

Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases: Methane

Source/Sectors: Agriculture/Manure Management

Technology: Anaerobic digestion systems (A.3.2.1)

Description of the Technology:

In general, measures to mitigate methane emissions from manure management include livestock reduction, prevention of fermentation during stabling, controlled fermentation of manure, composting, and aerobic digestion. The key reduction option is the capture and use of methane emissions through the use of anaerobic digesters that can be farm scale or centralized for the intensive agricultural zones (Lucas *et al.*, 2006). The technological options for anaerobic digestion include covered lagoons, plug flow digesters, and centralized digesters. Controlled anaerobic digestion can be operated in psychrophilic (10-20 °C), mesophilic (20-40 °C), or thermophilic (50-60 °C) range.

Effectiveness: Good

Implementability: Anaerobic digestion technologies can be applied at various scales (i.e., farm or centralized) and require separate effluent storage and a gas use device (US Climate Change, 2005).

Reliability: Anaerobic digesters are practical and often cost-effective for most large dairy and swine farms, especially those located in warm climates. These systems also reduce foul odor and can reduce the risk of ground- and surface-water pollution (US Climate Change, 2005).

Maturity: Good

Environmental Benefits: Methane recovery and utilization for energy generation

Cost Effectiveness:

Technology	Lifetime (yrs)	MP (%)	RE (%)	TA (%)	Capital cost	Annual cost	Benefits
Covered lagoon, not including lagoon cost (large dairy) ¹	15	70	95	29	\$42.22	\$5.12	\$14.27
Covered lagoon, including lagoon cost (large dairy) ¹	15	30	95	29	\$56.30	\$5.12	\$14.27
2-stage plug flow digester (large dairy) ¹	15	1	95	100	\$96.38	\$5.12	\$14.27
Plug-flow digester ¹	15	34	95	100	\$69.27	\$5.12	\$14.27
Covered lagoon, not including lagoon cost (small dairy) ¹	15	70	95	29	\$145.67	\$5.12	\$14.27
Covered lagoon, including lagoon cost (small dairy) ¹	15	30	95	29	\$194.09	\$5.12	\$14.27
Centralized digester ¹	15	4	95	100	\$174.67	\$26.14	\$32.31

Note: MP: market penetration; RE: reduction efficiency; TA: technical applicability; costs are in year 2000 US\$/MT_{CO₂-Eq.}
1: CEC (2005)

Industry Acceptance Level: Fair

Limitations: Utility policies toward independent power producers delay further development of digestion technologies for power generation. The complexity of operation also impedes the market penetration; a centralized operating structure with dedicated expertise may justify this limitation. Moreover, bio-security issues may reduce the potential of these options (US Climate Change, 2005).

Sources of Information:

1. Bates, J. (2001) “Economic Evaluation of Emission Reductions of Nitrous Oxide and Methane in Agriculture in the EU: Bottom-up Analysis”, a final report to European Commission.
2. California Energy Commission (2005) “Emission Reduction Opportunities for Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases in California”, a report prepared by ICF Consulting for California Energy Commissions, CEC-500-2005-121, July 2005.
3. Cole, V.; Cerri, C.; Minami, K.; Mosier, A.; Rosenberg, N. *et al.* (1996) “Chapter 23 – Agricultural Options for Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions” in Climate Change 1995. Impacts, Adaptions and Mitigation of Climate Change: Scientific-Technical Analyses. IPCC Working Group II, Cambridge Univ. Press.
4. de Jager, D.; Hendriks, C.A.; Byers, C. ; van Brummelen, M.; Petersdorff, C. ; Strucker, A.H.M.; Blok, K.; Oonk, J ; Gerbens, S.; Zeeman, G. (2001) “Emission Reduction of Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases”, Dutch National Research Programme on Global Air Pollution and Climate Change, Report no. 410-200-094.
5. http://www.maf.govt.nz/mafnet/rural-nz/sustainable-resource-use/climate/greenhouse-gas-policies/greengas-14.htm#P1797_148161
6. http://www.maf.govt.nz/mafnet/rural-nz/sustainable-resource-use/climate/abatement-of-agricultural-greenhouse-gas-emissions/abatement-of-agricultural-greenhouse-gas-emissions-19.htm#P4056_323708
7. Leng, R. A. (1993) “Quantitative ruminant nutrition - A green science”, Australian Journal of Agricultural Research, 44: 363-80, 1993.
8. U.S. Climate Change Technology Program (2005) “Technology Options for the Near and Long Term”, U.S. Department of Energy, <http://www.climatechange.gov/index.htm>, August 2005.
9. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1999) “Report on U.S. Methane Emissions 1990-2020: Inventories, Projections, and Opportunities for Reductions”, United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA 430-R-99-013, September 1999.
10. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2004) “International Methane and Nitrous Oxide Emissions and Mitigation Data”, United States Environmental Protection Agency. Available online at www.epa.gov/methane/appendices.html (in Excel file).
11. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2006a) “Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004”, Office of Atmospheric Programs, United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-430-R-06-002, June 2006.
12. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2006b) “Global Mitigation of Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gases”, Office of Atmospheric Programs, United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-430-R-06-005, June 2006.