
Masters Theses

Student Theses and Dissertations

Summer 2014

Aspen simulation of furfural and hydroxymethylfurfural production from biomass

Zachary Daniel King

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses



Part of the [Chemical Engineering Commons](#)

Department:

Recommended Citation

King, Zachary Daniel, "Aspen simulation of furfural and hydroxymethylfurfural production from biomass" (2014). *Masters Theses*. 7300.

https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses/7300

This thesis is brought to you by Scholars' Mine, a service of the Missouri S&T Library and Learning Resources. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact scholarsmine@mst.edu.

ASPEN SIMULATION OF FURFURAL
AND HYDROXYMETHYLFURFURAL
PRODUCTION FROM BIOMASS

by

ZACHARY DANIEL KING

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
MISSOURI UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

2014

Approved by:

Dr. Neil L. Book, Advisor
Dr. Muthanna H. Al-Dahhan
Dr. Joseph Smith

© 2014

Zachary Daniel King

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Biomass field liquefaction is a concept where green biomass is chemically treated to produce organic liquids using small-scale equipment in the field. If liquefaction occurs as the crop is harvested, the energy requirements for growing the biomass can be charged to the crop as if the biomass were left in the field. The energy in the organic liquid product is available at the expense of the energy required by the process. A simplified process was simulated using ASPEN to assess the energy production feasibility.

Acid catalyzed liquefaction of cellulose and hemicellulose solids produces furfural and hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF). The simulation assumed furfural from xylans and HMF from hexosans were the only organic products. Reaction rate was regressed from published data. Complete physical properties were estimated for HMF using group contribution methods (Marrero-Pardillo, critical properties; Benson, ideal gas heat capacity and standard heat of formation; UNIFAC, vapor-liquid-liquid equilibrium).

Two figures of merit were determined over a range of process temperatures, residence times, and feed compositions (xylan, hexosan, and a mixture representative of corn stover). Maximum energy recovery ratio was nearly 2/3 and represents the ratio of combustion energy in the organic liquid product minus energy required for the reactor to biomass feed combustion energy. This value occurred at short residence time, desirable for field liquefaction. The product to process energy ratio is the ratio of the combustion energy in the organic liquid product to the process energy requirements. The 9:1 maximum occurred with low temperature and high conversion (long residence time). The value was greater than 7:1 for high temperature and conversion (short residence time), which compares favorably with the enzymatic ethanol biomass reported value of 2.61:1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Dr. Neil Book for his insight, assistance and patience, Justin Cobb for his work on the properties on hydroxymethylfurfural, committee member Dr. Oliver Sitton for his knowledge of ASPEN, and committee members Dr. Muthanna Al-Dahhan and Dr. Joseph Smith for their participation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iv |
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS..... | vii |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | viii |
| SECTION | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1. AGRICULTURAL RESIDUES | 1 |
| 1.2. FOREST RESIDUES | 2 |
| 1.3. ENERGY PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY | 2 |
| 1.4. PRODUCTION OF FURFURALS..... | 3 |
| 1.5. THERMODYNAMIC COMPARISON | 3 |
| 1.6. SIMULATION OF THE SOLVENT LIQUEFACTION PROCESS..... | 7 |
| 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... | 10 |
| 2.1. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES | 10 |
| 2.1.1. Minimum Physical Properties Required by ASPEN..... | 10 |
| 2.1.2. Properties of HMF..... | 10 |
| 2.1.2.1 Chemicals with similar structure | 12 |
| 2.1.2.2 Critical and normal properties of HMF | 18 |
| 2.1.2.3 Vapor pressure of HMF | 25 |
| 2.1.2.4 Liquid molar volume of HMF..... | 25 |
| 2.1.2.5 Ideal gas heat of formation and heat capacity of HMF..... | 26 |
| 2.1.3. UNIFAC Parameters | 27 |
| 2.2. PROPERTIES OF SOLIDS..... | 31 |
| 2.3. REACTION KINETICS | 32 |
| 3. SIMULATION..... | 35 |
| 3.1. PROCESS DESCRIPTION | 35 |
| 3.1.1. Process..... | 35 |
| 3.1.2. Reactor..... | 35 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| 3.1.3. Phase Separator | 36 |
| 3.2. FEEDSTOCK | 36 |
| 4. SIMULATION RESULTS..... | 37 |
| 5. DISCUSSION | 41 |
| APPENDICES | |
| A. ASPEN SIMULATION FILES..... | 43 |
| B. SIMULATION RESULTS | 45 |
| C. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES | 50 |
| REFERENCES | 52 |
| VITA..... | 54 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| Figure | Page |
|---|------|
| 1.1 Chemical Pathways for the Combustion of Xylan..... | 5 |
| 1.2 Chemical Pathways for the Combustion of Cellulose | 6 |
| 1.3 Solvent Liquefaction Process for Biomass | 7 |
| 1.4 Process Flow Diagram for Simulation..... | 8 |
| 2.1 Furfural-HMF-Water Ternary Diagram..... | 30 |
| 2.2 Reaction Rate Regression | 33 |
| 2.3 Regressed Reaction Rate as a Function of Temperature | 34 |
| 3.1 Simulation Process Flow Diagram..... | 35 |
| 4.1 Heat of Reaction as a Function of Temperature | 37 |
| 4.2 Product Energy Recovery Ratio as a Function of Conversion | 39 |
| 4.3 Product Energy to Process Energy as a Function of Conversion..... | 40 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 2.1 Physical Properties of HMF | 11 |
| 2.2 Normal Boiling Point Estimates and Comparison with Reported Values | 19 |
| 2.3 Critical Property Estimates and Comparison with Reported Values | 24 |
| 2.4 Benson Group Contribution Method | 27 |
| 2.5 UNIFAC Parameter Values for Ring Groups | 28 |
| 2.6 Group Energy Interaction Parameters (K) | 29 |
| 2.7 Solids Property Data | 31 |
| 2.8 Reaction Rate Data for Solvent Liquefaction | 33 |

1. INTRODUCTION

The patent, A Process for the Liquefaction of Lignocellulosic Material (Petrus and Voss, 2005), describes a process for the solvent liquefaction of lignocellulosic residues. The process achieves high liquefaction fractions in short residence times. The short residence times create the potential for performing the liquefaction in the field with small-scale equipment on green (wet) residues and transporting the liquid product to a large-scale refinery where the crude product is converted to fuels and/or chemicals. The potential advantages of field liquefaction are:

- 1) Single-pass harvesting
- 2) Transport and storage of liquid products
- 3) Enhanced revenue from co-product residues.

1.1. AGRICULTURAL RESIDUES

Harvesters, such as combines, harvest much of the plant and then separate the grain from the biomass which is returned to the field. After field drying, a second pass is required to bale the residues. Since the residues are a distributed resource and produced seasonally but processed continuously at large-scale facilities, transportation and storage costs are significant. The spontaneous combustion of wet residues and the natural degradation of residues in storage complicate the problem.

Adding liquefaction equipment to the harvester has the potential to allow single-pass harvesting of both grain and plant residue. Farms and grain elevators could add liquid storage facilities to take advantage of off-season collection price increments as is done with grain. Pipeline systems from elevators or other liquid storage facilities to large-scale refineries provide inexpensive solutions for large-scale transportation of liquids. Most importantly, the farmer realizes additional revenues with very small incremental costs (a tank truck would be required for transportation of liquid products).

1.2. FOREST RESIDUES

The logs produced from a tree represent a small fraction of the total biomass. Leaves, branches and tops are left in the forest. Small-scale liquefaction equipment that converts the residues to a liquid product that can be pumped from the forest to a tank truck represents the potential to coproduce value from the residues.

1.3. ENERGY PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY


Studies on biomass and petrochemical processes for energy employ a variety of comparison strategies. These often reflect the scope of the analysis as well as assumptions made and insure consistent and equitable comparison between renewable biomass and fossil fuel processes. At one extreme, a comprehensive life cycle analysis of energy inputs is employed. On the other, only the process by which feedstock is converted to product is used. The former must include the latter and thus requires additional assumptions. Further when biomass such as corn stover and not grain, for which the crop was grown, is used as a feedstock, the energy and monetary costs associated with growing the crop are shared. Assigning value for these co-products is another important parameter in energy production efficiency comparisons.

There has been considerable controversy over the amount of net energy that is obtained from ethanol produced from grain. Pimental and Patzek claim that more energy is expended in production, harvesting and converting the grain to ethanol than is derived from its combustion as a fuel (2005). Graboski refutes Pimentel's claims, and, based on a different set of assumptions, indicates that there is a positive net energy production from grain-derived ethanol (2002). However, the ratio of available combustion energy to production energy consumed was, at best, approximately 5:4. Thus, a 100,000-gallon per year grain ethanol plant requires the consumption of the equivalent of 80,000 gallons per year having a net energy production of only 20,000 gallons per year. This is in stark contrast to the petroleum-derived fuels that consume about 7% (Graboski, 2002) of the available energy (14:1 ratio) in production. Lorenz et al. estimate that the product to process energy ratio is approximately 2.62:1 for ethanol derived from enzymatic hydrolysis of lignocellulosic residues. The estimates for the enzymatic hydrolysis process are based on second-pass harvesting of field-dried residues and assume that conversion

efficiencies obtained from small-scale equipment with uniform feedstocks will be obtained at large scale with seasonal feedstocks that vary widely in composition.

1.4. PRODUCTION OF FURFURALS

A method of producing furfurals is to hydrolyze the biomass into the constituent sugars and then dehydrate. Both reactions are acid catalyzed.



The hemicellulose fraction of the biomass contains a large percentage of xylans which dehydrate to furfural. The cellulose fraction of the biomass is composed of hexosans that dehydrate to hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF).

1.5. THERMODYNAMIC COMPARISON

Various processes are available for converting biomass to both energy and feedstocks for further processing including; synthesis gas (SynGas, H₂ and CO), methane, ethanol and furfurals. Two factors that can describe the thermodynamics of each of these processes is the enthalpy of reaction to create the products and the chemical energy embodied by the products. If complete combustion is assumed in all cases, the sum of the process energy and combustion energy must be the same for each process for thermodynamic consistency.

Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2 show these thermodynamic relationships starting with both xylan, a pentosan, and cellulose, a hexosan for six routes from the feed to complete combustion. The molar quantities have multipliers so that both processes result in the same molar quantities of combustion products. See Appendix B for results of simulations. Exothermic reactions may offer energy to carry out the process but represent a net loss from feedstock to product. Endothermic reactions represent a necessary input to the process in the form of energy or using some of the feed to drive the process and generally require a high temperature process. However, the energy input in the conversion process

is recovered in the combustion of the fuel. The most appealing processes will neither be highly endothermic or exothermic. The conversion of xylans and hexosans to furfurals is very nearly athermal. Thus, energy expended in the furfural conversion process is lost and cannot be recovered during combustion.




Figure 1.1 Chemical Pathways for the Combustion of Xylan




Figure 1.2 Chemical Pathways for the Combustion of Cellulose

1.6. SIMULATION OF THE SOLVENT LIQUEFACTION PROCESS

A process flow diagram for solvent liquefaction of biomass is given in Figure 1.3.




Figure 1.3 Solvent Liquefaction Process for Biomass

Biomass, acid solution, and solvent are fed to a reactor in which the cellulose and hemicellulose fractions of the biomass are converted to organic liquids. A neutralizing agent is added to the product of the reactor to convert the acid to a solid precipitate (such as lime addition to sulfuric acid to form gypsum). The solids (precipitate and unreacted solids) are filtered and washed with water to recover entrapped solvent and organic liquids. The solvent is recovered from the overflows from the filter and recycled. Upon cooling to atmospheric conditions, two liquid phases form that can be decanted.

The patent used levulinic acid and gamma valerolactone as the liquefaction solvent. However, a claim was made for a family of compounds (containing these two compounds) that could serve as the solvent. For the field liquefaction, high solvent recoveries for recycle are necessary so that quantities of makeup solvent are minimal. A solvent, perhaps from this family, but with a moiety that is effective at liquefaction,

unaffected by the neutralization process, and easily recovered will be required. The washed solids are returned to the soil to satisfy the soil conservation requirements.

A simulation of a simplified version of the solvent liquefaction process has been performed to assess energy production efficiency. The process flow diagram for the simulation is given in Figure 1.4.




Figure 1.4 Process Flow Diagram for Simulation

It is assumed that an acid/solvent combination exists that converts xylans to furfural and cellulose to HMF. The feedstock is taken to be a green residue that is modeled as a moist solid composed of cellulose and hemicelluloses. The patent achieves high solids liquefaction percentages that indicate lignin is also liquefied. The chemical products of lignin liquefaction are unknown so the solid feed is taken to be free of lignin. The cellulose is assumed to hydrolyze to glucose and then dehydrate to hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF). The hemicellulose fraction is assumed to be xylan that hydrolyzes to xylose and then dehydrates to furfural.

Water, furfural, and HMF can form immiscible liquid phases: an aqueous or water-rich phase that is predominantly water and an organic or furfural-rich phase that is largely furfurals. The energy efficiency of the process is measured using a figure of merit defined as the ratio of the combustion energy in the HMF and furfural in the organic

phase minus the process energy requirement to the combustion energy in the cellulose and hemicellulose in the feedstock. The figure of merit is determined for wet feedstocks of varying composition, process temperature and residence times in order to assess the energy production potential of the solvent liquefaction process.


2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

2.1.1. Minimum Physical Properties Required by ASPEN. The ASPEN process simulator requires certain physical properties dependent on the calculation method selected. In this simulation UNIFAC is used to predict the vapor-liquid-liquid equilibrium of the furfurals and water. For these compounds involved in the vapor-liquid-liquid equilibrium calculations a complete set of physical properties are required. In ASPEN this will depend on the calculation route used. For this simulation; critical temperature, critical pressure, ideal gas heat of formation, vapor pressure, ideal gas heat capacity, heat of vaporization, and liquid density are required. For solids, xylan and cellulose, which are not involved in the vapor-liquid-liquid equilibrium only heat capacity and density are required.


2.1.2. Properties of HMF. Furfural is a commercial solvent and precursor chemical so its physical properties have been measured. Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF) is not a common commercial product and many of its properties have been estimated. The complete list of physical properties used in the simulation can be found in Table 2.1.

Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF) is the common name for 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furancarboxaldehyde, (CAS Registry Number 67-47-0). HMF is formed by the dehydration of glucose in the presence of an acid catalyst.



Other common names are: 2-furaldehyde, 5-(hydroxymethyl)-; 5-hydroxymethylfurfural; hydroxymethylfurfurole; HMF; 5-(hydroxymethyl)furfurole; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-formylfuran; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-furaldehyde; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-furancarboxal; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-furfural; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-furfuraldehyde; 5-(hydroxymethyl)furan-2-aldehyde; 5-(hydroxymethyl)furfural;

5-hydroxymethylfuraldehyde; 5-oxymethylfurfurole; 5-hydroxymethylfurfuraldehyde; 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furancarbaldehyde; hydroxymethylfurfuraldehyde; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-furancarboxaldehyde; and 2-hydroxymethyl-5-furfural; 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-furfural). The chemical structure is:



The base chemical structure is a furan ring. The molecular mass is 126.11 g/mol.


Table 2.1 Physical Properties of HMF

| Property | ASPEN Property | Units | Value | See Section |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Molecular Weight | MW | | 126.11 | |
| Critical Temperature | TC | K | 787.9 | 2.1.2.2 |
| Critical Pressure | PC | bar | 56.4 | 2.1.2.2 |
| Boiling Point | | K | 564 | 2.1.2.2 |
| Ideal Gas Heat of Formation | DHFORM | J/Kmole | -277200000 | 2.1.2.5 |
| Ideal Gas Energy of Formation | DGFORM | J/Kmole | -186000000 | 2.1.2.5 |
| Vapor Pressure | PLXANT/1 PLXANT/2 | Pascal | 25.67 -7977 | 2.1.2.3 |
| Ideal Gas Heat Capacity | CPIG/1 CPIG/2 | J/Kmole K | -5234.35936 535.854217 | 2.1.2.5 |
| Liquid Molar Volume | RKTZRA | cum/kmol | 0.0621 | 2.1.2.4 |

2.1.2.1 Chemicals with similar structure. A number of chemical species have a structure that is similar to HMF and have published data. The methods used to estimate the physical properties of HMF were used on these compounds to confirm the accuracy of the methods.

- **Furfural**


The chemical structure of 2-furancarboxaldehyde (furfural; 2-furaldehyde; α -furole; artificial ant oil; fural; furaldehyde; furale; furancarboneal; furfuraldehyde; furfurole; furfurylaldehyde; furole; pyromucic aldehyde; 2-formylfuran; 2-furanaldehyde; 2-furancarboneal; 2-furfural; 2-furfuraldehyde; 2-furylaldehyde; furol; 2-furylmetanal; artificial oil of ants; furfurale; furfurol; NCI-C56177; 2-furil-metanal; 2-furankarbaldehyd; furfuralu; RCRA waste number U125; UN 1199; 2-furylaldehyde xypropane; 2-furylcarboxaldehyde; cyclic aldehyde; QO furfural; 2-furancarboxyaldehyde; furan-2-aldehyde; furan-2-carbaldehyde; furancarboxaldehyde) is:



The normal boiling point is 434.7 ± 0.4 K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein & Thermodynamics Research Center). The molecular mass is 96.0841 g/mol.

- **Furan**


The chemical structure of furan (divinylene oxide; furfuran; oxacyclopentadiene; oxole; tetrole; furane; furfurane; NCI-C56202; RCRA waste number U124; UN 2389; QO furan) is:



The normal boiling point is 304.7 ± 0.6 K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein & Thermodynamics Research Center). Poling et al. report the boiling point as 304.44 K. The molecular mass is 68.0740 g/mol.

- **Methylfuran (MF)**


The chemical structure of 2-methylfuran is:



The normal boiling point is $337. \pm 1.$ K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein, Thermodynamics Research Center). Poling et al. report the boiling point as 337.87 K. The molecular mass is 82.1005 g/mol.

- **Tetrahydrofuran (THF)**


The chemical structure of tetrahydrofuran (butane α,δ -oxide; butane, 1,4-epoxy-; cyclotetramethylene oxide; furanidine; oxacyclopentane; oxolane; tetramethylene oxide; THF; hydrofuran; tetrahydrofuraan; tetrahydrofuranne; tetrahydrofurano; NCI-C60560; RCRA waste number U213; UN 2056; diethylene oxide; dynasolve 150; QO tetrahydrofuran (THF); tetrahydrofurane;) is:



The normal boiling point is $339. \pm 1$. K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein, Thermodynamics Research Center, Domalski and Hearing). Poling et al. report the boiling point as 339.12 K. The molecular mass is 72.1057 g/mol.

- **Dihydrofuran (DHF)**


The chemical structure of 2,3-dihydrofuran (4,5-dihydrofuran) is:



The normal boiling point is 327.7 and $328.15. \pm 3$. K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein). The molecular mass is 70.0898 g/mol.

- **Dimethylfuran (DMF)**


The chemical structure of 2,5-dimethylfuran (2,5-dimethylfurane) is:



The normal boiling point is $367. \pm 1$. K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein, Thermodynamics Research Center). The molecular mass is 96.1271 g/mol.

- **Methyltetrahydrofuran (MTHF)**


The chemical structure of tetrahydro-2-methylfuran (tetrahydrosylvan; 2-methyltetrahydrofuran; furan, 2-methyl-tetrahydro-; methyltetrahydrofuran; 2-methyloxolane; tetrahydrofuran, 2-methyl-; 2-methylfuranidine) is:



The normal boiling point is 352 ± 10 K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein, Thermodynamics Research Center). Poling et al. report the boiling point as 353.37 K. The molecular mass is 86.1323 g/mol.

- **Methyldihydrofuran (MDHF)**


The chemical structure of 2,3-dihydro-5-methyl-furan (2-methyl-4,5-dihydrofuran; 2,3-dihydro-5-methylfuran; 4,5-dihydro-2-methylfuran; 5-methyl-2,3-dihydrofuran; 4,5-dihydrosylvan) is:



Values for the normal boiling point are 355.2 and 354.65 ± 1.5 K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein). The molecular mass is 84.1164 g/mol.

- **Pyran**


The chemical structure of 4H-pyran is:



The normal boiling point is not reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook. The molecular mass is 82.1005 g/mol.

- **Tetrahydropyran (THP)**


The chemical structure of tetrahydro-2H-pyran (tetrahydropyran; oxacyclohexane; oxane; pentamethylene oxide; THP) is:



The normal boiling point is 361.0 ± 0.7 K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein, Thermodynamics Research Center). The molecular mass is 86.1323 g/mol.

- **Dihydropyran (DHP)**


The chemical structure of 3,4-dihydro-2H-pyran (δ (sup2)-dihydropyran; 2,3-dihydro-4H-pyran; 2H-3,4-dihydropyran; 3,4-dihydro-2H-pyran; 3,4-dihydropyran; 5,6-dihydro-4H-pyran; 2,3-dihydropyran; 3,4-dihydro-2H-pyrane; 3,4-dihydro-2-pyran; δ 2-dihydropyran; pyran, dihydro-) is:



Values for the normal boiling point are 359.7 , 359 ± 4 (Brown and Stein), 359 ± 2 , and 358.85 ± 0.3 K (Thermodynamics Research Center) as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook. The molecular mass is 84.1164 g/mol.

- **Furfuryl Alcohol (FA)**


The chemical structure of 2-furanmethanol (furfuryl alcohol; α -furfuryl alcohol; α -furylcarbinol; furfuralcohol; furyl alcohol; furylcarbinol; 2-(hydroxymethyl)furan; 2-furancarbinol; 2-furanylmethanol; 2-furfuryl alcohol; 2-furylcarbinol; 2-furylmethanol; 5-hydroxymethylfuran; furfural alcohol; methanol, (2-furyl)-; NCI-C56224; 2-furfurylalkohol; UN 2874; 5-hydroxymethylfuranal; FA; QO furfuryl alcohol; 2-furanemethanol; 2-furane-methanol (furfurol); 2-furanmethanol (furfuryl alcohol); 2-hydroxymethylfurane; furan-2-methanol; furanmethanol; furfurol) is:



The normal boiling point is $430. \pm 70$. K as reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook (Brown and Stein, Thermodynamics Research Center). The molecular mass is 98.0999 g/mol.

- **Methylhydroxymethylfuran (MHMF)**


The chemical structure of 5-methyl, 2-furanmethanol, ((5-Methyl-2-furyl)methanol; 5-methyl-2-furfuryl alcohol; (5-methylfurfur-2-yl)-methanol; 5-methylfurfuryl alcohol) is:



The normal boiling point is not reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook. The molecular mass is 112.1265 g/mol.

- **Dihydroxymethylfuran (DHMF)**

The chemical structure of 2,5-dihydroxymethylfuran is:



The normal boiling point is not reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook. The molecular mass is 128.1259 g/mol.

2.1.2.2 Critical and normal properties of HMF. The normal boiling point of HMF is not reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook. Román-Leshkov et al. report the value of 564 K (2007). The Marrero-Pardillo bond contribution method was used to estimate the normal boiling point of HMF and several other molecules of similar structure for which data are published (Marrero-Marejón and Pardillo-Fontdevila, 1999). The results are given in Table 2.2

Table 2.2 Normal Boiling Point Estimates and Comparison with Reported Values

| Bond | Contribution χ_{T_b} | Pair # | Bond Incidence η_b | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| | | | HMF | Furfural | Furan | MF | THF | DHF | DMF | MTHF |
| -CH[=][r]&-CH[=][r] | -0.2246 | 130 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| =CH-[r]&=CH-[r] | 0.2089 | 133 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| =CH-[r]&-O-[r] | 0.1000 | 135 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| =C<[r]&-O-[r] | 0.1104 | 143 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| -CH[=][r]&>C[=][r] | -0.3586 | 131 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| =C<[r]&-CHO | 0.0919 | 152 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| -CH2-&=C<[r] | 0.1012 | 37 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| -CH2-&-OH | -0.0786 | 42 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| -CH2-[r]&-O-[r] | -0.0092 | 117 | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 |
| -CH2-[r]&-CH2-[r] | -0.0098 | 112 | | | | | 3 | 1 | | 2 |
| CH3-&=C<[r] | 0.0987 | 10 | | | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| -CH2-[r]&=CH-[r] | 0.0976 | 115 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| CH3-&>CH-[r] | -0.0214 | 8 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| >CH-[r]&-O-[r] | -0.0218 | 125 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| -CH2-[r]&>CH-[r] | -0.0093 | 113 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Predicted Value (K) | | | 535.3 | 423.9 | 310.9 | 348.0 | 343.6 | 322.9 | 381.6 | 351.7 |
| Reported Values (K) | | | | | | | | | | |
| NIST | | | | 434.7 | 304.7 | 337. | 339. | 327.7 328.15 | 367. | 352 |
| PPOC | | | | | 304.44 | 337.87 | 339.12 | | | 353.37 |
| RPP | | | | 434.9 | 304.5 | 338. | 338. | | | 351. |
| RBLD | | | 564 | 435 | | 336 | | | 366 | |
| Accepted Value (K) | | | 564 | 434.7 | 304.7 | 337. | 339. | 327.7 | 367. | 352 |
| Absolute Error (K) | | | -28.7 | -10.8 | 6.2 | 11.0 | 4.6 | -4.8 | 14.6 | -0.3 |
| Percentage Error (%) | | | -5.1 | -2.5 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 1.4 | -1.5 | 4.0 | -0.1 |

NIST--National Institute for Standards and Technology Chemistry WebBook (<http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/>) on July 1, 2009

PPOC--Poling, B. E., J. M. Prausnitz, and J. P. O'Connell, **The Properties of Gases and Liquids**, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill, (2000)

RPP--Reid, R. C., J. M. Prausnitz, and B. E. Poling, **The Properties of Gases and Liquids**, 4th Edition, McGraw-Hill, (1987)

RBLD-- Roman-Leshkov, Y, C. J. Barrett, Z. Y. Liu, and J. A. Dumesic, **Nature**, **447**, (June 21, 2007) p. 982

Table 2.2 Normal Boiling Point Estimates and Comparison with Reported Values (cont.)

| Bond | Contribution χ_{T_b} | Pair # | Bond Incidence η_b | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | MDHF | Pyran | THP | DHP | FA | MHMF | DHMF |
| -CH[=][r]&-CH[=][r] | -0.2246 | 130 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| =CH-[r]&=CH-[r] | 0.2089 | 133 | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| =CH-[r]&-O-[r] | 0.1000 | 135 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| =C<[r]&-O-[r] | 0.1104 | 143 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 |
| -CH[=][r]&>C[=][r] | -0.3586 | 131 | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| =C<[r]&-CHO | 0.0919 | 152 | | | | | | | |
| -CH2-&=C<[r] | 0.1012 | 37 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| -CH2-&-OH | -0.0786 | 42 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| -CH2-[r]&-O-[r] | -0.0092 | 117 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| -CH2-[r]&-CH2-[r] | -0.0098 | 112 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | | | |
| CH3-&=C<[r] | 0.0987 | 10 | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| -CH2-[r]&=CH-[r] | 0.0976 | 115 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| CH3-&>CH-[r] | -0.0214 | 8 | | | | | | | |
| >CH-[r]&-O-[r] | -0.0218 | 125 | | | | | | | |
| -CH2-[r]&>CH-[r] | -0.0093 | 113 | | | | | | | |
| Predicted Value (K) | | | 359.0 | 325.1 | 364.0 | 344.7 | 443.8 | 471.3 | 552.7 |
| Reported Values (K) | | | | | | | | | |
| NIST | | | 355.2 354.65 | | 361.0 | 359.7 359 359 358.85 | 430 | | |
| PPOC | | | | | | | | | |
| RPP | | | | | 361. | 359. | | | |
| RBLD | | | | | | | 435 | 452 | 548 |
| Accepted Value (K) | | | 355.2 | | 361.0 | 359.7 | 435 | 452 | 548 |
| Absolute Error (K) | | | 3.8 | | 3.0 | -15.0 | 8.8 | 19.3 | 4.7 |
| Percentage Error (%) | | | 1.1 | | 0.8 | -4.2 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 0.9 |

NIST--National Institute for Standards and Technology Chemistry WebBook (<http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/>) on July 1, 2009

PPOC--Poling, B. E., J. M. Prausnitz, and J. P. O'Connell, **The Properties of Gases and Liquids**, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill, (2000)

RPP--Reid, R. C., J. M. Prausnitz, and B. E. Poling, **The Properties of Gases and Liquids**, 4th Edition, McGraw-Hill, (1987)

RBLD-- Roman-Leshkov, Y, C. J. Barrett, Z. Y. Liu, and J. A. Dumesic, **Nature**, **447**, (June 21, 2007) p. 982

The bond contribution values are those reported in Poling et al. (2000). The equation that relates the bond contributions to the normal boiling point is:

$$T_b = 156.00 + M^{-0.404} \sum \eta_b \chi_{T_b} \quad (1)$$

- T_b Estimate for the normal boiling point (K)
- M Molecular mass (g/mol)
- η_b Bond incidence
- χ_{T_b} Bond contribution for the normal boiling point

The predicted value for the normal boiling point of HMF is 535.3 K. The error between the predicted boiling point and the reported value is -28.7 K or -5.1%. Unfortunately, these errors are larger than those of the other 13 compounds of similar structure that were examined. HMF has the highest reported boiling point of the compounds in the analysis. The database used to determine the bond contributions would be unlikely to contain higher values for molecules containing furan bonds. However, the errors for the 13 compounds with reported data varied from -2.5% to +4.3% with no discernible pattern and an average absolute percentage error of 2.2%. The errors for the eight compounds that share at least one of the six bonds in HMF covered the full range from -2.5% to +4.3 with an average absolute percentage error of 2.5%. Poling et al. report an average absolute percentage error of 2.0% for 347 compounds using the Marrero-Pardillo method. Of the 347 compounds, only 29 had absolute percentage errors greater than 5% and only 10 were greater than 10%. The large error (-5.1%) between the predicted and reported values for the normal boiling point of HMF compared to the average error ($\pm 1.0\%$) for the Marrero-Padillo method reduces the confidence that other properties will be predicted within the average errors for the method. The reported value (564 K) was used.

The critical properties of HMF are not reported in the NIST Chemistry WebBook. The equations that relate the bond contributions to the critical properties are:

$$T_c = \frac{T_b}{0.5851 - 0.9286 \sum \eta_b \chi_{T_c} - \left(\sum \eta_b \chi_{T_c} \right)^2} \quad (2)$$

$$P_c = \left[0.1285 - 0.0059 N_a - \sum \eta_b \chi_{P_c} \right]^{-2} \quad (3)$$

$$V_c = 25.1 + \sum \eta_b \chi_{V_c} \quad (4)$$

- T_c Estimate for the critical temperature (K)
- χ_{T_c} Bond contribution for the critical temperature
- N_a Number of atoms in the molecule
- χ_{P_c} Bond contribution for the critical pressure
- χ_{V_c} Bond contribution for the critical volume

The accepted value (Table 2.2) for the normal boiling point was used to estimate the critical temperature (except for pyran) not the value predicted by the Marrero-Pardillo method. The predicted values for the critical properties of HMF are 787.9 K, 56.4 bar, and 229.9 cm³/mole. These values give a critical compressibility factor for HMF of 0.1998. A comparison with reported values for compounds with similar structure is given in Table 2.3. The seven compounds with reported values for the critical temperature had percentage errors that ranged from -0.7% to +1.0% with an average absolute percentage error of 0.4%. The three compounds that share bonds with HMF had a range of -0.5% to +0.3% and an average of 0.3%. Poling et al. report an average absolute percentage error of 0.9% for 343 compounds using the Marrero-Pardillo method using reported values for the normal boiling point. Of the 343 compounds, only 7 had absolute percentage errors greater than 5% and only one was greater than 10%. The seven compounds with reported values for the critical pressure had percentage errors that ranged from -4.3% to +12.6% with an average absolute percentage error of 7.8%. The three compounds that share bonds with HMF had a range of +7.9% to +12.6% and an average of 10.2%. Poling et al. report an average absolute percentage error of 5.3% for 338 compounds using the Marrero-Pardillo method. Of the 338 compounds, 110 had absolute

percentage errors greater than 5% of which 47 were greater than 10%. The six compounds with reported values for the critical volume had percentage errors that ranged from -0.5% to +3.9% with an average absolute percentage error of 1.2%. The two compounds that share bonds with HMF had percentage errors of -0.5% and 0% and an absolute average of 0.3%. Poling et al. report an average absolute percentage error of 3.2% for 296 compounds using the Marrero-Pardillo method. Of the 296 compounds, 55 had absolute percentage errors greater than 5% of which 18 were greater than 10%.

Table 2.3 Critical Property Estimates and Comparison with Reported Values

| | Chemical Species | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------|------------------------|--------|------------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| CRITICAL TEMPERATURE | HMF | Furfural | Furan | MF | THF | DHF | DMF | MTHF | MDHF | Pyran | THP | DHP | FA | MHMF | DHMF |
| Predicted Value (K) | 787.9 | 672.1 | 490.7 | 525.4 | 540.5 | 523.7 | 555.5 | 538.2 | 549.9 | 514.1 | 568.3 | 567.5 | 624.7 | 635.0 | 729.3 |
| Reported Values (K) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NIST | | 670. | 490.2 490.2 487. | 528. | 540.2 540.1 541. | | | 537. | | | 572.2 | 561.7 | | | |
| PPOC | | | 490.15 | 527.85 | 540.20 | | | 537.00 | | | | | | | |
| RPP | | 670. | 490.2 | 527. | | | | 537. | | | 572.2 | 561.7 | | | |
| Accepted Value (K) | | 670. | 490.2 | 528. | 540.2 | | | 537. | | | 572.2 | 561.7 | | | |
| Absolute Error (K) | | 2.1 | 0.5 | -2.6 | 0.3 | | | 1.2 | | | -3.9 | 4.2 | | | |
| Percentage Error (%) | | 0.3 | 0.1 | -0.5 | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | | | -0.7 | 1.0 | | | |
| CRITICAL PRESSURE | HMF | Furfural | Furan | MF | THF | DHF | DMF | MTHF | MDHF | Pyran | THP | DHP | FA | MHMF | DHMF |
| Predicted Value (bar) | 56.4 | 59.4 | 59.9 | 52.0 | 49.7 | 53.4 | 45.5 | 40.6 | 46.7 | 54.0 | 46.7 | 50.2 | 56.8 | 49.4 | 53.9 |
| Reported Values (bar) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NIST | | 55.1 | 53.2 | 47.2 | 51.9 | | | 37.5763 | | | 47.7 | 45.6 | | | |
| PPOC | | | 55.00 | 47.20 | 51.90 | | | 37.60 | | | | | | | |
| RPP | | 58.9 | 55.0 | 47.2 | | | | 37.6 | | | 47.7 | 45.6 | | | |
| Accepted Value (bar) | | 55.1 | 53.2 | 47.2 | 51.9 | | | 37.6 | | | 47.7 | 45.6 | | | |
| Absolute Error (bar) | | 4.3 | 6.7 | 4.8 | -2.2 | | | 3.0 | | | -1.0 | 4.6 | | | |
| Percentage Error (%) | | 7.9 | 12.6 | 10.1 | -4.3 | | | 8.0 | | | -2.0 | 10.0 | | | |
| CRITICAL VOLUME | HMF | Furfural | Furan | MF | THF | DHF | DMF | MTHF | MDHF | Pyran | THP | DHP | FA | MHMF | DHMF |
| Predicted Value (cm³/mole) | 229.9 | 175.3 | 218.0 | 247.0 | 225.1 | 220.8 | 276.0 | 273.7 | 249.8 | 263.7 | 272.3 | 268.0 | 272.6 | 301.6 | 327.2 |
| Reported Values (cm³/mole) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NIST | | | 219. | 247. | 225. | | | 267. | | | 262. | | | | |
| PPOC | | | 218.00 | 246.40 | 224.00 | | | 267.00 | | | | | | | |
| RPP | | | 218. | 247. | | | | 267. | | | 263. | 268. | | | |
| Accepted Value (cm³/mole) | | | 219. | 247. | 225. | | | 267. | | | 262. | 268. | | | |
| Absolute Error (cm³/mole) | | | -1.0 | 0 | 0.1 | | | 6.7 | | | 10.3 | 0 | | | |
| Percentage Error (%) | | | -0.5 | 0 | 0.0 | | | 2.5 | | | 3.9 | 0 | | | |

NIST--National Institute for Standards and Technology Chemistry WebBook (<http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/>) on July 1, 2009

PPOC--Poling, B. E., J. M. Prausnitz, and J. P. O'Connell, **The Properties of Gases and Liquids**, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill, (2000)

RPP--Reid, R. C., J. M. Prausnitz, and B. E. Poling, **The Properties of Gases and Liquids**, 4th Edition, McGraw-Hill, (1987)

2.1.2.3 Vapor pressure of HMF. Vapor pressure regressed from the Clausius-Clapeyron equation for the vapor pressure of HMF using the normal boiling and critical points is (Koretsky, 2004):

$$P = e^{-7977/T+25.67} \quad (5)$$

- P Vapor pressure in pascal
- T Temperature in K

2.1.2.4 Liquid molar volume of HMF. The Rackett equation was used to estimate liquid molar volume using critical temperature, critical volume and critical compressibility factor (1970):

$$Z_c = \frac{P_c V_c}{T_c R} \quad (6)$$

$$V_f = \frac{RT_c}{P_c} Z_c^{1+(1-T_r)^{2/7}} \quad (7)$$

- Z_c Critical compressibility factor
- V_c Critical volume
- V_f Liquid molar volume
- T_r Reduced temperature
- R Ideal gas constant

$$Z_c = 0.198$$

$$V_f = 0.05589 \text{ L/mol}$$

2.1.2.5 Ideal gas heat of formation and heat capacity of HMF. Enthalpy of formation for HMF is not reported in the NIST Chemistry Webook. The Benson group method was used to estimate the ideal gas heat of formation and heat capacity at temperatures from 298 to 1000 K (Poling et al., 2000).

The Benson Group Method

$$\Delta H_f^\circ(298.15K) = \sum_k N_k (\Delta H_{fk}^\circ) \quad (8)$$

$$C_p^\circ(T) = \sum_k N_k C_{pk}^\circ(T) \quad (9)$$

- ΔH_f° Enthalpy of formation at 298 K
- $C_p^\circ(T)$ Heat capacity at temperature T
- N_k Incidence number for group k
- H_{fk}° Group contribution for enthalpy of formation
- $C_{pk}^\circ(T)$ Group contribution for heat capacity at temperature T

Table 2.4 contains the incidence numbers, the group contribution values, and the property values. The group contribution values are those reported in Poling et al. (2000).

The Benson group method produces estimates for heat capacities over a range of temperatures. These were further regressed to fit ASPEN's CPIG equation.

$$C_p = -2.284 \times 10^{-4} T^2 + 0.5259T - 5.2344 \quad (10)$$


- C_p heat capacity in J/molK

Table 2.4 Benson Group Contribution Method

| Group | N _k | ΔH_f° | C_p° | C_p° | C_p° | C_p° | C_p° | C_p° |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | 298K | 298K | 400K | 500K | 600K | 800K | 1000K |
| | | kJ/mol | J/molK | J/molK | J/molK | J/molK | J/molK | J/molK |
| OH—(C) | 1 | -158.56 | 18.12 | 18.63 | 20.18 | 21.89 | 25.2 | 27.67 |
| CH ₂ —(=C,O) | 1 | -27.21 | 19.51 | 29.18 | 36.21 | 41.36 | 48.3 | 53.29 |
| =C—(C,O) | 1 | 43.11 | 17.16 | 19.3 | 20.89 | 22.02 | 24.28 | 25.45 |
| =CH—(=C) | 2 | 28.38 | 18.67 | 24.24 | 28.25 | 31.06 | 34.95 | 37.63 |
| =C—(CO,O) | 1 | 31.39 | 22.94 | 29.22 | 31.02 | 31.98 | 33.53 | 34.32 |
| O—(2=C) | 1 | -138.13 | 14.02 | 16.32 | 17.58 | 18.84 | 21.35 | 22.6 |
| (CO)H—(=C) | 1 | -121.81 | 24.32 | 30.22 | 39.77 | 48.77 | 63.12 | 74.68 |
| Furan ring | 1 | 37.25 | -20.51 | -18 | -15.07 | -12.56 | -10.88 | -10.05 |
| Property Value | | -277.2 | 132.9 | 173.35 | 207.08 | 234.42 | 274.8 | 303.22 |

2.1.3. UNIFAC Parameters. The UNIFAC method was used to estimate activity coefficients (Seader and Henley, 2006). Values for group volume, surface area, and energy interaction parameters are required by the UNIFAC method. Furfural, a common solvent, has its own group and main group. As such, values for group volume and surface area for this group are available. However, group values for furfural with a hydrogen atom removed from the ring is required for the constituent group in HMF.

HMF can be considered to be a combination of the following structural groups:



The UNIFAC parameter values are tabulated for the –OH and –CH₂- groups. There are tabulated UNIFAC parameter values for furfural (C₄H₃O-CHO), but not for the -C₄H₂O-CHO group.

The -C₄H₂O-CHO group is the furfural group with a hydrogen atom removed from the ring. There are tabulated values for other groups that differ by a hydrogen atom removed from the ring. Table 2.5 shows the UNIFAC parameter values and main group assignments for hydrogen atom removal from carbon atoms in aromatic rings, pyridine rings, and thiophene rings.




Table 2.5 UNIFAC Parameter Values for Ring Groups

| Ring | Group | Main Group Assignment | Group Volume R | Hydrogen Atom Volume Contribution ΔR | Group Surface Area Q | Hydrogen Atom Surface Area Contribution ΔQ |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| Aromatic | ACH | 3 | 0.5313 | 0.1663 | 0.400 | 0.280 |
| | -AC | 3 | 0.3652 | | 0.120 | |
| Pyridine | C ₅ H ₅ N | 18 | 2.9993 | 0.1661 | 2.113 | 0.280 |
| | - C ₅ H ₄ N | 18 | 2.8332 | 0.1662 | 1.833 | 0.280 |
| | > C ₅ H ₃ N | 18 | 2.6670 | | 1.553 | |
| Thiophene | C ₄ H ₄ S | 50 | 2.8569 | 0.1661 | 2.140 | 0.280 |
| | -C ₄ H ₃ S | 50 | 2.6908 | 0.1661 | 1.860 | 0.280 |
| | >C ₄ H ₂ S | 50 | 2.5247 | | 1.580 | |
| Furfural | C ₄ H ₃ O-CHO | 30 | 3.1680 | 0.1662 | 2.481 | 0.280 |
| | -C ₄ H ₂ O-CHO | 30 | 3.0018 | | 2.201 | |

The removal of a hydrogen atom from various rings (aromatic, pyridine, thiophene) results in a uniform reduction in both group volume (0.1662 ± 0.0001) and surface area (0.280) for primary or secondary substitutions (Table 2.5). Further, the groups with common ring types are assigned to the same main group. These data provide UNIFAC parameter estimates for the $-C_4H_2O-CHO$ group (Table 2.5) derived from the values for furfural and indicate that the group would be in the same main group as furfural and, therefore, have the same energy interaction parameters.

Group energy interaction parameters for furfural-water were regressed from in **Liquid-Liquid Equilibrium Data Collection (J.M. Sørensen, W. Arlt.)** specifically for the temperature range of 15 to 30 °C.


Other energy interaction parameters were taken from ASPEN's LLE group energy interaction parameter set as presented in ASPEN's Appendix Table 3.15. The values used in the simulation can be found in Table 2.6

Table 2.6 Group Energy Interaction Parameters (K)

| ASPEN Group ID | 2450 & 4001 | 1300 | 1010 | 1200 |
|----------------|-------------|---------|--------|--------|
| Group | Furfural | Water | >CH2 | OH-P |
| Furfural | 0 | 165.562 | -25.31 | 521.6 |
| Water | 111.266 | 0 | 300 | -229.1 |
| >CH2 | 354.6 | 1318 | 0 | 986.5 |
| OH (primary) | -120.5 | 353.5 | 156.4 | 0 |

These values predict a Type 2 liquid-liquid equilibrium as show in Figure 2.1.

Aspen Distillation Synthesis Distillation Analysis - Ternary Map



Ternary Map computed at the following conditions :

Pressure: 101325 N/SQM

Envelope Type: Liquid-Liquid at 20 C

VLE/VLLE Model: UNIF-LL

LLE Model: UNIF-LL

Valid Phases: Vapor-Liquid-Liquid

Basis: Mass fraction

© 2001 Aspen Technology, Inc., Ten Canal Park, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141-2200 * (2/21/2012)

Figure 2.1 Furfural-HMF-Water Ternary Diagram

2.2. PROPERTIES OF SOLIDS

The parameter values for correlations of the properties of cellulose and xylan are listed in Table 2.7 (Wooley and Putsche, 1996). ASPEN's solid property formulas for the methods used are given following Table 2.7

Table 2.7 Solids Property Data

| Property | Aspen Property | Units | Xylan | Cellulose | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|--------|--------|
| Molecular Weight | MW | | 132.117 | 162.1436 | | |
| Solid Heat of Formation | DHFORM | kJ/Kmole | -762416 | -976362 | | |
| Solid Molar Volume | VSPOLY/1 | cum/Kmole | 0.0864 | 0.1060 | | |
| | VSPOLY/2 | | | | | |
| | VSPOLY/3 | | | | | |
| | VSPOLY/4 | | | | | |
| | VSPOLY/5 | | | | | |
| | VSPOLY/6 | | | | 298.15 | 298.15 |
| | VSPOLY/7 | | | | 1000 | 1000 |
| Solids Heat Capacity | CPSP01/1 | J/Kmol K | -9529.9 | -11704 | | |
| | CPSP01/2 | | | | 547.25 | 672.07 |
| | CPSP01/3 | | | | | |
| | CPSP01/4 | | | | | |
| | CPSP01/5 | | | | | |
| | CPSP01/6 | | | | | |
| | CPSP01/7 | | | | 298.15 | 298.15 |
| | CPSP01/8 | | | | 1000 | 1000 |

Solid Volume Polynomial VSPOLY/1....

$$V^*(T) = C_1 + C_2T + C_3T^2 + C_4T^3 + C_5T^4 \text{ for } C_6 \leq T \leq C_7 \quad (11)$$

Solid Heat Capacity CPSP01/1....8

$$C_p(T) = C_1 + C_2T + C_3T^2 + C_4/T + C_5/T^2 + C_6/\text{SQRT}(T) \text{ for } C_7 \leq T \leq C_8 \quad (12)$$

2.3. REACTION KINETICS

Currently available data for reaction rate consist of that presented in the patent filing (Petrus and Voss, 2005). The results of five experiments are reported in which biomass feedstock, solvent, acid and acid concentration, temperature and time vary in the different experiments. This data set only records the solid residue left after the reaction, making no distinction between pentosans, hexosans or other organic compounds. To approximate reaction rate the data given in the patent is regressed based on a first order reaction rate with mass basis. This assumes that the reaction rate is independent of biomass feedstock, solvent, acid, acid concentration and that the reaction rate is first order. Data from the experiments is presented in Table 2.8 with the linear regression ($R^2 = 0.8397$) for the first order reaction plotted Figure 2.2. Finally the reaction rate as a function of temperature is presented in Figure 2.3.

The resulting rate law

$$E_a/R = -13721 K \quad (13)$$

$$\ln k_\infty = 25.901 \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = mk \quad (15)$$

$$k = k_\infty e^{-E_a/RT} \quad (16)$$

- m fraction of the original mass
- k given in inverse minutes

Table 2.8 Reaction Rate Data for Solvent Liquefaction

| Biomass | Solvent | Acid | Temperature [C] | Time [min] | % residue | ln(k) | 1/T [K ⁻¹] |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|
| Birch sawdust | gammaVL | H ₃ PO ₄ | 200 | 60 | 0.16 | -3.488 | 0.002114 |
| Birch sawdust | gammaVL | H ₃ PO ₄ | 180 | 240 | 0.1 | -4.646 | 0.002208 |
| Birch sawdust | gammaVL | H ₃ PO ₄ | 184 | 180 | 0.18 | -4.654 | 0.002188 |
| Birch sawdust | gammaVL | H ₃ PO ₄ | 230 | 16 | 0.03 | -1.518 | 0.001988 |
| Bagasse | Levulinic acid | H ₂ SO ₄ | 190 | 60 | 0.04 | -2.925 | 0.002160 |




Figure 2.2 Reaction Rate Regression




Figure 2.3 Regressed Reaction Rate as a Function of Temperature

3. SIMULATION

3.1. PROCESS DESCRIPTION

3.1.1. Process. The process is continuous. As seen in Figure 3.1 the feed (stream #1) is sent to the reactor (vessel B1) where it is heated to the reactor temperature. The reactor product (stream #2) is cooled and sent to the decanter (vessel B2) where the two liquid phases, organic (stream #4) and aqueous (stream #5) are separated. All unreacted solids are part of the aqueous phase. The vapor product (stream #3) is unused.








Figure 3.1 Simulation Process Flow Diagram

3.1.2. Reactor. In the process simulation, the reactor provides heating and a vessel for the reaction. Due to limitations in ASPEN a “Stoichiometric” reactor is used. Temperature, conversion and vapor fraction of the reactor are specified.



Only the complete reactions will be considered such that the reactions simulated are simplified.



3.1.3. Phase Separator. The phase separator or decanter separates the less dense organic liquid phase from the aqueous phase and solids. Temperature is specified to be 20 °C, and vapor fraction to be 0. The UNIFAC group interaction parameters for furfural and water were regressed using data from a temperature range of 15-30° C, an appropriate choice for the simulation.

3.2. FEEDSTOCK

The simulation feedstock was intended to approximate corn stover. The moisture content of biomass is taken to be 55% (Sokhansanj et al., 2002).

Cellulose and xylan were taken to be a representative species for all hexosans and pentosans respectively. The split between pentosans and hexosans of corn stover was taken to be 27.5% pentosans and 72.5% hexosans (Kamm et al., 2006).

Runs were done with feedstock composition of pure xylan, pure cellulose and the 27.5%-72.5% mixture. The simulated feedstock contained only xylan, cellulose and water. No lignin was included in any of the simulated feedstocks. Simulation feedstock was set at a temperature of 25 °C and atmospheric pressure.

4. SIMULATION RESULTS

Based on the predicted physical property data, the heat of reaction for the formation of both furfural and HMF varies with temperature. Both reactions have very small heats of reaction that become increasingly endothermic as the temperature is increased (Figure 4.1).




Figure 4.1 Heat of Reaction as a Function of Temperature

The simulation was run for feedstocks at 55% moisture content, containing pure xylan, pure cellulose and the mixture approximating corn stover. Runs were conducted at three temperatures over the range of data provided in the patent.

Of great interest is how much chemical energy is available in the product less the amount of energy required by the process, relative to the total chemical energy input into the process. The laws of thermodynamics will prevent this value from being greater than one. Zero values reflect the product only has as much energy as was required by the

process. Values less than zero are possible. These occur when more energy is required by the process than is available in the feed.

Figure 4.2 shows that the fractional energy return (equation 17) of the process is positive for a wide range of conversions and that the extent of reaction and not feedstock composition is the primary determining factor of fractional energy return. The complete table of simulation run results is available in Appendix B. Two of the sample data points for cellulose did not contain enough HMF to result in a phase split. As a result all of the HMF in these simulation runs was recovered in the organic phase resulting in higher fractional energy recovery. One point lies off of the line at a conversion of 0.28. The other is at a conversion of 0.017 and has a slightly higher fractional energy recovery than the all xylan feed simulation at the same conversion.

$$q = \frac{\textit{enthalpy of combustion of furfural} - \textit{process energy requirements}}{\textit{enthalpy of combustion of feed}} \quad (17)$$




Figure 4.2 Product Energy Recovery Ratio as a Function of Conversion

Figure 4.3 shows the ratio of enthalpy of combustion of the organic product to process energy requirement which varied with conversion, temperature and feed composition. Product to process energy ratios decreased with increasing temperatures and, with the exceptions of the two previously noted points where a phase split did not occur, increased with conversion and were higher for xylan than cellulose at the same conversion and temperature. The range of ratios increased with conversion and varied from 7 to 11.5 for high conversion.




Figure 4.3 Product Energy to Process Energy as a Function of Conversion

5. DISCUSSION

Many physical properties were estimated as detailed in Section 2. If more accurate estimates or experimental data become available, the simulation may be updated to reflect this. This also applies to the liquefaction reaction where limited data resulted in many assumptions being made in estimating a reaction rate. Additional investigation should seek to detail the effects of solvent and acid on the reaction rate as well as identifying if lignin is being reacted in addition to cellulose and hemicellulose.

As described in Section 3.1.1 the simulation's only energy input requirement is heating the feed. While a range of reactor temperatures were simulated, the increased heating requirement for higher temperatures was of little significance compared to conversion in the final fractional energy recovery. Given the faster reaction rate at higher temperatures, operation at these higher temperatures is likely to be more economical. Future simulations could seek to detail additional energy requirements for cooling, pumping, mixing, etc. The simulation does not include an economizer, a heat exchanger that would use the reactor product to heat the feed while being cooled. The economizer would lower the feed heating requirement, improving the process energy recovery ratio.

Figure 2.1, the ternary map, shows that more HMF than furfural will be in the aqueous phase. Despite this the simulated biomass feed's ratio of cellulose to xylan had a limited effect on the process energy ratio. Only energy density and liquid-liquid equilibrium could have caused any such difference in the simulation since the reaction rate was assumed to be the same on a mass basis for both species. Further studies could seek to analyze liquefaction of both cellulose and xylan separately.

The moisture content of the feed is expected to play an important role in the process energy ratio but was not studied in this thesis. The simulation could be used to further investigate the effects of biomass moisture content on process energy recovery ratio. Additional moisture in the feed will result in increased heating requirements and shift the liquid-liquid equilibrium.

The liquefaction process simulation indicates that much of the chemical energy in the biomass feedstock can be recovered as an organic rich phase. Further, high recovery

ratios are achieved at short residence times required for field liquefaction. For field liquefaction, energy expended to grow and harvest grain and biomass coproducts can be charged to the grain (as must be done when the biomass is returned to the field). The energy in an organic liquid coproduct is achieved at the energy cost of the liquefaction process. Simulation of the simplified liquefaction process indicated an energy recovery ratio of 2/3 could be obtained. Some of the loss is due to unreacted biomass and some to process energy requirements. Feed composition, cellulose or xylan did not result in major differences in this ratio.

The ratio of enthalpy of combustion in the product to process energy requirement varied with conversion, temperature and feed composition as seen in Figure 4.3. There is a clear tradeoff between reactor temperature and process energy requirement. The higher temperatures allows for lower residence times and thus a smaller reactor for the same conversion. The lowest temperature (180 C), highest conversion and the mixed feedstock had a product to process energy ratio of over 9:1. This is much greater than the 5:4 ratio for grain ethanol reported by Graboski (2002), where the energy expended growing the grain must be charged to the ethanol, and larger than the 2.61:1 value quoted for enzymatic ethanol (Lorenz 1995).

With an energy recovery ratio above those for ethanol processes the furfural-HMF liquefaction clearly deserves further study. While not as high as petroleum derived products energy recovery ratio of 1:14 the furfural-HMF process competes on its renewable benefits and not energy efficiency alone.

Further development of the process simulation will bring it closer to modeling all of the steps presented in Figure 1.3, including neutralizing acid used, solvent recovery, and treatment of the aqueous phase and unreacted biomass.

APPENDIX A.
ASPEN SIMULATION FILES

Relevant ASPEN documents are included in an attached folder.

Simulation PFD.PNG Simulation Process Flow Diagram Image

Phase Diagrams and PFD.pdf

final simulation.inp Input Summary

final simulation.rep Sample Run

final simulation.apmbd

final simulation.apw

final simulation.bkp

final simulation.def

final simulation.dxf

final simulation.sum

reactor decater.bkp

aspen simulation runs.xlsx Spreadsheet and Charts of Simulation Results

APPENDIX B.
SIMULATION RESULTS

| Run | Time | Temperature | Conversion |
|-----|---------|-------------|-------------|
| | Minutes | C | |
| 1 | 30 | 180 | 0.286150764 |
| 2 | 60 | 180 | 0.490419268 |
| 3 | 120 | 180 | 0.740327477 |
| 4 | 180 | 180 | 0.867675886 |
| 5 | 240 | 180 | 0.932570181 |
| 6 | 5 | 205 | 0.239591703 |
| 7 | 15 | 205 | 0.560316122 |
| 8 | 25 | 205 | 0.745765646 |
| 9 | 30 | 205 | 0.806678087 |
| 10 | 60 | 205 | 0.962626638 |
| 11 | 2 | 230 | 0.366387184 |
| 12 | 5 | 230 | 0.680434503 |
| 13 | 10 | 230 | 0.897877893 |
| 14 | 15 | 230 | 0.967365298 |

Reaction rate is assumed to be first order mass basis. A range of temperatures and reaction times were used to calculate conversion for the simulation runs.

Xylan 12.38 kg/hr, Cellulose 32.625 kg/hr, Water 55 kg/hr, 25 C

| | | | | | | | | | | Enthalpy of Combustion | | |
|-----|-----------|---------------|----------|--------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|-----------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Organic Phase | | | Aqueous Phase | | | | | In Organic Phase | | |
| Run | Heat Duty | Water | Furfural | HMF | Water | Furfural | HMF | Xylan | Cellulose | Furfural | HMF | Q |
| | Cal/sec | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | kJ/hr | kJ/hr | |
| 1 | 3484 | 0.586 | 0.704 | 2.129 | 57.455 | 1.872 | 5.132 | 8.837 | 23.289 | -17171.25462 | -49768.10568 | 0.018414702 |
| 2 | 3692 | 2.012 | 2.483 | 7.294 | 58.199 | 1.932 | 5.15 | 6.309 | 16.625 | -60562.81992 | -170506.6054 | 0.223415514 |
| 3 | 3937 | 3.746 | 4.685 | 13.577 | 59.12 | 1.98 | 5.209 | 3.215 | 8.472 | -114271.7726 | -317379.789 | 0.474121847 |
| 4 | 4060 | 4.611 | 5.807 | 16.703 | 59.587 | 2.006 | 5.237 | 4.416 | 1.628 | -141638.4596 | -390454.0484 | 0.599656267 |
| 5 | 4126 | 5.081 | 6.386 | 18.403 | 59.829 | 2.011 | 5.26 | 0.835 | 2.2 | -155760.8409 | -430193.7289 | 0.666974078 |
| 6 | 4068 | 0.259 | 0.307 | 0.941 | 57.287 | 1.85 | 8.139 | 9.414 | 24.808 | -7488.03291 | -21997.08194 | -0.040477224 |
| 7 | 4414 | 2.496 | 3.097 | 9.052 | 58.458 | 1.947 | 5.166 | 5.443 | 14.345 | -75538.88574 | -211602.1102 | 0.280965146 |
| 8 | 4609 | 3.784 | 4.733 | 13.713 | 59.14 | 1.981 | 5.21 | 3.147 | 8.294 | -115442.5399 | -320558.9634 | 0.466772255 |
| 9 | 4673 | 4.207 | 5.272 | 15.243 | 59.365 | 1.991 | 5.226 | 2.393 | 6.307 | -128589.2818 | -356324.6758 | 0.52782599 |
| 10 | 4836 | 5.289 | 6.651 | 19.157 | 59.94 | 2.016 | 5.269 | 0.463 | 1.219 | -162224.4524 | -447819.446 | 0.684030231 |
| 11 | 4879 | 1.148 | 1.399 | 4.164 | 57.745 | 1.9 | 5.133 | 7.844 | 20.672 | -34122.99036 | -97338.84079 | 0.073817394 |
| 12 | 5237 | 3.33 | 4.156 | 12.072 | 58.9 | 1.97 | 5.194 | 3.956 | 10.426 | -101368.9406 | -282198.4837 | 0.38796232 |
| 13 | 5480 | 4.841 | 6.079 | 17.533 | 59.7 | 2.006 | 5.25 | 1.264 | 3.332 | -148272.808 | -409856.363 | 0.605574728 |
| 14 | 5557 | 5.322 | 6.693 | 19.276 | 59.958 | 2.016 | 5.271 | 0.404 | 1.065 | -163248.8738 | -450601.2236 | 0.674799166 |

Xylan 45 kg/hr, Water 55 kg/hr, 25 C

| Run | Heat Duty | Organic Phase | | Aqueous Phase | | | Enthalpy of Combustion in Organic Phase | Q |
|-----|-----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|--------|---|-------------|
| | | Water | Furfural | Water | Furfural | Xylan | Furfural | |
| | Cal/sec | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | kJ/hr | |
| 1 | 3297 | 0.23 | 4.287 | 58.282 | 5.078 | 32.123 | -104564.1599 | 0.068722805 |
| 2 | 3363 | 0.578 | 10.784 | 60.441 | 5.266 | 22.931 | -263032.4003 | 0.265833693 |
| 3 | 3439 | 1.004 | 18.733 | 63.082 | 5.496 | 11.685 | -456916.3534 | 0.507086012 |
| 4 | 3477 | 1.221 | 22.784 | 64.428 | 5.613 | 5.955 | -555724.2405 | 0.630047738 |
| 5 | 3497 | 1.331 | 24.848 | 65.113 | 5.673 | 3.034 | -606067.237 | 0.692685163 |
| 6 | 3915 | 0.15 | 2.806 | 57.79 | 5.035 | 34.218 | -68441.10862 | 0.0118559 |
| 7 | 4047 | 0.697 | 13.008 | 61.179 | 5.33 | 19.786 | -317277.9547 | 0.320837135 |
| 8 | 4119 | 1.013 | 18.906 | 63.139 | 5.501 | 11.441 | -461135.9941 | 0.499547264 |
| 9 | 4143 | 1.117 | 20.843 | 63.783 | 5.557 | 8.699 | -508381.3353 | 0.558231929 |
| 10 | 4203 | 1.383 | 25.804 | 65.431 | 5.701 | 1.682 | -629385.0202 | 0.70856143 |
| 11 | 4651 | 0.366 | 6.839 | 59.13 | 5.152 | 28.513 | -166809.9579 | 0.121108228 |
| 12 | 4802 | 0.902 | 16.828 | 62.449 | 5.441 | 14.38 | -410451.5238 | 0.423228294 |
| 13 | 4905 | 1.272 | 23.744 | 64.747 | 5.641 | 4.595 | -579139.5877 | 0.632433785 |
| 14 | 4937 | 1.391 | 25.954 | 65.481 | 5.705 | 1.469 | -633043.6682 | 0.699302387 |

Cellulose 45 kg/hr, Water 55 kg/hr, 25 C

| Ru n | Heat Duty | Organic Phase | | Aqueous Phase | | | Enthalpy of Combustion in Organic Phase | Q |
|---------|--------------|---------------|--------|---------------|-------|-----------|--|-------------|
| | | Water | HMF | Water | HMF | Cellulose | HMF | |
| | Cal/sec | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | Kg/hr | kJ/hr | |
| 1 | 3555 | 57.861 | 10.015 | 0 | 0 | 32.123 | -234113.4703 | 0.231435157 |
| 2 | 3813 | 2.575 | 9.626 | 57.329 | 7.538 | 22.931 | -225020.0964 | 0.214799158 |
| 3 | 4124 | 4.912 | 18.354 | 57.491 | 7.558 | 11.685 | -429048.291 | 0.47030129 |
| 4 | 4281 | 6.102 | 22.798 | 57.575 | 7.57 | 5.955 | -532932.491 | 0.600420338 |
| 5 | 4361 | 6.706 | 25.062 | 57.62 | 7.578 | 3.034 | -585856.3948 | 0.666709297 |
| 6 | 4126 | 57.396 | 3.186 | 0 | 0 | 34.218 | -74476.8364 | 0.015802756 |
| 7 | 4549 | 3.228 | 12.067 | 57.374 | 7.544 | 19.786 | -282081.6023 | 0.273726796 |
| 8 | 4792 | 4.962 | 18.543 | 57.495 | 7.558 | 11.441 | -433466.4084 | 0.463067841 |
| 9 | 4871 | 5.529 | 20.669 | 57.537 | 7.565 | 8.699 | -483164.3853 | 0.525241384 |
| 10 | 5072 | 6.986 | 26.111 | 57.64 | 7.581 | 1.682 | -610378.1152 | 0.684412813 |
| 11 | 4965 | 1.417 | 5.296 | 57.247 | 7.528 | 28.513 | -123800.7927 | 0.062824564 |
| 12 | 5398 | 4.353 | 16.263 | 57.452 | 7.552 | 14.38 | -380168.4841 | 0.38305577 |
| 13 | 5694 | 6.383 | 23.851 | 57.596 | 7.574 | 4.595 | -557547.7165 | 0.604691086 |
| 14 | 5789 | 7.03 | 26.276 | 57.644 | 7.581 | 1.469 | -614235.2019 | 0.675514302 |

APPENDIX C.
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Data Used to Generate Figure 1.1 & Figure 1.2

| | ΔH°_c (HHV) Kcal/gmole | ΔH°_f kJ/mol | Source |
|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------|
| Xylan | -560.6 | | Wooley |
| Xylose | -561.5 | | Wooley |
| Cellulose | -671.9 | | Wooley |
| Glucose | -673 | | Wooley |
| CO ₂ (g) | | -393.52 | NIST |
| H ₂ O (l) | | -288.043 | Wooley |
| Furfural (l) | | -200.2 | NIST |
| CO (g) | | -110.53 | NIST |
| CH ₄ (g) | | -74.87 | NIST |
| Ethanol (l) | | -276 | NIST |
| HMF | | -277.266 | Benson |

REFERENCES

ASPEN PLUS, version 23.0; Aspen Technology Inc.: MA, 2010.

Brown, R.L.; Stein, S.E., "Boiling Point Data" in **NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 69**, Eds. P.J. Linstrom and W.G. Mallard, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg MD, 20899, <http://webbook.nist.gov>, (retrieved November 3, 2012).

Domalski, E.S.; Hearing, E.D., "Condensed Phase Heat Capacity Data" in **NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 69**, Eds. P.J. Linstrom and W.G. Mallard, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg MD, 20899, <http://webbook.nist.gov>, (retrieved November 3, 2012).

Graboski, M. S. Fossil Energy Use in the Manufacture of Corn Ethanol: Prepared for National Corn Growers Association, 2002.
<http://www.oregon.gov/energy/RENEW/Biomass/docs/FORUM/FossilEnergyUse.pdf> (accessed Nov 6, 2012).

Koretsky, M. D. *Engineering and Chemical Thermodynamics*; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, 2004; pp 260.

Liquid-Liquid Equilibrium Data Collection Sørensen J. M.; Arlt, W.; Chemistry data series. v 5. Pt 2 Ternary systems [c1979-c1980]

Lorenz, D.; Morris, D., How Much Energy Does It Take to Make a Gallon of Ethanol, Institute for Local-Self Reliance, 1995.

Marrero-Morejón, J.; Pardillo-Fontdevilla, E. Estimation of Pure Compound Properties Using Group-Interaction Contributions. *AIChE J.*, **1999**, *45*, 615.

Petrus, L.; Voss, A. A Process for the Liquefaction of Lignocellulosic Material. World Intellectual Property Organization Patent WO 2005/058856 A1, 2005.

Pimentel, D.; Patzek, T. W. Ethanol Production Using Corn, Switchgrass, and Wood; Biodiesel Production Using Soybean and Sunflower. *Nat. Resour. Res. (Dordrecht, Neth.)* **2005**, *14*, 65-76.

Poling, B. E.; Prausnitz, J. M.; O'Connell, J. P. *The Properties of Gases and Liquids*, 5th ed; McGraw-Hill: New York, 2000.

Rackett, H. G. Equation of State for Saturated Liquids. *J. Chem. Eng. Data.* **1970**, *15*, 514-517.

Reid, R.C.; Poling, B. E.; Prausnitz, J. M. *The Properties of Gases and Liquids*, 4th ed; McGraw-Hill: New York, 1987.

Román-Leshkov, Y.; Barrett, C. J.; Liu, Z. Y.; Dumesic, J. A. Production of Dimethylfuran for Liquid Fuels from Biomass-Derived Carbohydrates. *Nature* (London, U. K.). **2007**, *447*, 982.

Seader, J. D.; Henley, E. J. *Separation Process Principles* 2nd ed; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, 2006; pp 57.

Sokhansanj, S.; Turhollow, A.; Cushman, J.; Cundiff, J. Engineering Aspects of Collecting Corn Stover for Bioenergy. *Biomass Bioenergy*. **2002**, *23*, 347-355.

Kamm, B.; Gruber, P. R.; Kamm, M. *Biorefineries – Industrial Processes and Products*; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, Germany, 2006; Vol. 1, pp 195.

Thermodynamics Research Center, NIST Boulder Laboratories, M. Frenkel director, "Thermodynamics Source Database" in **NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 69**, Eds. P.J. Linstrom and W.G. Mallard, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg MD, 20899, <http://webbook.nist.gov>, (retrieved November 3, 2012).

Wooley, R. J.; Putsche, V. *Development of an ASPEN PLUS Physical Property Database for Biofuels Components*; NREL/MP-425-20685; National Renewable Energy Laboratory: Golden, CO, 1996.

VITA

Zachary Daniel King was born in Lawrence, Kansas. He completed his Bachelor of Science degree in Chemical Engineering from the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas in May 2007. He subsequently worked on data analysis and management of instrumentation for wind resource assessment projects, commencing graduate studies in 2009. He worked as an intern for NOWA Technology in the summer of 2010 at a pilot plant for converting wastewater sludge to useful biofuel feedstocks. He received his Master of Chemical Engineering degree from the Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, Missouri in August 2014.