



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

PNNL-17831

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830

Source/Sink Matching for U.S. Ethanol Plants and Candidate Deep Geologic Carbon Dioxide Storage Formations

RT Dahowski
JJ Dooley

September 2008



Pacific Northwest
NATIONAL LABORATORY

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor Battelle Memorial Institute, nor any of their employees, makes **any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.** Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or Battelle Memorial Institute. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY

operated by

BATTELLE

for the

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

under Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830

Printed in the United States of America

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the
Office of Scientific and Technical Information,
P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0062;
ph: (865) 576-8401
fax: (865) 576-5728
email: reports@adonis.osti.gov

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161
ph: (800) 553-6847
fax: (703) 605-6900
email: orders@ntis.fedworld.gov
online ordering: <http://www.ntis.gov/ordering.htm>



This document was printed on recycled paper.

(9/2003)

**Source/Sink Matching for U.S. Ethanol
Plants and Candidate Deep Geologic
Carbon Dioxide Storage Formations**

RT Dahowski
JJ Dooley

September 2008

Prepared for
the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830


Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

ABSTRACT: This report presents data on the 140 existing and 74 planned ethanol production facilities and their proximity to candidate deep geologic storage formations. Half of the existing ethanol plants and 64% of the planned units sit directly atop a candidate geologic storage reservoir, while 70% of the existing and 97% of the planned units are within 100 miles of at least one candidate deep geologic storage reservoir. As a percent of the total CO₂ emissions from these facilities, 92% of the emissions from existing units and 97% of the emissions from planned units are generated within 100 miles of at least one potential CO₂ storage reservoir.

KEY WORDS: ethanol production, carbon dioxide capture and storage; climate change, United States.

Figure 1 shows current and announced ethanol production facilities in the United States as well as candidate deep geologic CO₂ storage reservoirs.¹ As can be seen from Figure 1, while many ethanol facilities sit directly atop a potential storage formation, a significant percentage do not. This brief paper will examine the proximity of U.S. ethanol production facilities to candidate storage reservoirs, as well as the implications of this analysis for the potential deployment of carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) technologies within the U.S. ethanol industry.

Figure 1: Candidate Deep Geologic CO₂ Storage Reservoirs and Current and Planned Ethanol Production Facilities



¹ A description of the United States' massive and geographically dispersed theoretical geologic CO₂ storage capacity can be found in RT Dahowski, JJ Dooley, CL Davidson, S Bachu, and N Gupta. 2005. *Building the Cost Curves for CO₂ Storage: North America*. Technical Report 2005/3. IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme.

Overview of U.S. Ethanol Plants

Table 1 presents an overview of the existing and planned U.S. ethanol production infrastructure using the most recently available data.

Table 1: Overview of Existing and Planned Ethanol Production Facilities

	Existing Facilities	Planned Facilities	Total
Number of Facilities	140	74	214
Total Emissions, MtCO₂/yr	19.3	15.1	34.4

Ethanol plants are seen as potential early adopters of CCS systems as the cost of capturing CO₂ from these facilities is believed to be quite low. The fermentation process involved in producing ethanol results in a very pure stream of CO₂ that is typically vented to the atmosphere. If there were a policy in place that created a disincentive for venting CO₂ to the atmosphere, the CO₂ stream from these ethanol plants would only need to be dehydrated (to prevent corrosion in CO₂ pipelines) and compressed to typical pipeline pressures. The cost of capture (including dehydration and compression) from these facilities could be in the range of \$6-12/tonCO₂, which is far lower than the potential costs to capture and prepare pipeline-ready CO₂ from even the most modern coal fired power plants.² For this reason, industrial facilities such as ethanol plants that produce high purity CO₂ streams are often seen as early opportunities for CCS deployment.

Source Sink Matching Transporting CO₂ from Ethanol Facilities

While the cost of capturing CO₂ from ethanol plants is considered to be quite low, the captured CO₂ still needs to be delivered to a suitable deep geologic storage reservoir, injected into that reservoir, and monitored for safety and efficacy. The cost of transport (which for the U.S. and many other parts of the world will almost surely be by dedicated CO₂ pipelines)³ is likely to be another significant cost element, particularly on a per-ton basis given the relatively low-volume CO₂ streams produced by ethanol facilities.⁴

² JJ Dooley, CL Davidson, RT Dahowski, MA Wise, N Gupta, SH Kim, EL Malone, "Carbon Dioxide Capture and Geologic Storage: A Key Component of a Global Energy Technology Strategy to Address Climate Change." Joint Global Change Research Institute, Battelle Pacific Northwest Division. May 2006. PNWD-3602. College Park, MD.

³ *IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage*. 2005. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [B Metz, O Davidson, H de Conick, M Loos, and L Meyer] Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 442 pp.

⁴ Joel Sminchak, Robert Dahowski, James Dooley, Casie Davidson, and Neeraj Gupta. *Developing a Better Understanding of the Cost of CO₂ Transport and Storage: Moving Beyond a Fixed Storage Cost Assumption*. Presented at the Sixth Annual Conference on Carbon Capture and Sequestration. Pittsburgh. May 9, 2007. Joint Global Change Research Institute. Battelle. PNWD-SA-7806.

Source Sink Matching for Existing Ethanol Production Facilities

Table 2 presents summary information on the existing ethanol facilities and their proximity to candidate deep geologic CO₂ storage formations. As shown in Table 2, 50% of the existing ethanol plants (which cumulatively account for 46% of the CO₂ produced from all existing ethanol plants) sit directly atop a candidate deep geologic CO₂ storage formation. If the search radius is expanded to 50 miles, 85 existing ethanol plants (61%) could reach a candidate CO₂ storage reservoir. If the search radius is extended to 100 miles, 110 existing facilities accounting for 92% of the cumulative CO₂ from these existing ethanol plants could likely reach at least one deep geologic CO₂ storage formation.

Table 2: Existing Ethanol Facilities and their Distance to Candidate Deep Geologic CO₂ Storage Reservoirs

	Number of Facilities	% of Facilities	Total Emissions, MtCO₂/yr	% Of Emissions
0 miles	70	50%	19.3	46%
50 miles	85	61%	9.0	76%
100 miles	110	79%	14.8	92%
Total	140	100%	19.3	100%

Source Sink Matching for Planned Ethanol Production Facilities

Table 3 presents summary information on the planned ethanol facilities and their proximity to candidate deep geologic CO₂ storage formations. As can be seen from Table 3, 64% of the planned plants (62% of the planned units CO₂ emissions), appear to sit atop a candidate deep geologic CO₂ storage formation. If pipeline lengths of up to 50 miles are considered, then slightly more than 80% of the facilities and a similar percentage of their CO₂ emissions should be able to reach a candidate CO₂ storage reservoir. If the search radius is extended to 100 miles, virtually all of the facilities and their associated emissions (97% by both measures) should be able to reach a candidate deep geologic CO₂ storage reservoir.

Table 3: Existing Ethanol Facilities and their Distance to Candidate Deep Geologic CO₂ Storage Reservoirs

	Number of Facilities	% of Facilities	Total Emissions, MtCO₂/yr	% Of Emissions
0 miles	47	64%	9.4	62%
50 miles	60	81%	12.5	83%
100 miles	72	97%	14.7	97%
Total	74	100%	15.1	100%

The following figures illustrate the findings for both the existing and planned ethanol facilities. Figure 2 shows the distance from each current and planned ethanol production facility to the nearest candidate CO₂ storage formation. Figure 3 shows the cumulative estimated CO₂ emissions from these same sets (and order) of plants. Figure 4 shows a preliminary estimate of

cumulative CO₂ pipeline requirements, assuming individual pipelines from each plant to nearest storage reservoir, with a 17% routing factor and 10 mile adder to locate a suitable injection location .




Figure 2: Distance in Miles to Nearest Candidate Deep Geologic CO₂ Storage Formation for Both Existing and Current Ethanol Plants




Figure 3: Cumulative Estimated CO₂ Emissions for the Set of Existing and Planned Ethanol Production Facilities Shown in Figure 2.




Figure 4: Estimated Cumulative CO₂ Pipeline Infrastructure for the Set of Existing and Planned Ethanol Production Facilities Shown in Figure 2.