Biomass Environmental Analysis in Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS) Modeling

Jorge Izar-Tenorio^{1,2}, Roksana Mahmud^{1,2}, Ashley Cutshaw^{1,2}, Rachel Nie^{1,2}, Xinyao Shen^{1,2}, Derrick Carlson^{1,2}, Michael Whiston^{1,2}, Matthew Jamieson¹ ¹U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, Pittsburgh, PA 15236; ²NETL Support Contractor, Pittsburgh, PA 15236

Introduction

- The BECCS Screening Tool V2 is an Excel-based tool that aims to provide an update to the 2021 version by examining the performance, environmental impact, and economics of co-firing biomass and pulverized coal in power plants.
- When combined with carbon capture, co-firing of biomass with coal can produce a system with zero or even negative greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Methods

- Biomass unit processes were created for nine biomass types*, 10 U.S. farming regions**, rain-fed/irrigated farming, and various post-harvest pretreatment options.
- Includes Aspen-simulated results for a 650-MW power plant with an 85% capacity factor, various biomass co-firing percentages (20, 35, 49, 100%), and carbon capture percentages (0, 90, 99%).

	values that cannot be adjusted		
Blue cells represent drop down menus Green cells represent user defined values			
Inputs	BECCS Scenario 1	BECCS Scenario 2	Default Value
Coal Type	Bituminous	Bituminous	
Biomass Moisture Content	50.0%	70.0%	
Carbon Storage	Saline Aquifer	Saline Aquifer	
Biomass Type	Hybrid Poplar	Energy Cane	
Region	Delta States	Southeast	
Processing	Chipped & Torrefied	Chipped, Dried & Pelletized	SRWC: Chipped& Dried Herbaceous: Raw & Dried
Biomass Mass % (Co-Firing)	49%	49%	
Carbon Capture (%)	99%	99%	
Global Warming Potential Method	AR6 100-yr		
Do you want to input biomass?	Νο	No	No
Annual Biomass Yield (kg/acre-year)	9533	4808	Hybrid Poplar, Delta States: 4808.08 kg/acre-year
Annual Biomass field (kg/acie-year)	9000	4000	Energy Cane, Southeast: 9533.46 kg/acre-year
Do you want to input Biomass Harvest Loss Rate?	Νο	Νο	No
Biomass Harvest Loss Rate	0.05	0.05	0.05
Biomass Transport Distance (miles)	100	100	100
CO2 Transport Distance (mile)	50	50	50
Do you want to include irrigation?	Νο	Νο	No

Dashboard tab selections

- Environmental impacts are evaluated using TRACI 2.1 factors and eight different Global Warming Potential (GWP) methods combining AR4, AR5, and AR6 for 20-yr or 100-yr time horizons.
- Water consumption is evaluated using the Available Water Remaining (AWARE) factors.
- Land use by each biomass type is shown in a map.

* Biomass types include Biomass Sorghum, Corn Stover, Eucalyptus, Energy Cane, Forest Thinnings, Hybrid Poplar, Southern Yellow Pine, Switchgrass, and Willow

** U.S. farming regions include Appalachia, Corn Belt, Delta States, Lake States, Mountain, Northeast, Northern Plains, Pacific, Southeast, Southern Plains



Comparison of Hybrid Poplar and Energy Cane shows that the latter has a greater environmental impact than the former in most categories.



Regional Water-Scarcity				
Select Month:	January			
		Scenario 1	Scenario 2	
Process	Net Consumption (m3/month)	Regional Water-Scarcity Footprint (m3 eq./month)	Net Consumption (m3/month) Regional Water-Scarcity Footprin	
Biomass production	8.85E+02	2.10E+02	3.49E+03	1.37E+03
Biomass processing	1.71E+05	4.06E+04	3.71E+05	1.45E+05
Power generation	1.50E+06	3.56E+05	1.53E+06	6.00E+05
CO2 transport and storage	4.69E+04	1.11E+04	4.49E+04	1.76E+04
Total	1.72E+06	4.08E+05	1.95E+06	7.65E+05



Disclaimer: This project was funded by the United States Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, in part, through a site support contract. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor the support contractor, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Research & Innovation Center



Results

Water Consumption/Scarcity and Land Use Results

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	
7.14E+08	4.03E+08	
1.76E+05	9.95E+04	

Scenario 1: Hybrid Poplar

Scenario 2: **Energy Cane**

Conclusion

The BECCS Screening Tool V2 allows users to compare various emissions potentials, water consumption and scarcity, and land use for nine biomass types in multiple U.S. farming regions for a co-firing application with coal and biomass in a 650 MW power plant with a saline aquifer for carbon storage.

Science & Engineering To Power Our Future









ATIONAL