



Absorption of CO₂ in Biogas with Amine Solution for Biomethane Enrichment

Wassana Kamopas*, Attakorn Asanakham & Tanongkiat Kiatsiriroat

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering,
Chiang Mai University, 239, Huay Kaew Road, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand
*E-mail: ic41062@hotmail.com

Abstract. Biogas upgrading with carbon dioxide absorption in a column of monoethanolamine (MEA) solution was carried out. The effects of controlled parameters on the CO₂ absorption such as gas flow rate, solution concentration, height to diameter ratio of the column were considered. High CH₄ concentration could be achieved at low gas flow rate and high MEA concentration. The CH₄ concentration could be up from 70-75% to 92-95% by volume for 0.2 M MEA. A set of breakthrough curves was obtained to determine the absorption characteristics, such as the absorption constant (k), the absorption time when the CO₂ concentration at the outlet was 50% of the concentration at the inlet (τ), and the absorption period (t^*) when the CH₄ concentration was over 90%. An empirical equation of the methane enrichment with the related parameters was developed.

Keywords: *amine solution; biogas; biomethane enrichment; CO₂ absorption; monoethanolamine (MEA).*

1 Introduction

Biogas mainly consists of 40-70% methane (CH₄) and 30-60% carbon dioxide (CO₂) by volume [1]. Since the proportion of CO₂ is relatively high it causes corrosive effects on some parts of the biogas equipment and decreases the gas heating value [1,2]. Several techniques can be used for CO₂ separation from biogas such as physical absorption, chemical absorption, pressure swing absorption, membrane technologies and cryogenic separation. The advantages and disadvantages of each process are shown in Table 1.

Several researchers have studied CO₂ absorption with amine solutions. Tippayawong and Thanompongchart [3] experimentally investigated chemical absorption of CO₂ and H₂S from biogas by aqueous solutions, calcium hydroxide (Ca(OH)₂), sodium hydroxide (NaOH) and monoethanolamine (MEA) in a packed column. The results showed that the aqueous solutions were effective in removing CO₂ from the biogas (> 90% removal efficiency), creating enriched CH₄ fuel. H₂S was also removed and the value was below the detection limit. Lin, *et al.* [4] studied the absorption of carbon dioxide by amine solutions,

Received December 10th, 2015, 1st Revision April 28th, 2016, 2nd Revision May 20th, 2016, Accepted for publication May 25th, 2016.

Copyright ©2016 Published by ITB Journal Publisher, ISSN: 2337-5779, DOI: 10.5614/j.eng.technol.sci.2016.48.2.9

monoethanolamine and tertiary N-methyldiethanolamine in a packed column. The CO₂ absorption characteristics of these two amines were experimentally examined under various operating conditions. The results showed that an increase in the absorption rate was due to an increase of the inlet CO₂ concentration or gas flow rate, which shortened the absorption period. An increase in the amine concentration enhanced the amount of CO₂ absorption.

Table 1 Advantages and disadvantages of CO₂ separation with different methods [2].

Item	PSA	Water Scrubbing	MEA	Membrane
Separation Method	Adsorption	Physical process	Chemical process	Membrane separation
Cleaning	Necessary	Unnecessary	Necessary	Necessary
Pressure (bar)	7-4	7-4	Atmosphere	16-40
Methane loss	10-3%	1-2%	< 0.1%	-
Methane concentration	> 96%	> 97%	> 99%	90-94%
Operating temperature (k)	Normal	Normal	373	Normal
Regeneration ability	Yes	Yes	Yes	-
Energy consumption in regeneration process	Moderate	Moderate	High	-

Bonenfant, *et al.* [5] studied carbon dioxide absorption with various amine solutions. The absorption solutions were a series of aqueous 5 % wt ammonia, monoethanolamine, triethanolamine, triethylamine, pyridine, pyrrolidine, 2-(2-aminoethylamino) ethanol, and N-(2-aminoethyl)-1,3-propanediamine solutions. The results showed that the CO₂ absorption efficiencies of the 5 % wt monoethanolamine and pyrrolidine solutions were lower than those of the aqueous 2-(2-aminoethylamino) ethanol, N-(2-aminoethyl)-1,3-propanediamine and triethanolamine solutions, but the use of monoethanolamine may present a certain advantage due to its acceptable regeneration capacity.

In addition, Conway, *et al.* [6] and Kim, *et al.* [7] studied CO₂ absorption and the absorption mechanism using aqueous amine blended solutions. Blended solutions of monoethanolamine with 2-amino-2-methyl-1-propanol and N, N-dimethylethanolamine with N, N-diethyl ethanolamine were used and their absorption behavior was compared to that of a standalone monoethanolamine solution. The results showed that absorption capacities of the blended solutions were similar to that of the standalone MEA solution [6]. The blended solutions of monoethanolamine with piperazine, monoethanolamine with 2-amino-aminoethylethanolamine and mono ethanolamine with diethylenetetramine improved the CO₂ capturing capability of the monoethanolamine compared to the standalone monoethanolamine solution, while 2-methyl-1-propanol and diethanolamine decreased the performance of the monoethanolamine [7].

A monoethanolamine (MEA) solution can also be used to capture CO₂ for biogas purification. When the solution is saturated, a regeneration process is needed, after which the regenerated MEA can be reused in the next cycle for biomethane enrichment [8].

In this study, CO₂ separation from biogas to get biomethane by MEA solution was carried out. The parameters that affect carbon dioxide absorption from the MEA solution, i.e. biogas flow rate, monoethanolamine and carbon dioxide concentrations and reactor size, were considered.

2 Methodology

2.1 Carbon dioxide Absorption


Separation of CO₂ from CH₄ is an important process in many areas, such as natural gas processing, biogas purification, enhanced oil recovery and flue gas treatment [9].

CO₂ absorption using an MEA solution is a popular method of CO₂ separation used by industries. In this study, CO₂ absorption from biogas with MEA in a bubbly flow column was carried out. The effects of biogas flow rate, MEA concentration, and height to diameter ratio of the flow column on CO₂ absorption were investigated. The characteristic absorption time (τ) and the absorption constant (k) were analyzed using the CO₂ absorption breakthrough curves.


2.2 Carbon dioxide Characteristics [3,4,10,11]

Amine solutions are the chemicals usually used for CO₂ absorption [10]. The chemical reaction equations of CO₂ sorption and desorption with amine are as follows:

CO₂ sorption:



CO₂ desorption:



CO₂ can be dissolved in an alkaline or an amine solution. The reaction depends strongly on pH, liquid solution and CO₂ concentration, and other factors [3]. The process of CO₂ absorption from biogas with MEA in a bubbly flow column is depicted in Figure 1.




Figure 1 The overall mass balances at the reactor.

In this study, the reaction took place in the liquid phase with controlled input conditions, i.e. gas flow rate, solution concentration and height to diameter ratio (H/D). With the bubbly gas flow in the column, the fluid in the column can be treated as lumped, which means that heat, mass and momentum transfer in each section of the column are almost negligible.

The breakthrough curve of the mole fraction of CO₂ at the outlet and the inlet over time is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2 Breakthrough curve of CO₂ absorption process [11].

The mole of absorbed CO₂ with mole of CO₂ at the column inlet can be denoted as:

$$A = 1 - \frac{C}{C_i} \quad (3)$$

The removal rate of CO₂ by absorption can be expressed as [3]:

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = +kA(1 - A). \quad (4)$$

After integration, we get:

$$\ln\left(\frac{A(1 - A_o)}{A_o(1 - A)}\right) = k(\tau - t). \quad (5)$$

The equation can be rearranged as:

$$t = \frac{1}{k} \ln\left(\frac{C}{C_i - C}\right) + \tau \quad (6)$$

From the above equation, it can be seen that the solution should be saturated with CO₂ after a period of 2τ .

3 Experiment

The experimental apparatus is shown in Figure 3. The unit consisted of 1) gas distributor; 2) gas flow meter (in the range of 1-10 liter/min (LPM)); 3) bubble column (acrylic cylinder with height to diameter ratios of 1.4, 3.3 and 6.5 (the height to diameter ratios were 28.0:20.0, 49.5:15.0 and 78.0:12.0, respectively – all units in cm); 4) dehumidifier (silica gel); 5) gas flow distributor set (porous medium packing, regularly arranged at the bottom of the tested MEA solution column).




Figure 3 Schematic sketch of the CO₂ absorption experimental setup.

The biogas used in this experiment was obtained from a 300-m³ biogas pond (120 m³/day) of a swine farm at Mae Hia Agricultural Research, Demonstrative and Training Center, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai and kept in a high pressure storage. In the experiment, the biogas from the storage was fed continuously at the bottom of the tested MEA solution column. The gas flowed through a porous nozzle to create a uniform bubbly gas flow (the bubble diameter was in the range of 1.5-3 mm). Fine bubbles generate a high interaction area, so CO₂ absorption can be performed effectively. The gas flow rate was controlled by a gas flow meter.

In the experiment, biogas consisting of 70-75% CH₄ and around 30-25% CO₂ (other components such as N₂ and H₂S were less than 0.5% and were neglected) with various flow rates (1, 3 and 5 liter/min) were fed through an 8 liter column of 0.05, 0.1 and 0.2 M (molar) MEA solution. The inlet biogas flow rate and the inlet CO₂ and CH₄ concentrations in the biogas were kept constant during every experimental test. The collected experimental data of CO₂ and CH₄ concentrations in the biogas entering and exiting the column were continuously monitored (Biogas Check Analyzer from Geotechnical Instruments, Ltd., United Kingdom). The absorption characteristics, i.e. the absorption constant and the characteristic absorption time, were considered.

4 Results and Discussion

From the experiment it could be seen that the MEA solution could absorb CO₂ from the biogas effectively, which resulted in a high percentage of CH₄ in the outlet gas. The outlet CH₄ concentration over time with a solution concentration of 0.2 M; biogas flow rate at 1, 3 and 5 liter/min; height to diameter ratio of the column at 1.4, 3.3 and 6.5; and inlet CO₂ concentration at 25-30 % are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4 The outlet methane concentration over time. MEA concentration of 0.2 M, inlet biogas flow rates of 1, 3 and 5 liter/min (LPM), and column height to diameter ratios of 1.4, 3.3 and 6.5 – (a) H/D = 1.4 (b) H/D = 3.3 (c) H/D = 6.5.

From Figure 4, for all column sizes, a low biogas flow rate and a high MEA concentration, the MEA could absorb CO₂ effectively and a high biomethane concentration at the outlet was obtained. The maximum CH₄ concentration was up to 92-95 % with a 0.2 M concentration and up to more than 95% with a high height to diameter ratio and a low biogas flow rate. The absorption performance tended to decrease with time since the solution was close to the saturation point. It can be noted that low concentration solutions, such as 0.05 M of MEA, could not absorb CO₂ effectively since the maximum CH₄ concentration was less than 90% by volume.

The percentage of CH₄ at the outlet depended on the result of CO₂ absorption in the solution. The proportion of outlet/inlet CO₂ concentration over time is shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5 Proportion of outlet/inlet CO₂ concentration over time. MEA concentration of 0.2 M, inlet gas flow rates of 1, 3 and 5 liter/min (LPM) and height to diameter ratios of 1.4, 3.3 and 6.5 – (a) H/D = 1.4 (b) H/D = 3.3 (c) H/D = 6.5.

A high biogas flow rate will shorten the absorption period. When considering the height to diameter ratio (H/D) of the CO₂ absorption column, it was found that the absorbed CO₂ ability increased with H/D since the contact time for CO₂ absorption was longer.

The kinetics of CO₂ absorption with various conditions were considered with the relation between operating time (min) with the value of $\ln\left(\frac{C}{C_i - C}\right)$ for CO₂

absorption as $t = \frac{1}{k} \ln\left(\frac{C}{C_i - C}\right) + \tau$. The absorption constant (k) and the characteristic absorption time when the CO₂ concentration at the outlet was 50% of the concentration at the inlet (τ) are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Kinetics of CO₂ absorption with MEA solution.

Item	Sol ^a Conc. (M)	H/D 1.4			H/D 3.3			H/D 6.5		
		Gas Flow Rate (liter/min)			Gas Flow Rate (liter/min)			Gas Flow Rate (liter/min)		
		1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5
$1/k$ (min)	0.05	5.30	5.12	5.07	3.68	2.66	2.55	3.57	2.52	2.36
	0.10	8.05	6.84	5.43	6.55	6.22	4.27	5.99	3.77	3.37
	0.20	16.03	8.33	6.35	12.83	8.08	6.24	11.43	8.08	6.08
k (min ⁻¹)	0.05	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.27	0.38	0.39	0.28	0.40	0.42
	0.10	0.12	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.16	0.23	0.17	0.27	0.30
	0.20	0.06	0.12	0.16	0.08	0.12	0.16	0.09	0.12	0.16
τ (min)	0.05	15.76	9.12	5.52	19.85	10.63	8.61	26.14	13.36	9.71
	0.10	38.81	19.74	13.71	41.43	19.96	14.42	49.94	33.73	17.62
	0.20	69.73	35.23	25.77	74.84	36.74	27.18	81.82	42.90	32.95

From the kinetics result, it was found that the CO₂ absorption capability by our technique was rather high. The absorption constant (k) in this study at a solution concentration of 0.1 M, H/D ratio of 6.5 and a gas flow rate of 1 liter/min was 0.17 min⁻¹, which is higher than that reported in the literature (0.04 min⁻¹) [3].

From Table 2, the characteristic absorption time when the CO₂ concentration at the outlet was 50% of the concentration at the inlet (τ , min) was related with solution concentration (SC), gas flow rate (GFR), height to diameter ratio (H/D) and biogas concentration (BC). The τ value can be formulated as

$$\tau = 0.60725 \frac{SC^{0.95977} \left(\frac{H}{D}\right)^{0.19723} BC^{1.4457}}{GFR^{0.62927}} \quad (7)$$

where $0.05 \leq SC \leq 0.2$ M, $1.4 \leq \frac{H}{D} \leq 6.5$, $70 \leq BC \leq 75$ % by volume and $1 \leq GFR \leq 5$ liter/min.




Figure 6 Characteristic absorption time when the CO₂ concentration at the outlet was 50% of the concentration at the inlet comparing the correlation and the experimental results.

A comparison of the characteristic absorption time when the CO₂ concentration at the outlet was 50% of the concentration at the inlet (τ , min) from the experimental data with those from Equation (7) are shown in Figure 6. The result showed that 96.3% of the experimental data was consistent with the simulation data within \pm .%15

In addition, the absorption period (t^* , min) during which the CH₄ concentration was more than 90% can be formulated as:

$$t^* = 0.6286 \frac{SC^{1.0832} \left(\frac{H}{D}\right)^{0.33225} BC^{1.3899}}{GFR^{0.78285}} \quad (8)$$

where $0.1 \leq SC \leq 0.2$ M, $1.4 \leq \frac{H}{D} \leq 6.5$, $70 \leq BC \leq 75$ % by volume and $1 \leq GFR \leq 5$ liter/min.

A comparison of the absorption period (t^* , min) from the experimental data with that from Equation (8) is shown Figure 7. The result shows that 94.4% of the experimental data was consistent with the simulation data within \pm .%15




Figure 7 Comparison of the simulated absorption period (t^*) with the experimental data where the CH₄ concentration was over 90%.

5 Conclusion

For biogas upgrading, biogas of 70-75% CH₄ and 30-25% CO₂ was fed continuously through a column containing MEA solution. The effects of controlled parameters on the absorbed CO₂, i.e. gas flow rate, solution concentration, height to diameter ratio of the column, were measured. The CH₄ concentration was up to 92-95% by volume. With a high height to diameter ratio and a low biogas flow rate, a high absorption rate could be achieved. For low concentration solutions such as 0.05 M of MEA, the solution could not

absorb CO₂ effectively since the maximum CH₄ concentration was less than 90% by volume. The characteristic absorption time when the CO₂ concentration at the outlet was 50% of the concentration at the inlet (τ) with the related parameters was formulated in the form of

$$\tau = 0.60725 \frac{SC^{0.95977} \left(\frac{H}{D}\right)^{0.19723} BC^{1.4457}}{GFR^{0.62927}}.$$

The absorption period (t^*) during which the CH₄ concentration was over 90% can be formulated as

$$t^* = 0.6286 \frac{SC^{1.0832} \left(\frac{H}{D}\right)^{0.33225} BC^{1.3899}}{GFR^{0.78285}}.$$

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the Energy Policy and Planning Office, Ministry of Energy, Thailand, Center of Excellence for Renewable Energy, Chiang Mai University and the Office of the Higher Education Commission, Thailand, under the National Research University Project for the funding. Our gratitude is also extended to the Graduate School, the Faculty of Engineering and the Science and Technology Research Institute (STRI), Chiang Mai University for their support and the testing facilities.

Nomenclature

- A Mole of absorbed CO₂ with mole of CO₂ at the column inlet
- C Mole fraction of outlet CO₂ compared to that of inlet biogas
- C_i Mole fraction of inlet CO₂ compared to that of biogas at the initial time
- k The absorption constant
- t* The absorption period where the CH₄ concentration is over 90%
- τ The characteristic absorption time when CO₂ concentration at the outlet is 50% of the concentration at the inlet

Reference

- [1] Ramaraj, R. & Dussadee, N., *Biological Purification Processes for Biogas Using Algae Cultures: A Review*, International Journal of Sustainable and Green Energy, **4**(1-1), pp. 20-32, 2015.
- [2] ERDI, *Biogas Upgrading for Biomethane Production*. Research Report, Energy Research and Development Institute Nakornping, offer to Energy Policy and Planning Office, Ministry of Energy, Thailand, 2010.

- [3] Tippayawong, N. & Thanompongchart, P., *Biogas Quality Upgrade by Simultaneous Removal of CO₂ and H₂S in a Packed Column Reactor*, Energy, **35**(12), pp. 4531-4535, 2010.
- [4] Lin, S.H. & Shyu, C.T., *Performance Characteristics and Modeling of Carbon Dioxide Absorption by Amines in a packed column*, Waste Manage, **19**(4), pp. 255-262, 1999.
- [5] Bonenfant, D., Mimeault, M. & Hausler, R., *Determination of the Structural Features of Distinct Amines Important for the Absorption of CO₂ and Regeneration in Aqueous Solution*, Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, **42**(14), pp. 3179-3184, 2003.
- [6] Conway, W., Bruggink, S., Beyad, Y., Luo, W., Melián-Cabrera, I., Puxty, G. & Feron, P., *CO₂ Absorption into Aqueous Amine Blended Solutions Containing Monoethanolamine (MEA), N,N-dimethyl ethanolamine (DMEA), N,N-diethylethanolamine (DEEA) and 2-amino-2-methyl-1-propanol (AMP) for Post-Combustion Capture Processes*, Chemical Engineering Science, **126**, pp. 446-454, 2015.
- [7] Kim, S., Shi, H. & Lee, J.Y., *CO₂ Absorption Mechanism in Amine Solvents and Enhancement of CO₂ Capture Capability in Blended Amine Solvent*, International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, **45**, pp. 181-188, 2016.
- [8] Ryckebosch, E., Drouillon, M. & Vervaeren, H., *Techniques for Transformation of Biogas to Biomethane*, Biomass and Bioenergy, **35**(5), pp. 1633-1645, 2011.
- [9] Atchariyawut, S., Jiraratananon, R. & Wang, R., *Separation of CO₂ from CH₄ by Using Gas-Liquid Membrane Contacting Process*, Journal of Membrane Science, **304**(1-2), pp. 163-172, 2007.
- [10] Filburn, T., Helble, J.J. & Weiss, R.A., *Development of Supported Ethanolamines and Modified Ethanolamines for CO₂ Capture*, Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, **44**, pp. 1542-1546, 2005.
- [11] Geankoplis, C.T., *Transport Processes and Separation Process Principle (includes unit operations)*, Prentice-Hall International: United States, 3rd edition, 2003.