuber:	; planted in Sprinç h	arvestTime: Sept (t	ops) Jan (tubers	lengthGrowings	ōeason:		
soil Temp: 7 C	growth	Temperature:		125 days			
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller ti	je, cover with 50-100 Jbers)	mm soil. Harvest: ren	move tops, harv	est with modified p	ootato		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium:	je, cover with 50-100 Jbers)	mm soil. Harvest: rer	move tops, harv	est with modified p	ootato		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller t rhizobium: nutrients extracted f	je, cover with 50-100 Jbers) rom soil:	imm soil. Harvest: rer itrogen) p	nove tops, harv	est with modified p	ium		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller t rhizobium: nutrients extracted f	je, cover with 50-100 Jubers) 	itrogen	nove tops, harv	est with modified p	um		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller t rhizobium: nutrients extracted f	je, cover with 50-100 Jbers) rom soil:	mm soil. Harvest: rer iltrogen p	nove tops, harv ohosphate	potassi	um		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester . (smaller b rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil: Finland:	mm soll. Harvest: rer itrogen p UK:	nove tops, harv	potassi	um Spain:		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller t rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha	je, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil: 	inm soil. Harvest: ren itrogen p UK; 14.7	nove tops, harv phosphate Austr 4.6	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um Spain:		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester . (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f nutrients extracted f tDM/ha NFixation:	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers)	mm soll. Harvest: rer itrogen p UK: 14.7	nove tops, harv ohosphate Austr 4.6	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f nutrients extracted f tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses	ge, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil: Finland: 9-16 .	mm soll. Harvest: ren itrogen p UK: 14.7	nove tops, harv ohosphate Austr 4.6	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller t rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol,	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil: Finland: 9-16 : fructose and forage	mm soil. Harvest: rer itrogen p UK: 14.7 production	move tops, harv ohosphate Austr 4.6	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um Spain:		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol, comments:	je, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil:	imm soil. Harvest: ren itrogen p UK: 14.7 production	nove tops, harv ohosphate Austr 4.6	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol, comments: bioher vield when nile	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil: Finland: 9-16 ; fructose and forage nted as annual. Tube	inm soil. Harvest: ren itrogen p UK: UK: 14.7 production rs can be stored in	nove tops, harv ohosphate Austr 4.6 constraints: Scierchina afr	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um		
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol, comments: higher yield when pla ground at 0.0 if soil m	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil:	inm soil. Harvest: rer itrogen p UK: 14.7 production rs can be stored in	nove tops, harv ohosphate Austr 4.6 Constraints: Sclerotinia afte	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um		_
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol, comments: higher yield when pla ground at OC if soil m recorded biogas yield	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil: Finland: Finland: fructose and forage nted as annual. Tube ss	inm soil. Harvest: rer itrogen p UK: 14.7 production rs can be stored in	ohosphate Austr Austr 4.6 Constraints: Sclerotinia afte	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha	um		_
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol, comments: higher yield when pla ground at OC if soil m recorded biogas yield year part u	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers)	inm soil. Harvest: rer itrogen p UK: 14.7 production rs can be stored in S (%) Biogas (m2 p. crs. o c	ohosphate Austr Austr Austr Austr Sclerotinia afte Sclerotinia afte Austr Sclerotinia afte Austr	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha r 4 years 6CH4 CH4 yie	um 	a stage	
cultivationMethod: Similar to potato, ridi harvester. (smaller to rhizobium: nutrients extracted f recorded yields tDM/ha NFixation: alternative crop uses human food, alcohol, comments: higher yield when pla ground at OC if soil m recorded biogas yield year part 1096 tops	pe, cover with 50-100 ubers) rom soil:	imm soil. Harvest: rer itrogen production uK: 14.7 production stored in S (%) Biogas (m3) 0.505±0.01 0.505±0.01	ohosphate Austr Austr 4.6 Sclerotinia aftt 3/kg VS ad 9 45 61 77	a/Germany: (tops?)-16 tDM/ha ar 4 years 6CH4 CH4 yie 1 0.309	um	a stage Fresh	

- Data base of energy inputs into the cultivation of different crop types established
- Factors affecting the energy use in the process have been identified
- Equations developed to account for energy usage in the digestion process
- Energy usage model developed based on typical anaerobic digestion plant configurations and substrates



Energy balance

- Inputs / outputs
- Direct energy
- Indirect energy
- Energy balance
- Energy ratio





Direct and indirect energy

- Direct energy
 - consumption of energy directly in the production process includes:
 - fossil fuels
 - labour
- Indirect energy
 - energy which has been used in producing something then used in the production process - includes:
 - fertiliser
 - pesticides / herbicides
 - machinery



Direct & indirect energy inputs

	energy input type					
operation/input	direct	indirect				
cultivation	fuel	equipment				
fertiliser	application fuel	production, application equipment				
harvest	fuel	equipment				
fuel		production and transport				
processing	heat, power	construction				
product distribution	fuel	transport equipment				



Energy inputs in maize crop production

				energy of				
	No of			equipment		fuel used	CO ₂ indirect	
operation	operations	equipment	time (h/ha)	MJ/ha	tractor (kW)	(l/ha)	(kg/ha)	
		e de se lle v	1 000	100	00	110	5.4	
subsoil	1	subsoiler	1.333	120	90	14.6	5.4	
plough	1	plough+press	1.333	120	90	17.5	5.4	
drill/harrow	1	combined drill and harrow	0.62	158	90	3.9	7.1	
fertiliser	1	fertiliser spreader	0.36	45	55	1.2	2.0	
spray	2	sprayer	0.54	68	55	2.4	3.1	
harvest	1	forage harvester	2	420		17.5	33.6	
cart	1	trailer	2	120	55	7.8	5.4	
ensile	1	tractor and bucket	1.48	8	55	5.8	0.4	
tractor		00 KW	3 286	564			45 1	
tractor			3.200	207			40.1	
ITACION		55 KW	4.30	297			23.0	
fuel used (litr	es)			2785	5 MJ/ha	70.7	213.6	
total indirect				1920) MJ/ha		131.2	
			hours					
labour			9.7	18.8	3 MJ/ha			
seed		kg/ha	16	215	5 MJ/ha		2.4	
chemicals			(kg/ha)					
Ν			150	6045	5 MJ/ha		285.6	
P_2O_5			200	680) MJ/ha		140	
K₂O			175	1277.5	MJ/ha		79.3	
-								
packaging &	transport			1362	2 MJ/ha			
sprays			12.8	2432	2 MJ/ha		63.0	
total energ	jy input to	crop production and s	torage	16.7	′ GJ/ha		915.2	kg/ha



Crop production inputs





Digester energy flows

Main energy inputs are heat and electricity







An energy balance

	value	unit
digester capacity	2000	m ³
daily load	34.8	t/day
crop area	318	ha
crop energy requirement	5310.6	GJ/year
crop transport	93	GJ/year
parasitic heat requirement	2133	GJ/year
parasitic electricity requirement	420	GJ/year
digester embodied energy	1350	GJ/year
digestate disposal energy	259.5	GJ/year
total energy requirement	9566	GJ/year
	30	GJ/ha
biogas produced	2,331,092	m ³
methane	1,398,655	m ³
energy value	49,932	GJ/year
	157	GJ/ha





Digestate

- the digestate is what remains after the biogas has been removed
- it contains most of the nutrients of the original feedstock
- the nutrients are in a form which are more available for crop uptake
- it has a consistency similar to slurry (approx 10% solids)
- it can be separated into solid and liquid fractions



Effect of digestate use on the energy balance

	value	unit
mineral fertiliser		
crop energy requirement	16.7	GJ/ha
energy for nitrogen	6.04	GJ/ha
total energy requirement	30.1	GJ/ha
digestate fertiliser		
crop energy requirement	9.3	GJ/ha
total energy requirement	22.7	GJ/ha
methane energy value	157	GJ/ha
net energy yield		
mineral	126.9	GJ/ha
digestate	134.3	GJ/ha



Example energy comparisons

fuel	biodiesel	bioet	thanol	methane				methane
crop	OSR seed	sugar beet	wheat grain	sugar beet	wheat grain	maize	whole crop triticale	whole crop triticale
fertiliser (N kg/ha)	195	147	150	147	150	150	160	80
crop yield (fresh yield t/ha)	3	56	8	56	8	40	38	38
crop yield (t DM/ha)	3	11.5	6.9	11.5	6.9	12.6	15	15
energy for crop production (GJ/ha)	12.7	11.9	12.8	11.9	15.5	16.7	16	11.6
energy for processing (GJ/ha)	9.2	41.4	13.2	10.8	8	8	8.3	8.3
energy of fuel produced (GJ/ha)	40.4	117	61.1	124.8	89	157.1	166	166
energy ratio (output/input)	1.84	2.20	2.35	5.50	3.79	6.36	6.83	8.34
net energy produced (GJ/ha)	18.5	63.7	35.1	102.1	65.5	132.4	141.7	146.1

Elsayed, M. A., Matthews, R. and Mortimer, N. D. (2003) *Carbon and Energy Balances for a Range of Biofuels Options*, School of Environment and development, Sheffield Hallam University, B/B6/00784/REP



Potential vehicle fuel produced per ha





Potential CHP per hectare





Feedstocks for biofuel production

- for biodiesel
 - oilseed rape
 - sunflower
 - linseed
 - soya
 - peanut

• for bioethanol

- wheat
- sugar beet
- maize
- sugar cane
- lignocellulosic material

- for biogas
 - barley
 - cabbage
 - carrot
 - cauliflower
 - clover
 - elephant grass
 - flax
 - fodder beet
 - giant knotweed
 - hemp
 - horse bean
 - jerusalem artichoke
 - kale
 - lucerne
 - lupin
 - maize
 - marrow kale

- meadow foxtail
- miscanthus
- mustard
- nettle
- oats
- pea
- potato
- rape
- reed canary grass
- rhubarb
- ryegrass
- sorghum
- sugar beet
- triticale
- turnip
- verge cuttings
- fetch
- wheat





Which crops?



CO₂ and energy cycles



