

# Pilot plant reliability metrics for grinding and fast pyrolysis of woody residues

Daniel Carpenter, Vicki Thompson, Katie Gaston, Neal Yancey

October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019

NREL/PR-5100-75328



# Outline

- Background & Motivation
- Feedstock-Conversion Interface Consortium (FCIC)
- Objectives of Pilot-Scale Tests
- Materials and Methods
- Experimental Results
- Summary and Conclusions



# It Takes a Village



Tim Dunning

Katie Gaston

Chris Golubieski

Ray Hansen

Rebecca Jackson

Matt Oliver

Marc Pomeroy

Kristin Smith



Vicki Thompson

John Aston

Jeff Lacey

Neal Yancey

Tyler Westover



Pacific Northwest  
NATIONAL LABORATORY

Proudly Operated by **Battelle** Since 1965

Mike Thorson

Huamin Wang

<https://fcic.inl.gov/>

Mike Resch

Ed Wolfrum

Liz Moore

Beau Hoffman

Mark Ellis

*This work was supported by the **Bioenergy Technologies Office (BETO)** at the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

***National Renewable Energy Laboratory** is operated by The Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC under Contract no. DE-AC36-08-GO28308.*


***Idaho National Laboratory** is operated by Battelle under contract no. DE-AC07-05ID14517 with the Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office.*

*The views expressed in the article do not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government.*



# Background

- **Problem:** Most pioneer biorefineries have failed
- **Why?** (Mostly) moving biomass is hard! 'Real-world' feedstocks are not well understood
- **Feedstock Conversion Interface Consortium (FCIC):**
  - 9 National Laboratories
  - Goal: Understand how biomass variability (chemical, physical, mechanical) impacts critical unit ops
- **Outcomes:**
  - **Fundamentals** of feedstock-process interactions
  - **Scaling** relations
  - Valuation of **intermediates**
  - Improved ***Operational Reliability***



*Adapted from biomass-to-gasoline conceptual design\**

\*NREL/TP-5100-62402, PNNL-23822, 1-189



# Experimental Approach


- How do we measure process reliability (or productivity)?
- What feedstock attributes can we control?
- 2 x 2 matrix
- Collect data for:
  - Process variables
  - Material characterization
  - Observational**(interventions, downtime, etc.)**

	Moisture at grinder →	
Ash Content ↑	HALM	HAHM
	10% 3-4%	30% 3-4%
	LALM	LAHM
	10% <1%	30% <1%



# Forest Residue Sourcing

- Commercially harvested
- Debarked loblolly pine (low ash)
- Loblolly pine tops/limbs (high ash residues)
- Chipped to 2"
- Moisture at harvest: ~50%
- Age at harvest: 11-25 yr



# Preprocessing (INL BFNUF)




***Biomass Feedstock National User Facility***




# Preprocessing Process Flow

Throughput: 5 ton/h

1. Grind to  $\frac{3}{4}$ "
2. Dry to 10% or 30%
3. Hammer mill to  $\frac{1}{4}$ " screen
4. Dry all to  $<10\%$




# Fast Pyrolysis (NREL TCPDU)



***Thermal & Catalytic Process Development Unit***






# Fast Pyrolysis Process Flow



- **Throughput: 0.5 ton/day**
- **Pyrolysis Temperature: 500°C**
  - **Average Residence Time: < 3 s**
  - **Condensation: Spray Quench**



# Grinder Throughput & Energy Use




\*2x grinder overloads w/ low ash


\*6x grinder overloads w/ high moisture



# Feedstock Properties




- Wood particles in high-ash samples appears smoothed
- High moisture samples ~20% larger mean particle size



*Particle size distributions*




# Pyrolysis Operations




# Operator Interventions

- Significant variation between feedstocks
- **High-Ash/Low-Moisture**, required fewest interventions
- On-stream factors:
  - ✓ **LALM – 0.57**
  - ✓ **HALM – 0.71**
  - ✓ **HAHM – 0.58**
  - ✓ **LAHM – 0.59**



# Pyrolysis Throughput & Yield




- Mass Balances: 83-89%
- **High-ash** produced:
  - 3-4% more water
  - More char
  - More light gases



# Pyrolysis Oil Quality


- **High-moisture** feedstocks  
→ **Higher aldehydes** in oil
- **High-ash** feedstocks  
→ **Lower sugar** in oil  
(consistent with alkali  
metal-catalyzed reactions)




***GC-MS Analysis of Pyrolysis Oils***



# Combined System Performance




System throughput



- Hydrotreating yields are similar
- H<sub>2</sub> consumption varies



# 'Hydrotreatability' of the oil



- Catalyst life varies (**carbonyl** vs. time)
- **High-ash** oils have **higher sulfur**
- But...**low-ash** feedstocks have *more* sulfur...



# Summary & Conclusions


- **High-Ash/Low Moisture** feedstock had highest throughput
- **Preprocessing** throughput (INL BFNUF) = 31-48% of nameplate capacity (5 T/hr)
- **Conversion** throughput (NREL TCPDU) = 57-72% of nameplate capacity (20 kg/hr)
- **Overall** throughput (preprocessing x conversion to oil) was 18-35% of nameplate capacity
- **Yield** to pyrolysis oil varied between 46-53% ( $g_{\text{daf oil}}/g_{\text{biomass}}$ )
- Combined performance/efficiency of the entire process must be considered



# Acknowledgements



We have  
oil!



# *Supplemental Material*




# Feedstock Source and Preprocessing

	Clean Pine	Forest Residues
Sample:	Clean Loblolly Pine	Loblolly Pine Residues
Harvest Site:	Screven, GA; 3/27/18	Edgefield County, SC; 3/26/18
Moisture Content:	49.3% at harvest	50.9% at harvest
Anatomical Fraction:	Chips of de-barked stem / bole, 11-25 years of age	Loblolly in-woods tops, ~7-in. dib at large end, 11-25 years of age
Harvest Equipment:	TIGERCAT 724G Feller buncher, TIGERCAT 630E grapple skidder, Peterson Pacific 5000H Disc Chipper with flail chains	CAT 563D Feller buncher, CAT 535D grapple skidder, CAT 559C knuckleboom loader, MORBARK 40/36 drum knife chipper
Harvest Operations:	Debarked, chipped, 2-in. nominal, ~23 tons (wet) loaded directly to trailer	Tops removed and placed in a pile, chipped 2-in. nominal, ~22 tons (wet) loaded directly into trailer
Screening:	NO	NO



# Plugging at Scrubber



- Graphs are differential pressure across scrubber inlet
- Low-ash and high-ash feedstocks have different “plugging profiles”
- Suggests different condensation mechanism or composition of deposits





# Feedstock Analysis

Properties	LALM	LAHM	HALM	HAHM
<b>Proximate analysis (wt-% dry, ash free) unless otherwise noted</b>				
Moisture (%)	9.7	8.13	8.7	8.08
Ash (wt% dry)	0.52	0.49	2.52	1.55
Volatile Matter	84.6	84.66	80.57	81.24
Fixed Carbon	14.9	14.85	16.91	17.21
<b>Ultimate analysis (wt-% dry, ash free)</b>				
C	51.0	51.29	50.57	50.90
H	6.03	6.12	5.79	5.75
O (by diff.)	42.3	41.96	41.01	41.61
N	0.05	0.01	0.16	0.13
S	0.14	0.14	0.06	0.06
<b>Compositional analysis (wt-%, dry basis)</b>				
Extractives	3.14	3.15	4.32	4.65
Glucan	40.47	40.25	35.72	34.98
Xylan	6.51	6.43	7.15	6.90
Galactan	2.18	2.39	2.69	3.16
Arabinan	1.93	1.55	1.96	1.35
Mannan	12.24	11.63	10.66	10.51
Lignin	32.84	33.74	36.00	36.25
<b>Particle Size Distribution (mm)</b>				
Geometric Mean	1.16	1.26	1.14	1.34
D10	0.3	0.36	0.25	0.38
D50	0.94	1.01	0.93	1.06
D90	1.95	2.05	2.53	2.49

Feedstock	LALM	LAHM	HALM	HAHM
<b>Product Yields (wt-% of biomass fed, wet basis)</b>				
Total Liquid	62.3	69.6	54.1	60.2
Char	11.2	13.8	14.7	14.1
Gas	12.6	12.8	14.9	13.2
Mass balance	86.1	88.2	83.3	89.1
<b>FP Oil Analysis (wt-% as received)</b>				
Ash	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
C	43.1	44.0	41.1	42.2
H	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5
N	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
O (by diff.)	49.5	48.5	51.3	50.1
S	—	0.01	0.02	0.02
Water	23.5	20.5	26.4	24.5
Carbonyl (mol/kg)	5.78	6.54	5.51	5.78
TAN (mg KOH/g)	68.3	67.9	66.1	67.3
Viscosity (cp, 40 °C)	31.8	41.7	21.4	30.1
Density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> , 20 °C)	1.23	1.23	1.21	1.22



# High-T Results (Mass Balances)



# High-T Results (Mass Balances)

