Engineering Conferences International ECI Digital Archives

Pyroliq 2019: Pyrolysis and Liquefaction of Biomass and Wastes

Proceedings

6-18-2019

Comparison among technical and milled wood lignins through principal component analysis of FTIR spectra

Manuel Garcia-Perez

Erika Bartolomei

Yann Le Brech

Anthony Dufour

Evan Terrell

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.engconfintl.org/pyroliq_2019 Part of the <u>Engineering Commons</u>



Co-hydrotreatment of Bio-oil Lignin-rich Fraction and Vegetable Oil

Yinglei Han¹, Anamaria P.P. Pires¹, Mariefel Olarte², Manuel Garcia-Perez^{1,3}

¹Biological Systems Engineering, Washington State University, Pullman, WA ²Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA ³Bio-products Science and Engineering Laboratory, WA

Pyroliq 2019

Cork, Ireland June 16-20, 2019



Two-Step Hydrotreatment

To ensure economic competitiveness, bio-oil price needs to be a fraction of molasses (\$ 300-400/ton) and petroleum (\$ 200-700/ton). Bio-oil production cost needs to be below **\$ 150/t**.

In our analysis we used the recommendations made by Lange (2016)

Product cost ~ (feed Price + conversion cost) / yield

Feed Price: \$ 150/ ton_{feed}

Conversion Cost: \$ 200/ton_{feed}

Yield: 0.33 ton fuel/ton_{feed}

Product Cost: \$ 1060/ton_{feed}

Gasoline market: \$ 700-800/ton_{feed}







All biomass derived Jet Fuel Production Technologies end-up with a Hydrodeoxygenation step







Can the cracking and stabilization step be avoided?



3. Experimental Scheme

Part 1: Bio-oil Fractionation



Part 2: Cohydrotreatment of lignin rich oil (LRO) and Canola oil





Bio-oil Pyrolytic Lignin Extraction

Butanol/Water/Bio-oil



Under each picture, the ratio of butanol/water/bio-oil is indicated, for example, Butanol/Water/Bio-oil: 70/20/10 for the first one on the top left.



Bio-oil Pyrolytic Lignin Extraction





Bio-oil Pyrolytic Lignin Extraction

What is the difference between raw bio-oil and the lignin rich oil ?





3. Experimental Scheme





The LRO/Canola blends with and without 1-butanol before and after hydrotreatement





Mass balance on co-hydrotreatment of different blends





H₂ consumption of cohydrotreatment



Hydrogen consumption decreased with the increase in pyrolytic lignin content



Mass balance on co-hydrotreatment of different blends





UV-Fluorescence on all the hydrotreated oils





Van Krevelen plot for LRO, Canola oil, their blends



(yellow zone, ratios with underline, such as <u>1:8</u>, represent the blends with 1-butanol) and the corresponding hydrotreated oils (green zones). Distinctive line patterns can be associated with specific reactions: (A) hydrogenation, (B) decarbonylation, (C) decarboxylation, (D) direct deoxygenation, (E) dehydration, (F) demethoxylation.



FTIR on the hydrotreated oils



(a) No BuOH

(b) With BuOH



Carbonyl content of the LRO/Canola blends





Gaseous products from cohydrotreatment of different blends





GC/MS on all the hydrotreated Oils





Yields of n-Paraffinic products



Yields of major Aromatic Products





Product distribution of phenolics after co-hydrotreating LRO/Canola blends



LRO/Canola wt ratio



Hydrocracking and Stabilization



Cracking of LRO:

Catalyst: Ni/SiO₂-Al₂O₃

Solvent used: Methanol, Butanol

GC/MS (concentrated by rotavap)

Temperature: 200 °C

Time: 24 hours





Product distribution of co-hydrotreatment (after hydrocracking)

| | | LRO/Canola=1:4 | Cracked LRO* (in MeOH) /Canola=1:4 | Cracked LRO* (in BuOH) /Canola=1:4 | Canola |
|----------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------|
| | Overall produc | ct distribution | | | |
| | Liquid | 76.43 % | 80.69% | 80.72% | 84.31 % |
| | Gas | 16.72 % | 16.14% | 18.16% | 15.65 % |
| | Solid | 6.85 % | 3.18% | 1.13% | → 0.04 % |
| | Distillation cuts of the resulting oils (wt.%) | | | | |
| | <71 °C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| aphtha | 71-182°C | 20.80 | 21.69 | 23.08 ← | → 17.88 |
| Kerosene | 182-260 °C | 14.59 | 18.26 | 21.24 | → 21.67 |
| Diesel | 260-330 °C | 13.16 | 18.00 | 19.52 - | → 20.67 |
| | 330-566 °C | 29.61 | 24.18 | 20.34 | 25.37 |
| | Residue | 10.91 | 7.36 | 7.23 | 4.44 |
| | Weight loss | 10.92 | 10.51 | 8.58 | 9.97 |
| | Coke formation (LRO basis) | | | | |
| | LRO basis | 34.73 % | 16.08 % | 6.65% | N/A |
| | coke | | | | |

Cracking and stabilization seems to help the hydro-deoxygenation of lignin rich fraction



Conclusions

- 1. An important HDO had been achieved for the blends of lignin-rich oil and vegetable oil, resulting in a two-phase liquid product formed with the oil stayed on the top and water at the bottom.
- By varying the ratio between lignin rich oil and vegetable oil, some phenolics started to be detected when the weight percentage of lignin oil in the blend increased to 1/3 or above.
- 3. The major components of the hydrotreated oils were paraffinic and aromatic hydrocarbons, with less carbonyl groups than the pristine blends.
- Adding BuOH into the lignin rich oil resulted in more tetramers and pentamers being produced in the oil which on the other hand mitigated the coke formation in cohydotreatments.
- 5. Hydrocracking/stabilization is an efficient step to depolymerize the lignin-rich oil which then effectively reduces the coke formation in the HDO step.



Thank you!

Acknowledgements:

- DOE Biomass Technolgoy Office(DE-EE0008505)
- Washington State Department of Ecology
- Federal Aviation Administration
- USDA/NIFA
- WSU-BSE colleagues



