Agronomic aspects of future energy crops in Europe



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM ~ UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA Il presente materiale è riservato al personale dell'università di bologna e non può essere utilizzato al termini di legge da altre persone o per fini non istituzionali



Biomass crops energy supply



Fig. 1. World total primary energy supply 2004, shares of 11.2 billion tons of oil equivalent, or 470 EJ (15, 16).

Goldemberg, 2007



European Union Directives

- 10% biofuels by 2020 (Res. PE-CONS 3736/08; Res. 8040/09 ADD1)
- 17.5 and 21.1 millions hectares of arable land dedicated to energy crops



- No information on production potential/agronomic practices
- Appropriate crop management practices assed





- Low production costs
- Suitability to marginal lands
- Low water needs (switchgrass,

Miscanthus)

• Low nutrient and agrochemical

requirements

• Environmental benefits





Figure 1. Distribution map of possible biomass (a) and oilseed (b) energy crops in Europe. The potential cropping areas were determined according to the crop climatic requirements taking in consideration the bioclimatic zones determined by Metzger *et al.*¹²¹ The data source for the elaboration of the present map was taken from Mücher *et al.*¹²² The crops are listed in order of importance from left to right.

Zegada-Lizarazu et al., 2010

Switchgrass and Miscanthus:

• Central and northern Europe

Giant reed:

• Mediterranean climates of southern Europe



Switchgrass seeds



Miscanthus and giant reed rhizomes



Seed reproduction gives switchgrass an economical and environmental advantage



• Weed control



Non weeded (early growth stage)

Weeded (early growth stage)

- Fertilization
- Supplemental irrigation

Table 5-1. Response to switchgrass to pre-emergence herbicides at Yoakum TX, seeded 7 Oct. 1999.

Herbicide treatment	Rate kg/ha	Switchgr 11-23-99 %	ass stands– 4-26-00	DM yield ^a (kg/ha)
Chaok		40	2	280
Duel Meenum	0.56	40	27	1022
Dual Magnum	0.56	28	1	1055
Ctaon comm	1.12	8	4	389
Strongarm	0.02	2	1	115
Descul	0.05	16	4	/5
Prowl	0.84	15	2	170
Zorial	0.44	45	2	170
Caparol	1.12	28	4	306
~ ~	1.68	10	4	347
Cotoran	1.12	13	8	444
	1.68	3	6	426
Atrazine	1.12	50	3	103
	2.24	8	10	2226
Frontier	0.84	43	8	1382
	1.40	20	7	213
Sencor	0.56	13	11	908
	1.12	5	4	137
First Rate ^b	21.0	73	11	1307
	42:8	75	16	3504
Python ^b	35.0	40	12	1691
.,	70.0	45	16	1556
LSD (0.05)	1010	23	14	1634

Switchgrass harvested 26 July, 2000

^bgrams/ha Ocumpaugh et al., 2002







Table 4. A	gronomic characteristics	s of the mos	t common en	ergy crops.			
	Sowing, crop duration (days), and harvesting for maximum energy yields	Plant density (plants m ⁻²)	Nitrogen Requirement (Kg ha ⁻¹)	Water needs (mm)	Pests management	Biomass yield (Mg ha ⁻¹ d.w.)	Energy yield (GJ ha ⁻¹)
Miscanthus	Sowing: spring Economic life: >20 years ³¹ Harvesting: annually (spring), when the crop has senesced ¹⁹ , yields stabilize from the 2 nd year onwards.	1–3 ¹⁹	0 –100 ¹⁹	700-800 ³²	Mechanical or chemi- cal weed manage- ment required during the establishment year only. No serious problems from pest and diseases have been reported.	10–30 ¹⁹	170-528 ¹¹⁸
Switchgrass	Sowing: spring. Economic life: >20 years ³³ . Harvesting: annually (fall), between R3 an R5 ^{34,a} , yields stabilize from 3 to 5 years after sowing.	100 to 200 ³³	0 –70	450–750 ³⁵	Mechanical or chemi- cal weed manage- ment required during the establishment year only. No serious problems from pest and diseases have been reported.	10–25 ³⁰	174–435 ³⁰
Giant reed	Sowing: spring Economic life: 10 ³⁶⁻³⁸ Harvesting: annually (spring) ³¹ , yields stabilize from the 2nd year onwards	1-2 ³⁶⁻³⁸	50–100	??	Mechanical or chemi- cal weed manage- ment required during the establishment year only. No serious problems from pest and diseases have been reported.	7–61	496-637 ³⁶⁻³⁸



Table 5. Effects of delayed harvest on mineral and carbohydrate contents (% dry matter) in giant reed, switchgrass and miscanthus biomass.

	Gian	Giant reed		grass ^{87,a}	Miscanthus ⁷⁵		
	Fall	Winter	Fall	Spring	Fall	Winter	
Ash	-	7.1 ^{88,b}	-	4.9e	-	4.1e	
N	-	2.4 ^{88,b}	0.46	0.41	0.47	0.36	
Р	-	0.06 ^{88,b}	0.09	0.05	0.06	0.00	
К	-	0.53 ^{88,b}	0.34	0.06	1.22	0.96	
CI	-	0.63 ^{88,b}	0.08	0.03	0.56	0.09	
Sugars	-	-	3.55	0.37	0.30	2.07	
Starch	-	-	0.92	0.29	0.70	0.14	
Yield (Mg ha ⁻¹)	24 ^{36,c}	26 ^{36,c}	7	4	17 ^{31,d}	11 ^{31,d}	

^a Mineral contents averaged over three years and locations, carbohydrates averaged over two years and yields averaged over three locations and years.

^b Average values of different plant parts.

^c Average biomass of six years.

^d Average yields of different genotypes grown at several locations in Europe during the third growing season.

Zegada-Lizarazu et al., 2010

Late harvest

- Maintain soil nutrients
- Biomass quality
- Reduced yield







Fig. 4 – Harvest losses in 2006 and 2007, and discrepancy between plot (PBY) and field (A + B + C) potential biomass yields. ABY is the actual harvested biomass, NRB and UB represent the biomass losses during field harvest (cut and not recovered biomass and uncut biomass, respectively). Monti. et al., 2009









Figure 1. Willow biomass crops planted in the typical doublerow configuration. Plants have just sprouted in the spring, after being cut back to ground level (coppiced) during the winter. Each willow plant will develop multiple (6–15) stems. Arrows indicate the recommended spacing for willow biomass crops, resulting in a plant density of just over 14 000 per hectare.



Eucalyptus

seedling



Eucalyptus Rooted cutting

Volk et al., 2004



Fig. 4 Mean coppice growth increment over the 2-year study period (year II-year 0) with weediness expressed as a proportion of the growth increment in weed-free conditions (per trial row, n = 20weeded and 20 unweeded stools for each point). This relationship is significant ($P < 0.01, r^2 = 0.57$, n = 15 rows) and, for indices between about 5 and 60, is defined by the expression (with standard error of slope): $G_{0-II} = 1.0078 (0.0071 \pm 0.0017) \times I_{0-II}$. G_{0-II} is coppice growth increment as a proportion of stool growth with no weeds; I0-I is weediness index for year I (% area × mean height).





Table 4. A	gronomic characteristic						
	Sowing, crop duration (days), and harvesting for maximum energy yields	Plant density (plants m ⁻²)	Nitrogen Requirement (Kg ha ⁻¹)	Water needs (mm)	Pests management	Biomass yield (Mg ha ⁻¹ d.w.)	Energy yield (GJ ha ⁻¹)
Poplar	Planting: spring Economic life: 25–30 years ³⁹ Harvested on 3–7 years rota- tion (winter) ³⁹	0.8–1 ³⁹	112-450 ³⁹	> 350 ³⁹	Requires good and moderate manage- ment during the establishment and harvesting periods, respectively.	7–28 ³⁹	173–259 ¹⁸
Willow	Planting: spring Economic life: 25–30 Harvested on 3–4 years rota- tion (winter) ⁴⁰	0.5–2 ⁴¹	80–150 ^{42,b}	1000 ⁴³	Requires good and moderate manage- ment during the establishment and harvesting periods, respectively.	10–30 ⁴⁴	187–280 ¹⁸
Eucalyptus	Planting: spring Economic life: Harvested on 6–15 years rota- tion (in very short rotations harvested every 2–3 years) (winter) ⁴⁵	0.1-2 ^{45,c}	60–125	870–1085 ^{46,47}	Requires good and moderate manage- ment during the establishment and harvesting periods, respectively.	10.4–25.5 ⁴⁵	1000 ⁴⁸





Fig. 2. Effect of N-fertilization (from 30-240 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) on the simulated yield of poplar coppice, and on the N leaching. Averages of 150 years simulation are given.

Deckmyn et al., 2004

Cropping strategies to minimize fertilization:

- Longer rotations
- Mixture of nitrogen fixing trees (alder,

Albizia)

Intercropping with nitrogen fixing annual

crops

- Reincorporation crop residues (leaves, twigs)
- Harvest during dormancy/ growth cessation





Chipping



Trunk stacking on-site



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA



Figure 1. Distribution map of possible biomass (a) and oilseed (b) energy crops in Europe. The potential cropping areas were determined according to the crop climatic requirements taking in consideration the bioclimatic zones determined by Metzger *et al.*¹²¹ The data source for the elaboration of the present map was taken from Mücher *et al.*¹²² The crops are listed in order of importance from left to right.

Zegada-Lizarazu et al., 2010



Sorghum:

• Mediterranean climates of

southern Europe

Hemp:

• Wide variety of agro-

ecological conditions (manly

central Europe)





Sorghum genotypes: fiber, grain, sugar

Hemp: long history as a fiber crop



Advantages:

- Propagated by seeds
- Deep rooted
- High cellulose content (hemp) and

fermentable carbohydrates (sweet sorghum)

• Relatively low nutrient requirements







Advantages:

- Row crops
- High planting density:

14 to 20 plants m⁻² (sweet sorghum)

Up to 270 plants m⁻² (hemp)





Crop rotations:

- Control of pest
- Efficient use of soil resources



Figure 1. Yields of annual and perennial crops grown 1989 through 1992 near Ames, IA. Anderson et al., 1995

Nutrient requirements:

- Low compared to maize (sweet sorghum)
- High leaf turnover rate (hemp)



Table 4.	Agronomic characteristics	s of the most	t common en	ergy crops.			
	Sowing, crop duration (days), and harvesting for maximum energy yields	Plant density (plants m ⁻²)	Nitrogen Requirement (Kg ha ⁻¹)	Water needs (mm)	Pests management	Biomass yield (Mg ha ⁻¹ d.w.)	Energy yield (GJ ha ⁻¹)
Sweet sorghum	Sowing: spring Duration: 105–119 ^{26,27} Harvesting: fall	14.3–20 ^{20,28}	56-224 ²⁹	300–700 ³⁰	Requires moder- ate management of weeds, diseases and other pests.	5-30 ^{20,28}	250-42230
Hemp	Sowing: spring Duration: 112–154 ²² Harvesting: summer	90–270 ²²	100–220 ²²	400-600 ^{116,117}	Less pest and dis- ease complex, easy management.	12–22.5 ²²	128–207 ³⁰

Zegada-Lizarazu et al., 2010

Harvest:

- Silage harvesters, straw balers, or sugarcane harvesters (sweet sorghum)
- Available harvesting equipment need some modifications (hemp)



Oilseed crops (Ethiopian mustard)



Figure 1. Distribution map of possible biomass (a) and oilseed (b) energy crops in Europe. The potential cropping areas were determined according to the crop climatic requirements taking in consideration the bioclimatic zones determined by Metzger *et al.*¹²¹ The data source for the elaboration of the present map was taken from Mücher *et al.*¹²² The crops are listed in order of importance from left to right.

Zegada-Lizarazu et al., 2010





ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA



Oilseed crops (Ethiopian mustard)

Table 4. A	Agronomic characteristics						
	Sowing, crop duration (days), and harvesting for maximum energy yields	Plant density (plants m ⁻²)	Nitrogen Requirement (Kg ha ⁻¹)	Water needs (mm)	Pests management	Biomass yield (Mg ha ⁻¹ d.w.)	Energy yield (GJ ha ⁻¹)
Ethiopian mustard	Sowing: fall Duration: 155–175 ⁴⁹ Harvesting: spring/summer	100 ⁵⁰	80–170	??	Requires moderate/ low management of weeds, diseases and other pests	2.6–3.98 ⁵¹	17–171 ^{52,53}



• Harvesting with existing technology



• The most suitable energy crops (in terms of agronomic management, climatic adaptability and potential biomass production) for northern Europe are some fast growing trees and perennial grasses such as poplar, willow, and miscanthus.

• Under Mediterranean climates of southern Europe eucalyptus, sweet sorghum, and giant reed are promising energy crops.



• In general, most of the perennial grasses and woody crops are largely undomesticated and are at their early stages of development and management. These crops, however, show some advantages over annual crops in terms of agricultural inputs, yields, production costs, food security, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental sustainability.



• Important cultivation and management practices that need further development and evaluation are: appropriate selection of species and genotypes, crop establishment, water needs, fertilization timing and rates, control of weeds and pests, and harvest time and method.





Walter Zegada-Lizarazu

Dept. of Agroenvironmental Science and Technology, University of Bologna

walter.zegadalizarazu@unibo.it

www.unibo.it

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA