

4-28-2008

Developing LCFS for Biofuels: Getting it right for Corn Ethanol

Kenneth Cassman

Nebraska Center for Energy Sciences Research, UNL, kcassman1@unl.edu

Adam Liska

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, aliska2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/bseliska>

 Part of the [Biological Engineering Commons](#)

Cassman, Kenneth and Liska, Adam, "Developing LCFS for Biofuels: Getting it right for Corn Ethanol" (2008). *Adam Liska Papers*. 6.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/bseliska/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Biological Systems Engineering at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Adam Liska Papers by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Developing LCFS for Biofuels: Getting it right for Corn Ethanol

**Kenneth G. Cassman
Heuermann Professor of Agronomy
Director, Nebraska Center for Energy Sciences
University of Nebraska**

**Adam Liska
Postdoctoral Fellow, University of Nebraska**

Topics

- **Purpose of LCFS**
- **Deployment timeframes for both biofuels and LCFS**
- **Importance of getting it right for corn-ethanol**
- **Biofuel Energy Systems Simulator**

Purpose of LCFS

- **2007 Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA)**
 - **Help guide R&D prioritization & investment**
- **CA Low Carbon Fuel Standard**
 - **Achieve a 10% reduction in motor fuel GHG intensity by 2020**
- **Foster and reward the build-out of a “green” biofuel industry**
 - **GHG emissions trading, certification**

2007 EISA definition: Life Cycle GHG Emissions

“(H) LIFECYCLE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.—The term ‘lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions’ means the aggregate quantity of greenhouse gas emissions (including direct emissions and significant indirect emissions such as significant emissions from land use changes), as determined by the Administrator, related to the full fuel lifecycle, including all stages of fuel and feedstock production and distribution, from feedstock generation or extraction through the distribution and delivery and use of the finished fuel to the ultimate consumer, where the mass values for all greenhouse gases are adjusted to account for their relative global warming potential.


EPA Life Cycle Assessment Approach

- **Domestic (FAPSOM) and international (FAPRI) agricultural sector models**
 - Estimates land-use change in USA and globally
- **GHG emissions derived from GREET and IPCC defaults**
 - GREET includes carbon intensities for all petroleum-based and bio-based fuels

Need to get corn-ethanol right

- **Rapid expansion of production capacity**
- **Actual data can be obtained for direct effects from crop production, ethanol conversion, and co-product use**
 - **Important to use values consistent with how the industry currently functions**

Biorefinery thermal energy efficiency: Previous natural gas estimates vs. RFA & UNL surveys, NE & IA state records



Need to get corn-ethanol right

- **Rapid expansion of production capacity**
- **Actual data can be obtained for direct effects from crop production, ethanol conversion, and co-product use**
 - **Important to use values consistent with how the industry currently functions**
- **Indirect effects difficult to estimate and highly uncertain**
 - **At what volume of production (15, 18, or 30 bgy?)**
 - **Currency exchange rates, land use policies, rate of yield gains on existing land?**

2007 EISA renewable fuel standard mandate

YEAR	STARCH ETHANOL	ADVANCED BIOFUEL	TOTAL BIOFUEL
2008	9.0		9.0
2009	10.5	0.6	11.1
2010	12.0	1.0	13.0
2011	12.7	1.3	14.0
2012	13.2	2.0	15.2
2013	13.9	2.7	16.6
2014	14.4	3.8	18.2
2015	15.0	5.5	20.5
2018	15.0	11.0	26.0
2022	15.0	21.0	36.0

Corn-ethanol GHG emissions from different life-cycle models

Life-cycle GHG emissions intensity from dry-mill corn-ethanol (gCO ₂ e/MJ)					
Emissions	GREET	EBAMM	BEACCON	BESS (1)	BESS (5)
Crop	44	37	44	30	33
Biorefinery	43	64	37	31	25
CP CREDIT	-17	-25	-17	-19	-24
Denaturant	-	-	6	-	-
Land use change	(104)	-	1	-	-
GWI	70	76	71	43	35
Gasoline	92	92	92	92	92
GHG reduction, %	24	17	23	54	62

GREET vs.1.8a: land use change from Searchinger et al. Science 2008

EBAMM: vs.1.1-1: Farrell et al. 2006, Science, "Ethanol Today" avg. ethanol plant in 2001

BEACCON vs.1.1: available from www.lifecycleassociates.com; largely based on GREET

BESS: vs.2008.3.0: Scenario-1 Midwest avg. natl gas dry mill (RFA); Scenario-5 NE avg. natl gas with wet DGS

BESS has a variable co-product credit which is dependent on the emissions intensity of crop production

Biofuel Energy Systems Simulator (BESS)

www.bess.unl.edu

- **Most up to date estimates for direct-effect GHG emissions for corn ethanol based on best current science and input from all key disciplines (engineers, agronomists, soil scientists, animal nutritionists, industry professionals)**
 - **User-friendly, completely transparent, and well documented**
 - **Default scenarios based on regional-scale data, but can also be used for certification of an individual ethanol plant, its associated corn supply and co-product use**
 - **Can be used for estimating carbon-offset credits for emissions trading with an individual ethanol plant as the aggregator**
 - **If GREET can be consistent with BESS for corn-ethanol GHG emissions estimates, then BESS can be used for compliance and certification**
-

Default scenarios in BESS model: for different cropping regions and biorefinery types

Scenario #	Crop production region	Biorefinery energy (dry mill)	Co-product type	NEW Survey Data
1	USA Midwest Avg.	natural gas-MW	mix dry-wet DGS	RFA-22
2	USA Midwest Avg.	natural gas-MW	mix dry-wet DGS	UNL-6
3	Iowa Avg.	natural gas-IA	mix dry-wet DGS	IDNR-9
4	Nebraska Avg.	natural gas-NE	mix dry-wet DGS	NDEQ-9
5	Nebraska Avg.	natural gas-NE	Wet DGS	NDEQ-4
6	Nebraska Avg.	NG, closed-loop	Wet DG	NDEQ-4
7	Nebraska Avg.	coal	Dry DGS	EPA
8	Progressive cropping (CSP)	natural gas-NE	mix dry-wet DGS	NDEQ-9



Input: Operation settings

Output: Individual scenarios

Output: Scenario comparison

Summary report

Open a scenario

2-US Midwest average-UNL

Scenario description (editable)
US Midwest, new dry-mill powered by natural gas, University of Nebraska survey

To create a new scenario, open an existing one, customize it and save it with a new scenario name

Corn production **Ethanol biorefinery** Cattle feedlot Biodigester

Production performance

Ethanol production, million L	<input type="text" value="379.0"/>
Corn-to-ethanol conversion rate, L/kg	<input type="text" value="0.429"/>
Water use, L/L ethanol	<input type="text" value="4.70"/>
Production of DDGS-Equivalent (100% DM), kg/L ethanol	<input type="text" value="0.707"/>
Production of DDG-Equivalent (100% DM), kg/L ethanol	<input type="text" value="0.572"/>

Energy use

Source of thermal energy	<input type="text" value="Natural gas"/>
Thermal energy for ethanol production, MJ/L	<input type="text" value="5.27"/>
Thermal energy for drying DGS, MJ/L	<input type="text" value="2.19"/>
Electricity input, kWh/L	<input type="text" value="0.150"/>
Depreciable capital energy, MJ/L	<input type="text" value="0.130"/>

Co-product composition

Dry DGS	<input type="text" value="25.0"/>	%
Modified DGS	<input type="text" value="40.0"/>	%
Wet DGS	<input type="text" value="35.0"/>	%

Compute

Open a scenario

2-US Midwest average-UNL

Scenario description (editable)
US Midwest, new dry-mill powered by natural gas, University of Nebraska survey

To create a new scenario, open an existing one, customize it and save it with a new scenario name

Corn production

Ethanol biorefinery | Cattle feedlot | Biodigester

Productivity

Corn grain (dry matter), Mg/ha	9.57
Soil C sequestration, Mg C/ha	0

Material inputs

Nitrogen, kg N/ha	144
Manure, kg N/ha	5.5
Phosphorus, kg P2O5/ha	49.8
Potassium, kg K2O/ha	53.9
Lime, kg/ha	212
Herbicides, kg/ha	5.25
Insecticides, kg/ha	0.210
Seed, kg/ha	20.0
Irrigation water, cm	4.90

Fuel consumption

By fuel type

Gasoline, L/ha	15.6
Diesel, L/ha	61.3
LPG, L/ha	52.3
Natural gas, m3/ha	21.5
Electricity, kWh/ha	105

By field operation

Diesel use by tillage type: Chisel (dropdown)
Including planting, spraying, cultivation, & harvest

Irrigation: Well water (dropdown) Diesel (dropdown)

Depreciable capital energy, MJ/ha: 320

Compute

Input: Operation settings **Output: Individual scenarios** Output: Scenario comparison Summary report

Crop production Ethanol biorefinery Cattle feedlot LC analysis LC emissions GHG emission balance

Show results of scenario (A)

2-US Midwest average-UNL

US Midwest, new dry-mill powered by natural gas, University of Nebraska survey

Total harvest area, x1000 ha	92.3	1,797	Energy use rate, MJ/Mg grain
Total grain requirement, Mg	883,450		
Water use, million L	45,234	263	GHG intensity, kg CO ₂ eq/Mg grain

To plot

Absolute amount % in crop production % in life cycle total

CO₂eq. emissions

CO₂eq. emissions

Pie / Bar chart

Material input	Amount Mg	% in crop production	% in life cycle	
N fertilizer	13,293 Mg	34,430	15	7.4
P fertilizer	4,597 Mg	7,402	3.2	1.6
K fertilizer	4,976 Mg	3,553	1.5	0.8
Lime	19,571 Mg	14,678	6.3	3.2
Herbicides	485 Mg	12,141	5.2	2.6
Insecticides	19.4 Mg	504	0.2	0.1
Seed	1,846 Mg	1,482	0.6	0.3
Gasoline	1,440 x1000 L	4,047	1.7	0.9
Diesel	5,681 x1000 L	20,188	8.7	4.3
LPG	4,828 x1000 L	7,893	3.4	1.7
Natural gas	1,985 x1000 m3	4,031	1.7	1.0
Electricity	9,693 MWh	7,216	3.1	1.6
Depeccable capital	2,196	0.9	0.5	
Total N ₂ O emissions	112,229	48	24	
C sequestration	0	0.0	0.0	
Total	231,989	100	50	




Fig. 1-1

Input: Operation settings **Output: Individual scenarios** Output: Scenario comparison Summary report

Crop production Ethanol biorefinery Cattle feedlot LC analysis LC emissions **GHG emission balance**

Show results of scenario (A) **2-US Midwest average-UNL** US Midwest, new dry-mill powered by natural gas, University of Nebraska survey


To plot

Emission amount Emission intensity

CO₂eq emission balance & credit

	Amount Mg CO ₂ eq	Intensity g CO ₂ eq/MJ
Gasoline total emissions	735,715	92.0
Ethanol production-FF	351,502	44.0
Ethanol production-N ₂ O	112,229	14.0
Carbon sequestration	0	0
Co-product credit	-154,495	-19.3
Ethanol distribution	11,196	1.40
Net total emissions	320,431	40.1
Emissions reduction	415,283	51.9
Emission reduction, %	56	
Emissions offset credit, x1000 \$	1,661	
Credit per volume ethanol, \$/L	0.004	

Amount of CO₂eq emissions, Mg



- A: Gasoline emissions
- B: Ethanol production-FF
- C: Ethanol production-N₂O
- D: C sequestration
- E: Co-product credit
- F: Ethanol distribution
- G: Net total emissions
- H: Emission reduction

Fig. 6-1

Note: H = A - G

Show results of scenario (A) **6-NE closed-loop**

State of Nebraska (US), dry-mill with closed-loop facility

Versus reference scenario (B) **2-US Midwest average-UNL**

US Midwest, new dry-mill powered by natural gas, University of Nebraska survey

0 Tolerance, as % relative to the reference, for reporting a difference

When a reference scenario (B) is selected, colored cells in the summary report below indicate results and/or input settings that differ by more than the specified tolerance level (%) compared to Scenario A.

Jump to section of
 Top of report Emissions inventory Input settings Internal parameters

Load report to MS Excel

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	REPORT OF BESS MODEL (Version 2008.3.0 for non-commercial use)				Conducted: 3:22:23 PM, 3/25/2008		
2	Scenario & description:		6-NE closed-loop		State of Nebraska (US), dry-mill with closed-loop facility		
3	Internal parameter values:		default				
4	Reference scenario & description:		2-US Midwest average-UNL		US Midwest, new dry-mill powered by natural gas, University of Nebraska survey		
5	Tolerance, as % relative to the reference scenario, for reporting a difference:		0				
6	Colored cells indicate results and/or input settings that differ more than the specified tolerance level compared with the reference scenario. Value outside parentheses are for the actual scenario, values inside parentheses are for the reference scenario.						
7							
8	CROP PERFORMANCE						
9		Harvest area	ha	92,084 (92,315)			
10		Grain use	Mg	895,981 (883,450)			
11		Energy use rate	MJ/Mg	1,899 (1,797)			
12		GHG intensity	kg CO2 eq./Mg grain	272 (263)			
13							
14	Material inputs						
15		Nitrogen fertilizer	kg	13,444,321 (13,293,290)			
16		Phosphorus fertilizer	kg	3,112,452 (4,597,263)			
17		Potassium fertilizer	kg	552,506 (4,975,752)			

To adjust column width: place the mouse cursor to the cell joint of the top row, then drag the mouse to the left or right.

Row height

Influence of cropping system and biorefinery type on GHG emissions reduction: %, Mg CO₂e*

**20% reduction for
2007 EISA RFS**

Corn Production System

Ethanol Biorefineries

	USA-MW average	Iowa average	NE average	Advanced Irrigated
coal	24%, 179,000	26%, 187,000	21%, 153,000	25%, 186,000
natural gas†	54%, 395,000	57%, 420,000	50%, 371,000	55%, 405,000
natural gas, wet DG	64%, 469,000	64%, 468,000	62%, 444,000	64%, 474,000
closed-loop facility	72%, 526,000	72%, 529,000	68%, 498,000	73%, 534,000

*Based on a 100 million gal yr⁻¹ production capacity, †average based on surveys

Our recommendation to California Air Resources Board: Create 3 classes of ethanol facilities for GHG regulation

- 1) Title V permitted facilities; major source, e.g. 100 tons VOC/yr (includes all wet mills and coal powered facilities in Nebraska and Iowa, 9 out of 31 facilities in 2006)
- 2) Dry mills powered by natural gas (largest group)
- 3) Dry mills powered by natural gas, without dryers for DG (e.g. high cattle densities, closed-loop facilities, DG as energy source)


Class	I	II	III
Description	Title V (coal with Dry DG)	Natural Gas Dry Mills	N.G. Dry Mills w/ Wet DG
Thermal Energy, MJ L-1	12.81	7.61	5.44
BESS Life-cycle GHG emissions reduction	7%	51%	62%

GHG emissions trading credit (cap-and-trade) for ethanol biorefineries according to type

**Current
European price***
April 15, 2008

€25 per Mt
or
\$40 per Mt

At future price
~\$0.23 per gallon



*www.pointcarbon.com; Chart results based on a 100 million gal yr⁻¹ production capacity in IA; \$6 per metric ton CO₂e, Apr. 15.2008, Chicago Climate Exchange, www.chicagoclimatex.com/ Future carbon price of \$49 per metric ton CO₂e, pending *Climate Security Act of 2007* (Kintisch 2007); BESS.2008.3.0, www.bess.unl.edu

Sensitivity of input parameters on corn-ethanol carbon intensity:

The three most influential input parameters:

1. crop yield: Mg per hectare (+25% possible)
2. conversion thermal energy inputs: MJ per liter (+10%)
3. conversion yield: liters ethanol per kg grain (+7%)

Next in importance:


- wet versus drying distiller's grains
- N fertilizer rate used in crop production

How to deal with indirect effects of land use change?

- **One value for carbon “debt” from LUC applied to all USA corn-ethanol**
- **Key issues are:**
 - **Direct-effect GHG emissions starting point (50-65% reduction as estimated by BESS, or 24% as estimated by GREET in Searchinger et al (*Science*, 2008))**
 - **Volume of corn-ethanol production modeled by FAPRI/FASOM to estimate magnitude of land use change**
 - **Assumptions about rate of gain in corn yields**
- **What if there was a focused program to accelerate the rate of gain in corn yields while reducing GHG emissions per bushel produced?**
 - **A process called ecological intensification (*PNAS*, 1999)**

Nebraska contest-winning vs average yield trends

Average yields are only about 60% of yield potential!



CONCLUDING REMARKS

- **Corn ethanol will be first to test the newly developed LCFS assessment methods; substantial amounts of other biofuels will come several years later**
 - **Accurate valuation of direct-effect GHG emissions from corn ethanol is the foundation of the LCFS process; these affects vary with ethanol biorefinery type and corn feedstock supply**
 - **Different reference GHG emissions values are needed for each major class of ethanol plants**
 - **The BESS model provides the most up-to-date, scientifically sound estimate of corn-ethanol GHG emissions; can BESS and GREET reach agreement?**
 - **Certification and compliance tools are also needed**
-

Funding Support for BESS Development

- Western Governor's Association & US DOE
- Environmental Defense
- USDA-CSREES Regional Research
- Nebraska Energy Office
- Nebraska Center for Energy Sciences Research



Acknowledgements

Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality

Iowa Department of Natural Resources

Dan Kenney, and Patrick Tracy, PRIME Biosolutions

Professor Dick Perrin, UNL Ag. Economics

FREE download of BESS model: www.bess.unl.edu

- BESS model for CELLULOSIC ETHANOL from Corn residue and switchgrass, *Summer 2008*

References

- Cassman, K.G. 1999. Ecological intensification of cereal production systems: Yield potential, soil quality, and precision agriculture. *Proc. National Acad. Sci. (USA)* 96: 5952-5959
- Farrell A.E., Plevin R.J., Turner B.T., Jones A.D., O'Hare M. & Kammen D.M. (2006). **Ethanol can contribute to energy and environmental goals.** *Science*, **311**, 506-508.
- Klopfenstein, T., G. Erickson, V. Bremer. **Use of Distillers Byproducts in the Beef Cattle Feeding Industry.** 2008. *Journal of Animal Science*, in press, doi:10.2527/jas.2007-0550
- Kintisch, E. **Senate Bill Would Provide Billions For Deploying Cleaner Technologies.** *Science* 318,1708(2007)
- Liska A. J., and K.G. Cassman, **Towards Standardization of Life-Cycle Metrics for Biofuels: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation and Net Energy Yield,** *Journal of Biobased-Materials and Bioenergy*, in press
- Naylor et al. **The Ripple Effect: Biofuels, Food Security, and the Environment.** *Environment* 49;30, 2007
- RFA-Renewable Fuels Association. **Changing the Climate: Ethanol Industry Outlook 2008.** Washington, DC., 2008
- Verma et al. **Annual carbon dioxide exchange in irrigated and rainfed maize-based agroecosystems,** *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 131, 77 (2005)
- Wahid M. B., C. K. Weng, C. Y. May, C. M. Chin, **The Need to Reduce National Greenhouse Emissions: Oil Palm Industry's Role.** *Journal of Oil Palm Research*, Special Issue - April 2006
- Wang M., M. Wu, H. Huo. **Life-cycle energy and greenhouse gas emission impacts of different corn ethanol plant types,** *Environmental Research Letters* 2, 024001, 2007