California Renewable Diesel Multimedia Evaluation

Final Tier III Report

Prepared By

Thomas E. McKone
David W. Rice
University of California, Berkeley

Timothy R. Ginn
University of California, Davis

For the

California Environmental Protection Agency
Multimedia Working Group

FINAL

April 2012

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 1

1. Introduction and Background 2

2. Summary of Renewable Diesel Tier I 5

- **2.1. Renewable Diesel Release Scenarios** 6
- **2.2. Renewable Diesel Production, Storage, Distribution and Use** 7
- **2.3. Renewable Diesel Toxicity** 9
- **2.4. Transport and Fate** 10

3. Summary of Renewable Diesel Tier II Findings 12

- **3.1. Fate and Transport/Toxicity Studies** 12
- **3.2. Air Emission Studies** 12
- **3.3. Renewable Diesel Tier II Conclusions** 14

4. Renewable Diesel Tier III Conclusion and Recommendations 15

5. Tier III References 17

6. Tier III Appendices 18

- **6.1. Appendix III-A: California Renewable Diesel Multimedia Evaluation, Tier I Final Report, September, 2011.** 19

1. Introduction and Background

This report summarizes the results of Tier I and Tier II studies along with interpretations and conclusions from these studies regarding the suitability of Renewable Diesel as a motor-vehicle fuel in California. Because this is a summary report, the reader is referred to the 2008 Guidance Document and the 2011 Renewable Diesel Tier I report (see Reference list) for specific citations and references supporting the finding summarized below. We begin here with a summary of the multimedia risk assessment process and how it was applied specifically to renewable diesel. We then summarize Tier I and Tier II findings and conclude with overall recommendations.

As required by Section 43830.8 California Health and Safety Code, before adopting new fuel specifications, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to prepare a "multimedia" evaluation and submit it to the California Environmental Policy Council for final review and approval. In general, the State of California needs information that will allow an informed decision as to the relative risk posed by any newly proposed fuel or fuel additive to the State's resources, human health and the environment.

The multimedia risk assessment evaluation includes three components or tiers each designed to provide input to the next stage of the decision-making process. This process is summarized in Table 1 and illustrated in Figure 1.

Table 1.1. Summary of the recommended multimedia risk assessment process.

	Fuel Applicant	Multimedia Work Group Review	MMWG Consultation and Peer Review
Tier I	Fuel Background Summary Report: • Chemistry • Release Scenarios • Environmental behavior	Screens applicant and establishes key risk assessment elements and issues	Technical consultation during development of Tier I Experimental plan including identification of key risk assessment elements and issues
	Mutually agreed upon Experimental Plan for Tier II		
Tier II	Experiments to evaluate key risk assessment elements	Draft Tier II Experimental Summary Report	Technical consultation and independent peer review of Tier II report
Tier III	Multimedia Risk Assessment Report	Prepare recommendations to the Environmental Policy Council based on Multimedia Risk Assessment Report	Independent peer review of Multimedia Risk Assessment report and MMWG recommendations



Figure 1.1. Multimedia evaluation process flow chart

The multimedia assessment process requires integration of information across different environmental media, different space and time scales, and different types of populations. New fuels or potential additives must be evaluated not only with regard to engine performance and emission requirements but also with consideration of health and environmental criteria involving air emissions and associated health risks, ozone formation potential, hazardous waste generation and management and surface and groundwater contamination resulting from production, distribution, and use.

The multimedia evaluation process begins with the applicant screening stage. This is a preliminary review by the CalEPA MMWG to assess the proposed fuel plausibility and/or feasibility. The purpose of this tier is screen out any proposals that are not worth pursuing even to Tier I. For example, ideas that clearly violate basic concepts of scientific feasibility—mass balance, the laws of thermodynamics, etc., or ideas that appear to be the work of a team with no financial or technical resources to move forward on the concept. Tier II follows the work plan developed during Tier I to draft a risk assessment protocol report. During Tier III the risk

assessment protocol is executed and a report prepared providing the results of the executed multimedia risk assessment.

Once a project has cleared the initial screening review, it moves in sequence through the next three Tiers. Tier I begins with the applicant bringing a summary report on the fuel to CalEPA and ends with the development of a work plan for the multimedia evaluation. A key goal of the Tier I report is to identify important knowledge gaps for a multimedia Assessment and recommend approaches to address these gaps. This does not always involve additional experiments, but could include additional requests for information from the proponents of any new fuel to be used in California.

An important aspect of the applicant's Tier I summary report is an effort to assign measures of importance to all information—both available and missing information. As the Tier I work plan is developed and important information gaps identified, methods and/or experiments for estimating and/or measuring these information gaps are also identified for action during Tier II.

Using the work plan developed in Tier I, the Tier II report comprises further data collection and the development of a risk-assessment experimental design. Tier II concludes with the preparation and MMWG review of a multimedia risk assessment protocol report that identifies the steps to be taken to reduce the identified key uncertainties. The risk assessment protocol should be based on the Tier I work plan and provide a comparison between the proposed fuel or fuel additive and the baseline fuel that the MMWG has agreed should be the basis for comparison in the work plan. Release scenarios of greatest interest will have been identified in the work plan based on the likelihood of adverse impact or occurrence.

During Tier III the risk assessment protocol is executed and a report prepared providing the results of the executed multimedia risk assessment. The Tier III report is submitted to the MMWG for evaluation and preparation of recommendations to the Environmental Policy Council. Prior to submittal to the Environmental Policy Council, the submitted Final multimedia risk assessment report as well as the MMWG recommendation will undergo independent external expert Tier III Peer Review.

2. Summary of Renewable Diesel Tier I

Currently, the majority of biological-source diesel fuels are fatty-acid methyl esters (FAME) produced through transesterification, but there are rapidly emerging alternatives to the transesterification production of diesel biofuels. Renewable diesel (also referred to as co-processed diesel or "green" diesel) is considered an alternative fuel that has potential in California. Renewable diesel is similar to biodiesel in that both use similar feedstocks, but they have different processing methods and can include chemically different components.

Renewable diesel is derived from non-petroleum renewable resources, including, (but not limited to) plant and algae oils, animal fats and wastes, municipal solid waste, sludge and oils derived from wastewater, and other wastes. Hydrogenation-derived renewable diesel (HDRD) is produced by refining fats or vegetable oils—typically in existing oil refineries. This process is also known as the Fatty Acids to Hydrocarbon (Hydrotreatment) or FAHC Hydrotreatment process. In this process, renewable feedstocks such as vegetable oils and animal fats are converted into diesel fuel as well as propane, and other light hydrocarbons through a catalytic treatment that adds hydrogen. Because it is free of ester compounds, renewable diesel has a chemical composition that is almost identical to petroleum-based diesel.

Preliminary evaluations indicate several potential advantages of renewable diesel relative to FAME and petroleum-based diesel. These advantages include:

- Renewable diesel can be used directly in existing diesel-powered vehicles without modification.
- Renewable diesel chemical properties fall within CARB diesel properties. A formal determination may need to be made to assess compatibility and functionality. However, it appears that renewable diesel may not require new or modified pipelines, storage tanks, trucking infrastructure, or retail station pumps.
- Renewable diesel can be produced using existing oil refinery capacity and does not require extensive new production facilities.
- The fuel properties of renewable diesel, specifically its high cetane number, suggest it will provide similar or better vehicle performance than conventional ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD).
- The ultra-low sulfur content of renewable diesel enables the use of advance emission control devices.
- The production of renewable diesel through the FAHC process does not produce a glycerin co-product.

Preliminary tests of renewable diesel emissions indicate that, relative to standard diesel, there is a potential for significantly better emissions profile during combustion with reduced particulate-matter (PM), NOx, hydrocarbons, and CO emissions. In addition to producing a fuel that uses recycled carbon, renewable diesel benefits include: a high level of quality control; compliance with ASTM standards; and easy blending with biodiesel.

Although renewable diesel is chemically very similar to conventional diesel, it is produced through a distinct process. The life-cycle risk posed by renewable diesel is assessed as a relative

risk compared to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) currently in use.

The renewable Tier I report does not address direct and indirect environmental, ecological, and health impacts associated with biomass production—such as changes in land use and the possible net gain in carbon emissions due to feedstock cultivation.

2.1. Renewable Diesel Release Scenarios

Releases associated with the production, storage, distribution, and use of renewable diesel can be regarded as normal (routine) or off-normal (unplanned but not necessarily unlikely). Different feedstock supplies and production processes may have different normal and off-normal releases and may affect different environmental media and human populations depending on geographic location.

Normal releases during the use of renewable diesel include both the upstream feedstock production and fuel production emissions along with combustion tailpipe emissions, both to the air and to surface waters (in the case of marine use). The specific magnitude of these normal production and use releases within California are not yet well characterized and will remain difficult to quantify until more process-specific data become available and more engine/vehicle combustion tests are conducted.

There are several companies planning to market renewable diesel in California and elsewhere, but they have different production and marketing plans. A key issue for release scenarios upstream from the combustion stage is whether blending renewable diesel stock will occur at a refinery or at a distribution facility.

Normal or routine releases during the production of renewable diesel include:

- hexane or CO_2 released to the air during seed extraction,
- odors associated with waste biomass, and
- used process water discharges of various pH and trace-chemical composition.

Off-normal releases or unanticipated releases can occur primarily during the production, distribution and storage of renewable diesel. Off-normal releases may include spills or leaks of bulk feedstock; releases of production chemicals, such as hexane or blending stocks such as ULSD; or releases of finished renewable diesel fuel. These off-normal releases may be the result of leaks or ruptures of:

- an above-ground or below-ground storage tank and associated piping,
- a liquid-transportation vehicle such as rail tank car, tanker truck, or tanker ship, or
- a bulk-fuel transport pipeline.

For a company that plans to produce 100% renewable diesel and then blend it with conventional diesel post-production, and possibly at some location remote from the production facility, the release scenarios are different from a company that plans to co-process “green” plant or animal oil with conventional crude oil at an existing refinery. In the former case, storage and transport of 100% renewable diesel must be considered in terms of how it differs from experience with conventional and ULSD diesel. Some questions that arise:

- Can it be transported via pipelines?

- What are the spill consequences for 100% renewable diesel releases compared to ULSD releases?

2.2. Renewable Diesel Production, Storage, Distribution and Use

In contrast to a biodiesel that contains mono-alkyl esters, the California Low Carbon Fuel Standard defines a "renewable diesel" fuel as:

> *"… a motor vehicle fuel or fuel additive which is all the following:*
> *(A) Registered as a motor vehicle fuel or fuel additive under 40 CFR part 79; A-9*
> *(B) Not a mono-alkyl ester;*
> *(C) Intended for use in engines that are designed to run on conventional diesel fuel; and*
> *(D) Derived from nonpetroleum renewable resources."*

Renewable diesel, produced from a variety of renewable feedstocks, is not composed of esters and is composed chemically of saturated hydrocarbon chains similar to conventional petroleum. The renewable diesel production process is designed to take advantage of the infrastructure of an existing refinery. Several of the renewable diesel products currently available meet the ASTM standard for conventional diesel. As part of its assessment of the US Renewable Fuel Standard, the US EPA reported that renewable diesel has a slightly higher energy content compared to biodiesel.

There are several different chemical approaches to producing renewable diesel. One is based on hydrotreating vegetable oils or animal fats. Hydrotreating can take place in the same facilities used to process petroleum-based diesel. A second method involves synthesis of hydrocarbons through enzymatic reactions. A third method involves partially combusting a biomass source to produce carbon monoxide and hydrogen—syngas—and then utilizing the Fischer-Tropsch reaction to produce complex hydrocarbons. Because there are currently few plans to engage the Fischer-Tropsch process in California, California Air Resources Board staff have requested that this report focus on the impacts of hydrotreated renewable diesel (HDRD/FAHC) produced in existing refineries. Hydrotreating is a hydrodeoxygenation process used to remove oxygen and nitrogen containing compounds as well as metals from the fuel feedstock.

There are two general production strategies for HDRD production and distribution:

- Co-processing vegetable/animal triglycerides in a conventional petroleum production stream using a hydrotreating process. Currently this results in diesel fuel that has a specified percentage of "green-derived" carbon, e.g., 20% renewable diesel (R20).
- Production of a pure HDRD (R100) in a dedicated hydrotreating facility that does not use conventional petroleum. The resulting fuel can be used as a 100% green fuel or blended with conventional CARB ULSD to any concentration.

Soybeans are expected to be the main feedstock for renewable diesel in California. Oil is extracted from soy by crushing the beans and applying n-hexane as a solvent. Soy-based renewable diesel is sufficiently similar in physical-chemical properties to CARB ULSD that it can be readily used in a range of blending applications.

Palm trees used to produce palm oil are grown primarily in tropical or subtropical areas such as Malaysia and Indonesia. Palm oil is characterized by high concentrations of medium-chain

saturated (palmitic acid) and mono-saturated (oleic acid) fatty acids. One of its greatest advantages as a biofuel feedstock is high oil yield.

Canola and Rapeseed oils show promise as renewable diesel feedstock. These oils have properties similar to soy oil. The oil yield of canola, however, is much higher than soy; the seed contains 45% oil.

Animal tallow is a triglyceride material that is recovered by a rendering process, where the animal residues are cooked and the fat is recovered as it rises to the surface. Since it is a waste by-product, it is relatively inexpensive, sustainable, and is available locally. Vegetable oil waste grease and brown trap grease can also be used to make renewable diesel.

Petroleum-based diesel fuels are mixtures of aliphatic (open chain and cyclic compounds that are similar to open chain compounds) and aromatic (benzene and compounds similar to benzene) petroleum hydrocarbons. In addition, they may contain small amounts of nitrogen, sulfur, and other elements as additives. The exact chemical composition (i.e., precise percentage of each constituent) of any particular diesel oil type can vary somewhat, depending on the petroleum source and other factors. Petroleum-based diesel fuels are distinguished from other fuels primarily by their boiling point ranges, and chemical additives.

Renewable diesel is required to meet the same ASTM D975 standards as conventional diesel and is composed of saturated hydrocarbons similar to conventional diesel along with performance and stability additives. The ASTM Standard Specification for Diesel Fuel Oils, when met, allows renewable diesel to be suitable for a variety of diesel engines.

The USEPA specifications for conventional diesel fuel include the requirement for additives. The required additives are:

- corrosion inhibitor,
- emulsifier,
- anti-oxidant, and
- metal deactivator.

Chemical additives are commercially available to address the oxidative stability, cold-flow properties, and microbial contamination of renewable diesel. It is expected that these additives would be the same as or very similar to additives currently in use for conventional diesel fuel.

In general, the handling and storage of renewable diesel that meets ASTM D975 standards are the same as handling and storage for petroleum diesel including the needed protection from ignition sources. Tanks used for transport and storage must be suitable for combustible liquids and precautions must be taken to prevent product spills on to the ground, into drains, and into surface and ground waters. In the evaluation of the multimedia impacts of new diesel formulations, material compatibility and storage stability are important considerations, but little information is available on pure renewable diesel materials compatibility.

Blended HDRD can be transported with the same methods used for conventional diesel, including pipelines, rail cars, tank trucks and drums. The choice of transport vessel depends on the quantity of renewable diesel being transferred and the cold flow properties of the fuel. It is technically straightforward to blend pure HDRD fuels (R100) with conventional diesel. R100 can be blended to as much as 65 to 70 volume % in conventional diesel to fulfill the minimum density requirement.

A key consideration in the Renewable Diesel Tier I review is how levels of criteria and hazardous air pollutants emitted during combustion of ULSD differ from those emitted from an energy-equivalent quantity of renewable diesel.

Although biofuels has been studied extensively over the past 20 years, knowledge gaps still exist and further research was needed to fully characterize the impact renewable diesel has on oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions and various other emissions. More recent reviews have emphasized the considerable variations in the results from study to study and engine to engine. Further, many of these studies are limited in their direct application to California, however, because exhaust emissions from diesel engines fueled with biofuels were not compared to these engines fueled with CARB ULSD diesel. Additionally, most of these studies are not as extensive as the testing requirements used in the certification of CARB alternative diesel formulations, which require fuels to be shown to be equivalent to a 10% aromatic reference diesel fuel over a test sequence of 20 or more iterations (CARB, 2004).

There are ongoing emissions testing studies designed to address this issue, but initial studies have revealed that in diesel engines:

- HDRD fuels showed significant emission benefits compared to conventional ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel. Higher blend percentages resulted in greater benefits.
- Blends below 10% renewable diesel can result in reductions in CO and HC, but not PM or NOx.
- While specific (density adjusted) fuel consumption is better with the HDRD, volumetric fuel consumption is 5% higher because of the lower HDRD density.
- HDRD fuels avoid some of the unwanted effects associated with FAME-based biodiesel fuels (instability, hygroscopicity, fouling, catalyst deactivation, etc.).
- Due to the absence of sulfur and aromatic compounds, NExBTL exhaust emissions show significant reductions in many regulated and non-regulated compounds compared to “traditional” petroleum diesel.

2.3. Renewable Diesel Toxicity

A significant challenge that arises in determining the human and ecological toxicity of renewable diesel fuels is that renewable diesel fuel is not a defined chemical formulation or a defined mixture of components, but can be formulated from a number of different feedstocks with different chemical components.

Limited tests on the inherent acute oral and dermal toxicity of pure renewable diesel indicate that renewable diesel has a very low inherent toxicity, but these tests are difficult to interpret since there were no controls using conventional diesel or tests using diesel blend.

There have been some initial mutagenic testing of pure renewable diesel using a reverse mutation assay (Ames Test) and a chromosome aberration test with human lymphocytes *in vitro*. In the Ames test, no significant increases in the frequency of revertant colonies were recorded for any dose, either with or without metabolic activation. In the human lymphocyte test, the pure renewable diesel was considered to be non-clastogenic to human lymphocytes *in vitro*.

Insight on aquatic toxicity comes from acute short-term exposure of fish, water fleas, and green algae to a pure renewable diesel water accommodated fraction. This study concluded that the No-Observed-Effect-Level (NOEL) was greater than 100 mg/L for all three species.

To date, there has been no publication of comprehensive testing of the relative toxicity of the tailpipe emissions from combusting renewable diesel (blends and/or pure fuel) compared to existing diesel and/or biodiesel. The CARB is funding studies that used in-vitro testing to assess and compare the inflammatory toxicity and genotoxicity of biodiesel and renewable diesel blends along with CARB diesel. Preliminary results indicate lower toxicity for renewable diesel. But based on the level of variation in emissions toxicity assessment for petroleum diesel, the chemical similarity of renewable diesel and petroleum diesel, and the likelihood for blends that still contain a significant fraction (80%) of petroleum diesel, we expect that it will be difficult to organize and interpret a study to compare the toxicity of petroleum diesel relative to R20 renewable diesel blends for the full range of vehicle-engine systems used in California. Therefore, unless the fuels market evolves to the point where renewable blends contain more than 50% non-petroleum diesel feedstock, there appears to be little value in calling for extensive emissions toxicity studies for renewable diesel.

Major differences in health and ecological impacts between existing diesel and renewable diesel blends are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix. So the key issue with regard to different life-cycle health/ecological impacts from existing diesel blends and renewable diesel blends will likely be linked to differences in additives.

The chemical comparison to conventional diesel is important for determining whether or how much additional toxicity tests are required. If a co-processed “green” renewable diesel is the intended product and is chemically indistinguishable from conventional diesel, then no additional toxicity testing should be conducted. Furthermore, if a post-production 100% pure renewable diesel is blended to a proportion such that it is chemically indistinguishable from conventional diesel, then no additional toxicity testing should be required in this case as well.

2.4. Transport and Fate

The transport and fate of a fuel and its component chemicals in the environment depend on the multimedia transport properties of its constituent chemicals. The purpose of the multimedia evaluation of renewable diesel is to identify impacts that may be different from the existing baseline fuel, which in the case of renewable diesel is conventional petroleum-based ULSD. Based on the fuel chemical composition analysis provided by both Kern Oil and Refining (KOR) and Neste Oil Corp., renewable diesel can be regarded as substantially similar to other conventional diesel fuels. The main difference between conventional ULSD and pure HDRD is that the pure renewable diesel has essentially no sulfur or oxygen and has a very low aromatic compound content. Co-processed 20% renewable diesel can be expected to be even closer in chemical composition to conventional CARB ULSD.

Based on the reported similarities in chemical composition, and thus the physicochemical properties governing fate and transport in the environment, between renewable diesel and conventional CARB ULSD, the multimedia environmental behavior of renewable diesel is also be expected to be similar. The transport and partitioning behavior, as well as biodegradation in soils can be expected to be similar. The release scenarios and materials compatibility issues should be essentially the same as the conventional diesel that is already in wide use.

Even when releases of renewable diesel would not cause significantly greater impacts to the environment, human health, or water resources relative to CARB ULSD, the impact from releases of associated additives and production chemicals could be of concern. The specific chemical composition of the additives used by various renewable diesel manufactures is typically not specified and the environmental impact of these additives is not well described.

In the case of co-processed 20% renewable diesel, it is reasonable to assume that any additives used in renewable diesel are currently used in CARB ULSD and would continue to be used with no substantive difference in environmental impact due to additives. If this is the case, then new studies on multimedia transport and impact from additives would not be necessary under the confirmation that the impacts of additives in CARB ULSD are either acceptable or at lease well-characterized. However, when the additives used in renewable diesel are different from those in ULSD with regard to composition and/or quantity, then a multimedia transport and impact assessment will be needed to determine the magnitude and significance of these additives.

3. Summary of Renewable Diesel Tier II Findings

3.1. Fate and Transport/Toxicity Studies

The Tier I review concluded that there are strong similarities between the chemical composition of petroleum diesel and renewable diesel. These similarities and the strong likelihood that renewable diesel will be blended with petroleum diesel limits the need for additional Tier II multimedia fate and transport/ toxicity experiments or an extensive life-cycle impact assessment.

To support the renewable diesel multimedia assessment, a comprehensive emissions study comparing renewable diesel fuels, to California Air Resources Board (CARB) diesel fuel was conducted. This program was coordinated by CARB in conjunction with researchers from the University of California Riverside (UCR), the University of California Davis (UCD), and others including Arizona State University (ASU)(Citation).

3.2. Air Emission Studies

To support the renewable diesel multimedia assessment, a comprehensive emissions study comparing renewable diesel fuels, to California Air Resources Board (CARB) diesel fuel was conducted. This program was coordinated by CARB in conjunction with researchers from the University of California Riverside (UCR), the University of California Davis (UCD), and others including Arizona State University (ASU)(Citation). The study was divided into two main areas, NOx impacts and filling of knowledge gaps. Two heavy-duty on-road engines were tested at the College of Engineering - Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CE-CERT) and two non-road engines were tested at CARB emissions test facilities in Stockton and El Monte. The second main area was to fill knowledge gaps in the area of health impacts and unregulated emissions. The study was conducted on four vehicles at the CARB's heavy-duty emissions test facility in Los Angeles.

A renewable diesel and a gas-to-liquid (GTL) diesel fuel were used for testing. The renewable diesel was provided by Neste Oil, and it is known as NExBTL. The renewable and the GTL diesel fuel were blended at 20%, 50%, and 100% levels with ULSD and biodiesel. The fuels for all testing utilized the same batches of primary fuels, and the blending for all testing was also done at the same time.

A 2006 Cummins ISM and 2007 MBE4000 engine equipped with a diesel particle filter (DPF) were tested at CE-CERT. For the renewable and gas-to-liquid (GTL) diesel fuels in the 2006 Cummins, the results showed a steady decrease in NOx emissions with increasing levels of renewable/GTL diesel fuel. For the renewable diesel fuel, these reductions ranged from 2.9% to 4.9% for R20, 5.4% to 10.2% for R50, and 9.9% to 18.1% for R100 through all the cycles. For the GTL fuel the reductions were 5.2% and 8.7%, respectively, for GTL50 and GTL100 during the Federal Test Procedure cycle.

Compared to the CARB ULSD, the renewable and GTL fuels provided reductions in PM and CO emissions, with the GTL fuel also providing reductions in THC, although these reductions were sometimes only seen for the higher blend levels. The renewable and GTL fuels provided a

slight reduction (2-4% for R100) in CO2 emissions at the higher blends, with a slight, but measureable, increase in fuel consumption. The fuel consumption differences are consistent with the results from previous studies, and can be attributed to the lower density or energy density of the renewable and GTL fuels compared to the CARB baseline fuel.

PAH and Nitro-PAH emissions both decreased as a function of increasing blend level for renewable diesel. The emission trends for Oxy-PAH emissions showed different trends for different compounds, with some compounds showing generally higher emissions in soy and animal-based biodiesels compared to CARB diesel, whereas others decreased in animal biodiesel and renewable diesel. However, for semivolatile nitro-PAHs, the renewable diesel may be slightly more effective in reducing emissions than soy- or animal-based biodiesels.

The emission trends observed renewable diesel were different for different compounds. For example, the results for 1,2-naphthoquinone (2-ring oxy-PAH) showed generally higher emissions in soy and animal-based biodiesels compared to CARB diesel, whereas perinaphthenone, 9-fluorenone, and 1,8-naphthalic anhydride (3-ring oxy-PAHs) emissions decreased in animal biodiesel and renewable diesel.

If blended with biodiesel, the NOx reduction observed for the renewable and GTL fuels may be used to offset the observed increase in NOx emissions from biodiesel alone. The renewable/GTL diesel reduction in NOx was less than the corresponding increases in NOx seen for the soy-based biodiesel, but are more comparable to the increases seen for the animal-based biodiesel blends. This suggests that the renewable and GTL diesel fuel levels need to be blended at higher levels than the corresponding biodiesel in order to mitigate the associated NOx increase, especially for the soy-based biodiesel blends.

Several NOx mitigation formulations were evaluated on 2006 Cummins engine, including those utilizing renewable and GTL diesel fuels, and additives. Successful formulations included those with higher levels of renewable diesel (R80 or R55) with a B20-soy biodiesel. Blends of 15% renewable or GTL diesel were also proved successful in mitigating NOx for a B5 soy blend, giving a formulation more comparable to what might be implemented with the low carbon fuel standard. A 1% di tertiary butyl peroxide (DTBP) additive blend was found to fully mitigate the NOx impacts for a B20 and B10 soy biodiesel, while 2-ethylhexyl nitrate (2-EHN) blends had little impact on improving NOx emissions. It was found that the level of renewable or GTL diesel fuels needed for blending can be reduced if a biodiesel fuel with more favorable NOx characteristics, such as animal-based biodiesel, is used, or if an additive with more favorable NOx characteristics, such as DTBP, is used. For the MBE4000 engine, only two blends were tested, CARB80/R15/B5-S and B-5 soy with a 0.25% DTBP additive. Of these two, only the B-5 soy with a 0.25% DTBP additive provided NOx neutrality. Overall, it appears that different strategies will provide mitigation for different engines, but that the specific response varies from engine to engine.

CARB diesel and renewable diesel all induced inflammatory markers, such as COX-2 and IL-8 in human macrophages and the mucin related MUC5AC markers in Clara type cells, with the inflammatory markers higher in the 2000 Caterpillar C-15 engine vehicle than the 2007 MBE4000 engine vehicle. For the comet assay, at the limited dose levels tested, there was little increase of chromosomal damage (gross DNA damage) from the various fuels tested, including the CARB diesel.

3.3. Renewable Diesel Tier II Conclusions

- As part of the overall multimedia assessment, each company proposing to market renewable diesel within California should provide the California ARB with a production, blending, additives, and distribution strategy that includes potential volumes to be stored and transported along with potential release scenarios that the company may foresee. Each company should also provide a comparative chemical analysis of the product they intend to market. This analysis should be compared to conventional diesel currently in the market place.
- A steady decrease in NOx emissions with increasing levels of renewable/GTL diesel fuel can be expected. Compared to the CARB ULSD, the renewable and GTL fuels provided reductions in PM and CO emissions. PAH and Nitro-PAH emissions both decreased as a function of increasing blend level for renewable diesel.
- If blended with biodiesel, the NOx reduction observed for the renewable and GTL fuels may be used to offset the observed increase in NOx emissions from biodiesel combustion.
- The lower density or energy density of the renewable and GTL fuels compared to the CARB baseline fuel resulted in a slight, but measureable, increase in fuel consumption.
- Overall, it appears that different strategies will provide mitigation for different engines, but that the specific response varies from engine to engine.

4. Renewable Diesel Tier III Conclusion and Recommendations

Through a review of the current knowledge on renewable diesel production, use, and environmental impacts, this report provides an assessment to aid the CalEPA Multimedia Working Group in formulating recommendations to the California Environmental Policy Council regarding the consequences of increased use of renewable diesel in California.

It must be recognized that the multimedia impact assessment is a process and not a product. It is important to realize that much is unknown about an emerging transportation fuel system on the scale of full implantation and will remain uncertain until the full system is created. A life-cycle impact assessment is a contingent process, based on scenarios that will be modified as new knowledge is acquired, and is not intended to make firm predictions.

Adaptive decision-making refers to learning by doing. Life-cycle approaches to emerging fuel options are often difficult to apply and may be burdened by uncertainty such that they become more informative as fuel technologies mature and are deployed. The uncertainties identified will inform decision-makers regarding:

- Investments to improve knowledge base,
- Formulation of processes used to collect and process new information,
- Formulation of processes to evaluate and communicate uncertainty, and
- Adjustment of the risk assessment process to mitigate the practical impact of uncertainty on decision-making.

Renewable diesel offers several beneficial characteristics that will help California meet State renewable fuel goals:

- Renewable diesel is chemically similar to the CARB ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel already in wide use and environmental releases from the life cycle of these fuels can be expected to behave in the environment in a manner similar to CARB ULSD releases.
- Renewable diesel can be used directly in existing diesel-powered vehicles without modification.
- Renewable diesel chemical properties fall within CARB diesel properties. A formal determination may need to be made to assess compatibility and functionality. However, it appears that renewable diesel may not require new or modified pipelines, storage tanks, trucking infrastructure, or retail station pumps.
- Pure renewable diesel has reduced aromatic hydrocarbon content and, since many of the chemicals of environmental concern are aromatic hydrocarbons, this reduction will likely reduce the overall toxic impacts of leaking or spilled fuel.
- A steady decrease in NOx emissions with increasing levels of renewable/GTL diesel fuel can be expected. Compared to the CARB ULSD, the renewable diesel fuels provided reductions in PM and CO emissions. PAH and Nitro-PAH emissions both decreased as a function of increasing blend level for renewable diesel.
- If blended with biodiesel, the NOx reduction observed for the renewable fuels may be used to offset the observed increase in NOx emissions from biodiesel combustion.

- Limited toxicity testing on rats (oral and dermal exposures), water fleas and green algae, and including mutagenic assays, reveals that pure 100% renewable diesel has limited inherent toxicity and that pure renewable diesel formations are unlikely to exceed the inherent toxicity or mutagenicity of standard diesel. Major differences in health and ecological impact between existing diesel and renewable diesel blends are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix.
- Renewable diesel fuels that are made from waste products such as tallow will likely have reduced life-cycle environmental impacts compared to fuels made from plant crops. These reduced impacts stem from possible reductions in pesticide, herbicide, and fertilizer use. Furthermore, the use of food supply crops as a fuel feedstock may not be sustainable as global population grows. Further studies are needed to confirm this assertion.
- The results here indicate that life-cycle health impacts of renewable diesel blends are not likely to differ significantly from those of petroleum diesel.

There are, however, concerns that arise from the knowledge gaps associated with renewable diesel use in California. These concerns include:

- **Additives impacts.** To provide a stable, useful, and reliable fuel, additive chemicals may need to be introduced into almost all renewable diesel blends. These additives will be required to address issues such as oxidation, corrosion, foaming, cold temperature flow properties, biodegradation, and water separation. These additives are currently used in conventional diesel fuels, but the specific chemicals and amounts to be used in renewable by various producers has not been yet been fully defined for the emerging industry in California. Nevertheless, the expectation of ARB is that renewable diesel will employ additives similar to those used standard diesel. Given the similarity of renewable diesel and standard diesel in terms of composition and performance, it is reasonable to expect the use of similar performance additives in renewable diesel relative to standard diesel. It follows that health and environmental impacts will also be similar or lower. Additional research may be needed to confirm this finding, but this is not a high priority given the relative low impact of additives within the life cycle of existing standard diesel.
- **Production and storage releases.** Increased renewable diesel production and associated feedstock processing may involve impacts from released reactants and by-products. There are potential impacts to California's air and water during the large-scale industrial operations used to extract seed oils. These impacts may result from air emissions of solvents used to extract the seed oil (e.g., hexane) and from leaking tanks containing process chemicals. There is also the issue of occupational exposures.

  Currently, the possible impacts during seed extraction will be minimal in California since it is anticipated that most of the seed oils will be derived from soy grown and extracted out-of-state. The impacts during seed extraction will be become more of an issue for California as in-state production of plant-derived oils increases and may require further study.

  As the volume of tallow that is rendered out of state and shipped by rail or truck into California increases, there is a potential impact from releases of large volumes of raw

triglycerides to soils or water. The impact of such a release has not been documented and additional research would be beneficial as large-scale tallow usage increases.

- **Toxicity Testing.** Based on the level of variation in emissions toxicity assessment, the chemical similarity of renewable diesel and petroleum diesel, that specific mitigation response varies from engine to engine. and the likelihood for blends that still contain a significant fraction (80%) of petroleum diesel, we expect that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to organize and interpret a study to compare the toxicity of petroleum diesel relative to 20% or less renewable diesel blends. Therefore, unless the market evolves to the point where renewable blends contain more than 50% non-petroleum diesel feedstock, there appears to be little value in calling for further toxicity studies for renewable diesel.

Not specifically addressed in the Tier I, II, and III evaluations are the environmental impacts from the increased use of fertilizers and water and land resources if the production of plant oils increases in the State to supply renewable-diesel feedstocks. These factors may be some of the most important eventual impacts to California as the renewable and biofuels industry expands. More sustainable sources of renewable diesel such as yellow or brown grease or tallow may be preferable and should be encouraged.

5. Tier III References

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2008. Guidance Document and Recommendations on the Types of Scientific Information to be Submitted by Applicants for California Fuels Environmental Multimedia Evaluations.

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency) Multimedia Working Group. 2011. California Renewable Diesel Multimedia Evaluation Tier I Final Report, prepared by the University of California, Davis and the University of California, Berkeley. September 2011.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2004. The California Diesel Fuel Regulations, Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Sections 2281-2285, Title 17, California Code of Regulations, Sections 93114.

6. Tier III Appendices

6.1. Appendix III-A: California Renewable Diesel Multimedia Evaluation, Tier I Final Report, September, 2011.

California Renewable Diesel Multimedia Evaluation

Tier I
Final Report

Prepared By

Thomas E. McKone
David W. Rice
University of California, Berkeley

Timothy R. Ginn
University of California, Davis

For the

California Environmental Protection Agency
Multimedia Working Group

FINAL

September 2011

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....6
Background..... 6
Study Approach 7
Release Scenarios..... 7
Renewable Diesel Production, Storage, Distribution and Use 8
Renewable Diesel Toxicity 11
Transport and Fate 11
Tier I Conclusions..... 12
1. Renewable Diesel Background Information 15
1.1. Introduction..... 15
1.2. History..... 18
1.3. Legislative Incentives for Biofuels 20
2. Renewable Diesel Life Cycle Impacts.....22
2.1. Life Cycle Assessment..... 22
2.2. US EPA Life Cycle Assessment of Renewable Fuels 24
2.3. Life Cycle Impacts and Information Gaps..... 26
3. Release Scenarios.....27
3.1. Defining Release Scenarios 27
3.2. Normal Releases 27
3.3. Off-Normal Releases 28
4. Production of Renewable Diesel.....29
4.1. Renewable Diesel Production Chemistry 29
4.2. Renewable Diesel Reactor Configuration and Design..... 30
4.3. Overview of Renewable Diesel Feedstocks..... 32
4.4. Overview of Renewable Diesel Chemical Composition 35
4.4.1. U.S. EPA Registration..... 35
4.4.2. Renewable Diesel versus FAME Biodiesel..... 35
4.4.3. Chemical Composition of Renewable Diesel Compared to Conventional Diesel36
4.5. Solid Waste and Emissions to Water 40
5. Storage and Distribution of Renewable Diesel 41
5.1. Material Compatibility and Storage Stability 41
5.2. Distribution and Blending of Renewable Diesel 41
5.3. Use of Additives 42
5.3.1. Residual Water 42
5.3.2. Additives to Inhibit Biodegradation of Stored Diesel Fuel..... 43

6. Use of Renewable Diesel.....44
6.1. Renewable Diesel Standardization and Fuel Quality..... 44
6.2. Emissions of Pollutants to Air 44
6.3. Renewable Diesel Impact on Air Quality 45
7. Renewable Diesel Toxicity 47
7.1. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment..... 47
7.2. Acute Oral and Acute Dermal Toxicity 47
7.3. Human Health 48
7.4. Toxicity Testing of Renewable Diesel Fuel Exhaust Emissions 48
7.5. Aquatic Toxicity 50
7.6. Toxicity and Biodegradation in Aerated Soil 50
7.7. Summary of Toxicity Issues 51
8. Environmental Transport and Fate of Renewable Diesel 52
9. Tier I Conclusions 53
10. References 56
11. Appendices 61
11.1. Appendix A: ASTM D975-09b Standard Property Descriptions for Diesel Fuel Oils62
11.2. Appendix B: Renewable Diesel Additive Chemicals 64

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Summary of biofuel options..... 16

Figure 1.2. Generalized summary of renewable diesel life cycle impacts..... 18

Figure 2.1. An illustration of life stages and life-cycle impacts for renewable diesel fuels. 23

Figure 4.1. Hydrogen production from methane, adapted from Gary et al. (2007)..... 29

Figure 4.2. Hydrogenation of Triglycerides. 30

Figure 4.3. Stand-alone Renewable Diesel Production Unit used to produce a pure HDRD product (R100). Adapted from Kalnes et al. (2007). 31

Figure 4.4. Chemical Reaction Pathways. Adapted from Marker et al. (2005).....32

Figure 5.1. Rohm and Haas Kathon FP 1.5 Biocide (Rohm and Haas, 1999)..... 43

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Biofuel Production Plant Emission Factors in 2022 (grams per gallon produced)(US EPA, 2010a). 25

Table 2.2. Projected Renewable Fuel Volumes (billion gallons)(US EPA, 2010a). 25

Table 4.1. Comparison of Kern Oil and Refining Company R20 renewable diesel analysis performed by Southwest Research institute to three diesel fuel specifications. 37

Table 4.2. Comparative fuel properties for conventional low-sulfur diesel and a HRDF (NExBTL) (Rothe, et al., unpublished document) 39

Table 6.1. ASTM Diesel Fuel Grades (ASTM 2009). 44

Table 6.2. Effect of blending on an HRDF emissions (NExBTL) (Rothe et al, 2005). 45

Executive Summary

Background

Currently, the majority of biological-source diesel fuels are fatty-acid methyl esters (FAME) produced through transesterification, but there are rapidly emerging alternatives to the transesterification production of diesel biofuels. Renewable diesel (also referred to as co-processed diesel or "green" diesel) is considered an alternative fuel that has potential in California. Renewable diesel is similar to biodiesel in that both use similar feedstocks, but they have different processing methods and can include chemically different components.

Renewable diesel is derived from non-petroleum renewable resources, including, (but not limited to) plant and algae oils, animal fats and wastes, municipal solid waste, sludge and oils derived from wastewater, and other wastes. Hydrogenation-derived renewable diesel (HDRD) is produced by refining fats or vegetable oils—typically in existing oil refineries. This process is also known as the Fatty Acids to Hydrocarbon (Hydrotreatment) or FAHC Hydrotreatment process. In this process, renewable feedstocks such as vegetable oils and animal fats are converted into diesel fuel as well as propane, and other light hydrocarbons through a catalytic treatment that adds hydrogen. Because it is free of ester compounds, renewable diesel has a chemical composition that is almost identical to petroleum-based diesel.

Preliminary evaluations indicate several potential advantages of renewable diesel relative to FAME and petroleum-based diesel. These advantages include:

- Renewable diesel can be used directly in existing diesel-powered vehicles without modification.
- Renewable diesel is compatible with current diesel distribution infrastructure and does not require new or modified pipelines, storage tanks, trucking infrastructure, or retail station pumps.
- Renewable diesel can be produced using existing oil refinery capacity and does not require extensive new production facilities.
- The fuel properties of renewable diesel, specifically its high cetane number, suggest it will provide similar or better vehicle performance than conventional ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD).
- The ultra-low sulfur content of renewable diesel enables the use of advance emission control devices.
- The production of renewable diesel through the FAHC process does not produce a glycerin co-product.

Preliminary tests of renewable diesel emissions indicate that, relative to standard diesel, there is a potential for significantly better emissions profile during combustion with reduced particulate-mattter, NOx, hydrocarbons, and CO emissions. In addition to producing a fuel that uses recycled carbon, renewable diesel benefits include: a high level of quality control; compliance with ASTM standards; and easy blending with biodiesel.

California law states that the "California Air Resources Board cannot adopt any regulation establishing a motor vehicle fuel specification unless a multimedia evaluation is conducted to determine whether the regulation will cause a significant adverse impact on the public health or environment". Although renewable diesel is chemically very similar to conventional diesel, it is

produced through a distinct process, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) must provide a "life cycle multimedia risk assessment" before adopting new fuel specifications that allow renewable diesel blends.

This Tier I Renewable Diesel report is the first step in a three-tier process to evaluate the cumulative health and ecological impacts from releases to air, surface water, groundwater and soil at all stages of the renewable diesel life cycle: feedstock production, fuel production, storage and distribution, and fuel use. The life-cycle risk posed by renewable diesel is assessed as a relative risk compared to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) currently in use.

Study Approach

The goal of this Tier I report is to identify what is currently known about the life-cycle health, ecological, and resource impacts of renewable diesel and identify key uncertainties and data gaps. It provides important input to the Multimedia Working Group with regard to the need for and scope of Tier II and Tier III studies for renewable diesel formulations.

Meeting this goal requires the following elements:

- Identifying the physical and chemical and environmental toxicity characteristics of the reference fuel, candidate fuel, and additive components;
- summarizing all potential production, distribution, storage, and use release scenarios including a discussion of the most likely release scenarios;
- summarizing the expected environmental behavior (transport and fate) associated with a portfolio of release scenarios for proposed fuel or fuel components that may be released; and
- comparing the physical, chemical, and toxic properties of the fuel or additive components to the appropriate and consensus control fuel or fuel components.

The purpose of a life-cycle assessment (LCA) applied to renewable diesel is to quantify and compare environmental flows of resources and pollutants (to and from the environment) associated with both renewable diesel and petroleum-based diesel, over the entire life cycle of the respective products. The flows of resources and pollutants provide the framework for assessing human-health, environmental-systems, and resource impacts. LCA addresses a broad range of requirements and impacts for technologies, industrial processes, and products in order to determine their propensity to consume natural resources or generate pollution.

This report does not address direct and indirect environmental, ecological, and health impacts associated with biomass production—such as changes in land use and the possible net gain in carbon emissions due to feedstock cultivation.

Release Scenarios

Releases associated with the production, storage and distribution, and use of renewable diesel can be regarded as normal (routine) or off-normal (unplanned but not necessarily unlikely). Different feedstock supplies and production processes may have different normal and off-normal releases and may affect different environmental media and human populations depending on geographic location.

Normal releases during the use of renewable diesel include combustion tailpipe emissions, both to the air and to surface waters (in the case of marine use). The specific magnitude of these normal production and use releases within California are not yet well characterized and will remain difficult to quantify until more process-specific data become available and more engine/vehicle combustion tests are conducted.

There are several companies planning to market renewable diesel in California and elsewhere, but they have different production and marketing plans. A key issue for release scenarios upstream from the combustion stage is whether blending renewable diesel stock will occur at a refinery or at a distribution facility.

Normal or routine releases during the production of renewable diesel include:

- hexane or CO_2 released to the air during seed extraction,
- odors associated with waste biomass, and
- used process water discharges of various pH and trace-chemical composition.

Off-normal releases or unanticipated releases can occur primarily during the production, distribution and storage of renewable diesel. Off-normal releases may include spills or leaks of bulk feedstock, production chemicals, such as hexane or blending stocks such as ULSD, or finished renewable diesel fuel. These off-normal releases may be the result of leak or rupture of:

- an above-ground or below-ground storage tank and associated piping,
- a liquid-transportation vehicle such as rail tank car, tanker truck, or tanker ship, or
- a bulk-fuel transport pipeline.

For a company that plans to produce 100% renewable diesel and then blend it with conventional diesel post-production, and possibly at some location remote from the production facility, the release scenarios are different from a company that plans to co-process "green" plant or animal oil with conventional crude oil at an existing refinery. In the former case, storage and transport of 100% renewable diesel must be considered in terms of how it differs from experience with conventional and ULSD diesel. Some questions that arise:

- Can it be transported via pipelines?
- What are the spill consequences for 100% renewable diesel compared to ULSD?

Renewable Diesel Production, Storage, Distribution and Use

In contrast to a biodiesel that contains mono-alkyl esters, the California Low Carbon Fuel Standard defines a "renewable diesel" fuel as:

> *"… a motor vehicle fuel or fuel additive which is all the following:*
> *(A) Registered as a motor vehicle fuel or fuel additive under 40 CFR part 79; A-9*
> *(B) Not a mono-alkyl ester;*
> *(C) Intended for use in engines that are designed to run on conventional diesel fuel; and*
> *(D) Derived from nonpetroleum renewable resources."*

Renewable diesel, produced from a variety of renewable feedstocks, is not composed of esters and is composed chemically of saturated hydrocarbon chains similar to conventional petroleum. The renewable diesel production process is designed to take advantage of the infrastructure of an existing refinery. Several of the renewable diesel products currently available meet the ASTM standard for conventional diesel. As part of the US Renewable Fuel Standard, US EPA reported that renewable diesel has a slightly higher energy content compared to biodiesel.

There are several different chemical approaches to producing renewable diesel. One is based on hydrotreating vegetable oils or animal fats. Hydrotreating can take place in the same facilities used to process petroleum-based diesel. A second method involves systhesis of hydrocarbons through enzymatic reactions. A third method involves partially combusting a biomass source to produce carbon monoxide and hydrogen—syngas—and then utilizing the Fischer-Tropsch reaction to produce complex hydrocarbons. Because there are currently few plans to engage the Fischer-Tropsch process in California, California Air Resources Board staff have requested that this report focus on the impacts of hydrotreated renewable diesel (HDRD/FAHC) produced in existing refineries. Hydrotreating is a hydrodeoxygenation process used to remove oxygen and nitrogen containing compounds as well as metals from the fuel feedstock.

There are two general production strategies for HDRD production and distribution:

- Co-processing vegetable/animal triglycerides in a conventional petroleum production stream using a hydrotreating process. Currently this results in diesel fuel that has a specified percentage of "green-derived" carbon, e.g., 20% renewable diesel (R20).
- Production of a pure HDRD (R100) in a dedicated hydrotreating facility that does not use conventional petroleum. The resulting fuel can be used as a 100% green fuel or blended with conventional CARB ULSD to any concentration.

Soybeans are expected to be the main feedstock for renewable diesel in California. Oil is extracted from soy by crushing the beans and applying n-hexane as a solvent. Soy-based renewable diesel is sufficiently similar in physical-chemical properties to CARB ULSD that it can be readily used in a range of blending applications.

Palm used to produce palm oil are grown primarily in tropical or subtropical areas such as Malaysia and Indonesia. Palm oil is characterized by high concentrations of medium-chain saturated (palmitic acid) and monosaturated (oleic acid) fatty acids. One of its greatest advantages as a biofuel feedstock is high oil yield.

Canola and Rapeseed oils show promise as renewable diesel feedstock. These oils have properties similar to soy oil. The oil yield of canola, however, is much higher than soy; the seed contains 45% oil.

Animal tallow is a triglyceride material that is recovered by a rendering process, where the animal residues are cooked and the fat is recovered as it rises to the surface. Since it is a waste by-product, it is relatively inexpensive, sustainable, and is available locally. Vegetable oil waste grease and brown trap grease can also be used to make renewable diesel.

Petroleum-based diesel fuels are mixtures of aliphatic (open chain and cyclic compounds that are similar to open chain compounds) and aromatic (benzene and compounds similar to benzene) petroleum hydrocarbons. In addition, they may contain small amounts of nitrogen, sulfur, and other elements as additives. The exact chemical composition (i.e., precise percentage of each constituent) of any particular diesel oil type can vary somewhat, depending on the petroleum source and other factors. Petroleum-based diesel fuels are distinguished from each other fuels primarily by their boiling point ranges, and chemical additives.

Renewable diesel is required to meet the same ASTM D975standards as conventional diesel and is composed of saturated hydrocarbons similar to conventional diesel along with performance and stability additives. The ASTM Standard Specification for Diesel Fuel Oils, when met, allows renewable diesel to be suitable for a variety of diesel engines.

The USEPA specifications for conventional diesel fuel include the requirement for additives. The required additives are:

- corrosion Inhibitor,
- demulsifier,
- anti-oxidant, and
- metal deactivator.

Chemical additives are commercially available to address the oxidative stability, cold-flow properties, and microbial contamination of renewable diesel. It is expected that these additives would be the same as or very similar to additives currently in use for conventional diesel fuel.

In general, the handling and storage of renewable diesel that meets ASTM D975 standards is the same as for petroleum diesel including the needed protection from ignition sources. Tanks used for transport and storage must be suitable for combustible liquids and precautions must be taken to prevent product spills on to the ground, into drains, and into surface and ground waters. In the evaluation of the multimedia impacts of new diesel formulations, material compatibility and storage stability are important considerations, but little information is available on pure renewable diesel materials compatibility.

Blended HDRD can be transported via the same methods used for conventional diesel, including pipelines, rail cars, tank trucks and drums. The choice of transport vessel depends on the quantity of renewable diesel being transferred and the cold flow properties of the fuel. It is straight forward technically to blend pure HDRD fuels (R100) with conventional diesel. R100 can be blended to as much as 65 to 70 volume % in conventional diesel to fulfill the minimum density requirement.

A key consideration in this Tier I review is how the levels of criteria and hazardous air pollutants emitted during combustion differ from those emitted from and energy-equivalent quantity of renewable diesel verses ULSD.

While emissions testing is ongoing, initial studies concluded that in diesel engines:

- HDRD fuel showed significant emission benefits compared to ultra-low sulfur conventional diesel fuel. Higher blend percentages resulted in greater benefits.
- Blends below 10% renewable diesel can result in reductions in CO and HC, but not PM or NOx.
- While specific (density adjusted) fuel consumption is better with the HRDF, volumetric fuel consumption is 5% higher because of the lower HRDF density.
- HDRD fuels avoid some of the unwanted effects associated with FAME-based biodiesel fuels (instability, hygroscopicity, fouling, catalyst deactivation, etc).
- Due to the absence of sulfur and aromatic compounds, NExBTL exhaust emissions show significant reductions in many regulated and non-regulated compounds compared to “traditional” petroleum diesel.

Renewable Diesel Toxicity

The greatest difficulty we anticipate with determining the human and ecological toxicity of renewable diesel fuels is that renewable diesel fuel is not a defined chemical formulation or a defined mixture of components, but can be formulated from a number of different feedstocks with different chemical components.

Limited tests on the inherent acute oral and dermal toxicity of pure renewable diesel indicate that renewable diesel has a very low inherent toxicity, but these tests are difficult to interpret since there were no controls using conventional diesel or tests using diesel blend.

There have been some initial mutagenic testing of pure renewable diesel using a reverse mutation assay (Ames Test) and a chromosome aberration test using human lymphocytes *in vitro*. In the Ames test, no significant increases in the frequency of revertant colonies were recorded for any dose, either with or without metabolic activation. In the human lymphocyte test, the pure renewable diesel was considered to be non-clastogenic to human lymphocytes *in vitro*.

Insight on aquatic toxicity comes from acute short-term exposure of fish, water fleas, and green algae to a pure renewable diesel water accommodated fraction. This study concluded that the No-Observed-Effect-Level was greater than 100 mg/L for all three species.

To date, there has been no publication of comprehensive testing of the relative toxicity of the tailpipe emissions from combusting renewable diesel (blends and/or pure fuel) compared to existing diesel and/or biodiesel. The ARB has funding studies that used in-vitro testing to assess and compare the inflammatory toxicity and genotoxicity of biodiesel and renewable diesel blends along with CARB diesel and preliminary results indicate lower toxicity for renewable diesel. But based on the level of variation in emissions toxicity assessment for petroleum diesel, the chemical similarity of renewable diesel and petroleum diesel, and the likelihood for blends that still contain a significant fraction (80%) of petroleum diesel, we expect that it will be difficult to organize and interpret a study to compare the toxicity of petroleum diesel relative to R20 renewable diesel blends for the full range of vehicle-engine systems used in California. Therefore, unless there market evolves to the point where renewable blends contain more than 50% non-petroleum diesel feedstock, there appears to be little value in calling for extensive emissions toxicity studies for renewable diesel.

Major differences in health and ecological impact between existing diesel and renewable diesel blends are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix. So the key issue with regard to different life-cycle health/ecological impacts from existing diesel blends and renewable diesel blends will likely be linked to differences in additives.

Additionally, the chemical comparison to conventional diesel is important for determining whether or how much additional toxicity tests are required. If a co-processed “green” renewable diesel is the intended product and is chemically indistinguishable from conventional diesel, then no additional toxicity testing should be conducted. Further, if a post-production 100% pure renewable diesel is blended to a proportion such that it is chemically indistinguishable from conventional diesel, then no additional toxicity testing should be required in this case as well.

Transport and Fate

The transport and fate of a fuel and its component chemicals in the environment depend on the multimedia transport properties of its constituent chemicals. The purpose of the multimedia

evaluation of renewable diesel is to identify impacts that may be different from the existing baseline fuel, which in the case of renewable diesel is conventional petroleum-based ULSD. Based on the fuel chemical composition analysis provided by both Kern Oil and Refining (KOR) and Neste Oil Corp., renewable diesel can be regarded as substantially similar to other conventional diesel fuels. The main difference between conventional ULSD and pure HDRD is that the pure renewable diesel has essentially no sulfur or oxygen and has a very low aromatic compound content. Co-processed 20% renewable diesel can be expected to be even closer in chemical composition to conventional CARB ULSD.

Based on the reported similarities in chemical composition, and thus the physicochemical properties governing fate and transport in the environment, between renewable diesel and conventional CARB ULSD, the multimedia environmental behavior of renewable diesel should also be expected to be similar. The transport and partitioning behavior, as well as biodegradation in soils can be expected to be similar. The release scenarios and materials compatibility issues should be essentially the same as the conventional diesel that is already in wide use.

Even when releases of renewable diesel would not cause significantly greater impacts to the environment, human health, or water resources when compared to CARB ULSD, the impact from releases of associated additives and production chemicals could be of concern. The specific chemical composition of the additives used by various renewable diesel manufactures is typically not specified and the environmental impact of these additives is not well described.

In the case of co-processed 20% renewable diesel, it is reasonable to assume that any additives used in renewable diesel are currently in use in CARB ULSD and would continue to be used with no substantive difference in environmental impact due to additives. If this is the case, then new studies on multimedia transport and impact from additives would not be necessary under the confirmaiton that the impacts of additives in CARB ULSD are either acceptable or at lease well-characterized. However, when the additives used in renewable diesel are different from those in ULSD with regard to composition and/or quantity, then a multimedia transport and impact assessment will be needed to determine the magnitude and significance of these additives.

Tier I Conclusions

Through a review of the current knowledge on renewable diesel production, use, and environmental impacts, this report provides an assessment to aid the CalEPA Multimedia Working Group in formulating recommendations to the California Environmental Policy Council regarding the consequences of increased use of renewable diesel in California. A key goal of this report is to identify important knowledge gaps for a Multimedia Assessment and recommend approaches to address these gaps. This does not always involve additional experiments, but could include additional requests for information from the proponents of any new fuel to be used in California.

Renewable diesel offers several beneficial characteristics that will help California meet State renewable fuel goals:

- Renewable diesel is chemically similar to the CARB ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel already in wide use and environmental releases from the life-cycle of these fuels can be expected to behave in the environment in a manner similar to CARB ULSD releases.
- Renewable diesel is compatible with existing refining and distribution infrastructure and can be used in current diesel engines without modification.

- Pure renewable diesel has reduced aromatic hydrocarbon content and, since many of the chemicals of environmental concern are aromatic hydrocarbons, this reduction will likely reduce the overall toxic impacts of leaking or spilled fuel.
- Limited toxicity testing on rats (oral and dermal exposures), water fleas and green algae, and including mutagenic assays, reveals that pure 100% renewable diesel has limited inherent toxicity and that pure renewable diesel formations are unlikely to exceed the inherent toxicity or mutagenicity of standard diesel. Major differences in health and ecological impact between existing diesel and renewable diesel blends are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix.
- Renewable diesel fuels that are made from waste products such as tallow will likely have reduced life cycle environmental impacts compared to fuels made from plant crops. These reduced impacts stem from possible reductions in pesticide, herbicide, and fertilizer use. Further, the use of food supply crops as a fuel is not likely sustainable as global population grows. Further studies are needed to confirm this assertion.
- The results here indicate that life-cycle health impacts of renewable diesel blends are not likely to differ significantly from those of petroleum diesel.

There are, however, concerns that arise from the knowledge gaps associated with renewable diesel use in California. These concerns include:

- **Additives impacts.** The most important information gaps are associated with possible differences in additive use. To provide a stable, useful, and reliable fuel, additive chemicals will be introduced into almost all renewable diesel blends. These additives are used to address issues such as oxidation, corrosion, foaming, cold temperature flow properties, biodegradation, water separation, and NO_x formation. While many of these additives are already used in conventional diesel fuels currently in use, the specific chemicals and amounts to be used in renewable diesel by various producers has not been well defined for the emerging industry in California.

  It is important to note that, although the use of additives in diesel fuels (conventional or renewable) is common, the impact of various additives is not well known. A careful evaluation of the possible chemicals used in additives would be beneficial to California and may lead to a "recommended list" or "acceptable list" that would minimize the uncertainty of future impacts as new fuels and industry standards are developed. Additional research on the impacts of a "recommended list" of acceptable additives needs to be considered with respect to releases to water and soils and fugitive emissions to air.
- **Production and storage releases.** Increased renewable diesel production and associated feedstock processing may involve impacts from released reactants and by-products. There are potential impacts to California's air and water during the large-scale industrial operations used to extract seed oils. These impacts may result from air emissions of solvents used to extract the seed oil (e.g., hexane) and from leaking tanks containing process chemicals. There is also the issue of occupational exposures.

  Currently, the possible impacts during seed extraction will be minimal in California since it is anticipated that most of the seed oils will be derived from soy grown and extracted out-of-state. The impacts during seed extraction will be become more of an issue for California as in-state production of plant-derived oils increases and may require further study.

As the volume of tallow that is rendered out of state and shipped by rail or truck into California increases, there is a potential impact from releases of large volumes of raw triglycerides to soils or water. The impact of such a release has not been documented and additional research would be beneficial as large-scale tallow usage increases.

- **Air Emissions Toxicity Testing.** While there has been air-emission toxicity using pure renewable diesel, these studies did not directly compare results to a baseline diesel fuel. Based on the level of variation in emissions toxicity assessment for petroleum diesel, the chemical similarity of renewable diesel and petroleum diesel, and the likelihood for blends that still contain a significant fraction (80%) of petroleum diesel, we expect that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to organize and interpret a study to compare the toxicity of petroleum diesel relative to 20% renewable diesel blends. Therefore, unless the market evolves to the point where renewable blends contain more than 50% non-petroleum diesel feedstock, there appears to be little value in calling for emissions toxicity studies for renewable diesel.
- **Priority list of renewable diesel fuel formulations.** Because the number of potential feedstocks, the number of fuel blends, and the number of additive choices and mixes makes for an unmanageable suite of permutations that may require evaluation, it is critical to identify the priority feedstocks, fuel blends, and additives requiring study for any additional impacts assessment.

Not specifically addressed in this Tier I evaluation are the environmental impacts from the increased use of fertilizers and water and land resources if the production of plant oils increases in the State to supply renewable-diesel feedstocks. These factors may be some of the most important eventual impacts to California as the renewable and biofuels industry expands. More sustainable sources of renewable diesel such as yellow or brown grease or tallow may be preferable and should be encouraged.

During this review, we discovered that there are strong similarities between the chemical composition of petroleum diesel and renewable diesel. These similarities and the likelihood that renewable diesel will be used as a blend with petroleum diesel limits the need for additional Tier II Multimedia experiments or an extensive life-cycle impact assessment.

A key goal of this report is to identify important knowledge gaps for a Multimedia Assessment and recommend approaches to address these gaps. This does not always involve additional experiments, but could include additional requests for information from the proponents of any new fuel to be used in California.

As part of the overall multimedia assessment, each company proposing to market renewable diesel within California should provide the California ARB with a production, blending, additives, and distribution strategy that includes potential volumes to be stored and transported along with potential release scenarios that the company may foresee. Each company should also provide a comparative chemical analysis of the product they intend to market. This analysis should be compared to conventional diesel currently in the market place.

1. Renewable Diesel Background Information

1.1. Introduction

This multimedia assessment provides the State of California information that will support decisions about the relative impacts posed by renewable diesel to the State's resources, human health, and environment. "Renewable diesel" and "biodiesel" are names of alternative diesel-equivalent fuels, derived from biological sources (such as vegetable oils or tallow), which can be used in unmodified diesel-engine vehicles.

Currently, the majority of biological-source diesel fuels are fatty-acid methyl esters (FAME) produced through transesterification, but there are rapidly emerging alternatives to the transesterification production of diesel biofuels. Renewable diesel (also referred to as co-processed diesel or "green" diesel) is considered an alternative fuel that has potential in California. Renewable diesel is similar to biodiesel in that both use similar feedstocks, but they have different processing methods and can include chemically different components (**Figure 1.1**).

Renewable diesel is derived from non-petroleum renewable resources, including, (but not limited to) plant and algae oils, animal fats and wastes, municipal solid waste, sludge and oils derived from wastewater, and other wastes. Hydrogenation-derived renewable diesel (HDRD) is produced by refining fats or vegetable oils—typically in existing oil refineries. This process is also known as the Fatty Acids to Hydrocarbon (Hydrotreatment) or FAHC Hydrotreatment process. In this process, renewable feedstocks such as vegetable oils and animal fats are converted into diesel fuel as well as propane, and other light hydrocarbons through a catalytic treatment that adds hydrogen (Hilber et al., 2007; Knothe, 2010). Because it is free of ester compounds, renewable diesel has a chemical composition that is almost identical to petroleum-based diesel (CEC, 2007).

Preliminary evaluations (CEC, 2007; U.S. DOE, 2010) indicate several potential advantages of renewable diesel relative to FAME and petroleum-based diesel. These advantages include:

- Renewable diesel can be used directly in the current diesel-powered vehicle fleet without modification.
- Renewable diesel is compatible with current diesel distribution infrastructure and does not require new or modified pipelines, storage tanks, trucking infrastructure, or retail station pumps.
- Renewable diesel can be produced using existing oil refinery capacity and does not require extensive new production facilities.
- The fuel properties of renewable diesel fuel, specifically its high cetane number, suggest it will provide similar or better vehicle performance than conventional CARB ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD).
- The ultra-low sulfur content of renewable diesel enables the use of advance emission control devices.
- The production of renewable diesel through the FAHC process does not produce a glycerin co-product.

In addition to producing a fuel that uses recycled carbon, renewable diesel benefits include: a high level of quality control; compliance with ASTM D975, Standard Property Descriptions for Diesel Fuel Oils (Appendix A); and easy blending with FAME biodiesel.

Preliminary tests of renewable diesel emissions indicate that, relative to standard diesel, there is a potential for a significantly better emissions profile during combustion with reduced particulate, NOx, hydrocarbons, and CO emissions (Rothe et al, 2005; Kaufman, 2007). Emissions testing for US EPA Tier 1 requirements released by Kern Oil and Refining Co. (Fanick, 2009) report total hydrocarbon, total particulate, carbon monoxide, and NOx emissions that satisfy the requirements for ASTM D975. Analogous testing by Neste Oil Co. (Fanick, 2008) reported reduced emissions of these compounds in comparison of the NExBTL renewable diesel product with European sulfur-free EN590 grade diesel (Fanick, 2008). Disadvantages include less desirable cold flow properties and the need for a lubricity additive.



Figure 1.1. Summary of biofuel options.

Although renewable diesel is chemically very similar to conventional diesel, it is produced through a distinct and novel process, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) must provide a "life cycle multimedia risk assessment" before adopting new fuel specifications that allow renewable diesel blends (as required by California Health and Safety Code, Section 43830.8). In addition, existing law states that the "California Air Resources Board cannot adopt any regulation establishing a motor vehicle fuel specification unless a multimedia evaluation is conducted to determine whether the regulation will cause a significant adverse impact on the public health or environment" (California Senate Bill 140, 2007).

This Tier I Renewable Diesel report is the first step in a three-tier process to evaluate the cumulative health and ecological impacts from releases to air, surface water, groundwater and soil at all stages of the renewable diesel life cycle: feedstock production, fuel production, storage and distribution, and fuel use. The life cycle risk posed by renewable diesel is assessed as a relative risk compared to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) currently in use.

The goal of this Tier I report is to identify what is currently known about the life-cycle health, ecological, and resource impacts of renewable diesel and identify key uncertainties and data gaps. Meeting this goal requires the following elements:

- identifying the physical, and chemical and environmental toxicity characteristics of the reference fuel, candidate fuel, and additive components,
- summarizing all potential production, distribution, storage, and use release scenarios including a discussion of the most likely release scenarios,
- summarizing the expected environmental behavior (transport and fate) associated with a portfolio of release scenarios for proposed fuel or fuel components that may be released, and
- comparing physical, chemical, and toxic properties of the fuel or additive components to an appropriate and consensus control fuel or fuel components.

This report does not address direct and indirect environmental, ecological, and health impacts associated with biomass production—such as changes in land use and the possible net gain in carbon emissions due to feedstock cultivation. There is a scientific debate concerning the sustainability of wide-scale energy conversion from fossil fuels to biofuels (Wang & Haq, 2008, NRC, 2009). Some researchers have suggested that the demand for biomass feedstocks will result in the clearing of virgin rainforests and grasslands and that this clearing with result in high initial "carbon debts" estimated to have decades or even centuries-long pay-back periods due to the modest savings in carbon emissions from burning biofuels (Searchinger et al. 2008). Such issues have led the European Union to propose a ban on certain biofuel sources such as palm oil from Southeast Asia due to associated deforestation and habitat loss and due to non-sustainability of palm tree monoculture (Kantor 2008, Rosenthal 2007). Some end-users (e.g., Virgin Atlantic airlines) seek only sustainable sources of biofuels that are not produced in ways that compete with food-grain production and/or add to deforestation and other land-use conversions (Clark 2008). It is clear that the issue of sustainability and a more complete life cycle impact assessment of biofuels are important aspects of the decision to expand biofuels use.

However such evaluations are beyond the scope of the multimedia working group, which is mandated to focus on the human health, ecological, and resource risks associated with the production, transportation, storage, and use of biofuels and not the broader impacts of increased/decreased use of various raw feedstocks. Because the life-cycle carbon impacts of alternative fuels are addressed in the working reports of the California Low-Carbon Fuels Standard (LCFS) Program, only the issues not explicitly addressed in the LCFS, including health, ecological, and resource impacts, are the primary objectives of this report.

This Tier I report sets the stage for determining whether subsequent Tier II and Tier III multimedia assessments are needed and if so with what level of detail. The process follows the guidance set forth in the report "Guidance Document and Recommendations on the Types of

Scientific Information to be Submitted by Applicants for California Fuels Environmental Multimedia Evaluations" (CalEPA, 2008).

In any Tier-II activities, the guidance noted above requires Cal-EPA together with its collaborators at the University of California to evaluate critical uncertainties and data gaps identified during Tier I evaluations and propose any action needed to address potential life-cycle impacts renewable diesel may have to the State's resources, human health and environment. During Tier III activities, potential life cycle impacts are compared to the selected baseline fuel and the results and conclusions are reported to California Environmental Policy Council. **Figure 1.2** provides an overview of the life-cycle stages that we address in this report. We consider four major life stages—feedstock production/collection, renewable diesel production, transport and storage, and fuel use (combustion).

In an earlier report, the Multimedia Working Group has already issued a Tier I multimedia assessment for FAME biodiesel, produced through a transesterification process. In addition the Tier II and Tier III reports for FAME biodiesel are in process (CARB, 2009).



Figure 1.2. Generalized summary of renewable diesel life cycle impacts.

1.2. History

Raw vegetable and animal oils contain an abundance of triglycerides that have value as sources of combustion energy and feedstocks to produce motor vehicle fuels. Although these oils can be used directly in diesel engines and provide reliable short-term performance, engine

manufacturers discourage this practice because it can cause severe engine problems in the long term (US EPAa, 2010). This concern is primarily due to the raw oils forming engine deposits, as well as coking and plugging in engine injector nozzles, piston rings, and lubricating oil. This happens due to polymerization of the triglycerides in the raw oils as the fuel is combusted. To prevent these problems, it is necessary to convert the raw oils into a more appropriate form of biomass-based diesel fuel—either esters or hydrocarbons. It has been recognized for a number of years that triglycerides can be hydrogenated into linear alkanes in a refinery hydrotreating unit with the presence of conventional sulfated hydrodesulphurization catalysts (Donnis et al., 2009). This process is referred to here as the Fatty Acids to Hydrocarbon Hydrotreatment (FAHC-Hydrotreatment) process.

Hydrogenation-derived renewable diesel (HDRD) processes have been used at fossil fuel refineries since the 1950s to remove impurities and to produce higher quality oil (Donnis et al., 2009). The first work describing hydroprocessing of bio-oils was by Nunes (1984), who described a reaction of soy oil with hydrogen over silica- and alumina-supported catalysts. During the 1980s Elliot and others successfully hydrotreated pyrolysis-derived oils at Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) (Elliot and Baker, 1988). Research at PNNL and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) has lead to contemporary commercial development of the process by Neste, UOP, and Conoco-Phillips (Elliot, 2007).

A number of manufacturers around the world are developing HDRD refining processes and testing them in commercial trials. The following paragraphs provide brief descriptions of some of these projects (US DOE, 2010):

ConocoPhillips (United States, Ireland)

Conoco Phillips has been producing HDRD at its Whitegate refinery in Cork, Ireland since 2006. The primary renewable feedstock is soybean oil, but other vegetable oils and animal fats could be used as well. The HDRD is being produced using existing refinery equipment and is blended and transported with petroleum-based diesel. Initial production has been 1,000 barrels per day. ConocoPhillips has also partnered with Tyson Foods to produce HDRD using animal fat, beginning in 2007 with projections for having ramped up to as much as 11,000 barrels per day by 2009. Currently the tallow used to make renewable diesel is commonly used to make cosmetics, soaps, candles, and some pet food.

Neste Oil (Finland)

Neste Oil has been producing pure HDRD using its NExBTL process at its Porvoo refinery in Kilpilahti, Finland since 2007. A second plant was added to the Porvoo refinery in 2009, for a total production capacity of 340,000 metric tons per year at this facility. US EPA registration and toxicity and biodegradability testing has been submitted. Neste Oil is 50% owned by the Finnish government.

Petrobras (Brazil, Portugal)

Brazilian oil company Petrobras developed the H-Bio process, which produces HDRD using hydrotreating units in existing oil refineries. Petrobras had employed the H-BIO process in three of its refineries by 2007 with plans for more facilities to reach a total vegetable oil consumption of more than 7,000 barrels per day. More recently, Petrobras has announced plans in partnership with Galp Energia to develop production facilities in Portugal for up to 250,000 tons of biodiesel per year, from Brazilian palm feedstocks, by 2018.

Syntroleum (United States)

Syntroleum formed a joint venture with Tyson Foods to produce HDRD and jet fuel using its Biofining process. Production from its first plant was scheduled to come online in 2010 at a rate of about 5,000 barrels of synthetic fuel per day.

UOP-Eni (United States, Italy)

UOP-Eni is an American (UOP LLC, a Honeywell company) and Italian oil and gas company (Eni) project supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to build a commercial scale facility at Eni's Livorno, Italy refinery. The U.S. Department of Energy has supported UOP's Renewable Energy and Chemicals unit in developing HDRD production technologies. The first "Ecofining" facility developed by UOP and Eni was scheduled to come online in 2009, processing 6,500 barrels per day of vegetable oils.

Other companies that have plans to produce renewable diesel through hydrogenation include Nippon Oil in Japan, and BP in Australia (co-processed R5),. The Nippon Oil plant expects to be operating commercially in three years. The BP plant is planned to have a demonstrated capacity of 80,000 gallons per day.

UOP, NesteOil, LiveFuels, and Sapphire Energy each independently introduced "green crude" or biocrude from algae as a petroleum substitute.

1.3. Legislative Incentives for Biofuels

Over the last decade, there have been a number of state and federal mandates to encourage the development and use of a broad range of biofuels. To reduce US dependence on imported oil, the US Congress passed the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct). The Energy Conservation and Reauthorization Act of 1998 amended and updated many elements of the 1992 EPAct. The 1998 amendment allowed "qualified fleets to use B20 in existing vehicles to generate alternative fuel vehicle purchase credits, with some limitations". This amendment significantly increased the use of B20 by government and alternative-fuel-provider fleets.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) provide tax incentives and research funds for biofuels. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 was signed into law in August 2005. This legislation supports the growth of the biodiesel and renewable diesel industry. Consumer and business federal tax credits for biofuels were extended to 2008 and credits were provided to small agri-biofuel producers. This legislation also requires a comprehensive two-year "analysis of impacts from biodiesel on engine operation for both existing and expected future diesel technologies, and provides recommendations for ensuring optimal emissions reductions and engine performance with biodiesel." (Federal Record, 2005).

The Renewable Fuels Standards (RFS) program was created under the EPAct of 2005, and established the first renewable fuel volume mandate in the United States. As required under EPAct, the original RFS program (RFS1) required 7.5 billion gallons of renewable fuel to be blended into gasoline by 2012 (US EPA, 2010c,d). This Act requires that 75% of new vehicle purchases made by federal and state governments must be alternative fuel-vehicles. Compliance was mandatory for the agencies that operated, leased, or controlled 50 or more lightweight vehicles. The alternative fuels on which these vehicles could run included: pure biodiesel (B100), renewable diesel blends or biodesel blends, blends of 85% or more of ethanol with

gasoline (E85), natural gas and liquid fuels domestically produced from natural gas, hydrogen, electricity, coal-derived liquid fuels, and liquefied petroleum gas (CEC, 2007).

Under the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007, the RFS program was expanded in several key ways (RFS2):

- EISA expanded the RFS program to include diesel, in addition to gasoline;
- EISA increased the volume of renewable fuel required to be blended into transportation fuel from 9 billion gallons in 2008 to 36 billion gallons by 2022;
- EISA established new categories of renewable fuel, and set separate volume requirements for each one.
- EISA required EPA to apply lifecycle greenhouse gas performance threshold standards to ensure that each category of renewable fuel emits fewer greenhouse gases than the petroleum fuel it replaces.

RFS2 lays the foundation for achieving significant reductions of greenhouse gas emissions through the use of renewable fuels, reducing imported petroleum, and encouraging the development and expansion of the US renewable fuels sector (US EPA 2010c,d). While most of the focus to date has been on FAME biodiesel (B100, B20) and ethanol, there is increased interest on HDRD renewable diesel (R100, R20) because of its infrastructure and performance advantages.

In 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed the California Global Warming Solutions Act, requiring by 2020 reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions down to 1990 levels (California Office of the Governor, 2006; Young, 2008). It is the responsibility of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to determine the technologically and economically feasible methods of achieving these goals. The first goal of the agency was to quantify 1990 emissions levels and create a framework for reporting emissions from industrial sources. The emissions goal was set at "427 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents" in December 2008 and to be achieved by 2020. In June 2008, CARB released a scoping plan to "reduce overall carbon emissions in California, improve our environment, reduce our dependence on oil, diversify our energy sources, save energy, and enhance public health while creating new jobs and enhancing the growth in California's economy" (CARB, 2008). Goals include strengthening energy efficiency programs, increasing electricity production from renewable sources and approving new fuels that meet the California Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS). Executive Order S-1-07 initiated the LCFS, with the goal of reducing transportation-based emissions. On April 23, 2009, the Air Resources Board approved the specific rules and carbon intensity reference values for the LCFS that will go into effect on January 1, 2011. The Board approved the technical proposal without modifications by a 9-1 vote. This technical proposal sets the 2020 maximum carbon intensity reference value for gasoline to 86 g of carbon dioxide equivalent released per MJ of energy produced. The regulation is based on an average declining standard of carbon intensity that is expected to achieve 16 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emission reductions by 2020. One standard was established for gasoline and its alternatives, and a second similar standard was set for diesel fuel and its alternatives.

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) gives renewable diesel the same tax credit given to plant-derived biodiesel ($1/gal tax credit). To attain this credit the renewable diesel fuel must meet US EPA registration requirements for fuel and fuel additives under the Clean Air Act, and the ASTM standard for conventional petroleum diesel (D975).

2. Renewable Diesel Life Cycle Impacts

2.1. Life Cycle Assessment

The purpose of a life-cycle assessment (LCA) applied to renewable diesel is to quantify and compare environmental flows of resources and pollutants (to and from the environment) associated with both renewable diesel and petroleum-based diesel, over the entire life cycle of the respective products. The flows of resources and pollutants provide framework for assessing human-health, environmental-systems and resource impacts. LCA addresses a broad range of requirements and impacts for technologies, industrial processes and products in order to determine their propensity to consume natural resources or generate pollution. The term "life cycle" refers to the need to include all stages of a process—raw material extraction, manufacturing, distribution, use and disposal including all intervening transportation steps—so as to provide a balanced and objective assessment of alternatives. An LCA includes three types of activities: (1) collecting life cycle inventory data on materials and energy flows and processes; (2) conducting a life-cycle impact assessment (LCIA) that provides characterization factors to compare the impacts of different product components; and (3) life-cycle management, which is the integration of all this information into a form that supports decision-making. A comprehensive LCA for renewable diesel must address cumulative impacts to human health and the environment from all stages, impacts from alternative materials, and impacts from obtaining feedstocks and raw materials. **Figure 2.1** illustrates our approach for renewable diesel LCA.

The focus of the Multimedia Working Group efforts is on the direct health and environmental impacts associated with pollutant emissions from renewable diesel production and use. There are many other life-cycle issues that are of interest—including green-house-gas (GHG) emissions, water use, energy balance, land conversion, and competing uses for food crops. These are outside of the scope of this effort and are being addressed in detail by other California programs—particularly the LCFS program (CalOAL, 2010).

There are other ongoing efforts to evaluate lifecycle impacts of non-petroleum diesels (e.g., Huo et al., 2008; 2009, focusing on biodiesel and renewable diesel derived from soy feedstocks; Kalnes et al., 2009, comparing biodiesel and renewable diesel) and this literature is expected to continue to grow.

The life-cycle of renewable diesel fuels include the following stages:

- Biomass production and preparation (for renewable diesel derived from plant biomass),
- Oil extraction processes (for renewable diesel derived from plant biomass),
- Collection of recycled oils, greases, and tallow,
- Renewable diesel production--refining the final product blend,
- Transportation, storage and distribution of renewable diesel product, and
- End-use of the fuel product--combustion.



Figure 2.1. An illustration of life cycle stages and some potential life-cycle pollutant emissions for renewable diesel fuels.

For each of these stages we must address emissions to the environment for the following pollutant categories:

- carbon monoxide (CO),
- nitrogen oxides (NO_x),
- ozone,
- particulate matter,
- volatile organic compounds (VOCs) such as benzene, formaldehyde, etc.,
- semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons,
- metals,
- fuel product leaks and spills, and
- hazardous wastes.

Modeling damages from the life-cycle emissions attributable to petroleum-based or renewable fuels requires characterization of emissions factors for both the life cycle of the fuel and the operation of the vehicle.

2.2. US EPA Life Cycle Assessment of Renewable Fuels

As part of the U.S. EPA RFS2 rulemaking, a life cycle assessment of alternative and petroleum transportation fuels was conducted. EPA used a variety of agricultural and process engineering models and spreadsheet analysis tools, including the Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) model; the Forest and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model (FASOM); and the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute (FAPRI) model, to analyze life cycle impacts of petroleum and renewable fuels (US EPA 2010a,b).

The EPA LCA analysis addressed production emission factors for the biofuels, ethanol, biodiesel, and renewable diesel. Emissions from the production of biofuels include the emissions from the production facility itself as well as the emissions from production and transport of the biomass and any other fuels used by the biofuel plant, such as natural gas, coal, and electricity. Table 2.1., which includes results from the EPA LCA study, shows that compared to ethanol (including wet and dry milled biomass, and cellulosic production) or biodiesel, renewable diesel had the lowest production plant emissions.

Table 2.2., which also provides results from the US EPA LCA study, compares the projected renewable diesel use volumes to other biofuel volumes (in billion gallons per year). The US EPA LCA assumes that ethanol and biodiesel will be the major fuels used to meet Renewable Fuel Standards in the future. As a result, the US EPA LCA did not address distribution or use impacts because it was assumed that renewable diesel production would constitute less than 0.5 billion gallons per year.

Table 2.1. Biofuel Production Plant Emission Factors in 2022 (grams per gallon produced)(US EPA, 2010a)**.**

Biofuel Production Plant Type	VOC	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	SOx	NH3
Corn Ethanol, Dry Mill NG	4.000	1.900	5.500	2.200	0.265	7.000	0.000
Corn Ethanol, Dry Mill NG (wet DGS)	4.000	1.900	5.500	2.200	0.222	7.000	0.000
Corn Ethanol, Dry Mill Coal	4.000	1.900	5.500	2.200	1.884	7.000	0.000
Corn Ethanol, Dry Mill Biomass	4.000	1.900	5.500	2.200	0.421	7.000	0.000
Corn Ethanol, Dry Mill Biomass (wet DGS)	4.000	1.900	5.500	2.200	0.313	7.000	0.000
Corn Ethanol, Wet Mill NG	2.330	1.039	1.677	0.998	0.288	0.012	0.000
Corn Ethanol, Wet Mill Coal	2.334	3.501	4.857	4.532	1.984	4.595	0.000
Cellulosic Ethanol (switchgrass or corn stover, enzymatic)	1.937	11.722	16.806	2.792	1.116	0.625	0.000
Cellulosic Ethanol (forest waste, thermochemical)	0.363	5.154	7.427	0.854	0.435	0.271	0.000
Biodiesel, Soybean oil	0.040	0.454	0.733	0.062	0.062	0.005	0.000
Renewable Diesel, Soybean Oil	**0.029**	**0.329**	**0.530**	**0.045**	**0.045**	**0.004**	**0.000**

Table 2.2. Projected Renewable Fuel Volumes (billion gallons)(US EPA, 2010a).

	Advanced Biofuel					**Non-Advanced Biofuel**	
	Cellulosic Biofuel	**Biomass-Based Diesel[a]**		**Other Advanced Biofuel**			
Year	**Cellulosic Ethanol**	**FAME[b] Biodiesel**	**Non-Co-processed Renewable Diesel**	**Co-processed Renewable Diesel**	**Imported Ethanol**	**Corn Ethanol**	**Total Renewable Fuel**
2009	0.00	0.50	**0.00**	**0.00**	0.50	9.85	10.85
2010	0.10	0.64	**0.01**	**0.01**	0.29	11.55	12.60
2011	0.25	0.77	**0.03**	**0.03**	0.16	12.29	13.53
2012	0.50	0.96	**0.04**	**0.04**	0.18	12.94	14.66
2013	1.00	0.94	**0.06**	**0.06**	0.19	13.75	16.00
2014	1.75	0.93	**0.07**	**0.07**	0.36	14.40	17.58
2015	3.00	0.91	**0.09**	**0.09**	0.83	15.00	19.92
2016	4.25	0.90	**0.10**	**0.10**	1.31	15.00	21.66
2017	5.50	0.88	**0.12**	**0.12**	1.78	15.00	23.40
2018	7.00	0.87	**0.13**	**0.13**	2.25	15.00	25.38
2019	8.50	0.85	**0.15**	**0.15**	2.72	15.00	27.37
2020	10.50	0.84	**0.16**	**0.16**	2.70	15.00	29.36
2021	13.50	0.83	**0.17**	**0.17**	2.67	15.00	32.34
2022	16.00	0.81	**0.19**	**0.19**	3.14	15.00	35.33

[a]Biomass-Based Diesel includes FAME biodiesel, cellulosic diesel, and non-co-processed renewable diesel.
[b]Fatty acid methyl ester (FAME) biodiesel.

2.3. Life Cycle Impacts and Information Gaps

A recent study by the National Research Council on the "Hidden Costs of Energy" (NRC, 2009) used life-cycle assessment to consider health impacts for a range of both light-duty and heavy-duty fuel/vehicle combinations. This study evaluated motor-vehicle damages over four life-cycle stages: 1) vehicle operation, which results in tailpipe emissions and evaporative emissions; (2) production of feedstock, including the extraction of the feedstock resource (oil for gasoline, biomass for biofuels, or fossil fuels for electricity) and its transportation to the refinery; (3) refining or conversion of the feedstock into usable fuel and its transportation to the dispenser; and (4) manufacturing and production of the vehicle. Importantly, the study found that vehicle operation accounted in most cases for less than one-third of total damages, with other components of the life cycle contributing the rest. While life-cycle stages 1, 2, and 3 were somewhat proportional to actual fuel use, stage 4 (which is a significant source of life-cycle emissions that form criteria pollutants) was not.

The NRC estimates of damage per vehicle-mile traveled (VMT) among different combinations of fuels and vehicle technologies were remarkably similar. Because these assessments were so close, the NRC (2009) noted that it is essential to be cautious when interpreting small differences between fuel/vehicle combinations.

The NRC considered annual health damage for 2005 as base year and 2030 as a future scenario. Although diesel-fueled light-duty vehicles had some of the highest damages per VMT in 2005, diesel-fuel use in light-duty vehicles are expected to have some of the lowest impacts per VMT in 2030. This change assumes full implementation of the Tier-2 vehicle emission standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This regulation, which requires the use of low-sulfur diesel, is expected to significantly reduce PM and NOx emissions, resulting in significant reductions of population exposures to direct and indirect fine-particle pollutants.

Heavy-duty vehicles have much higher damages per VMT than light-duty vehicles because they carry more cargo or people and therefore have lower fuel economies. However, between 2005 and 2030, these damages are expected to drop significantly, assuming the full implementation of the EPA Heavy-Duty Highway Vehicle Rule.

The finding that life-cycle impacts are insensitive to a range of vehicle/fuel combinations (differences between vehicle/fuel combinations were often less than the confidence interval for each single fuel/vehicle combination) indicates that any life-cycle impact study for renewable diesel will be unlikely to resolve any key differences in health/ecological impacts between petroleum-based diesel and renewable diesel blends.

A review of this analysis was commissioned by the American Petroleum Institute (Unnasch et al. 2010) and found several questionable assumptions and concerns with the use of the GREET model. With regard to biofuels, the review concluded that optimistic assumptions make biofuels look very feasible. With regard to petroleum usage, the review concluded that the analysis could be refined to reflect appropriate data. Unnasch et al. (2010) also noted that a key challenge in applying the GREET LCA model is in identifying input assumptions that are appropriate for these complex models and EPA should review and better justify the input assumptions adopted. They further noted that there was no uncertainty analysis, only sensitivity case studies.

3. Release Scenarios

3.1. Defining Release Scenarios

For the Tier I evaluation of release scenarios, we focus on identifying releases that could have the greatest impact on the environment, human health, and important resources such as surface and ground waters. In order to define release scenarios it is important to understand differences in fuel production, blending, and distribution plans among the different fuel products.

There are a several companies planning to market renewable diesel in California and elsewhere; however, they have different production and marketing plans. A key issue for release scenarios upstream from the combustion stage is whether blending renewable diesel stock will occur at the refinery or at a distribution facility.

An additional challenge in setting up scenarios is that feedstock sources will be widely distributed geographically and will use a variety of transportation options. Palm oil will likely arrive from distant global sources via tanker ship. Soy oil will likely arrive via rail tank car from the Midwestern United States. Yellow grease will be collected from a variety of sources within a city or region and transported by truck to a processing facility. Tallow from the southern United States may be shipped by rail to an out-of-state oil refinery to produce renewable diesel that is transported to California via existing fuel pipelines.

Releases associated with the production, storage and distribution, and use of renewable diesel can be regarded as normal (routine) or off-normal (unplanned but not necessarily unlikely). Different feedstock supplies and production processes may have different normal and off-normal releases and may affect different environmental media and human populations depending on geographic location.

3.2. Normal Releases

There are various regulations in place to address normal releases from renewable diesel production, transport, and use. At the federal level, the 1972 Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. §1251 et seq.) and the 1990 Oil Pollution Act (OPA) (33 U.S.C. §2702 et seq.) "outline various requirements that must be met in order to comply with regulations" (Van Gerpen, 2004). Under these acts, there is no distinction between petroleum oils, vegetable oils, and animal fats, as they share common physical properties and produce similar environmental effects.

Normal or routine releases during the production of renewable diesel include:

- hexane or CO_2 released to the air during seed extraction,
- odors associated with waste biomass, and
- used process water discharges of various pH and trace-chemical composition.

Normal releases during the use of renewable diesel include combustion tailpipe emissions, both to the air and to surface waters in the case of marine use. The specific magnitude of these normal production- and use-releases within California are not yet well characterized and will remain difficult to quantify until more process specific data become available as well as more engine/vehicle combustion tests are conducted.

3.3. Off-Normal Releases

Off-normal or unanticipated releases can occur primarily during the production, distribution and storage of renewable diesel. Off-normal releases may include spills or leaks of bulk feedstock, production chemicals, such as hexane or blending stocks such as ULSD, or finished renewable diesel fuel. These off-normal releases may be the result of a leak or rupture of:

- an above-ground or below-ground storage tank and associated piping,
- a liquid-transportation vehicle such as rail tank car, tanker truck, or tanker ship, or
- a bulk-fuel transport pipeline.

The amendment of the Oil Pollution Act in 2002 introduced the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). This legislation requires "owners or operators of vessels and certain facilities that pose a serious threat to the environment to prepare facility response plans" (Van Gerpen, 2004). Greater contingency planning can reduce spills during transportation and at the plant.

In 2002, the EPA published a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule within Part 112 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, (40 CFR 112) to ensure that fuel production/distribution facilities put in place containment and other countermeasures that would prevent oil spills. While each SPCC is unique to the facility, all should clearly address "operating procedures that prevent oil spills, control measures installed to prevent a spill from reaching navigable waters, and countermeasures to contain, clean up, and mitigate the effects of an oil spill that reaches navigable waters" (Van Gerpen, 2004).

For a company that plans to produce 100% renewable diesel and then blend it with CARB ULSD post-production, possibly at some location remote from the production facility, the release scenarios may be different from a company that plans to co-process "green" plant or animal oil along with conventional crude oil. In the former case, storage and transport of 100% renewable diesel must be considered in terms of how it differs from experience with conventional and ULSD diesel. Some questions that arise:

- Can it be transported via pipelines?
- What are the spill consequences for 100% renewable diesel compared to ULSD?

4. Production of Renewable Diesel

4.1. Renewable Diesel Production Chemistry

There are several different chemical approaches available to produce renewable diesel. One is based on hydrotreating vegetable oils or animal fats. Hydrotreating can take place in the same facilities used to process petroleum-based diesel. A second method involves synthesis of hydrocarbons through enzymatic reactions. A third method involves partially combusting a biomass source to produce carbon monoxide and hydrogen—syngas—and then utilizing the Fischer-Tropsch reaction to produce complex hydrocarbons. Because there are currently few plans to engage the Fischer-Tropsch process in California, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) staff have requested that this report focus on the impacts of hydrotreated renewable diesel (HDRD/FAHC) produced in existing refineries.

Hydrotreating is a hydrodeoxygenation process used to remove oxygen and nitrogen containing compounds as well as metals from the fuel feedstock. Both crude oil and bio-oils contain minerals as well as aromatic and oxygenated compounds that provide only minor contributions to the combustion performance and emission profile of the fuel. With hydrotreating, the feedstock oil flows through a fixed bed reactor under high pressure, where it is mixed and reacted with hydrogen gas. Marker et al. (2005) describe this process as having hydrogen gas injected at approximately 1.5% the mass of vegetable oil feedstock with lower amounts required for a predominately saturated fatty acid feedstock such as coconut oil.

Olefins and aromatic compounds react with hydrogen atoms, converting them into paraffins. Cobalt-Molybdenum and other catalysts are used to increase the rates of reaction (Gary et al., 2007). Aromatic rings are broken in catalyzed reactions with hydrogen, forming saturated hydrocarbons and methyl functional groups attached to carbon chains creating iso-paraffins (Liu et al., 2008). Hydrotreatment of vegetable oils produces alkanes with one carbon atom less than the fatty acid chains, although the exact nature of the product mix depends on reaction conditions and catalysts used. As a result, avvegetable oil consisting of the typical C16 and C18 fatty acids would yield C15 and C17 alkanes (Knothe, 2010).

According to Gary et al. (2007), hydrogen gas for this process can be produced by reacting steam and methane, where the gas and vapors pass through catalysts in a heated reactor. This reaction is illustrated in **Figure 4.1**. The reaction also produces carbon monoxide, which is converted to CO_2 in a second stage, where the reactants are again mixed with steam, and pass over solid chromium and iron oxide catalyst. CO_2 is then removed from the gas phase through absorption processes.

$$CH_4 + 2H_2O \xrightarrow{Catalyst} CO_2 + 4H_2$$

Figure 4.1. Hydrogen production from methane, adapted from Gary et al. (2007).

Hydrotreating can alter the sulfur and aromatic content of crude oil for the production of ULSD (Gary et al., 2007). Metals bonded to aromatics and hydrocarbon chains are released and replaced by hydrogen, however some bonding sites have a higher affinity for nitrogen

compounds, potentially inhibiting the desulphurization reactions (Liu et al., 2008). Minerals shed from the organic compounds are deposited on catalyst surfaces, extinguishing capacity over time (Gary et al., 2007). For this reason, it has been argued that the use of conventional refining facilities for production of renewable diesel may be less cost-effective in the long-term than establishment of dedicated facilities (Kalnes et al., 2009). Hydrogen sulfide, ammonia and CO_2 are produced as gasses and must be captured by emission control devices.

4.2. Renewable Diesel Reactor Configuration and Design

Many of the companies that are now making renewable diesel, including UOP (Green Diesel), Neste (NexBTL) and Conoco-Philips, have developed proprietary processes for the hydrogenation of non-petroleum feedstocks with hydrogen gas. These processes remove impurities from the feedstock while saturating free fatty acids (Kalnes et al., 2007).

There are two general production strategies for HDRD production and distribution:

- Co-processing vegetable/animal triglycerides in a conventional petroleum production stream using a hydrotreating process. Currently this results in diesel fuel that has a specified percentage of "green-derived" carbon, e.g., 20% renewable diesel (R20).
- Production of a pure HDRD (R100) in a dedicated hydrotreating facility that does not use conventional petroleum. The resulting fuel can be used as a 100% green fuel or blended with conventional ULSD to any concentration.

As an illustration of the chemical processes that take place in renewable diesel reactors, we consider the case of vegetable oils that are composed primarily of triglycerides. These are organic molecules that include chains of carbon atoms bonded to hydrogen atoms and various functional groups. Soy and canola oils are largely unsaturated fatty acids—that is only some carbon atoms are double bonded. Fully saturated fatty acids are composed solely of single bonds between carbon atoms and achieve a stable valence state through bonding to hydrogen atoms (Petrucci et al., 2002). Saturated fatty acids are less susceptible to oxidation and decomposition from heat and therefore provide a more stable fuel. **Figure 4.2** illustrates the hydrogenation of triglycerides.



Figure 4.2. Hydrogenation of Triglycerides

Hydrogen for saturation can be generated onsite through reactions with methane (Huo et al., 2008). Neste's NexBTL process requires the input of sodium hydroxide and phosphoric acid as a step in the pretreatment of the oil. Any additional chemical inputs used in the UOP Green Diesel process have not been specified.

To carry out hydrotreating, existing refineries can be retrofitted with additional equipment (see **Figure 4.3** for an example) rather than needing completely new infrastructure as is the case with fast pyrolysis oil production (Huber et al., 2007). However it has been pointed out that it may be more cost-effective to construct a dedicated unit for processing of vegetable oils, due to the apparent competition between hydrodeoxygenation and hydrodesulfurization applied to obtain ultra-low sulfur petrodiesel (Kalnes et al., 2009; Knothe, 2010).



Figure 4.3. Stand-alone Renewable Diesel Production Unit used to produce a pure HDRD product (R100). Adapted from Kalnes et al. (2007).

Most published evaluations on the performance of renewable diesel refineries are based on the use of soybean oil, however palm oil, yellow grease, and tallow have also been proposed as feedstocks (Marker, et al., 2005).

Oxygenated compounds provide less energy per unit mass of fuel, and are thus considered to act as a "reduced combustion" volume, lowering the heating value (Fitzgerald, 2008). UOP has considered both a hydrodeoxygenation (HDO) and decarboxylation (DeCO2) as reaction pathways for removing oxygen from compounds in the diesel feedstock oils. These reaction pathways are illustrated in **Figure 4.4**.

Decarboxylation requires less hydrogen influent and allows for longer catalyst life. However if feedstock sulfur concentrations are too high, it is not effective (Marker, et al., 2005). Hydrocarbons bonded to carboxyl groups are converted into paraffins, CO_2 or water.



Figure 4.4. Chemical reaction pathways that remove carbon dioxide and oxygen from renewable diesel (adapted from Marker et al., 2005).

4.3. Overview of Renewable Diesel Feedstocks

In this section we review the characteristics, technical issues, and potential life-cycle implications of the four most-frequently proposed feedstocks for renewable diesel. This includes soybean oil, palm oil, waste grease, canola and rapeseed oils, and animal tallow.

Soybean Feedstock

Soybeans are expected to be the main feedstock for renewable diesel in California. In 2006, soy was grown on 74.6 million acres of US farmland, producing on average 42.7 bushels per acre (Huo, et al., 2008). Oil is extracted from soy by crushing the beans and applying n-hexane as a solvent. When n-hexane is used as a solvent in soy oil extraction; there is the potential for leaks and spills at processing facilities (Huo, et al., 2008). Growing, harvesting, and extracting the oil require fossil fuel energy sources and generate some greenhouse gas emissions (Huo et al., 2008; 2009).

Soybean Physical Characteristics

Soy is expected to provide an oil yield on the order of 20% of feedstock mass (Huo, et al., 2008). Soy based renewable diesel (Green Diesel) has a "higher heating value" (HHV also known as the gross calorific value or gross energy) that exceeds than both FAME biodiesel and nearly doubles that of pyrolysis-based fuels (Marker, et al., 2005). Kalnes et al. (2007) observe that soy-based renewable diesel is sufficiently similar in physical-chemical properties to ULSD that it can be readily used in a range of blending applications.

Soybean Chemical Composition

The carbon content of the UOP renewable diesel called "Green Diesel" is approximately 87.2% with no oxygen present (Huo, et al., 2008). The sulfur content of Green Diesel is reported to be below 10 ppm (Marker, et al., 2005), which is comparable to ULSD and FAME biodiesel. Co-products of the process include propane and naphtha, which can be used as inputs to gasoline production. The current literature provides no discussion of preservatives and anti-corrosive additives for renewable diesel from soy. Due to its relatively low cloud point, it is expected that additives would be required for normal engine operation in cold climates.

Palm Oil

The Palms used to produce palm oil are grown primarily in tropical or subtropical areas such as Malaysia and Indonesia. Palm oil is characterized by high concentrations of medium-chain saturated (palmitic acid) and monounsaturated (oleic acid) fatty acids. One of the significant advantages of palm oil as a biofuel feedstock is high oil yield (Kemp, 2006). Palm plantations "typically produce about 610 gallons per acre of palm oil plantings, compared with 122 gallons per acre for rapeseed and 46 gallons per acre for soybeans"(Jessen, 2007). Also, the production costs of palm oil are low, providing a moderate world-market price compared to other edible vegetable oils.

Palm oil sustainability is an issue of concern. With the recent increased demand for palm oil, Indonesia and Malaysia, the world's top producers, are clear-cutting and burning forests to build palm plantations. This deforestation releases greenhouse gas emissions and threatens the rich biodiversity of the ecosystem (Jessen, 2007).

Greenhouse gas emissions from existing palm oil forests are also a concern. After the forests are destroyed, the lands are filled to make peat bogs where the palm oil trees can be grown. A four-year study conducted by the Wetlands International, Delft Hydraulics and Alterra Research Center of Wageningen University in Holland examined the carbon release from peat swamps in Indonesia and Malaysia in recent years. It was determined that on average, 600 million tons of carbon dioxide seep into the air each year from these peat bogs. It has been estimated that these carbon dioxide releases, combined with releases from burning of rain forests during clearing, equate to approximately 8% of the world's current carbon output from fossil fuels (Max, 2007).

To help efforts towards sustainability, a global, nonprofit organization known as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) was formed in April 2004. It is composed of 144 members who represent growers, processors, consumer-goods companies, retailers and other non-governmental organizations. In November, 2005, the RSPO adopted eight criteria for sustainable palm oil production which include:

1. Commitment to transparency;
2. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations;
3. Commitment to long-term economic and financial viability;
4. Use of appropriate best practices by growers and millers;
5. Environmental responsibility and conservation of natural resources and biodiversity;
6. Responsible consideration of employees, individuals and communities affected by growers and mills;
7. Responsible development of new plantings;
8. Commitment to continuous improvement in key areas of activity.

Waste Grease

There are two primary types of waste grease based on the source of the grease—yellow grease and trap grease (brown grease). Yellow grease consists of waste vegetable oils (WVO) such as soy, peanut, canola, and sunflower as well as used cooking lard, that are recycled from industrial cooking, franchise cooking operations, or other large scale cooking projects. It is estimated that recycling and processing waste oils can generate over 1.25 billion kg of yellow grease annually (Kemp, 2006). Since yellow grease is a waste product, it is relatively inexpensive and available in all regions. Trap grease or brown grease is the oil that is recovered from the bottom of

commercial frying systems and from grease traps. Typically restaurants install grease traps as part of a discharge system to collect the grease that is washed down the drain. The trap collects grease before it enters the sewer, where it can congeal on the pipe walls and restrict flow. Restaurants normally pay to have these traps emptied and for the grease to be disposed. Since the grease currently has no other market value, its cost is extremely low.

Physical and flow properties of brown and yellow grease have not yet been published. Further research is needed to determine whether these feedstocks produce fuel products significantly different from soybean oils. Due to the acidity of yellow and brown grease, Marker et al. (2005) note that refinery piping must be constructed with 317L stainless steel. It is assumed that less resilient materials can be corroded in normal use.

Canola and Rapeseed Oils

Canola and Rapeseed oils also show promise as renewable diesel feedstock. These oils have properties similar to soy oil. But the oil yield of canola, with seeds containing more than 30% by mass oil, is much higher than soy, with seeds containing on the order of 20% oil..

Canola was developed through conventional plant breeding with rapeseed. To improve the characteristics of rapeseed, breeders created cultivars with reduced levels of erucic acid and glucosinolates. The end product, canola, is now widely grown in Canada, along with some production in the United States. North Dakota is the leading US state in the production of canola and typically grows approximately 90% of the total US domestic production of Canola.

There are currently tests plots in California that produce canola-fuel feedstock. There is little experience with canola in California, but much may be learned from Australia's success in cultivating the crop. The climate where canola is grown in Australia is similar to the California Central Valley from Bakersfield to Redding (Kaffka, 2007). Canola is considered a relatively drought tolerant crop that typically requires around 18 inches of water a year (under Australian conditions) (Johnson, 2007). California's similar climate and the crop's relatively low water requirement suggest that canola could be widely produced within the state. Steve Kaffka, a University of California Cooperative Extension agronomist, is conducting a UC study on the conditions required to grow canola efficiently in California. As part of the study, trial canola varieties have been planted in Chico, Davis, the West Side Field Station, and the Imperial Valley.

Rapeseed oil is composed of oleic, linoleic, linolenic, eicoscenoic, erucic, stearic, and palmitic acids, which are prone to oxidation. Hydrotreating this oil feedstock saturates the carbon-to-hydrogen bonds, providing oxidative stability and improved flow properties. Oil extraction is accomplished with the addition of steam and phosphate compounds for de-gumming, followed by alkali refining and bleaching. Sodium hydroxide is used to precipitate impurities in the oil, although it does not remove chlorophyll compounds. Process wastewater must be treated, since phosphorus contributes to nutrient loading in natural waters and chlorine compounds are toxic to many species (Mag, 1983).

In Europe, rapeseed is primarily used as a source for renewable diesel plant oils. Harvest is accomplished by direct thrashing and rapeseed straw is incorporated into the soil. The rapeseed is dried, cleaned and stored.

Once transported to the oil mill, the seed is pressed and the crude rapeseed oil extracted. Rapeseed meal is a by-product of this process and is used as animal feed, which can be used in place of soy meal imported from North America.

Animal Tallow

Animal tallow is a triglyceride material that is recovered by a rendering process, wherein the animal residues are cooked and the fat is recovered after rising to the surface. Since it is a waste by-product, it is relatively inexpensive, sustainable, and is locally available (Hilber, et al. 2007).

4.4. Overview of Renewable Diesel Chemical Composition

Here we consider the composition of renewable diesel with particular emphasis on how renewable diesel differs from FAME biodiesel and ULSD with respect to overall chemistry, environmental performance, and combustion performance. We begin with a review of EPA registrations that provide some information needed for this analysis. We also consider information provided by the fuel producers regarding the composition of their product.

4.4.1. U.S. EPA Registration

US EPA requirements for registration and analysis of designated fuels and fuel additives is stipulated in sections 211(b) and 211(e) of the Clean Air Act (CAA). The US EPA Tier I emission testing requirements are identified in 40 CFR Part 79, subpart F, Section 7.57. These regulations require that manufactures or importers of gasoline, diesel fuel, or a fuel additive provide a chemical description of the product and certain technical, marketing and health-effects information. The registration requirements are organized in a three-tiered structure. Standard mandatory requirements are contained in the first two tiers. The third tier provides for additional testing as needed.

Two renewable diesel producers have provided the California ARB with US EPA Tier I documents. These producers are Kern Oil Company, which produces a co-processed HDRD (R20), and Neste Oil Corporation, which uses a "bio-only" hydrotreating process to produce a pure HDRD (R100). We use these documents reporting our efforts to characterize the chemical composition of potential renewable diesel fuels that may be used in California.

4.4.2. Renewable Diesel versus FAME Biodiesel

Both renewable diesel and FAME biodiesel are "biomass-based fuels", which according to the California Low-Carbon Fuels Standard (LCFS) (CalOAL, 2010) are defined as "a biodiesel (mono-alkyl ester) or a renewable diesel that complies with ASTM D975-08ae1…".

Biodiesel is chemically distinct from petroleum diesel and has a separate ASTM standard (D6751), which specifies the standard for biodiesel when it is used as a blend component with petroleum diesel.

In contrast to a biodiesel that contains mono-alkyl esters, the California LCFS and US EPA defines a "renewable diesel" fuel as:

"… a motor vehicle fuel or fuel additive which is all the following:

(A) Registered as a motor vehicle fuel or fuel additive under 40 CFR part 79; A-9

(B) Not a mono-alkyl ester;

(C) Intended for use in engines that are designed to run on conventional diesel fuel; and

(D) Derived from nonpetroleum renewable resources."

Renewable diesel, produced from a variety of renewable feedstocks, is not composed of esters and is composed chemically of saturated hydrocarbon chains similar to conventional petroleum (e.g., Knothe, 2010; Federal Register, 2007). The renewable production process is designed to take advantage of the infrastructure of an existing refinery. Several of the renewable diesel

products currently available meet the ASTM standard for conventional diesel (D975). As part of the RFS, US EPA reported that renewable diesel has a slightly higher energy content compared to biodiesel (US EPA, 2010a, 2010d,).

4.4.3. Chemical Composition of Renewable Diesel Compared to Conventional Diesel

Petroleum-based diesel fuels are mixtures of aliphatic (open chain compounds and cyclic compounds that are similar to open chain compounds) and aromatic petroleum hydrocarbons (benzene and compounds similar to benzene). In addition, they may contain small amounts of nitrogen, sulfur, and other elements as additive compounds. The exact chemical composition (i.e., precise percentage of each constituent) of any particular diesel oil type can vary somewhat, depending on the petroleum source and other factors. Petroleum-based diesel fuels are distinguished from other fuels primarily by their boiling point ranges, and chemical additives.

Current examples of a non-ester renewable diesel include: ‘‘Renewable diesel’’ produced by the Neste, Kern Oil and Refining, or UOP process, or diesel fuel produced by processing fats and oils through a refinery hydrotreating process. These renewable diesel fuels consists of a mixture of hydrocarbons that meets the ASTM D 975 standard for petroleum diesel and can include performance and stability additives along with some aromatic hydrocarbons. ASTM fuel standards are the minimum accepted values for properties of the fuel to provide adequate customer satisfaction and/or protection. For diesel fuel, the ASTM standard is ASTM D 975. All engine and fuel injection manufacturers design their engines around ASTM D 975 (ASTM, 2009).

The US EPA has not included ASTM 975 in their rule making, but notes that information received to date indicates that renewable diesels will in general be indistinguishable from petroleum-based diesel at the molecular-composition level (US EPA, 2007). For the purpose of tax credits, the US Internal Revenue Service defines renewable diesel as a fuel that “meets the registration requirements for fuels and fuel additives established by US EPA under Section 211 of the Clean Air Act, and the requirements of the ASTM D975 …” (Internal Revenue Service, 2010).

Co-Processed HDRD (R20)

In response to the requirements of the 211(b) fuel analysis, Kern Oil and Refining (KOR) Company submitted to Southwest Research Institute a co-processed renewable diesel (R20) for detailed chemical analysis and speciation (Fanick, 2009a). The fuel was manufactured by co-processing a conventional petroleum stream and a triglyceride (tallow) in a hydrotreating process. The fuel contained less than 15% sulfur. The results were compared to Title 40 CFR, Subpart 86, and ASTM D975 property specifications, and the results of a USEPA 1990 survey of diesel fuels.

Three techniques were used to evaluate the fuel composition, hydrocarbon speciation, direct filter injection/gas chromatography (DFI/GC), and High Temperature Programmable Temperature Vaporization Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy (HTPTV-GCMS). Each technique characterizes a different hydrocarbon block within in the fuel. The SwRI analysis was performed using replicate samples from two separate fuel totes. The analysis agreed closely between totes. The average result is reported in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Comparison of Kern Oil and Refining Company R20 renewable diesel analysis performed by Southwest Research institute to three diesel fuel specifications.

Fuel Property	Test method	EPA Certification Fuel Specification [a]	1990 USEPA Diesel Fuel Survey [b]	ASTM D975	SwRI Analysis
Sulfur, ppm	D5453	7-15	240-1600	<15	6.65
Aromatics, vol %	D1319	27 min.	23.7-54.3	35 max.	29.4
Olefines, vol %	D1319	NA[c]	0.6-3.3	NA	1.6
Saturates, vol %	D1319	NA	45.9-75.0	NA	69.05
Cetane Number	D613	40-50	40.8-51.2	40 min.	53.05
Cetane Index	D976	40-50	43.3-49.9	40 min.	44.5
API Gravity	D287	32-37	NA	NA	36.45
Flash Point, F^o (C^o)	D93	130 (54) min.	NA	126 (52) min.	141 (60.6)
Viscosity@ 40°C	D445	2.0-3.2	NA	1.9-4.1	2.219
Lubricity, HFRR@60°C, micron	D6079	NA	NA	520 max.	442.5
Ash, % mass	D482	NA	NA	0.01	<0.001
Cloud Point, ^{o}C	D2500	NA	NA	D975 spec.[d]	-15.25
Cold Filter Plugging Point, ^{o}C	D6371	NA	NA	D975 spec.[d]	-19
Copper Strip Corrosion	D130	NA	NA	No. 3 max.	1B
Water & Sediment, vol %	D2709	NA	NA	0.05 max.	0.01
Ramsbottom, wt %	D524	NA	NA	0.35 max.	0.115
IBP, ^{o}C	D86	171-204	146-201	NA	163
10%, ^{o}C	D86	204-238	194-258	NA	197
50%, ^{o}C	D86	243-282	240-284	NA	245
90%, ^{o}C	D86	293-321	293-337	282-338	314
EP, ^{o}C	D86	321-366	319-355	NA	343

[a] Data from an April 13, 1992 EPA memorandum from james Greaves, subject "Revised Base diesel Fuel Determination Procedures for the Fuels and Fuel Additives Rulemaking" put into Docket No. A-90-07.

[b] Certification diesel fuel specification in the Title 40 CFR Part 86, Subpart N, 86.1313-2007.

[c] Not Applicable.

[d] "It is unreasonable to specify low-temperature properties that will ensure satisfactory operation at all ambient temperature. The appropriate low-temperature operability properties should be agreed upon between the purchaser for the intended use." (ASTM D975).

Aside from the SwRI assessments there are very few comparative chemical analysis available among various renewable diesel products. There is however a common expectation among producers and researchers that R100 products will have significantly reduced aromatic hydrocarbons compared to conventional petroleum diesel. Other blends such as R20 would be expected to meet ASTM D 975 criteria and regulated combustion emission standards.

The SwRI hydrocarbon speciation analysis of R20 showed that the lower molecular weight n-, iso-paraffins, and cycloparaffins accounted for between 13 and 16 percent of the total saturates; the olefins were between 1.3 and 1.5 percent of the hydrocarbons, and the aromatics were between 29 and 30 percent. The unidentified C^9 – C^{12+} hydrocarbons accounted for the remainder of the hydrocarbons, with a mass percentage between 53 and 55 percent.

The DFI/GC analysis showed that the majority of the hydrocarbons were between C^{12} and C^{18}. Between 15 and 17 percent of the hydrocarbons were between C^{19} and C^{24}, and the concentrations decreased above C^{24}.

The HTPTV-GSMS analysis showed that identified individual hydrocarbons ranged from tolulene (C^7H^9) to tricosane (C^{23}). In general, about 60 percent of the compounds were saturates and between 44 and 47 percent of the hydrocarbons were straight-chain hydrocarbons. Between 30 and 34 percent of the hydrocarbons were straight-chain compounds between C^{13} and C^{19}. Between 13 and 16 percent of the total hydrocarbons were branched-chain compounds between C^{15} and C^{19}.

The KOR R20 diesel fuel met both the USEPA certification and ASTM specifications except for the cetane number (slightly higher for both the USEPA certification specifications and 1990 Survey), and Initial Boiling Point and the 10 percent Boiling Point for the USEPA certification specification. In 2007 the maximum allowable sulfur concentration in diesel fuel was lowered to 15 ppm so the comparison to 1990 sulfur concentrations is now inappropriate.

The SwRI study concluded that the KOR R20 fuel was substantially similar to other conventional diesel fuels when compared to two different fuel specifications and the results of an USEPA fuel survey.

Bio-only Pure HDRD (R100)

One of the renewable diesel fuels proposed for use in California is a Bio-only Pure HDRD produced by Neste Oil Corporation using the NExBTL process. In the NExBTL renewable diesel process, animal fats and vegetable oils (triglycerides) are converted into diesel fuel components. The process uses all types of vegetable oils as well as all kinds of animal greases and fats. All of these oils and fats have a similar chemical structure that is comprised of three fatty acid chains joined to a glycerol to form a triglyceride.

The process steps utilize technology adapted from normal refinery processes. The process steps are:

- Feedstock pre-treatment to reduce contaminants to very low levels. During this step, commercial vegetable oil de-gumming technology is used. This step is needed to achieve purity levels required to maintain a long catalyst lifetime.
- Hydrotreating to remove oxygen in which paraffins are formed and branched. In this step, hydrogen is fed into a reactor vessel under pressure together with the feedstock. The resulting product is an iso-paraffin with significantly improved cold flow characteristics, lowering the cloud point to -25 °C or even lower. The extent of this process step is controlled depending on the grade of fuel required. Cold flow properties (cloud point) can be adjusted to between -5 to -30 °C to be applicable to winter operating conditions.
- Product finishing and stabilization. Lubricity can be improved with additives, as is commonly done with conventional sulfur-free fuels.

"Bio-only" hydrotreated plant oils result in a HDRD that is a pure hydrocarbon product, which meets sulfur free diesel specifications in all aspects except for density. It is free of sulfur and oxygen, and has a very low content of aromatics (<0.02%). HDRD typically has a very high cetane number. In the case of NExBTL, the blending cetane number varies between 85 and 99 as measured with standard method ASTM D 613-03b. Conversely, HDRD fuels are less dense than conventional diesel fuels. Pure NExBTL fuel meets European EN590 ultra-low sulfur fuel specifications except for density.

The chemical composition of the resulting pure R100 is a combination of straight and branched chain paraffins or alkanes. Neste has determined the chemical speciation of the pure R100 using gas chromatography and mass spectrographic analysis.

The carbon numbers range from C^{10} – C^{20} and the boiling range is from 120 °C to 320 °C, values that are within the range of conventional diesel. Other analyses indicate Neste's NExBTL consists of n- and iso-parrafins (Rantanen, et al, 2005) and contains very low amounts of poly-aromatic hydrocarbons, oxygenated compounds and sulfur. In 2005, VTT Processes in Finland conducted physical properties characterization tests on Neste's fuel (Rothe, et al., unpublished document). The fuel was produced from vegetable oils (canola/rapeseed or palm oil). Table 4.2 summarizes the reported fuel properties of R100 fuel produced by Neste (NExBTL). The NExBTL fuel was found to be similar to the European Union's EN90 and Sweden's EC1 ULSD equivalent fuels.

Table 4.2. Comparative fuel properties for conventional low-sulfur diesel and a HRDF (NExBTL) (Rothe, et al., unpublished document)**.**

Fuel Property	Units	EN590*	NExBTL
Density @ 15°C	kg/m^3	833	783
Viscosity @ 40°C	mm^2s^{-1}	2.35	3.4
Sulfur Content	mg/kg	6	<1
CH_x		1.86	2.1
IBP**	°C	171	216
FBP***	°C	364	321
Total Aromatics	vol %	24.9	<0.02
Cetane Index		49.7	97.9

* European ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel
** Initial boiling point
*** Final boiling point

Neste Oil Corporation has also conducted a life-cycle assessment of the energy and greenhouse gas balance of its R100 NExBRL fuel (Gartner, et al., 2006). This assessment was conducted using an approach consistent with the ISO 14040-43 standard. During this analysis, the consumption of non-renewable energy sources, i.e., non-renewable fossil fuels, natural gas, coal, etc., and production of greenhouse gases, i.e., carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, were considered. The feedstocks considered were rapeseed (canola) and palm oil. For all comparisons, scenarios and sensitivity analyses considered, the assessment found that use of NExBTL R100 saves primary energy and greenhouse gas emissions over its entire life-cycle when compared to conventional-fossil diesel fuel. The biggest variation in the results was associated with impacts from the production, transportation, and extraction of the crude plant oils used to make the R100. The rapeseed energy savings ranged from 30 to 33 giga-joule (GJ) primary energy per ton of NExBTL. The rapeseed greenhouse gas savings ranged from 1.2 – 2.5 tons of CO_2-equivalents per ton of NExBTL.

The energy savings for palm oil ranged from 44 GJ to 16 GJ primary energy per ton NExBRL. The greenhouse gas savings ranged from 2.2 tons to 1 ton CO_2-equivalents per ton of NExBTL. The results for palm oil depended mainly on the land use practices on the plantations used to grow the palms. "Good practice" palm oil resulted in about 65% higher savings compared to "typical practice" palm oil. The report cautioned that these results cannot be transferred to other environmental impacts such as acidification, eutrophication, and biodiversity that may arise during palm oil production.

4.5. Solid Waste and Emissions to Water

In evaluating the production of renewable (and other alternative diesel-fuel options) it is important for the multimedia assessment and the life-cycle assessment to identify where and what kind(s) of hazardous waste(s) may be generated. For example, co-processed HDRD produces propane, carbon dioxide, and water from the oil/fat feedstock, and the fermentation of palm oil mill effluent leads to significant biogas emissions.

Proper identification and management of the waste solvents during oil extraction are required to comply with hazardous waste laws and regulations. Degradation of the fuel could be caused by temperature, oxidation, and/or material incompatibility.

Once the sources, composition, and magnitude of waste streams from renewable diesel fuel feedstock and fuel production have been identified, there is a need to identify management approaches that could be applied to the identified hazardous waste streams. When generated hazardous wastes are identified, the appropriate waste management approaches, such as treatment, storage, and disposal should be specified and described in the Tier II and Tier III reports. Among the waste management strategies considered, priority should be given to available alternatives for hazardous waste reduction and pollution prevention. To address these and other hazardous-waste issues, the Tier II and Tier III reports will include a section that provides a work plan to specify the hazardous waste storage, transportation, treatment, disposal, waste reduction, and emergency planning for the renewable diesel life cycle.

Hazardous and non-hazardous wastes are generated from many of the refining processes, petroleum handling operations, as well as wastewater treatment. The petroleum refining industry generates relatively large volumes of wastewater, including contaminated surface water runoff and process water. Accidental releases of liquid hydrocarbons have the potential to contaminate large volumes of ground water and surface water with a potential risk to human health and the environment. The extraction of crude oil accounts for 78% of the total wastewater flow in petroleum-based diesel's life cycle, while only 12% is associated with the refinery process. The largest contributor to the wastewater flows of biofuels comes from soybean and oil processing (66%).

The life cycle assessments also include two classifications of solid waste: hazardous and non-hazardous. Almost all of renewable diesel's hazardous solid waste is derived from the refining process. Agriculture accounts for a very small fraction of renewable diesel's hazardous waste, "but these flows are indirect charges against agriculture for hazardous waste flows associated with the production of diesel fuel and gasoline used on the farm" (USDA and USDOE, 1998). The total hazardous waste generation of current petroleum-based diesel is 0.41g/bhp-h of engine work and there is no reliable estimate yet available for renewable diesel.

The non-hazardous waste generated within renewable diesel's life cycle is largely attributed to the trash and trap metals that are removed from the soybeans after the crushing stage. Diesel's non-hazardous waste is significantly lower with an estimated waste generation of only 2.8 g/bhp-h of engine work. This waste is primarily generated in diesel's crude oil refining and extraction steps.

5. Storage and Distribution of Renewable Diesel

In this section we review information that is needed to assess multimedia health and environmental impacts associated with storage and distribution of renewable diesel. A key consideration in this review is materials compatibility, which determines potential for leaks into soil, ground water, and surface water.

Soybean oil, canola oil, and rapeseed oil are composed of oleic, linoleic, linolenic, eicoscenoic, erucic, stearic, and palmitic acids, all of which are prone to oxidation. This report does not address how to solve the poor stability and corrosive problems of these feedstock oils during storage and transportation, because these issues are not relevant to materials compatibility and health/resource impacts that are the topic of this report. But stability is an issue that will be important for fuel proponents to address with respect to the overall potential of renewable diesel.

5.1. Material Compatibility and Storage Stability

In general, the handling and storage of renewable diesel that meets ASTM D 975 standards is the same as for petroleum diesel including the needed protection from ignition sources. Tanks used for transport and storage must be suitable for combustible liquids and precautions must be taken to prevent product spills on to the ground, into drains, and into surface and ground waters.

In the evaluation of the multimedia impacts of new diesel formulations, materials compatibility and storage stability are important considerations, but little information is available on pure renewable diesel materials compatibility.

As noted above, the feedstocks for renewable diesel include vegetable oils, fryer grease and tallow. Relative to petroleum, these feedstocks are more acidic, with an expected *Total Acid Number* between 2 and 200 (Marker, et al., 2005). Therefore, existing refineries must be retrofitted with more resistant pipes, seals and pumps (Marker, et al., 2005). Nitrile rubber, neoprene, or PVC gloves are protective equipment required to handle renewable diesel (ASTM F739/Diesel Fuel).

Storage stability refers to the ability of the fuel to resist chemical changes during long-term storage. While storage stability is an important parameter for any diesel fuel, little information is available regarding pure renewable diesel. Because renewable diesel typically does not contain unsaturated materials, it can be expected to have good stability, particularly if blended with conventional ULSD.

5.2. Distribution and Blending of Renewable Diesel

Blended HDRD can be transported via the same methods used for conventional diesel, including pipelines, rail cars, tank trucks and drums. The choice of transport vessel depends on the quantity of renewable diesel being transferred and the cold flow properties of the fuel.

It is straight forward technically to blend pure HDRD fuels (R100) with conventional diesel. R100 can be blended to as much as 65 to 70 volume % in conventional diesel to fulfill the minimum density requirement.

5.3. Use of Additives

The USEPA 211(b) specifications for baseline fuel include the requirement for additives. The required additives are:

- corrosion Inhibitor, 4.5 pounds per thousand barrels of fuel (ptb),
- demulsifier, 2 ptb,
- anti-oxidant, 2 ptb, and
- metal deactivator, 2 ptb.

Chemical additives are commercially available to address the oxidative stability, cold-flow properties, and microbial contamination of renewable diesel. It is expected that these additives would be the same as or very similar to additives currently in use for conventional diesel fuel. In addition, R100 renewable diesel fuels will need to have a lubricity additive.

Cold flow properties including cloud point and pour point for renewable diesel are generally better than those of biodiesel and similar to or better than those of ULSD (Knothe, 2010). For instance, cloud point ranges for renewable diesel range generally between -25 and -5 °C (e.g., Table 4.1; Knothe, 2010) although values as high as 7 degrees C have been reported, and cloud point for ULSD ranges around -12 °C (Phillips Petroleum, 2002).

Unlike biodiesel that, by virtue of the ester moiety, has intrinsic lubricity (Knothe and Steidly 2005), renewable diesel requires a lubricity additive similar to petroleum-based ULSD. Knothe (2010) points out that blends involving more than 2% biodiesel restores lubricity.

5.3.1. Residual Water

Similar to conventional diesel, renewable diesel is generally considered to be insoluble in water, it can actually contain as much as 0.05 % by volume of water. Storage stability of renewable diesel is also affected by the presence of water within the tank used for storage or transport (ASTM 2003).

Water in vapor phase (humidity) can enter through vents and seals of fuel tanks where it either condenses or dissolves into the fuel. According to Van Gerpen et al. (1996), virtually all diesel fuel storage tanks can be assumed to contain some water. Water can cause hydrolytic degradation of the fuel, contribute to microbial growth in the fuel, and cause corrosion of fuel systems and tanks.

The presence of water within renewable diesel can cause corrosion of fuel tanks and engine fuel system components. The most direct form of corrosion is rust, "but water can become acidic with time and the resulting acid corrosion can attack storage tanks" (Wedel, 1999). Hydrolytic degradation can also occur if concentrations of water are present within the tank.

Condensed water in a fuel tank can support the growth of bacteria and mold that use the hydrocarbons in the renewable diesel as a food source. These "hydrocarbon-degrading bacteria and molds will grow as a film or slime in the tank and accumulate as sediment" (Wedel, 1999).

The control of water is primarily a housekeeping issue (i.e. keeping storage tanks clean) and a problem frequently addressed by using fuel filters (ASTM 2003). Additives may also be used to address residual water problems (ASTM 2003).

5.3.2. Additives to Inhibit Biodegradation of Stored Diesel Fuel

Additives used to control microbes in fuel storage tanks are generally water-soluble and migrate into any water phase residing in the fuel storage tank. Given the expected potential for biodegradation of renewable diesel at rates similar to rates of biodegradation of petroleum diesel (Knothe, 2010), the same biocides used in petroleum-based diesel fuel systems can be expected to be used with biofuels. Biocides are too expensive to be widely deployed upstream in the distribution process, and there is an added concern of creating microbial resistance, so biocides are typically used on an "as-needed" basis in the distribution chain wherever and whenever microbial contamination is detected as a problem (Irwin, 2007; Cheznow, 2008, personal communication).

The biocide with the largest current market share is manufactured by Rohm and Haas Corporation and is sold under the product name of Kathon FP 1.5. The active ingredients in the Kathon product, isothiazols, are shown in **Figure 5.1** and listed in Appendix C, Table C-4.



5-chloro-2-methyl-4-isothiazolin-3-one
CAS Registry N° 26172-55-4
EINECS N° 2475007



2-methyl-4-isothiazolin-3-one
CAS Registry N° 2682-20-4
EINECS N° 2202396

Figure 5.1. Rohm and Haas Kathon FP 1.5 Biocide (Rohm and Haas, 1999).

Other common fuel biocide chemicals are methylene-bis-thiocyanate (MBT) and nitro-morphalines (Cheznow, 2008, personal communication). MBT is often used as a biocide in water treatment plants, paper mills, and other industrial processes involving large-scale water use. Carbamates also appear on the material safety data sheets (MSDSs) of some commercial biocides listed in Table 4 of Appendix C.

An additional environmental issue for biocides involves the treatment and disposal of biocide-containing effluent drained from the storage tanks. The Rohm and Haas literature discusses this process and proper deactivation, which involves the use of sodium metabisulphate or sodium bisulphate (Rohm and Haas, 1999).

6. Use of Renewable Diesel

In this section we review and evaluate multimedia health and environmental impacts associated with the use, that is combustion, of renewable diesel. We first consider the quality of renewable diesel as a substitute for ULSD in terms of energy performance. A second key consideration in this review is how the emissions of criteria and hazardous air pollutants from renewable diesel combustion differ from those emitted by an energy-equivalent quantity of combusted ULSD.

6.1. Renewable Diesel Standardization and Fuel Quality

Renewable diesel is required to meet the same performance standards as conventional diesel. ASTM Standard Specification for Diesel Fuel Oils (D975-09b) (ASTM, 2009) provides standards that, when met, allow renewable diesel to be suitable for a variety of diesel engines. Appendix A summarizes these standards. Additionally, the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) identifies seven grades of diesel fuel oils that can be used in a variety of diesel engines (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1. ASTM Diesel Fuel Grades (ASTM 2009).

Diesel Fuel Grade*	Description
1-D S15**	Special-purpose, light middle distillate for engines requiring 15 ppm sulfur (maximum) and higher volatility than provided by Grade 2-D S15 fuel.
1-D S500**	Special-purpose, light middle distillate for engines requiring 500 ppm sulfur (maximum) and higher volatility than provided by Grade 2-D S500 fuel.
1-D S5000	Special-purpose, light middle distillate for engines requiring 5000 ppm sulfur (maximum) and higher volatility than provided by Grade 2-D S5000 fuel.
2-D S15**	General-purpose, middle distillate for engines requiring 15 ppm sulfur (maximum). Especially suitable for varying speed and load conditions.
2-D S500**	General-purpose, middle distillate for engines requiring 500 ppm sulfur (maximum). Especially suitable for varying speed and load conditions.
2-D S5000	General-purpose, middle distillate for engines requiring 5000 ppm sulfur (maximum). Especially suitable for varying speed and load conditions.
4-D	Heavy distillate fuel or a blend of distillate and residual oil. Suitable for constant load and speed application.

* S5000 grades of diesel fuel refer to so-called "Regular" sulfur grades. S500 grades refer to so-called "Low Sulfur" grades. S15 grades are commonly referred to as "Ultra-Low Sulfur" grades or ULSD.
** Meets 40 CFR Part 80 fuel quality regulations for highway diesel fuel sold in 1993 and later years.

6.2. Emissions of Pollutants to Air

In terms of human health damage, the air emissions for the life-cycle of any diesel fuel take place during refining, fuel loading/transport, and fuel combustion. Pollutants generated during crude oil refining typically include volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SOx), nitrogen oxides (NOx), particulates, ammonia (NH_3), hydrogen sulfide (H_2S), metals, spent acids, and numerous toxic organic compounds. Emissions occur throughout refineries and arise from the thousands of potential sources such as valves, pumps, tanks, pressure-relief valves, and flanges. Emissions also originate from the loading and unloading of materials (such as VOCs released during charging of tanks and loading of barges), as well as from wastewater treatment processes (such as aeration and holding ponds). Storage tanks are

used throughout the refining process to store crude oil, intermediate products, finished products, and other materials. The tanks can be a significnat source of VOC emissions. Combustion of petroleum-based and renewable diesel fuels by motor vehicles results in exhaust emissions that include VOCs, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, hazardous air pollutants, and carbon dioxide. These pollutant categories include known carcinogens, such as benzene, and probable human carcinogens, such as formaldehyde or diesel particulate matter.

6.3. Renewable Diesel Impact on Air Quality

Because of the importance of the combustion emissions, we explore here air-quality impacts of renewable diesel relative to extant diesel fuels. Emission testing data is available for renewable diesel from Conoco-Phillips, Kern Oil Refining Company co-processed HDRD, and Neste Oil.

Conoco-Phillips conducted tests using a 2006 International 6.0-L V8 engine. Blends of R5 to R30 produced from soy oil showed reduction in most criteria pollutants relative to conventional ULSD. For an R20 blend, non-methane hydrocarbon emissions were reduced by about 50%, NOx emissions by about 8%, and CO emissions by about 60% relative to ULSD. Particulate matter (PM) emissions showed only a slight decrease compared to ULSD, and did not improve with higher blend concentrations. (Kaufman, 2007).

Conoco-Phillips renewable diesel emissions testing was also conducted using beef tallow, canola, poultry fat, and yellow grease feedstocks. There were some emissions variation both up and down compared to soy renewable diesel, but all feedstock sources showed lower emissions compared to baseline ULSD.

As part of the required 211(b) fuel analysis, Kern Oil Refining Co. submitted its renewable diesel fuel to Southwest Research Institute for emissions analysis (Fanick, 2009a). The KOR renewable diesel fuel was 20% co-processed tallow and conventional petroleum (R20). The emissions testing was conducted using a 2007 6.4-L Navistar A350 heavy-duty diesel engine. In general, the engine met 2009 emission standards except for NOx. The 2009 emission standard for NOx is 0.2 g/bhp-hr, and the KOA renewable diesel resulted in NOx 0.1 g/bhp-hr higher than the standard. All other emissions tested—CO, PM, and non-methane hydrocarbons—were significantly lower than the 2009 standard.

As part of the required 211(b) fuel analysis, Neste Oil Corporation also submitted its NExBTL fuel for emissions analysis by Southwest Research Institute (Fanick, 2008). The NExBTL fuel tested was a bio-only pure HDRD (R100). Comparative duty diesel engine combustion emissions testing by Neste and the Nutzfahrzeuge Gruppe (Rothe et al, 2005) are summarized in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2. Effect of blending on an HRDF emissions (NExBTL) (Rothe et al, 2005).

	100% NExBTL	50% NExBTL*	10% NExBTL*
Emissions			
PM	-28%	-5%	0
NOx	-10%	-6%	0
HC	-48%	-48%	-33%
CO	-28%	-22%	-11%
Fuel consumption			
specific**	+5%	+2%	0
volumetric	-1.75%	-1%	0

* Blended with EN 590 ultra-low sulfur fuel.
** Adjusted for density differences in fuels

Neste also conducted emissions testing using a 2007 6.4-L Navistar A350 heavy duty diesel engine with after-treatment running NExBTL (R100) fuel. These test found CO emissions were slightly higher compared to a baseline ULSD fuel (0.05 g/bhp-hr). Emissions were 17% lower for NOx with no relative change for HC and PM (Fanick, 2008).

During combustion there are also concerns about speciation of volatile- and particulate-phase polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and nitrated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (NPAHs). For all fuels, the particulate-phase PAHs and NPAH emissions are higher than the volatile-phase compounds. In the emissions test cited above, the total PAH and NPAH emissions for the NExBTL fuel was lower than the baseline ULSD (Fanick, 2008).

The Neste studies concluded that in diesel engines:

- HDRD fuel (NExBTL) showed significant emission benefits compared to ultra-low sulfur conventional diesel fuel. Higher blend percentages resulted in greater benefits.
- Blends below R10 can result in reductions in CO and HC, but not PM or NOx.
- Specific (density adjusted) fuel consumption is better with the HRDF, but volumetric fuel consumption is 5% higher because of the lower HRDF density.
- HDRD fuels avoid some of the unwanted effects associated with FAME-based biodiesel fuels (instability, hygroscopicity, fouling, catalyst deactivation, etc).
- Due to the absence of sulfur and aromatic compounds, NExBTL exhaust emissions show significant reductions in many regulated and non-regulated compounds compared to “traditional” petroleum diesel.

7. Renewable Diesel Toxicity

7.1. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment

As is the case with any new fuel formulation where large quantities of processed and synthetic chemicals enter into California commerce, renewable diesel fuels raise concerns about the potential toxicity to humans and to the environment from chemical emissions associated with fuel production, transport, storage and combustion. Estimating toxic chemical risk requires that we follow a standard paradigm for risk assessment applied to renewable-diesel components and combustion. This assessment process includes:

1. Hazard identification,
2. Toxicity assessment,
3. Evaluation of the potential for human and ecological exposure, and
4. Definition of sensitive populations at risk of exposure.

The greatest difficulty we anticipate with determining the human and ecological toxicity of renewable diesel fuels is that renewable diesel fuel is not a defined chemical formulation or a defined mixture of components, but can be formulated from a wide array of different feedstocks with different chemical components. It is beyond the scope of the multimedia-working group to attempt to consider all of these possibilities. Instead we make recommendations with the understanding that it is useful to focus on the toxicity impacts from the life cycle of one or two typical feedstocks for renewable diesel formulations and then attempt to draw generalizations from these results. Refining and production of renewable diesel fuel may well occur, at least in part, in California, so we will have to consider potential releases of chemicals involved in synthesis and use of renewable diesel, as well as their appropriate disposal, and their degradation products. Extraction of oils from plants will generally require the use of organic solvents such as hexane. Thus, we must consider potential adverse health effects and ecological damage related to release scenarios for organic solvents as well. Finally, there may be significant amounts of fuel additives put into renewable diesel formulations. The toxicity of these compounds and their potential release products will also have to be considered. Significant routes of exposure that must be considered include inhalation, ingestion through water and food, and dermal contact. We find that significant data gaps exist at every stage of tracking sources to exposure and risk.

7.2. Acute Oral and Acute Dermal Toxicity

The acute oral and dermal toxicity of pure NExBTL renewable diesel was assessed for Neste Oil Corporation in testing conducted by SafePharm Laboratories (Mullaney, 2005). Both oral and dermal testing were conducted using the Sprague-Dawley CD strain rat and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) testing Guidelines (RIVM, 1994).

During the acute oral testing, two groups of three female rats were administered an undiluted oral dose at a level of 2,000 mg/kg bodyweight (Mullaney 2005). The rats were monitored for clinical signs and subjected to gross necropsy after 14 days.

There were no observed mortalities or observed evidence of systemic toxicity. All animals showed expected gains in body weight. No abnormalities were observed at necropsy. The acute oral median lethal dose (LD_{50}) of NExBTL in female Sprague-Dawley rats is estimated to be greater than 2,500 mg/kg bodyweight.

During the acute dermal exposures, a group of ten rats (five males and five females) was given a single 24-hour, semi-occluded dermal application of undiluted NExBTL renewable diesel to intact skin at a dose level of 2,000 mg/kg bodyweight (Mullaney, 2005). The rats were monitored for clinical signs and subjected to gross necropsy after 14 days.

The dermal-toxicity study on rats showed no mortalities or systemic toxicity. There were no signs of dermal irritation in the male rats. All animals show expected gains in body weight. No abnormalities were observed at necropsy. Hyperkeratinisation or crust formation with or without small superficial scattered scabs, possibly caused by the animals scratching at the treatment site, was noted in females during the study. This may be due to a drying/defatting effect caused by application of the test material. The acute dermal median lethal dose (LD_{50}) of NExBTL in Sprague-Dawley rats was determined to be greater than 2,000 mg/kg bodyweight (Mullaney, 2005).

7.3. Human Health

Mutagenic Assays

Using pure NExBTL, SafePham Laboritories conducted a reverse mutation assay (Ames Test) and a chromosome aberration test using human lymphocytes *in vitro*. Testing was conducted for Neste Oil Corporation using OECD guidelines.

During the Ames Test assay, *Salmonella typhimurium* bacteria cultures were treated with NExBTL at five dose levels (50, 150, 500, 1500, and 5000 µg/plate) in triplicate, both with and without rat liver metabolic activation (Thompson 2005). There was no visible reduction in growth of the bacterial background lawn at any dose level. An oily precipitate was observed at and above 1,500 µg/plate, but this did not prevent scoring of revertant colonies. No significant increases in the frequency of revertant colonies were recorded for any dose, either with or without metabolic activation. The study concluded that NExBTL can be considered non-mutagenic under the conditions of this test.

The in vitro human lymphocyte assay supplements the microbial (Ames Test) assays insofar as it identifies potential mutagens that produce chromosomal aberrations rather than gene mutations (Scott et al, 1990). Duplicate cultures of human lymphocytes, treated with pure NExBTL, were evaluated for chromosomal aberrations using four dose levels along with appropriate vehicle controls and positive controls (Wright, 2007). The final concentrations of NExBTL used were 78.13, 156.25, 312.5, 625, 1,250, and 2,500 µg/ml. An oily precipitate of test material was noted above 78.13 µg/ml. The dose levels did not induce a statistically significant increase in the frequency of cells with chromosome aberrations in either the absence or presence of a liver enzyme metabolic activation system in either of two separate experiments. The NExBTL was considered to be non-clastogenic to human lymphocytes in vitro.

7.4. Toxicity Testing of Renewable Diesel Fuel Exhaust Emissions

Diesel exhaust (DE) is a complex mixture of gaseous and particulate matter (PM) components containing hundreds of compounds with the particles less than 2.5 µm having the most relevance for human health impacts (Madden, 2008). Exposure to PM induces increased mortality and some types of morbidity, such as hospitalizations for cardiopulmonary problems. In spite of a large literature on the health impacts of combustion emissions from petroleum diesel, a key uncertainty relates to a range of dose-response relationships. Lung disease links to DE have been examined with variable findings using controlled exposures, but to date relatively little is known

about cardiovascular responses (Madden, 2008). Induction of other health effects from DE exposure has been examined mainly through either controlled nonhuman animal model exposures or epidemiological approaches.

To date there are no studies comparing the toxicity of combustion emissions from petroleum diesel with those from renewable diesel and it is unlikely that such comparisons can provide any results useful for decision makers. There are two issues that mitigate the value of these comparisons. First, due to changing regulations and emerging technologies to achieve compliance with regulatory standards, DE from emissions associated with more recent engine/fuel combinations contains less PM and less of certain gases than older engine technologies and fuels (Madden, 2008). This makes both the comparisons to older emissions and the choice of a petroleum baseline for renewable diesel complicated. In more recent diesel formulations, the gas-phase emissions contain proportionally more mass than the PM phase, presenting technological problems in terms of the collection of the DE for future studies and across-laboratory comparison. A second problem is the uncertainty and variation in blending ratios.

In December of 2010, Vogel (2010) presented preliminary results of ARB-funded studies that used *in-vitro* testing to assess and compare the inflammatory toxicity and genotoxicity of biodiesel and renewable diesel blends along with CARB diesel (ultra low sulfur diesel). These experiments used human cell models to test for the inflammatory response to diesel combustion emissions—(a) human macrophages (U937), phagocytotic cell types that serve as first line of defense, and (b) lung Clara cells from pulmonary epithelium (NCI H441). The Comet assay was also used to test for genotoxicity. The combustion emissions from CARB diesel were compared to renewable diesel, pure biodiesel, and six biodiesel blends using CARB diesel:

- 100 percent biodiesel derived from soy (S B100)
  and from animal fat (A B100)
- 100 percent renewable diesel (R100)
- CARB diesel blended with:
  - 50 percent soy-derived biodiesel (S B50)
  - 20 percent soy-derived biodiesel (S B20)
  - 50 percent animal-derived biodiesel (A B50)
  - 20 percent animal-derived biodiesel (A B20)
  - 50 percent renewable diesel (R50)
  - 20 percent renewable diesel (R50)

The preliminary results from these studies reveal that PAHs in the CARB diesel, biodiesel blends and renewable diesel blends can activate the aryl hydrocarbon (Ah) receptor (by inducing cytochrome P450 [CYP1A1]) indicating the potential for inflammatory response, but the rate of activation from renewable diesel blends was lower than from biodiesel blends and CARB diesel. CARB diesel, biodiesel blends and renewable diesel blends all induce inflammatory markers such as COX-2 and IL-8 in macrophages and MUC5AC in lung Clara cell type (NCI H441), but the effect renewable diesel blends on inflammatory markers such as COX-2 and IL-8 were consistently lower than CARB diesel. The Comet assay indicated no genotoxic effects of renewable blends at 200 g/ml. More details of these experiments will be provided in Teir II and Tier III renewable diesel assessments.

7.5. Aquatic Toxicity

SafePharm Laboratories conducted acute short-term tests for Neste Oil Corporation with exposures of fish, water flea, and green alga to a pure NExBTL renewable diesel water accommodated fraction (WAF). Testing using NExBTL WAF has also been conducted on Rainbow Trout (*Onchorynchus mykiss*) (Goodband 2006), *Daphnia magna* (Goodband, 2005), and green alga (*Scenedesmus subspicatus*) (Vryenhoef 2005) following OECD Guidelines.

The WAF in these experiments was prepared by loading dechlorinated tap water with pure NExBTL and stirring the mixture for 23 hours. After a one-hour settling period, a clear colorless water column with a clear oily slick at the surface was observed. The WAF was removed from the middle of the column and used for the toxicity-test exposure. The total organic carbon analysis of all the WAFs used showed no difference from controls that contained no NExBTL. The concentration, homogeneity, and stability of the WAF test material were not determined. No comparisons to conventional diesel or renewable diesel blends were conducted. The concentration, homogeneity and stability of the WAF test material were not determined at the request of Neste Corp.

Rainbow Trout were examined for mortality and abnormalities at 3, 6, 24, 48, 72, and 96 hours. No mortalities or abnormalities were observed throughout all testing and the study concluded that the No Observed Effect Loading rate for Rainbow Trout was greater than 1000 mg/l.

Daphnia were examined for immobility at 24 and 48 hours. No *Daphnia* immobilization was observed throughout all testing and the study concluded that the No Observed Effect Loading rate was greater than 100 mg/l.

Neither the growth nor the biomass of *Scenedesmus subspicatus* was affected by a 72 hr exposure to a WAF loading rate of 100 mg/l. The No Observed Effect Loading rate was greater than 100 mg/l.

7.6. Toxicity and Biodegradation in Aerated Soil

The constantly increasing number of motor vehicles and the increasing volume of oil products transport/distribution has made soil pollution by petroleum-based hydrocarbons a topic of interest to impact assessors (Lapinskiene, et al., 2005). For the impact of petroleum diesel and other oils on soil, there is a vast literature, which demonstrates that small quantities of oil encourage the growth of microorganisms since hydrocarbons can serve as nutrients. At higher levels of pollution, the numbers of microorganisms decrease and their relative composition changes along with quantitative indicators of microbiological processes, such as enzyme activity. There are also studies of the influence of oil products on the population of earthworms. Lapinskiene, et al. (2005) compared the soil impacts of diesel fuel to FAME biodiesel by quantitatively evaluating the microbial transformation of these materials in non-adapted aerated soil. The toxicity levels were determined by measuring the respiration of soil microorganisms as well as the activity of soil dehydrogenases. Lapinskiene, et al. (2005) found that conventional diesel fuel is more resistant to biodegradation and produces more humus products than biodiesel. To date, there are no published comparisons of this type for petroleum and renewable diesel (Knothe, 2010). In a marine context, DeMello et al. (2007) found that n-alkanes decomposed at approximately the same rate as fatty acid methyl esters, and this may indicate potential for renewable diesel degradation rates between that of petroleum diesel and biodiesel. Overall, however, the similar chemistry of renewable and petroleum diesel fuels would suggest that their impacts on soil ecosystems would not be significantly different, particularly when the renewable

diesel is in a blend (Knothe, 2010). Major differences in soil impact are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix. So the key issue with regard to different impact on soil organisms from existing diesel blends and renewable diesel blends will likely be linked to differences in additives.

7.7. Summary of Toxicity Issues

Limited tests on the inherent acute oral and dermal toxicity of pure renewable diesel indicate that renewable diesel has a very low inherent toxicity. In these tests, two groups of three female rats were administered an undiluted oral dose at a level of 2000 mg/kg bodyweight (Mullaney 2005). The rats were monitored for clinical signs and subjected to gross necropsy after 14 days. No increases in mortality or systemic toxicity were found. But these tests are difficult to interpret since there were no controls using conventional diesel or tests using diesel blend.

There have been some initial mutagenic testing of pure (NExBLT) renewable diesel using reverse mutation assay (Ames Test) and the chromosome aberration test using human lymphocytes in vitro were conducted using pure NExBTL. In the Ames test, no significant increases in the frequency of revertant colonies were recorded for any dose, either with or without metabolic activation. In the human lymphocyte test, the pure (NExBTL) renewable diesel was considered to be non-clastogenic to human lymphocytes in vitro.

Insight on aquatic toxicity comes from acute short-term exposure of fish, water flea, and green alga to a pure NExBTL renewable diesel water accommodated fraction (WAF). This study concluded that the No Observed Effect Loading rate was greater than 100 mg/L for all three species.

At this point, there has been only limited testing of the relative toxicity of the emissions from combusting renewable diesel (blends and/or pure fuel) compared to existing diesel and/or biodiesel. Based on the level of variation in emissions toxicity assessment for petroleum diesel, the chemical similarity of renewable diesel and petroleum diesel, and the likelihood for blends that still contain a significant fraction of petroleum diesel, we expect that it will be difficult if not impossible to organize and interpret a study to compare the toxicity of petroleum diesel relative to renewable diesel blends. Therefore, unless there market evolves to the point where renewable blends contain more than 50% non-petroleum diesel feedstock, there appears to be little value in calling for emissions toxicity studies for renewable diesel.

Among the limited renewable diesel blends tested to date, toxicity testing indicates limited inherent toxicity and that pure renewable diesel formations are unlikely to exceed the inherent toxicity or mutagenicity of standard diesel. Major differences in health and ecological impact between existing diesel and renewable diesel blends are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix. Any difference in life-cycle health/ecological impacts between existing and renewable diesel blends will likely be linked to differences in additives.

Additionally, the chemical comparison to conventional diesel is important for determining whether or how much additional toxicity tests are required. If a co-processed “green” renewable diesel is the intended product and is chemically indistinguishable from conventional diesel, then no additional toxicity testing is needed. Further, if a post-production 100% pure renewable diesel is blended to a proportion such that it is chemically indistinguishable from conventional diesel, then no additional toxicity testing is likely needed.

8. Environmental Transport and Fate of Renewable Diesel

The fate and transport of a fuel and its component chemicals in the environment depend on the multimedia transport properties of its constituent chemicals. The purpose of the multimedia evaluation of renewable diesel is to identify impacts that may be different from the existing baseline fuel, conventional petroleum-based ULSD in the case of renewable diesel. Based on the fuel chemical composition analysis provided by both KOR and Neste Oil Corp., renewable diesel can be regarded as substantially similar to other conventional diesel fuels (Fanick, 2008; Fanick, 2009). The main difference between conventional ULSD and R100 is that the pure HDRD has no sulfur or oxygen and has a very low aromatic compound content. R20 co-processed renewable diesel can be expected to be even closer in chemical composition to conventional ULSD.

Based on the reported similarities in chemical composition, and thus the physicochemical properties governing fate and transport in the environment, between renewable diesel and conventional ULSD, the multimedia environmental behavior of renewable diesel should be expected to also be similar and difficult to observed based on the reliability of existing models and measurement methods. The transport and partitioning behavior, as well as biodegradation in soils (as noted in Section 7) can be expected to be similar. The release scenarios and materials compatibility issues should be essentially the same as conventional diesel that is already in wide use.

Even when releases of renewable diesel do not cause significantly greater impacts to the environment, human health, or water resources when compared to ULSD, the impact from releases of associated additives and production chemicals can be of concern. The specific chemical composition of the additives used by various renewable diesel manufactures is not available and the environmental impact of available additives is not well described.

In the case of co-processed R20, it may transpire that any additives used in renewable diesel are currently in use in ULSD and would continue to be used with no substantive difference in environmental impact attributable to additives. If this is the case, then new studies on multimedia transport and impact from additives would not be necessary under the assumption that the impacts of additives in ULSD are either acceptable or at lease well-characterized. However, when the additives used in renewable diesel are different from those in ULSD with regard to composition and/or quantity, then a multimedia transport and impact assessment will be needed to determine the magnitude and significance of any potential impacts associated with these additives.

9. Tier I Conclusions

Through a review of the current knowledge on renewable diesel production, use, and environmental impacts, this report provides a foundation to aid the CalEPA Multimedia Working Group formulate recommendations to the California Environmental Policy Council regarding the consequences of increased use of renewable diesel in California. A key goal of this report is to identify important knowledge gaps for a Multimedia Assessment and recommend approaches to address these gaps. This does not always involve additional experiments, but could include additional requests for information from the proponents of any new fuel to be used in California.

Renewable diesel offers several beneficial characteristics that will help California meet State renewable fuel goals:

- Renewable diesel is chemically similar to the ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel already in wide use such that environmental releases from the life-cycle of renewable diesel can be expected to behave in the environment in a manner similar to ULSD releases.
- Renewable diesel is compatible with existing refining and distribution infrastructure and can be used in current diesel engines without modification.
- Pure renewable diesel (R100) has reduced aromatic hydrocarbon content and, since many of the chemicals of environmental concern are aromatic hydrocarbons, this reduction will likely reduce the overall environmental toxicity of the fuel.
- Limited toxicity testing on rats (oral and dermal exposures), water fleas and green algae, and including mutagenic assays, reveals that R100 has limited inherent toxicity and that pure renewable diesel formations are unlikely to exceed the inherent toxicity or mutagenicity of standard diesel. Major differences in health and ecological impact between existing diesel and renewable diesel blends are more likely to be associated with additives than with the hydrocarbon mix.
- Preliminary results of ARB-funded studies that used *in-vitro* testing to assess and compare the inflammatory toxicity and genotoxicity of renewable diesel blends and CARB diesel indicate that the impact of renewable diesel blends on inflammatory markers tend to be consistently lower than CARB diesel and a Comet assay indicated no genotoxic effects of biodiesel blends at 200 g/ml.
- Renewable diesel fuels that are made from waste products such as tallow will likely have reduced life-cycle environmental impacts compared to fuels made from plant crops. These reduced impacts stem from possible reductions in pesticide, herbicide, and fertilizer use. In addition there are sustainability concerns about the use of food supply crops as a fuel as global population grows. Further studies are needed to address this concern.

  One life-cycle study sponsored by Neste Oil Corporation found pure renewable diesel (R100) from rapeseed oil or palm oil has a quantitative advantage in energy and greenhouse gas balance compared to conventional diesel. For renewable diesel blends, recent studies on the life-cycle impact considered a range of fuel/vehicle combinations. The results indicate that life-cycle health impacts of renewable diesel blends are not likely to differ significantly from those of petroleum diesel.

In spite of the many benefits identified here for renewable diesel there are also knowledge gaps associated with renewable diesel use in California that may need to be addressed in more detail before these fuels enter the market. The knowledge gaps identified here include:

- **Additives impacts.** Key information gaps are associated with possible differences in additive use. To provide a stable, useful, and reliable fuel, additive chemicals will need to be introduced into almost all renewable diesel blends. These additives will be required to address issues such as oxidation, corrosion, foaming, cold temperature flow properties, biodegradation, water separation, and NO_x formation. While many of these additives are currently used in conventional diesel fuels, the specific chemicals and amounts to be used in renewable by various producers has not been well defined for the emerging industry in California.

  It is important to note that although the use of additives in diesel fuels (conventional or renewable) is common, the impact of various additives is not well known. A careful evaluation of the possible chemicals used in additives would be beneficial to California and may lead to a "recommended list" or "acceptable list" that would minimize the uncertainty of future impacts as new fuels and industry standards are developed. Additional research on the impacts of a "recommended list" of acceptable additives needs to be considered with respect to releases to water and soils and fugitive emissions to air.

- **Production and storage releases.** Increased renewable diesel production and associated feedstock processing may involve impacts from released reactants and by-products. There are potential impacts to California's air and water during the large-scale industrial operations use to extract seed oils. These impacts may result from air emissions of solvents used to extract the seed oil (e.g., hexane) and from leaking tanks containing process chemicals. There is also the issue of occupational exposures.

  Currently, the possible impacts during seed extraction will be minimal in California since it is anticipated that most of the seed oils will be derived from soy grown and extracted out-of-state. The impacts during seed extraction will be become more of an issue for California as in-state production of plant-derived oils increases and may require further study.

  As the volume of tallow that is rendered out of state and shipped by rail or truck into California increases, there is a potential impact from releases of large volumes of raw triglycerides to soils or water. The impact of such a release is not well known and additional research would be beneficial as large-scale tallow usage increases.

- **Air Emissions Toxicity Testing.** The currently-published emission toxicity for renewable diesel is based on pure renewable diesel (R100) and do not directly compare results to a baseline diesel fuel. The ARB is funding studies that used in-vitro testing to assess and compare the inflammatory toxicity and genotoxicity of biodiesel and renewable diesel blends along with CARB diesel and early results indicate lower toxicity for renewable diesel. But based on the level of variation in emissions toxicity assessment for petroleum diesel, the chemical similarity of renewable diesel and petroleum diesel, and the likelihood for blends that still contain a significant fraction (80%) of petroleum diesel, we expect that it will be difficult to organize and interpret a study to compare the toxicity of petroleum diesel relative to R20 renewable diesel blends for the full range of vehicle-engine systems used in California. Therefore, unless there market evolves to the point where renewable blends contain more than 50% non-petroleum diesel feedstock,

there appears to be little value in calling for extensive emissions toxicity studies for renewable diesel.

- **Priority list of renewable diesel fuel formulations.** Because the number of potential feedstocks, the number of fuel blends, and the number of additive choices and mixes makes for an unmanageable suite of permutations that may require evaluation, it is critical to identify the priority feedstocks, fuel blends, and additives requiring study for any additional impacts assessment.

Not specifically addressed in this Tier I evaluation are the environmental impacts from the increased use of fertilizers and water and land resources as the production of plant oils increases in the State. These factors may be some of the most important eventual impacts to California as the renewable and biofuels industry expands. More sustainable sources of renewable diesel such as yellow or brown grease or tallow may be preferable and should be encouraged.

During this review, we discovered that there are strong similarities between the chemical composition of petroleum diesel and renewable diesel. These similarities and the likelihood that renewable diesel will be used as a blend with petroleum diesel limits the need for additional Tier II Multimedia experiments or an extensive life-cycle impact assessment.

A key goal of this report is to identify important knowledge gaps for a Multimedia Assessment and recommend approaches to address these gaps. This does not always involve additional experiments, but could include additional requests for information from the proponents of any new fuel to be used in California.

As part of the overall multimedia assessment, each company proposing to market renewable diesel within California should provide the California ARB with a production, blending, additives, and distribution strategy that includes potential volumes to be stored and transported along with potential release scenarios that the company may foresee. Each company should also provide a comparative chemical analysis of the product they intend to market (blend or other wise). This analysis should be compared to conventional diesel currently in the market place.

10. References

ASTM. 2003. (American Society for Testing and Materials). Fuel and Fuel System Microbiology-Fundamentals, Diagnosis, and Contamination Control, MNL 47 ASTM International.

ASTM. 2009. American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). Standard D975-09b, "Standard Specification for Biodiesel Fuel Blend Stock (B100) for Middle Distillate Fuels," ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, 2009, www.astm.org.

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2008. Guidance Document and Recommendations on the Types of Scientific Information to be Submitted by Applicants for California Fuels Environmental Multimedia Evaluations.

California Office of the Governor. 2006. Gov. Schwarzenegger Signs Landmark Legislation to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Retrieved April 2, 2008, from Office of the Governor: http://gov.ca.gov/index.php?/press-release/4111/ .

CalOAL (State of California Office of Administrative Law). 2010. The California Low Carbon Fuel Standard Regulation. Title 17, California Code of Regulations. Government Code Section 11349.3. OAL file number 2009-1125-05 S. A list of reports currently available from this program is available at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/low_carbon_fuel_standard/ .

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2008. *Climate Change Draft Scoping Plan.* Retrieved July 3, 2008, from California Air Resources Board: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/draftscopingplan.pdf .

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2009. Fuels Multimedia Evaluation. http://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/multimedia/multimedia.htm .

California Senate Bill 140. 2007. Christine Kehoe. 2007 Senate Rules Committee. http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/sen/sb_0101-0150/sb_140_cfa_20070601_154941_sen_floor.html

CEC (California Energy Comission). 2007. A Low-Carbon Fuel Standard for California Part 1: Technical Analysis. Available at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/low_carbon_fuel_standard/UC_LCFS_study_Part_1-FINAL.pdf.

Chesnow, Howard. 2008. Personal communication. Fuel Quality Systems Group. Corporation.

Clark N. 2008. Virgin Atlantic Plans a Biofuel Flight, The New York Times, January 15, 2008.

DeMello, J. A., C. A. Carmichael, E. E. Peacock, R. K. Nelson, J. S. Arey, C.M. Reddy. 2007. Biodegradation and environmental behavior of biodiesel mixtures in the sea: an initial study. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*;54:894–904.

Donnis B, RG Egeberg, P. Blom, KG Knudson. 2009. Hydroprocessing of Bio-Oils and Oxygenates to Hydrocarbons. Understanding the Reaction Routes. Top Catal 52:229–240

Elliot, D., & Baker, E. 1988. *Catalytic hydrotreating processes for upgrading biocrude oils.* Richland: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Elliot, D. 2007. Historical Developments in Hydroprocessing Bio-oils . *Energy Fuels* , 1792 - 1815.

Fanick, E. R. 2008. Fuel and Fuel Additive Registration Testing for Neste Oil Corporation – Final Report. SwRI Project No. 03.13200rev., May 2008. Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas.

Fanick, E. R. 2009. Fuel and Fuel Additive Registration Testing for Kern Oil and Refining Co. – Final Report. SwRI Project No. 03.14904, July 2009. Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas.

Federal Record. 2005. One Hundred and Ninth Congress of the United States of America. Energy Policy Act of 2005. Washington D.C. 2005. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109_cong_bills&docid=f:h6enr.txt.pdf

Federal Register. 2007. 40 CFR Part 80. Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Renewable Fuel Standard Programs; Final Rule. Vol 72, No. 83, May 1, 2007/ Rules and Regulations. http://www.epa.gov/otaq/renewablefuels/rfs-finalrule.pdf

Fitzgerald, P. 2008. Oil Chemistry. (Personal communication via interview with D. Patten at UC Davis, July 23, 2008.

Gartner, S. O., G. H. Helms, G. Reinharft, and N. Rettenmaier. 2006. An Assessment of Energy and Greenhouse Gases of NExBTL. Final Report. Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Heidelberg, Germany. June, 2006.

Gary J, Handwek, G and Kaiser, M. 2007. Petroleum Refining. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Goodband, T. J. 2005. NExBTL Biodiesel: Acute Toxicity to *Daphnia magna.* SafePharm Laboratories Limited, Shardlow, Derbyshire, UK. SPL Project Number 2106/004.

Goodband, T. J. 2006. NExBTL Biodiesel: Acute Toxicity to Rainbow Trout (*Onchorynchus mykiss).* SafePharm Laboratories Limited, Shardlow, Derbyshire, UK. SPL Project Number 2106/0009.

Hilber, T., E. Ahn, M. Mittelbach, and E. Schmidt. 2007. "Animal Fats Perform Well in Biodiesel.", *Render Magazine*, February 2007.

Huber, G.W., P. O'Connor, A. Corma 2007.Processing biomass in conventional oil refineries: production of high quality diesel by hydrotreating vegetable oils in heavy vacuum oil mixtures. *Appl Catal A Gen*;329:120–9.

Huo, H.; Wang, M.; Bloyd, C.; Putsche, V. 2008a. *Life-Cycle Assessment of Energy and Greenhouse Gas Effects of Soybean-Derived Biodiesel and Renewable Fuels*; ANL/ESD/08-2; Argonne National Laboratory.

Huo, H, Wang, M, Bloyd, C, and Putsche, V. 2008b. *Life-Cycle Assessment of Energy and Greenhouse Gas Effects of Soybean-Derived Biodiesel and Renewable Fuels, Environmental Science and Technology*, 43:750-756.

Internal Revenue Service. 2010. Form 8864. Biodiesel and Renewable Diesel Fuels Credit. Notice 2007-37. http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-drop/n-07-37.pdf

Irwin, L. 2007. Additive Adjustment. Biodiesel Magazine, May 2007. www.biodieselmagazine.com .

Jessen, H. 2007. Waving the Palm Branch, *Biodiesel Magazine*, February 2007. http://www.biodieselmagazine.com/article.jsp?article_id=1433

Johnson, B. 2007. Increasing Use of Biodiesel could Fuel Canola Explosion, *SeedQuest News*, California Farm Bureau Federation. March 2007.

Kaffka, Stephen. 2007. Oral Communication. July 17, 2007.

Kalnes, T., T. Marker, and D. Shonnard. 2007. Green Diesel: A Second Generation Biofuel. *International Journal of Chemical Reactor Engineering*, **5**:A48. Available at: http://www.bepress.com/ijcre/vol5/A48.

Kalnes T.N., K.P. Koers T. Marker, D. R. Shonnard. 2009. A technoeconomic and environmental life cycle comparison of green diesel to biodiesel and syndiesel. *Environ Prog Sustain Energy* 28:111–20.

Kantor J, 2008. Europe May Ban Imports of Some Biofuel Crops, The New York Times, January 15, 2008.

Kaufman, J. 2007. *Conoco-Phillips Renewable Diesel*, presented to SAE Government/Industry Meeting, May 15, 2007.

Kemp, W. 2006. Biodiesel Basics and Beyond, Aztext Press, Ontario 2006.

Knothe, G. 2010. Biodiesel and renewable diesel: A comparison, *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 36(2010):364-373.

Knothe G. and K. R. Steidley. 2005. Lubricity of components of biodiesel and petrodiesel. The origin of biodiesel lubricity. *Energy Fuels*;19:1192–200.

Lapinskiene, A., P. Martinkus, and V. Rebzdaite. 2005. Exo-toxicological studies of diesel and biodiesel fuels in aerated soil, *Environmental Pollution*, 142: 432 – 437.

Liu, Z, Zheng, Y, Wang, W, Zhang, Q, and Jia, L. 2008. Simulation of hydrotreating of light cycle oil with a system dynamics model. *Applied Catalysis*, 209–220.

Madden, MC. 2008. *Experimental and Toxicologic Pathology* **60**:135–140.

Mag, T. 1983. Canola Oil Processing in Canada. Toronto: Canada Packers Inc. Research Center.

Marker, T, Petri, J, Kalnes, T, McCall, M, Mackowiak, D, Jerosky, B. 2005. Opportunities for biorenewables in oil refineries. Des Plaines: UOP LLC.

Max, Arthur. 2007. Palm Oil's Luster Fades on Biofuel Scene, *USA Today*. http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/2007-04-01-palmoil_N.htm

Mullaney, T. 2005. Acute Oral Toxicity of NExBTL Biodiesel in the Rat – Acute Toxic Class Method. SafePharm Laboratories Limited, Shardlow, Derbyshire, UK. SPL Project Number 2106/002.

NRC (National Research Council). 2009. *Hidden Costs of Energy: Unpriced Consequences of*

Nunes PP (1984) Ph.D. Thesis: ''Hydrocraquage de l'huile de soja sur des catalyseurs au rhodium et au ruthenium supportes''.Universite´ Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris.

Petrucci, R, Harwood, W, and Herring, F. 2002. *General Chemistry*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Phillips Petroleum. 2002. MSDS Summary Sheet for No. 2 Diesel Fuel.

RIVM. 1994. *Uniform System for the Evaluation of Substances (Uses), Version 1.0. Rep. VROM Distribution No. 11144/150*, National Institute of Public Health and Environmental Protection

(RIVM); Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment (VROM); Ministry of Welfare, Health, and Cultural Affairs (WVC), The Hague, the Netherlands.

Rohm and Haas. 1999. Product literature, Publication number BIO.KFPI.5GENECAL.TB.

Rosenthal E, 2007. Once a Dream Fuel, Palm Oil May Be an Eco-Nightmare, The New York Times, January 31, 2007. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/31/business/worldbusiness/31biofuel.html?pagewanted=1

Rothe, D., Lorenz, J., Lammermann, R., Jacobi, E., Rantanen, L., and Linnaila, R. 2005. New BTL Diesel Reduces Effectively Emissions of a Modern Heavy Duty Engine. Fortum Oil Oy.

Searchinger, T., R. Heimlich, R.A. Houghton, F. Dong, A. Elobeid, J. Fabiosa, S. Tokgoz, D. Hayes, and T.H. Yu. 2008, "Use of U.S. Croplands for Biofuels Increases Greenhouse Gases through Emissions from Land Use Change," *Sciencexpress*, available at www.sciencexpress.org, Feb. 7.

Thompson, P. W. 2005. Reverse Mutation Assay "Ames Test" Using *Salmonella tryphimurim.* SafePharm Laboratories Limited, Shardlow, Derbyshire, UK. SPL Project Number 2106/003.

US DOE (Department of Energy). 2010. Alternative Fuels and Advanced Vehicles Data Center. http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/fuels/emerging_green_benefits.html.

US (United States) DA (Department of Agriculture) and U.S. DOE (Department of Energy). 1998. An Overview of Biodiesel and Petroleum Diesel Life Cycles, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, NREL/TP-580-24772, May, 1998.

US EPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency). 2007. Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Renewable Fuel Standard Program. Summary of Analysis and Comments. Chapter 3, Types of Renewable Fuels. EPA-420-R-07-006, April 2007.

US EPA. 2010a. Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2) Regulatory Impact Analysis. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA-420-R-10-006, February 2010.

US EPA. 2010b. Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2) Summary and Analysis of Comments. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA-420-R-10-003, February 2010.

US EPA. 2010c. Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Changes to Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Final Rule. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA–HQ–OAR–2005–0161; FRL–9112–3, March 26, 2010.

US EPA. 2010d. Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives:Modifications to Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Final Rule and Proposed Rule. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA–HQ–OAR–2005–0161; FRL–9147–6, May 10, 2010.

Unnasch, S., B. Riffel, L. Waterland and C. Loreti. 2010. Evaluation of the Environmental Protection Agency Treatment of Life Cycle Assessment in the Renewable Fuel Standard Rulemaking. Life Cycle Associates. LCA.8009.21PES.2009.

Van Gerpen, J., E. Hammond, L. Johnson, S. Marley, L. Yu, I. Lee, and A. Monyem. 1996. *Determining the Influence of Contaminants on Biodiesel Properties*, Iowa State University.

Van Gerpen, J. 2004. Business Management for Biodiesel Producers, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, NREL/SR-510-36242, July, 2004. http://www1.eere.energy.gov/biomass/pdfs/36242.pdf

Vogel, C. (2010) Inflammatory response to assess toxicity of biodiesel emissions samples. Powerpoint presentation at the ARB Biodiesel and Renewable Diesel Multimedia Evaluation Public Meeting, Sacramento, December 8, 2010.

Vryenhoef, H. 2005. NExBTL Biodiesel: Algal Inhibition Test. SafePharm Laboratories Limited, Shardlow, Derbyshire, UK. SPL Project Number 2106/005.

Wang, M., and Z. Haq. 2008. Letter to *Science*, March 14, 2008. Available at: http://www.transportation.anl.gov/pdfs/letter_to_science_anldoe_03_14_08.pdf.

Wedel, R. 1999. Technical Handbook for Marine Biodiesel, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, DE-AC36-83CH10093, April, 1999.

Wright, N. P. 2007. Chromosome Aberration Test in Human Lymphocytes *In Vitro.* SafePharm Laboratories Limited, Shardlow, Derbyshire, UK. SPL Project Number 2106/0008.

Young, S. 2008. California charts course to fight global warming. Retrieved July 3, 2008, from California Air Resources Board: http://www.arb.ca.gov/newsrel/nr062608.htm .

11. Appendices

11.1. Appendix A: ASTM D975-09b Standard Property Descriptions for Diesel Fuel Oils

Flash Point
This is the minimum temperature at which the fuel ignites on application of an ignition source; it has no direct relationship to engine performance but instead indicates the level of fire safety (Test Methods D 93, D 3828, or D 56)(ASTM 2009).

Water and Sediment
These are primarily considered as post-production parameters since fuel most commonly comes into contact with water and sediment during storage.

Sediment "may consist of suspended rust and dirt particles or it may originate from the fuel as insoluble compounds formed during fuel oxidation" (Van Gerpen et al., 2004). These sediments can cause fuel filter plugging problems (Test Method D 2709 for all fuel grades except D-4 which requires Test Method D 1796)(ASTM 2009).

Distillation
Distillation is a measure of the volatility of a fuel. "The fuel volatility requirements depend on engine design, size, nature of speed and load variations." Note that heavier fuels will provide the best fuel economy due to having greater heat content (Test Method D 86 or D 2887)(ASTM 2009).

Kinematic Viscosity
It is important to designate a minimum viscosity, as there can be issues of power loss due to injection pump and injector leakage when fuels with low viscosity are used. Likewise, a maximum viscosity must be met for considerations involved in engine design, size, and characteristics of the injection system (Test Method D 445)(ASTM, 2009).

Ash
The ash content describes the amount of inorganic contaminants such as abrasive solids and soluble metallic soaps. "These can contribute to injector, fuel pump, piston and ring wear, engine deposits", and filter plugging (Test Method D 482)(ASTM 2009).

Sulfur
Limits have been placed on sulfur content for environmental reasons. The limits for Grade S15, Grade S500, and Grade S5000 indicate a limit of 15 ppm, 500 ppm and 5000 ppm of sulfur content, respectively. Note: "other sulfur limits can apply in selected areas in the United States and in other countries" (Test Methods D 129, D 1266, D 1552, D 2622, D 3120, D 4294, or D 5453)(ASTM 2009). In California, the California Air and Resource Board has set the sulfur content for diesel fuels at 15 ppm or less (ULSD).

Copper Strip Corrosion Rating
This is a test to measure the presence of acids or sulfur-containing compounds in the fuel. A copper strip is immersed in the fuel to determine the level of corrosion that would occur if diesel came in contact with metals such as copper, brass, or bronze. Grade 4-D does not have a copper corrosion requirement. (D 130)(ASTM 2009).

Cetane Number
The cetane number is a measure of the ignition quality of the fuel. To obtain the highest fuel availability, the cetane number should be as low as possible; otherwise fuel will be ignited too

quickly. For diesel fuels, a minimum cetane number of 40 is recommended, except for grade 4-D which is 30 (D 613 or D 6890)(ASTM 2009).

Cetane Index
"Cetane Index is a specified as a limitation on the amount of high aromatic components in Grades No. 1-D S15, No. 1-D S500, No. 2-D S15 and No. 2-D S500." The index for all four mentioned grades is 40. Note that it is required that either the cetane index or the aromaticity be met. Grades 1-D S 5000 and 2-D S 5000 and 4-D do not have aromatic content requirements (Test Method D 976-80) (ASTM 2009).

Aromaticity
Aromatics content is significant since it is important to "prevent an increase in the average aromatics content in Grades No. 1-D S15, No. 1-D S500, No 2-D S15 and No. 2-D S500 fuels" since they have a negative impact on emissions. For diesel fuels, the maximum percent volume of aromatics is 35. Grades 1-D S 5000 and 2-D S 5000 and 4-D do not have aromatic content requirements (Test Method D 1319(ASTM 2009).

Operability Requirements
Operability temperature limits for Grades No. 1-D S500, No. 1-D S5000, No. 2-D S500, and No. 2-DS5000 may be estimated by a Low Temperature Flow Test, and Cold Filter Plugging Point Test. Note that satisfactory operability below the cloud point may be achieved depending on use of flow-improver additives, equipment design, and operating conditions. Note that it is "unrealistic to specify low temperature properties that will ensure satisfactory operation at all ambient conditions" (ASTM 2009).

Cloud Point
This is an important property as it "defines the temperature at which a cloud or haze of wax crystals appears in the oil [and] relates to the temperature at which wax crystals begin to precipitate from the oil in use". Petroleum based diesel fuel generally has a low cloud point as it is not as susceptible to cold temperatures. There is currently no cloud point specification for diesel (Test methods D 5771, D5772, D5773, or D 2500)(ASTM 2009).

Carbon Residue
"Carbon residue is a measure of carbon depositing tendencies of a fuel oil when heated under prescribed conditions". This property is an approximation since it is not directly correlated with engine deposits. For diesel fuels Grades No. 1-D S15, S500, S5000, the residue maximum is 0.15% mass, whereas for Grades No. 2-D S15, S500, S5000, it is 0.35% mass (Test Method D 524). Note that there is no standard for Grade No. 4-D (ASTM 2009).

Lubricity
In some cases, diesel fuel may have insufficient lubricating properties that can negatively impact the operability of diesel fuel injection systems. This occurs due to by "low viscosity and lack of sufficient quantities of trace components that have an affinity for surfaces". Experts agree that lubricity values above 600 microns may not prevent operability issues, whereas fuels with less than 450 microns should have satisfactory lubricity. The standard for diesel fuels is a maximum of 520 microns for an HFFR test at 60°C (Test Method D 6079)(ASTM 2009).

11.2. Appendix B: Renewable Diesel Additive Chemicals

Figure B-1: Common Antioxidants.



Table B-1. Commercial Biodiesel Antioxidants**.**

Manufacturer	Product Name	Chemical Components	%
Albemarle	Ethanox 4737	2,6 di-t-butylphenol 2,4,6 tri-tert butylphenol 2-tert-butylphenol Phenol Naptha Petroleum	52.5% 10.5% 7% 1.1% 25-30% 2%
Biofuel Systems	Baynox	2,6 di-tert-butyl-4-methylphenol	20%
Chemiphase	AllClear	Methyl Alcohol	18-24%
Eastman Chemical	Bioextend30	2-tert-butylhydroquinone Butyle acetate Diethylene glycol monobutyl ether	20% 30% 30%
Eastman Chemical	Tenox 21	Tertiary butylhydroquinone	20%
Lubrizol	8471U	Butylated phenol	70-79%

Source: Company MSDSs and Product Data Sheets

Figure B-2. Lubrizol Corporation Cold Flow Additive Chemicals*.



*Data from Chor et al., 2000. Lubrizol cold-flow additives are formulated for all diesel fuels and can be used with standard diesel and biodiesel formulations.

Table B-2. Commercial Cold Flow Additives.

Manufacturer	Product Name	Chemical Components	%
Biofuel Systems	Wintron XC30	Toluene	2%
Chemiphase	Coldflow 350	Toluene	2%
Hammonds	ColdFlo	Vinyl copolymer in hydrocarbon solvent Naptha	N/A 40-70%
Lubrizol	FloZol502	Copolymer Ester Toluene	N/A 2%
Lubrizol	FlowZol503	Naptha Napthalene Trimetheyl Benzene Ethylbenzene Alkylphenol Xylene	40-49% 4.4% 1.4.9% 1.6% 5-9.9% 6.4%

Source: Company MSDSs and Product Data Sheets

Table B-3. Commercial Biocides.

Manufacturer	Product Name	Chemical Components	%
Chemiphase	AllKlear, FilterClear	Sodium dodecyclbenzene sulfonate	2-32%
FPPF Chemical	Kill-Em	Disodium ethylenebisdithiocarbamate Sodium dimethyldithiocarbamate Ethylene thiourea	15% 15% 1%
Hammonds	Biobor JF	Naptha 2,2-(1-methyltrimethylenedioxy)bis-(4-methyl-1,3,2 dioxyborinane; 2,2,oxybis(4,4,6-trimethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborinane) [Substituted dioxaborinanes]	4.5% 95%
Power Serve Products	Bio-Kleen	4-(2-nitrobutyl)-morpholine 4,4, (2-ethyl-2-nitrotrimethylene)-dimorpholine Methylene dimorpholine Morpholine 1-Nitropropane	76-85% 2-7% 3.9-6.5% 3-6% .3-5.3%
Rohm and Haas	Kathon FP 1.5	Magnesium nitrate 5-chloro-2-methyl-4-isothiazol-3-one 2-methyl-4-isothiazol-3-one	1-2.5% 1-2.5% To 1 mix
Star Brite Corp	Biodiesel Biocide	Sodium dimethyldithiocarbamate Ethylenedimine Dimethylamine Ethylene thiourea Nabam	15-20.2% 0.0-0.75% 0.0-0.75 0-1.0% 15-20%

Table C-4. NOx Reduction.

Manufacturer	Product Name	Chemical Components	%
Clean Diesel Technologies	Aris2000 Injection system	Urea or Ammonia injected into exhaust	N/A
Oryxe	LED for biodiesel (and diesel)	2-ethylhexyl nitrate Toluene	45% w/w 45-55 w/w
Viscon USA	Viscon	Polyisobutylene (Polyalphaolefin) Polymer	5%