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Goal Statement

Improve process economics of Catalytic Fast Pyrolysis (CFP) through understanding of chemistry and physics

- Demonstrate technical targets at a laboratory scale
  - Improve carbon efficiency from 27% to 44% in FY2022
  - Reduce oxygen content in oil from 15% to 6.4% in FY2022
- Build an understanding of underlying science of CFP so as to reduce inefficient walk through Edisonian space to improve the technology
- Provide guidance for development of new catalysts and operation of pilot scale reactors

Major Objectives for Ex Situ Pyrolysis Vapor Upgrading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Parameter</th>
<th>2014 SOT</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
<th>2022 Target / Design Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Addition during Vapor Upgrading</td>
<td>Initial focus on use of hydrogen to reduce coke and non-condensable gases; after 2017 incorporate hydrogen to improve product quality by increasing H/C ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Combination (Coupling)</td>
<td>Initial work using model compounds; after 2017 demonstrate using pyrolysis vapors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Process Options</td>
<td>Base cases assume fluidized catalysts (modified zeolites); consider the option to use catalysts that are feasible in fixed bed reactors (preceded by a hot gas filter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapor Products</td>
<td>Wt. % of dry biomass unless noted. Values rounded off except for smaller improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Condensable Gases</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqueous Phase (% C Loss)</td>
<td>25 (2.9)</td>
<td>25 (2.9)</td>
<td>25 (2.4)</td>
<td>26 (2.3)</td>
<td>30 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solids (Char + Coke)</td>
<td>12 + 11</td>
<td>12 + 10.8</td>
<td>12 + 10.5</td>
<td>12 + 10.2</td>
<td>12 + 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Phase</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/C Molar Ratio</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Efficiency (%)</td>
<td>27 (27)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen Content (% of organic)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydropyrolysis C Eff. (% of org.liq.)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Eff. to Fuel Blendstocks (%)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency to Fuels (LHV basis)</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fuel Selling Price ($ / GGE)</td>
<td>$56.47</td>
<td>$55.92</td>
<td>$55.24</td>
<td>$45.58</td>
<td>$33.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abhijit Dutta, Thermochemical Platform Analysis Project, WBS 2.1.0.302
Example: Deactivation of ZSM-5 catalyst during feeding of biomass pyrolysis vapors

- Laboratory experiments showed ranges of biomass-to-catalyst ratio where catalyst is active.
- Suggests riser reactor (NREL’s DCR reactor and TCPDU) are ideal reactors for vapor phase upgrading.
- Fixed and fluidized bed reactors not ideal.
- This experiment was completed in under 2 hours.
- Results are used by Computational Pyrolysis Consortium in CFD simulations to suggest operating conditions for DCR reactor.

Project Quad Chart Overview

Timeline

- **Start Date:** October 1, 2013
- **End Date:** September 30, 2017
- **50% percent complete**

Barriers

**Barriers addressed**

Tt-H. Bio-Oil Intermediate Stabilization and Vapor Cleanup

Tt-L. Knowledge Gaps in Chemical Processes

Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Costs FY 10 – FY 12</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><strong>DOE Funded</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,777K</td>
<td>$1,816K</td>
<td>$6,970K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Cost Share (Comp.)</strong>*</td>
<td>$400K JM</td>
<td>$400K JM</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.2M JM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partners & Roles

- Johnson Matthey: Catalyst development and characterization (Vapor Phase Upgrading)
- Colorado School of Mines (Richards, Trewyn): Catalyst development and characterization
- University of Colorado (Ellison): mechanisms of pyrolysis
- LBL - Advanced Light Source (Ahmed): pyrolysis
- MIT (Roman): Catalyst development
- ORNL (Daw), ANL (Curtiss): Computational modeling
1- Project Overview

• Catalytic Fast Pyrolysis (CFP) investigated since 1986
  o ZSM-5 was first and most effective catalyst to date
  o Done properly it can achieve low oxygen content oil
  o Low C yields (< 15%) have been reported. Loss to coke and light gases

• Incomplete understanding of the process

• We conduct laboratory experiments with model compounds and biomass pyrolysis vapors
  o Provide understanding of chemical mechanisms to Johnson Matthey to develop new catalysts
  o Provide data for technoeconomic analysis and planned pilot studies at NREL (DCR and TCPDU)
  o Collaborate with Computational Pyrolysis Consortium (WBS 2.5.1.302)

FY17 Targets
- $C_{eff}$: 27% -> 34%
- O: 15% -> 12.5%

FY22 Targets
- $C_{eff}$: -> 44%
- O: -> 6.4%
2 – Approach (Technical)

• Critical success factors:
  o At the laboratory scale, we will reach the following technical targets:
    - Carbon yields of 34% and oxygen content of 12% by 2017 will be achieved by establishing reactor conditions (high biomass-to-catalysts ratio, short residence time), stripping products with steam and the addition of hydrogen (< 5 bar)
    - Carbon yields of 44% and oxygen content of 6% by 2022 will be achieved by developing new catalysts to better utilize added hydrogen and to direct reaction through different products (furans)
  o Discover reaction pathways that reduce search through Edisonian space
  o Provide understanding and data that simplify operation at pilot scale

• Task plan
  o Development and testing of catalysts at lab scale for the Johnson Matthey CRADA
    - Data and understanding generated in this project is used by JM to develop catalysts
  o Laboratory performance testing of CFP improvements – Experiments are conducted at 100g scale using improvements discovered at 1g scale to measure C yield and O content.
  o Chemistry of catalytic upgrading – chemical mechanisms of CFP are studied using reactions of model compounds and biomass.
  o Biomass, catalyst and bio-oil: changes and characterization – Measurements of starting material, catalyst and resulting product are used to infer reaction mechanisms.
2 – Approach (Technical cont)

• **Challenges**
  
  o Pyrolysis vapors contain a mixture of many molecules with different functional groups – condensable and reactive
  o Catalysts deactivate rapidly
  o Heterogeneous chemical reactions are difficult to measure directly

• **Experiments conducted at multiple scales**
  
  o Small reactors (1g catalyst) and Molecular Beam Mass Spectrometer (MBMS): universal detection in real time
  o Pyroprobe GCMS (5 mg): direct measurement and quantification of products
  o 2” fluidized bed reactor (100g): collection of oils. Being modified for continuous replacement of catalyst
  o Laminar entrained flow reactor (100g): simulation of conditions in a riser reactor
  o Product and catalyst analysis: NMR (600 and 400 MHz), SEM, TEM, light microscopy, etc

**Baseline Experimental conditions: Pine pyrolysis vapors over Nexceris ZSM-5**
2 – Approach (Management)

- **Track progress**
  - Quarterly progress reports
  - Quarterly SMART milestones
  - Go/No-Go points to direct research

- **Monthly task meeting**

- **Johnson Matthey CRADA**
  - Monthly teleconferences
  - 1 – 2 face-to-face meetings per year at NREL

**Example Milestone (Q3 FY2015):** Compare catalysts developed by WBS 2.3.1.314 to determine if hydrogenation can increase yields to 40% at labscale (< 5 g catalysts).

Project integration for the overall NREL/BETO thermochemical platform:
Will present progress on the following:

- Our experimental measurements were used by the Thermochemical Platform Analysis Project to determine the SOT
- Studies to address the 2017 technical targets
  - We compared in-situ and ex-situ CFP
  - We determined limits of biomass-to-catalysts ratio for catalyst deactivation
  - The activities of catalysts with different acidities were compared
  - The addition of steam was investigated for increasing the carbon yield
- 2022 Targets: New catalyst development
  - We have screened catalyst provided by Johnson Matthey to identify mechanisms that lead to other products (furans)
  - The selective hydrogenation of C=C bonds has been investigated as a means of increasing carbon yields and reducing light gas formation

\[ C_{\text{eff}}: 27\% \rightarrow 34\% \]
\[ O: 15\% \rightarrow 12.5\% \]
\[ C_{\text{eff}}: \rightarrow 44\% \]
\[ O: \rightarrow 6.4\% \]
Results Measured for State of Technology (SOT)

- **2” fluidized bed reactor**
  - In- and ex-situ
  - 150 g h⁻¹
  - Fully characterized

- **Baseline catalysts (Nexceris)**
  - Clay, Al₂O₃ and SiO₂ binder
  - Mass balance 86% - 97%
  - Ex-situ (SiO₂)
    - C yield: 27%
    - O content in oil: 15%

- **Values from this work were used by the Thermochemical Platform Analysis Project to determine the SOT, which is used in the MYPP**

---

Kristina Lisa, Rick French, Matt Yung, NREL quarterly milestone, Dec 31, 2014
Ex-Situ CFP was compared to In-Situ CFP

- 2” FBR
- Milestone: June 30, 2014
- C yields
  - In-situ: 24%
  - Ex-situ: 20%
- O content
  - In-situ: 21%
  - Ex-situ: 18%
- Reactions were conducted in batch mode with regeneration after each batch of biomass
- Deactivation was observed after each batch in the in-situ configuration and not in ex-situ.
- Filtration in the ex-situ configuration likely removed alkali metals
- This results show that catalyst fouling will be reduced using using filtration and will favor ex-situ CFP

Catalyst Deactivation Suggests Reactor Configuration

- Upgrade vapors over HZSM-5
- Fixed bed, sequential addition of biomass pyrolysis vapors
- Monitor products with MBMS
  - Add pulses of pyrolysis vapors
  - Monitor chemical composition of vapors as catalyst deactivates
- Confirmed with pyroprobe GC/MS
- Short reaction time, low biomass-to-catalyst ratio optimal for hydrocarbon production
- Suggests that reactors with tightly controlled biomass/catalyst contact are desirable
  - Risers
  - Entrained flow
  - Continuous catalyst replacement

Riser Reactors Are Well-Suited for CFP

- Findings from laboratory studies suggest that riser reactors are ideal for CFP
- Davison Circulating Riser (DCR) Reactor and riser in TCPDU will be used for larger scale experiments
- Our lab results suggest reaction conditions and residence time required to optimize reactors
- Riser experiments conducted at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece)* obtained high C yields (34%) with low oxygen content (11%)
- Our results explain the high yields for this experiment and indicate that technical targets are achievable.

The Effects of Catalyst Acidity on Yields

- Measured deactivation of $\beta$-zeolite with different numbers of acid sites
- Determine yields and coke rates
- Hydrocarbon yield increases with number of acid sites
- Provide design criteria for our catalyst partner: Johnson Matthey

Steam Stripping Increases Carbon Yield

- Addition of steam strips additional product out of ZSM-5 catalyst
- Measurements at lab scale
  - Increased yields (20%)
  - Decreased in Coke (20%)
  - Water reacts with aromatic carbocations to form phenols
  - Manuscript is being prepared for publication
- Steam stripping commonly used in riser systems
- Working with Johnson Matthey to address catalysts stability in steam
Selective Hydrogenation of C=C Bonds Will Increase C Yields

- Cyclization reactions of C=C bonds are undesirable because they lead to the aromatics and coke.
- Carbonyl coupling reactions are desirable because they lead to carbon chain growth and reduce the formation of light gas (CO).
- Selective hydrogenation of C=C bonds with coupling of carbonyls will reduce coke and light gas formation and increase C yield.

Catalyst Development for FY2022 Targets

Showed that with selective hydrogenation we can reduce aromatic formation and still allow carbonyl coupling.
Catalyst Testing for Alternative Products

• Working with Johnson Matthey to test catalysts for products other than aromatic molecules
• Tested several catalysts (zeolites, hydrotalcites, alumina silicates)
• Some catalysts produce furans
• Producing products other than aromatic molecules could cut off pathways to coke formation and lead to products that can be coupled to form diesel-range molecules
4 - Relevance

BETO Barriers:

• **Tt-H. Bio-Oil Intermediate Stabilization and Vapor Cleanup**
  o Provided data for SOT for MYPP (C yields, O Content, coke formation, light gas, aqueous carbon)
  o Helping reach FY2022 cost target ($3.31 GGE) through increase C yield and reduced O content
  o Reported limits of Biomass-to-Catalyst ratios
  o Demonstrate steam stripping
  o Fouling of catalysts in *in-situ* operation, hot gas filtration reduces problem
  o Measuring benefits of added hydrogen
  o We provide information about reaction mechanisms that enable strategies to improve catalysts

• **Tt-L. Knowledge Gaps in Chemical Processes**
  o Scientific underpinning allow quicker development of technology
  o Providing information for design of new catalysts to catalyst providers
5. Future Work

• **FY2017 Targets:**
  o Go/NoGo decision for use of steam

  *Determine whether to continue with research into steam stripping and hot gas filtration for improving yields and cost of vapor phase upgrading. The basis for the Go/No Go will depend upon economic calculations (by WBS 2.8.2.1) using data generated in this project and the metric will be whether or not the cost of the product is reduced.* **3/30/2016**

  o Conduct measurements with Laminar Entrained Flow Reactor. Determine if FY2017 C Yield and oxygen content targets can be met.
  o Continue to study the effects of added hydrogen (< 5 bar). Determine increases in yield and decreases in coking.

• **Work with Johnson Matthey to select catalyst to scale up for experiments in DCR and pilot plant**
5. Future Work (cont)

FY2022 Targets:

• **Select bifunctional catalyst that can selectively hydrogenate olefines and allow C-C coupling of carbonyl compounds**
  
  o Use computational modeling (Computational Pyrolysis Consortium) to help identify low cost catalysts, with high efficiency hydrogenation and C-C coupling

• **Select catalysts that produce furans in high yields**
  
  o Determine yields and coking and light gas formation
Summary

• Helping reach technical targets (increase C yield to 44% decrease O content to 6% by 2022) for CFP by increasing our understanding of chemical reaction mechanisms

• Conducting laboratory experiments in collaboration with computational modeling to explore mechanisms, effects of catalyst composition and reactor conditions

• Produced results that help establish SOT, compared in-situ to ex-situ, establish operating ranges, compare catalyst acidity, increased yields with steam and hydrogen, and different reaction pathways with other catalysts.
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