

Ethanol Production in US

Vijay Singh

Associate Professor

Department of Agricultural & Biological Engineering
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Waste Management & Research Center

October 17, 2007

Collaborators


- Ron Belyea University of Missouri
- Mike Cotta NCAUR/ARS/USDA
- Bruce Dien NCAUR/ARS/USDA
- David Johnston ERRC/ARS/USDA
- Bob Moreau ERRC/ARS/USDA
- Eberhard Morgenroth University of Illinois
- Ganti Murthy Oregon State University
- Kent Rausch University of Illinois
- Vijay Singh University of Illinois
- Mike Tumbleson University of Illinois

Presentation Outline

- Ethanol Production Process (Video)
- Ethanol Industry
 - Ethanol Production Capacity
 - Growth in Industry
- Issues Facing Ethanol Industry
- Emerging Dry Grind Ethanol Processes
- Future of Ethanol Industry
 - Cellulosic Ethanol


Ethanol Production Video



Ethanol Production in US



2004: 3.4 billion gallons 2006: 5.6 billion gallons 2008: 8.9 billion gallons


U.S. Dry Grind Corn Facilities



-  **Plants in Production (115)**
-  **Plants Under Construction (79)**

Source: Renewable Fuels Association
4.3.07

Dry Grind Ethanol Plants in Illinois



Benefits of Ethanol

- Reduces dependence on foreign oil imports
- Extend the domestic supplies of gasoline
- Environment friendly, reduces green house gases
- Increase octane rating of gasoline
- Clean burning fuel
- Increases demand for corn, stabilizes prices
- Rural Development


Issues Related To Ethanol Industry

- Water Used
 - Approximately 4 gallon water/gallon of ethanol produced
- Emissions/Odor
- Food versus Fuel
 - Corn is also used for human consumption
- Low Coproduct Value
- Energy Independence
 - Ethanol from corn is limited by corn production
 - Converting all the corn in the US into ethanol will only meet 20 to 25% of the annual gasoline demand


Corn Dry Grind Ethanol Process




One bushel of Corn
(24.5 kg or 56 lb)




Conventional Dry Grind Process



DDGS Utilization (2005)




Source: Steve Markham, Commodity Specialists Company



**Emerging Technologies in Dry Grind
Ethanol Production:
Corn Fractionation Process**

Wet Corn Fractionation: Enzymatic Dry Grind Corn Process (E-Mill)

Bushel of Corn
(24.5 kg or 56 lb)




Other Benefits of Fractionation Process: Recovery of Valuable Coproducts

- Recovery of germ, pericarp and endosperm fiber as valuable coproducts
 - Germ
 - Corn Germ Oil
 - Pericarp and Endosperm Fiber
 - Corn Fiber Oil
 - Corn Fiber Gum
 - Ethanol



Fermentation Profiles: Conventional and E-Mill Processes



Singh, V., Johnston, D.B., Naidu, K., Rausch, K.D., Belyea, R.L. and Tumbleson, M.E. 2005. Comparison of modified dry grind corn processes for fermentation characteristics and DDGS composition. *Cereal Chem.* 82:187-190.

DDGS Composition: Conventional and E-Mill Processes


	Conv.	E-Mill	Soy Meal	CGM
Crude Prot. (%)	28.50	58.50	53.90	66.70
Crude Fat (%)	12.70	4.53	1.11	2.77
Ash (%)	3.61	3.24	----	----
Acid Det. Fiber (%)	10.8	2.03	5.95	6.88

Singh, V., Johnston, D.B., Naidu, K., Rausch, K.D., Belyea, R.L. and Tumbleson, M.E. 2005. Comparison of modified dry grind corn processes for fermentation characteristics and DDGS composition. Cereal Chem. 82:187-190.

**Emerging Technologies in Dry Grind
Ethanol Production:
Development of New Corn**


Transgenic Corn for Dry Grind Process

Transgenic Corn



500 ml Fermentations


Control vs 3, 5 and 10% amylase corn addition



Singh, V, Batie, C.J., Aux, G.W., Rausch, K.D. and Miller, C. 2006. Dry grind processing of corn with endogenous liquefaction enzymes. *Cereal Chem.* 83:317-320.

500 ml Fermentations

Control vs 1, 2 and 3% amylase corn addition



Singh, V, Batie, C.J., Aux, G.W., Rausch, K.D. and Miller, C. 2006. Dry grind processing of corn with endogenous liquefaction enzymes. *Cereal Chem.* 83:317-320.

DDGS Composition

Components	3% amylase corn addition	Control Treatment
Crude Protein (%)	26.1 ± 0.2	25.8 ± 0.1
Crude Fat (%)	14.1 ± 0.1	13.6 ± 0.2
Crude Fiber (%)	6.6 ± 0.1	6.8 ± 0.1
Ash (%)	3.78 ± 0.1	3.35 ± 0.1

No significant difference in composition of DDGS for 3% amylase corn addition and control treatment

Singh, V. and Graeber, J.V. 2005. Effect of corn hybrid variability and planting location on ethanol yields. Trans. ASAE 48:709-714


Feedstock Development: Transgenic Corn

- Reduces requirement of exogenous alpha amylase
- Only 3% amylase corn addition is required with dent corn for complete liquefaction
- No differences in DDGS composition between 3% amylase corn treatment and conventional treatment

**Emerging Technologies in Dry Grind
Ethanol Production:**

Raw Starch Hydrolyzing Enzymes


Raw Starch Hydrolyzing Enzymes



Granular Starch Hydrolyzing (GSH) Enzymes


- These enzymes have high granular starch (raw starch or native starch) hydrolyzing activity
- Can Liquefy and saccharify starch into glucose at low temperature ($< 48^{\circ}\text{C}$)
 - Stargen 001, Genencor International
 - BPX, Novozymes NA

Results: Ethanol Concentration




Wang, P., Singh, V., Xue, H., Johnston, D.B., Rausch, K.D. and Tumbleson, M.E. 2006. Comparison of raw starch hydrolyzing enzyme with conventional liquefaction and saccharification enzymes in dry grind corn processing. *Cereal Chem.* 84(1):10-14.

Results: Glucose Concentration




Wang, P., Singh, V., Xue, H., Johnston, D.B., Rausch, K.D. and Tumbleson, M.E. 2006. Comparison of raw starch hydrolyzing enzyme with conventional liquefaction and saccharification enzymes in dry grind corn processing. *Cereal Chem.* 84(1):10-14.

Results: Maltose Concentration




Wang, P., Singh, V., Xue, H., Johnston, D.B., Rausch, K.D. and Tumbleson, M.E. 2006. Comparison of raw starch hydrolyzing enzyme with conventional liquefaction and saccharification enzymes in dry grind corn processing. *Cereal Chem.* 84(1):10-14.

Results: Maltotriose Concentration



Wang, P., Singh, V., Xue, H., Johnston, D.B., Rausch, K.D. and Tumbleson, M.E. 2006. Comparison of raw starch hydrolyzing enzyme with conventional liquefaction and saccharification enzymes in dry grind corn processing. *Cereal Chem.* 84(1):10-14.

Results: DP4+ Concentration




Wang, P., Singh, V., Xue, H., Johnston, D.B., Rausch, K.D. and Tumbleson, M.E.
2006. Comparison of raw starch hydrolyzing enzyme with conventional liquefaction
and saccharification enzymes in dry grind corn processing. *Cereal Chem.* 84(1):10-14.

Granular Starch Hydrolyzing Enzymes

- Final ethanol yield with GSH enzymes is comparable to conventional enzymes
- Glucose, maltose and maltotriose concentrations are consistently low with GSH enzymes throughout fermentation
- GSH enzymes work at same temperature conditions as conventional SSF
 - With GSH enzymes simultaneous liquefaction, saccharification and fermentation can be conducted

Water Use in Dry Grind Ethanol Plant




Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer



Food Versus Fuel

U.S. Corn Supply & Total Use, 88-89 to 07-08




Source: USDA, ERS; ProExporter Network

Note: 07-08 is based on ProExporter Network projections

Food Versus Fuel


Ethanol Use vs. All Other Corn Uses



Source: USDA, ERS; ProExporter Network

Note: 07-08 Demand Figures from ProExporter Network; growth is absolute, 98-99 to 07-08


Food Versus Fuel



Source: USDA, ERS; Feed Outlook, June 13, 2007

Note: Percentages based on Total Supply

Future: Ethanol from Lignocellulosic Feedstocks



Thanks!