Improving the Economic Viability of Biological CO<sub>2</sub> Utilization by Improved Algae Productivity & Integration with Wastewater Treatment

Cooperative Agreement No: DE-FE0030822





Illinois Sustainable Technology Center 🕴 📕 ILLINOIS



# **Basic Project Information for DE-FE0030822**



- Title: Improving the Economic Viability of Biological Utilization of Coal Power Plant CO<sub>2</sub> by Improved Algae Productivity & Integration w/ Wastewater Treatment
  - DOE Program Manager: Andy Aurelio
  - Lead Organization: University of Illinois- Illinois Sustainable Technology Center
  - Primary Collaborating Organization: Helios-NRG
    - CO-Pi: Ravi Prasad, Fred Harrington
- DOE Funding Program DE-FOA-0001622: Applications for Technologies Directed at Utilizing Carbon Dioxide from Coal Fired Power Plants
  - Total Project Value: \$ 1,249,873 Government : \$999,536 Cost Share: \$250,337
  - Currently in Budget Period 2 (BP2)- October 1, 2018 September 30, 2019
- Major Project Objectives & Goals
  - End of project performance goals
    - 35 g/m<sup>2</sup>day biomass productivity (vs 8.5 g/m<sup>2</sup> day DOE Baseline- 2015 State of Technology)
    - 70% CO<sub>2</sub> capture efficiency
    - \$470/ton algal biomass projected n<sup>th</sup> plant (vs \$1,641/ton current DOE Baseline)



2





### **BP2 Project Tasks in Context of Process Flow Diagram**





NATIONAL

#### Techno-Economic Rationale: Integrating wastewater (WW) treatment can make algal animal feed cost-effective

Harvest & Dewater

\$82/DT

\$50/DT



Ponds/Inoculum: 2015 DOE Case \$1,359/DT Proposed Case \$331/DT



**Total Biomass Cost** 

\$1641 /DT

\$537 /DT



extra drying cost (\$330/DT)

# Task 4- BP2 Algae Testing Plan Overview



- Transition from lab batch to continuous (w/liquid transfer)
- Transition from artificial lighting to sunlight (Greenhouse)
  - Quantify sunlight variations and impact on performance
- Greenhouse tests w/ simulated flue gas
  - 12%  $CO_2$  + SO<sub>X</sub>, NO<sub>X</sub> & 5 heavy metals (Cu, Cr, Hg, As, Se)
- Investigate and optimize greenhouse cultivation operations
  - Algae concentration effects on productivity
  - Gas/liquid flow rates effect on CO<sub>2</sub> capture & productivity
  - Long term stability & performance in greenhouse
- Demonstrate weekly average productivity of 25 g/m<sup>2</sup>/day with 70%  $CO_2$  capture simultaneously for a simulated Multi-Stage Continuous (MSC) reactor system

#### Lab Side-Lit & Multi-Stage Continuous System









• Algae tolerance to key post-FGD flue gas contaminants demonstrated

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

ENERGY

• Wastewater can beneficially replace purchased nutrients to reduce costs

Illinois Sustainable Technology Center



Helios-NRG, LLC

# **Optimizing Long-term Greenhouse Operations**





- Fluctuating light intensity results in large variations in algae growth (productivity) and CO<sub>2</sub> uptake
- Resilience of system demonstrated despite natural and abnormal fluctuations in greenhouse conditions

Air supply disruption led to ~100% CO2 in feed



**ILLINOIS** 



### Demonstration of CO2 Capture and Productivity Goals



#### **Greenhouse Operation**



BP2 algae cultivation targets met  $\rightarrow$  Weekly average of 30 g/m<sup>2</sup>/day productivity achieved simultaneous with 74% CO<sub>2</sub> capture demonstrated for a 2-stage MSC system







- Bench-scale open cell forward osmosis system was developed to test algae dewatering
- Biomass dewatered to above 20% solid content without pre-treatment in reasonable time
- Dewatering efficiency:  $1 \text{ M MgCl}_2 > 20\% \text{ MgSO}_4 \sim 1 \text{ M NaCl}$

10

Improving F.O. dewatering process for cost and energy inputs



Effect of Feedstock Solids Content on Flux



• Forward osmosis dewatering efficiency drops as culture concentration increases

Illinois Sustainable Technology Center 🛛 👖 ILLINOIS

J.S. DEPARTMENT OF

ENERGY

Helios-NRG, LLC

### Improving F.O. dewatering process energy inputs



1 m <sup>3</sup> 1% 1 <sup>st</sup> sta	age F.O.	3% 0.3 m <sup>3</sup> 2 <sup>nd</sup> stage F.O ■ Source/Sink	20% 0.05 m <sup>3</sup>
	Starting Solid (%)	Ending Solid (%)	Energy consumption (kWh/m3)
Settling Pond	0.1	1	-
Membrane	1	13	0.04
Centrifuge	13	20	1.35
Forward Osmosis 1 <sup>st</sup> Stage	1	3	0.26
Forward Osmosis 2 <sup>nd</sup> Stage	3	20	0.57

\* 2-stage F.O. process using natural brines or sea water can greatly reduce dewatering energy inputs





#### Task 6. Characterize algal biomass for HTL & animal feed Proximate analysis of flue gas fed algal biomass H0322 H1903 9% 12% Carbohydrate Carbohydrate 9% 31% Crude Protein Crude Protein 1% 14% 45% Crude Fat Crude Fat 5% Crude Fiber Crude Fiber 36% Ash Ash 38%

• Both species are rich in protein and carbohydrates, low in fat, which is suitable for animal feeds



ILLINOIS



ATIONAL

# Heavy metals in algae grown w/ flue gas contaminants



Compare with animal feed maximum tolerable level (MTL)

Minerals	H-1903 Cu, Cr, As, Hg, Se (ppm)	Poultry Feed MTL (ppm)	Swine Feed MTL (ppm)	Cattle Feed MTL (ppm)	Fish Feed MTL (ppm)
As	2.18	30	30	30	5
Cd	<1	10	10	10	10
Cr	1.16	100	100	100	3,000 <sup>*</sup> as CrO
Со	<2	25	100	25	
Cu	46.6	250	250	40	100
Hg	0.5	1	2	2	1
Pb	<5	10	10	100	10
Ni	<5	250	250	100	50
Se	0.54	3	4	5	2
Zn	11.3	500	1000	500	250

• Algal biomass grown with flue gas contaminant meets most animal feed limits for metals and it can be blended with other feeds to mitigate any heavy metal concerns



## Cattle digestibility test with algal biomass

NATIONAL ENERGY TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

- In vitro fermentation assay
  - Rumen fluid from cannulated steer
  - Incubate samples for 24 hours



#### • Results

- Grinding with mortar and pestle increased In-vitro dry matter digestability (IVDMD)
- Looking into other biomass treatments to increase digestability
- Working to reduce run to run variations

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

#### Preprocessing Effects on Digestability



Helios-NRG, LLC

#### 15

### **Biomass elemental analysis and HTL Performance**



#### Carbon Distribution in HTL Products

	H1903	H0322	
C (% dw)	52.44	46.83	H19
H (% dw)	7.54	7.11	ЦОЗ
O (% dw)	35.52	40.98	1103
N (% dw)	4.50	5.10	
Biomass Heating Value (MJ/kg)	22.15	18.66	
HTL Biocrude oil Fraction	0.347	0.312	H19
HTL Biocrude oil HHV (MJ/kg)	35.1	34.8	HOS

- H1903 biomass was preferable for biocrude production
- Most of N is distributed to HTL aqueous product







# Task 7. Demonstrate ability to concentrate & recycleHTL aqueous phase (PHWW)





### Effect of recycling PHWW on biocrude yield & quality



	Algae Only	Algae + Run 1 Retentate (20%)	Algae + Run 2 Retentate (20%)
Biocrude Oil Yield Fraction	0.349	0.368	0.371
C (%)	70.64	73.74	73.42
H (%)	8.78	9.38	9.12
N (%)	5.63	5.59	5.72
O (%)	14.95	11.29	11.74
HHV (MJ/kg oil)	33.7	36.3	35.7

- 6% increase in biocrude yield w/ PHWW recycle
- Small N increase in the biocrude oil



- ~60% of PHWW organics captured in NF retentate
- Significant N also captured in NF retentate (~50%)
  - May not be desirable → Zeolite treatment can mitigate



#### TEA: Integrating WW treatment can make algal biofuels cost-effective



#### Algal biomass for fuel

Algal Biomass Supply Cost: \$15.15/gge (\$1,641/DT) Algal Biomass Supply Cost: \$5.25/gge (\$537/DT)



Aqueous Product Treatment Catalytic Hydrothermal Gasification \$1.54/gge Nanofiltration

\$0.28/gge





		Flupuseu
<b>Biofuel Production Cost</b>	Baseline	case for BP2
	(2015 case)	
Algal Biomass	\$15.15 /gge	\$ 5.25/gge
Hydrothermal Liquefaction	\$ 1.18/gge	\$ 1.18/gge
Bio-oil Upgrade	\$ 0.44/gge	\$ 0.44/gge
Aqueous post treatment	\$ 1.54/gge	\$ 0.28/gge
Balance of plant	\$ 0.29/gge	\$ 0.29/gge
TOTAL Biofuel Cost	\$ 18.60/gge	\$ 7.44/gge

Bio-oil Upgrade \$0.44/gge





**Revenue for Algal Biofuels** 

CO <sub>2</sub> Removal:	\$ 0 - \$ 0.6 /gge
Nutrient Removal:	\$ 3.7 - \$ 7.2 /gge
Fuel Selling Price:	\$ 2.0 - \$ 3.5 /gge
	\$ 5 7 - \$ 11 3/gge







# **Project Milestones for Budget Period 2**



Budget Period	Task #	Mile- stone #	Milestone Description	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Comments
2	4	T4.1	Single stage test of MSC representation with >70% CO <sub>2</sub> capture and >25 g/m <sup>2</sup> /d	9/30/2019	7/30/2019	Simulated Multi-stage CO <sub>2</sub> capture demonstrated >70% w/ single-stage tests
2	5	T5.1	Dewater algal biomass >15% solid content through forward osmosis using <1.35 kwh/m <sup>3</sup>	9/30/2019		In-Progress- >20% solids content shown w/ min. energy input of 0.83 kWh/m <sup>3</sup> when seawater available
2	6	T6.1	Characterize algal species that biomass heating value > 18MJ/kg and protein content > 30%	3/31/2019	3/20/2019	Completed- 2 species sample analyzed
2	6	T6.2	Demonstrate a minimum in vitro dry matter disappearance of 40% for algal strains digested in rumen fluid	9/30/2019		In-Progress- H0322 ground sample had >45% dry matter disappearance, but the result was not yet repeated
2	7	T7.1	Recycle >50% of carbon from HTL aqueous and increase biocrude oil yield by > 5%	9/30/2019	6/30/2019	Completed- ~60% of carbon from HTL-aq recycled to enhance oil by 5%







# **Project Success Criteria for Each Budget Period**



Decision Point	Date	Success Criteria
		Algal Productivity > 25 g/m <sup>2</sup> /d (weekly average)
		with Simulated Flue gas containing 12% CO2,
G/N-1		SOX, NOX and representative levels of heavy
Go/No-Go Budget Period 1	9/30/2018	metals Hg, Se, As, Cu and Cr
		Algal Productivity > 25 g/m <sup>2</sup> /d (weekly average)
		and >70% CO2 capture with Simulated Flue gas
		containing 12% CO2, SOX, NOX and
G/N-2		representative levels of heavy metals Hg, Se, As,
Go/No-Go Budget Period 2	9/30/2019	Cu and Cr
G/N-3		Integrated Application of Project Technologies w/
Go/No-Go Budget Period 3	9/30/2020	Projected Cost of Algal Biomass < \$470 /dry ton









Lance Schideman schidema@Illinois.edu 217-390-7070

© 2014 University of Illinois Board of Trustees. All rights reserved. For more permission information, contact the Illinois Sustainable Technology Center, a Division of the Prairie Research Institute.

istc.illinois.edu



