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Phase 1 Goal Statement

• Develop the capability for 2500 gal/ac-yr of biofuel intermediates via HTL from microalgae grown at an existing raceway wastewater treatment facility in California’s San Joaquin Valley.
• Determine productivity with CO$_2$ addition and demonstrate bioflocculation/settling harvesting.
• Model the process, TEA, and LCA.
• Plan for Phase 2 in collaboration with the facility owner.
What does it take to reach 2500 gal/ac-yr?

Two main unknowns are to be determined in field studies:

Biofuel Intermediate Goal:
2500 gal/ac-yr = 6.4 mL/m²-d = 6 g oil/m²-d

HTL Conversion:
?? g oil / g biomass

Productivity:
?? g biomass / m²-day

What kind of productivity?
With wastewater, we have gross and net.
1 - Project Overview

• A Central Valley town (pop. 11,000) operates a 7-acre algal raceway facility for municipal wastewater treatment.

• Nine 3.5-m$^2$ raceways, settling units, and drying beds (below right) were installed to work on optimization of productivity and harvesting.
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Timeline

- Started October 2013
- Ends June 2016
- 40% complete

Barriers

- Ft-A. Feedstock availability & cost
- Ft-D. Sustainable Harvesting
- Ft-N. Algal Feedstock Processing

Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>FY 13 Costs</th>
<th>FY 14 Costs</th>
<th>Total Planned Funding (FY 15-Project End Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE Funded</td>
<td>$1.6m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>683k</td>
<td>948k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost Share (Comp.)*</td>
<td>$0.5m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>236k</td>
<td>259k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partners

- Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (62%)
- PNNL (22%)
- SNL (16%)
- MicroBio Engineering, Inc. (cost share)
- Delhi County Water District (site host)
Site of Cal Poly Algal Biomass Yield Project

Delhi, Calif. Algae Wastewater Treatment Plant

Facultative Ponds

Settling Ponds

Paddle wheels

Two 3.5-acre raceways
In Phase 2, the Delhi plant will be upgraded to reach DOE’s initial 2,500 gallon per acre per year goal.
At full-scale, Delhi algae are coagulated, settled, and solar dried. ~100,000 gallons of 3% solids algae in decanted settling basin. Solar dried algae. New concrete drying pad.
2 – Approach (Technical)

TASK 0: Process and Data Validation
(Lead: Cal Poly)

TASK 1: Develop models to identify high-performance strains and culture methods
(Lead: M. Huesemann, PNNL)

TASK 2: Maximize algal productivity and harvesting efficiency in Delhi pilot ponds
(Lead: Cal Poly and T. Lane, Sandia)

TASK 3: Full-scale raceway hydraulic characterization
(Lead: Cal Poly and MicroBio Engineering)

TASK 4. Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates
(Lead: Doug Elliott, PNNL, and Cal Poly)

TASK 5. Scale-up engineering analysis, modeling, and planning
(Lead: MicroBio Engineering and Cal Poly)

TASK 6. Stage Gate Review and Preparations
(Lead: Cal Poly, with PNNL, SNL, and MicroBio Engineering)
2 – Approach (Management)

• Critical success factors
  – Technical: Achieving productivity, harvesting efficiency, and conversion to fuel sufficient to produce 2,500 gallons per acre per year, initially.

• Top challenges: Each of the technical success factors above require advancement.

• Management approach:
  – 19 milestones and a Go/No-Go.
  – Knowledge integration and vigorous collaboration among partners on multiple DOE projects. Eyes open for more partners.
  – Research economy-of-scale at Cal Poly in ABY, ASAP, and ATP³ projects.
Edge effects are minimized with transparent paddles and dividers.

Scale-up value is diminished by edge effects such as shading, wall growth, and heat transfer.
Remote control and data logging capabilities

Feed rates, CO₂ dosing, paddle speeds, etc. can be changed on timer basis or remotely.
Task 1: Develop models to identify high-performance strains and culture methods

**Goal:** Identify pond operation conditions (pH, HRT) to maximize algal biomass productivity

**Approach:** Use PNNL’s Biomass Assessment Tool (BAT) to identify optimum pH and dilution rate for *Chlorella sorokiniana* (DOE 1412)

---

**Step 1:** Use climate model to generate light intensity and temperature scripts

**Step 2:** Modify biomass growth model to include pH effects

**Step 3:** Determine algal productivity at the Delhi site using the Biomass Growth Model (BGM) as a function of pH, season, and dilution rate
Chlorella DOE 1412 modeling for dilution & pH optimization, followed by field validation.

7.5 g/m²-day annual average productivity at 0.2 and 0.3/day

- 30% increase over ~5.7 g/m²-day productivity at 0.1 and 0.4/day
- 40% increase in annual average productivity at pH 7 versus pH 8 (7.6 vs. 5.4 g/m²-day)
- DOE 1412 also being studied at LANL.
Bench-top pond simulator is under development to increase strain testing throughput.

Temperature and light control systems are working.

Next: Validate using outdoor pond cultivation data (northern AZ)
Task 2: We run three conditions in triplicate to maximize productivity. Current experiment:

- **North**: In: Primary effluent
  - HRT: 4.5-day (0.22/d)

- **Middle**: In: Facultative Pond eff.
  - HRT: 4.5-day (0.22/d)

- **South**: In: Primary effluent
  - HRT: 2-day (0.50/d)
Water source also affects temperature.

Middle pond is fed from deep a Facultative pond with more stable temperatures.
We are working to minimize differences with the triplicate ponds.

Twice-weekly calibration and independent checks.
We are working to minimize differences between pilot and full-scale raceways.

Pilot pH setpoints were adjusted to match HRPI.
Pilot vs. full-scale: Gross productivities differed due to higher suspended solids in the full-scale pond.

1.2-ha Inner Raceway vs. triplicate “M” pilot raceways also fed Facultative Pond water.
Pilot vs. full-scale: Net productivities were similar until recently but mostly negative!

The spring and summer comparison should be telling.
Gross productivity ranged 10-45 g/m$^2$-day during Dec-Mar. Some growth is fueled by influent organic matter.

Net productivity

- 5 g/m$^2$-d in Nov-Jan
- 20-25 g/m$^2$-d in Feb.

Gross productivity of triplicate ponds: S = 2-day and N = 3-day hydraulic residence time
Community genetic data (Sandia) may lead to better control of productivity and bioflocculation.

Preliminary relationships identified via combined 16s and 18s heat maps.
Different operating conditions are producing distinct communities. More substantial insights are expected as data analysis proceeds.

"RAS" is return activated sludge for comparison.

No *Vampirovibrio* in Cal Poly wastewater ponds, but is present in some Cal Poly ATP³ ponds. Not implicated in Cal Poly crashes.
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

HTL System Configuration:

Insert for Run 1 and 2a
No insert for Run 2b

Biocrude separated while removing product from collector
## Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

Demonstrate and optimize conversion of wastewater grown microalgae feedstock into a biofuel intermediate suitable for further upgrading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedstock source, harvesting mechanism, photo</th>
<th><strong>Run 1:</strong> 10 wt% TS</th>
<th><strong>Run 2:</strong> 18 wt% TS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bioflocculated, then centrifuged thickened from CP WW ponds.</td>
<td>Bio-flocculated, then solar-dried from CP WW ponds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biochemical characterization

- **Run 1:**
  - Protein: 35%
  - Carbs.: 16%
  - FAMEs: 6%
  - Ash: 12%
  - Other: 12%

- **Run 2:**
  - Protein: 39%
  - Carbs.: 10%
  - FAMEs: 
  - Ash: 15%
  - Other: 15%
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

Feed preparation: Material caught by 20 mesh in-line strainer after homogenization
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

**Results:** Run 2a and 2b operation summary

Run 2a terminated due to excessive solid accumulation in CSTR; relatively low solids accumulation in filter housing

CSTR insert removed in Run 2b, yields clean impeller and solids in filter
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

Gaseous emissions characterized for air permitting

Gas is predominantly CO₂

Unlikely to trigger air-pollution controls
## Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

### Mass Yields (Dry, Ash Free, Normalized):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Run 1</th>
<th>Run 2a</th>
<th>Run 2b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Balance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Yield, Mass (N)</td>
<td>$g_{oil}/g_{fd}$</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Yield, Mass (N)</td>
<td>$g_{solid}/g_{fd}$</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Yield, Mass (N)</td>
<td>$g_{gas}/g_{fd}$</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq. Yield, Mass (N)</td>
<td>$g_{aq}/g_{fd}$</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does it take to reach 2500 gal/ac-yr?

Two main unknowns are to be determined in field studies. Below are PRELIMINARY results.

Biofuel Intermediate Goal:
2500 gal/ac-yr = 6.4 mL/m²-d = 6 g oil/m²-d

HTL Conversion:
0.35 g oil / g biomass

Productivity Need:
17 g biomass / m²-day

If harvesting - dewatering efficiency is 85%:
20 g biomass / m²-day
5 – Future Work

TASK 1: Develop models to identify best strains and culture methods

* Validate new Climate Simulating Photobioreactor with climate scripts against pond data.
* Validate Biomass Growth Model predictions with pond data.

TASK 2: Maximize algal productivity and harvesting in pilot ponds

* Evaluate effect of dilution rate and feed water source on productivity and harvesting
* Generate biomass for HTL runs.

TASK 3: Full-scale raceway hydraulic characterization - Underway

TASK 4. Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

* To continue with quarterly runs

TASK 5. Scale-up engineering analysis, modeling, and planning

* Incorporate productivities, harvesting efficiencies, and HTL results into a process model to be used in planning Phase 2.
* Update TEA and LCA results
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Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

**Results**: Run 1 operation summary

Oil-water phase separation difficult due to low initial solids concentration
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

Utilization of Aqueous Phase (AP) nutrients for algal regrowth attempted:
• HTL AP was 0.2 um filtered
• Metals added (Mg, K, P…) to avoid nutrient limitation

Growth reduced in HTL cultures even with a 100 fold dilution, at saturating nutrient concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aqueous phase characterization:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH3</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbon</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organic Carbon</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>mgO/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetic acid</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propanoic acid</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methanol</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butanoic Acid</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur</td>
<td>ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>pH unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OD @750 nm</th>
<th>Time, [days]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5% HTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% HTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% HTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 0.5 1 1.5 2
0 0.5 1 1.5 2
0 0.5 1 1.5 2
0 0.5 1 1.5 2
0 0.5 1 1.5 2
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

Biofuel intermediate characterization (dry basis):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Run 1</th>
<th>Run 2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen, wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:C, mol ratio</td>
<td>ratio</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAN</td>
<td>mg_{KOH}/g_{oil}</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>g/mL</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity</td>
<td>cSt@40°C</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filterable Solids</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 3: Biomass processing to biofuel intermediates

Biofuel intermediate characterization: Simulated distillation

HT bed plugged with black, high molecular weight substance

High yield of distillate range hydrocarbons