CETESB Energy From Biogas April 23rd – 24th 2003



Biogas Applications



Dr Stephen P Etheridge Environmental Biotechnology Limited

Climate Change



- Climate is changing
- Not everyone agrees it is a result of human activity
- Carbon reserves being rapidly released into the atmosphere

Different countries release different amounts....





Kyoto Protocol



- 10% reduction on 1990 levels
- Can mean >30% reduction on current levels in some cases
- CDM important
- Not all non Appendix 1 countries agree with trading
- Value of credits?

Mitigation and Energy





Designers Responsibilities



- Understand the process
- Learn from mistakes
- Know the waste
- UK has bitter experience

Anaerobic Treatment



Waste + Heat (35°C/55°C)



Slow Growing Bugs...

No Sludge, COD to Biogas

90 % COD Removal ENDOTHERMIC Low COD Effluent +

Biogas (65%CH₄ + 35% CO₂)

Larger Reactors Energy Costs

Life and Death of a Microbe





Time

Optimum Digestion Temperatures





Temperature





Simplified AD Process





What Wastes Can you Treat with AD?



- Sewage
 Animal Manures
 Industrial Effluents:
 Solid Wastes: MSW etc
- COD/N/P = 100/5/1

Food Industry Paper & Pulp Industry Chemical Industry Pharmaceutical Wastes Petrochemical Steel Wastewasters

Digester Design



how do we realise the potential of biogas?

Microbial Growth



Monod Equation:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{kSX}{K_s + S}$$

 α Substrate
 α Bugs

- **S** substrate concentration
- **X** mass of microorganisms
- k maximum rate of substrate utilisation
- K_s half velocity coefficient

Digester Designs





Biomass Retention





HRT - Hydraulic Retention Time V - Volume

Q - Flow Rate

SRT - Solids Retention Time Sr - Solids in Reactor Se - Solids in Effluent



Hydraulic Limitations





Digester Performance Curve





Laboratory Evaluation





Laboratory Evaluation





Define the Problem... Waste Audit - Site Study

- Stream Identification
- Effluent Analysis
- Sampling
- Select the Right Process
 - Flow Proportional
 - Time Proportional
 - Spot
- Verification





Confectionery Plant





Flexible Liner Digestion Systems





Flexible Liner Digestion Systems











Upflow Anaerobic Sludge Blanket (UASB)











IC Reactor

Expanded Bed Digester





CASE STUDY: Brewery and Soft Drinks Effluent



Problem

- Failed effluent treatment plant
- Pressure from Water Company to reduce COD/SS
- Very high Mogden charges
- High variation in flow, COD, SS
- Due to
 - Plant corrosion
 - Poor design
 - Poor waste audit

Hall & Woodhouse Limited



Hall & Woodhouse Limited



CASE STUDY: Brewery and Soft Drinks Effluent



- Solution
 - Comprehensive waste audit (client owned)
 - Feasibility study
 - sewer or river
 - aerobic or anaerobic
 - new technologies/grants
 - New treatment plant
 - Novel heating and mixing system
 - THERMIE Grant
 - EBL design & project management
 - Client direct purchase of all equipment


Brewery Effluent



- 3,300 m3 insulated Tank
- 600-700 m3/d, COD = 3,000-6,000 mg/l
- >98%COD Removal
- Variable Volume Reactor (Monday = 1,800 m3, Friday = 3,300m³)
- Stirred Tank Reactor
- Heated with Submerged Combustion
- Venturi Mixing



Submerged Combustion





Submerged Combustion





Venturi Mixing System









Hall & Woodhouse Limited





CASE STUDY: Textile Industry Effluent



- Mill on Site for more than 190 Years (Part of Axminster Carpet Group)
- 140 Staff
- 2,900 tonnes Wool processed
- 2,000 tonnes Spun Yarn produced
- Lanolin wool grease and sheep dip pesticides in the fleeces



- Buckfast Spinning has operated a flocculation effluent treatment process for 25 years
- Wool scouring and dyeing effluents combined to give overall discharge COD of 4,000 mg/l

Effluent Characteristics



- High COD (3,500 mg/l)
- Flow 420 m³/d
- pH 6 8
- High Temperature Effluent (25-40°C)
- Trace Organophosphate Pesticides
- Colour
- Grease, Dirt, Sweat Salts, Trace Sheep Dip, Oils, Dyes, Detergents

Pre-treatment of Effluent



- Effluent stored in Holding Tanks
- Pretreatment by Acid Cracking/Flocculation
- Effluent is Centrifuged and Resulting Sludge is Landfilled
- Final Effluent is Discharged to Sewer
- COD and SS Monitored
- 70% of COD is removed by Pretreatment

Problems



- £311,000 for Discharge of Effluent to Sewer in 1997 (23% increase in last two years)
- £113,000 for on- site Effluent Treatment in 1997(excl. maintenance & parts)
- Pesticide Emissions at least < 8.0 ppb
- Future Direct Toxicity Assessment
- Sensitive Location





- Two 50m³ Reactors
- De-gas Tank prior to Discharge
- Flare/Boiler for Biogas Handling
- pH Control
- Gas Compressor for Mixing

Pilot Plant





Pilot Plant





Pilot Plant





Status and Objectives



- Biotechnology is the key to eliminating and degrading potentially harmful effluent
- Future Objectives
 - Demonstrate successful Treatment of Textile Effluent by Anaerobic Digestion
 - COD Removal (>50%)
 - Degradation of Toxic Organics and Pesticide (40-80%)
 - Colour Reduction

CASE STUDY: Cassava Processing in Asia



Problem

- 6000m3/d effluent discahrged to 72 open lagoons
- Massive methane emissions to atmosphere
- No energy capture

Solution

- New Flexible Liner Digester
- Third Party design, install, own operate
- Natural Gas to run plant
- Excess electricity to Grid

Cassava Delivery and washing





Washing and Processing





Pretreatment







Flexible Liner Digester



33



Digester Volume = 100,000m³

Alkaline Hydrolysis

pH14 150 °C

3 hours - 4 bar

WRE System



Centralised Digesters



- 20 years experience in Europe
- Well understood & proven in Denmark, Scandinavia & Germany
- 7 out of 20 biogas plants in Denmark take sewage sludge (1999)
- Track record of no disease spread (human or animal)
- Final Product is integrated into European "composting" networks
- Used to solve variety of waste management and public acceptance issues (e.g. Energy from Waste, landfill emissions, poor use of CHP, odours from spreading raw slurry, disposal of sewage sludge, food supply chain quality assurance)

Hashøj Biogas Plant (DK) - 140 tonnes/day – started operation 1994 (also takes Isopropanol & MSW fines from Copenhagen)





Hashøj Biogas Plant (1994)



- Digester 3000m3 operated at 37C
- 10 pig farms + 6 cattle farms feed 100t/d manure (one vacuum tanker)
- Industrial and other waste (abattoir, grease traps, fish processors etc.) 38t/d
- Pasteurisation at 70C (sterilised returned effluent)
- 2,200m3 gas storage
- Owned by cooperative, 17 members all stakeholders
- Electricity and hot water to two communities (38% of needs)

Kristianstad Biogas Plant (S) - 200 tonnes/day - started operation 1996 (takes source separated kitchen wastes, manures)







Loick Digester (2001)



- Digester 970m3 operated at 38C
- 35t/d @ 14% TS biomass from 700pigs, grease traps, food processing wastes, corn and rye silage
- 25-30 days HRT with 75% organic removal efficiency
- 2,640m3/d biogas to 249kWe CHP

Biogas system by Biogas Nord Ltd.



Witte Digester (1998)




Witte Digester (1998)



- Digester 1206m3 operated at 42C
- 16t/d @ 20% TS biomass from 80 cows, 1,100 turkeys, food processing wastes, fat, grease traps, vegetables
- 60 days HRT
- 2,000m3/d biogas to 3 x 110kWe CHP sets
- US\$ 600,000 cost with 25% grant
- Revenue is US\$12,000/month electric and US\$1,000 fertiliser sales
- 7 year payback quoted

Holsworthy Plant, Devon













Holsworthy Biogas Company



- 146,000 tonne/y of cattle, pig & poultry manure and food waste
- Manure from 30 farmers within approx. 5 miles radius
- Pasteurisation at 70°C for one hour
- Digestion (37°C) for 20 days HRT
- Gas production: 6 million m³ biogas (equivalent to 39m kWh)
- CHP provides on-site heat for treatment requirements
- Continual N, P & K monitoring for bio-fertiliser taken to supplying farmers



Reception Hall





The Process



- Totally enclosed (& pressurised) system after unloading
- Only manually controlled at point of 'reception pit' to ensure right mixture goes into 'mixing tank' via chopper pumps
- Automatic return (re-start) if parameters of 'pasteurisation unit' not reached
- Farmers usually operate 3 week no grazing system
- Constant Monitoring

Tankered Effluent





Barriers to Co-Digestion in the UK



- Complexity of legislation increasing
- Limited understanding by Regulators of relatively new concept
- Increasing requirements for involvement with farmers and monitoring of spreading practices
- UK has narrow focus on "composting" industry poor awareness
- Physical contamination problems when using source separated kitchen wastes (MSW)
- Classification of what is a "waste" and when does it become a product

CASE STUDY: Baguio



Feasibility Study Funded by the UK Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO)

- Waste Study
- Site Review
 - Characterisation of Benefits
 - Collection
 - Impact on Local Community
- Design Options
- Selection, Costing and Funding

Irisan Dumpsite



Waste Sampling

Waste Characteristics



Waste Category	White Truck(kg)	Yellow Truck (kg)
Paper	37	146
Plastic	53	479
Rubber/Leather	0	0
Vegetable/Organic Waste	4,564	1,193
Food Waste	0	0
Glass	14	2
Metal/Tin Cans	8	12
Textile	4	0
Inert	0	0
Wood	16	435
Special Waste/Fish & Meat Waste	0	20
Total	4,696	2,287
Bulk Density	470 kg/m3	229 kg/m3



Low Solids Digester Option



High Solids Digester Option





Two Stage Digester Option





Solids 10.7t/d



Composting Digestate







Process Characteristics



Characteristic	Value
Baguio Wet Market Waste	14 t/d
La Trinidad Wet Market Waste	11 t/d
Total	25 t/d
Assumed average Bulk Density	470 kg/m3
Volume of waste per day	53.2m3
Average Total Solids	26%
Average Volatile Solids	64%
Total Volatile Solids	16.64%
Projected Biogas Potential (at 65% CH4)	1955m3/d
Electrical Energy	160 kWe
Solid Digestate at 60% solids recovery	3,900t/y
Compost including bulking agent	7,800t/y

Process Economics



	PhP (million)	£'000
Revenues		
- Tipping Fee	3.47	50
- Electricity	4.42	63
- Compost	8.18	117
	16.07	230
Operating Costs	10.72	153
Revenue	5.3	230
Total Project Costs	42.11	601

Baguio Project Development



Phase 1 : 25t/d Wet Market Waste

Phase 2 : + 70t/d 50% Baguio MSW

Phase 3 : +70t/d 50% Baguio MSW

MSW Treatment





Akras Herb & Essence Waste





Anaerobic Digestion of High Solids Wastes





Anaerobic Digestion of MSW







Overview of renewables support measures to date



- NFFO introduced in 1990 Electricity Act
- 5 Orders (& 3 in Scotland, 2 in NI)
- over 3600 MW contracted
- only 950 MW built so far
- low prices
- long period of consultation
- Start of Renewables Obligation



- Competitive tendering for banker-friendly contracts
- Bankers became familiar with renewables and NFFO contracts
- Supported range of technologies
- kick started industry & brought prices down
- but commissioning very slow

NFFO (1 - 3) and AD



- NFFO1
- 3 contracts awarded for AD projects (NI SG) All commissioned.
 - 0.88 MW, Heathfield, Devon
 - 0.17 MW, Ham Sewage Treatment Works, Somerset
 - 3MW, Avonmouth Sewage Treatment Works, Avon
- NFFO2 & 3 No AD

• NFFO4, 6 contracts awarded for AD projects Status as of April 2002

- LRZ Ltd
 - Eye Airfield 1.05 No PA made
- AGTEC Ltd
 - Spalford ADS, Lincs 1 No PA made
 - Whitchurch Hydro ADS, Shropshire 2 No PA made
 - Hydro Leeming AD, N. Yorkshire 0.5 PA approved
 - Hydro Seamer ADS, N Yorkshire
 0.6 No PA made
- Holsworthy Biogas Company
 - Holdsworthy, Devon
 1.43
 Commissioned
- NFFO5 AD not eligible to enter

Which RE sources are eligible?



- All non thermal RE sources (excluding hydro >20MW)
- Various restrictions on Biomass
- Where MSW is a fuel only gasification, pyrolysis or AD technology qualifies.
- With exception of certain hydro projects, nothing built before 1990, unless refurbished
- If it has a NFFO contract which was not terminated properly
- AD in (provided OK re. bullet points 4 & 5)



- German Renewable Energy Act (1.4.2000)
- Electricity 20 year min price
- 30% capital refund after construction (grant)
- Long term soft loan


- 150 developers and installers of new systems
- 1000 new plants installed
- > 2000 new jobs
- now stopped...





Biogas Development



Biogas incentives in Germany



Compensation in Cent including 1% annual reduction

	2002	2003	2004	2005
Up to 500 kWe	10.1	10.0	9.9	9.8
Up to 5 MWe	9.1	9.0	8.9	8.8
Up to 20 MWe	8.6	8.5	8.4	8.4

Conclusions



- Technology available and developing
- Poor implemention lack of understanding
- Needs careful incentivisation
- Barriers public perception, scale, cost
- Developments new forms of ownership, project development and operation



The End