

Ethanol effects on the fate and transport of gasoline constituents in the UK

ETHANOL EFFECTS ON THE FATE AND TRANSPORT OF GASOLINE CONSTITUENTS IN THE UK

1st edition

July 2012

Published by ENERGY INSTITUTE, LONDON The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003 Registered charity number 1097899 The Energy Institute (EI) is the leading chartered professional membership body supporting individuals and organisations across the energy industry. With a combined membership of over 14 000 individuals and 300 companies in 100 countries, it provides an independent focal point for the energy community and a powerful voice to engage business and industry, government, academia and the public internationally.

As a Royal Charter organisation, the EI offers professional recognition and sustains personal career development through the accreditation and delivery of training courses, conferences and publications and networking opportunities. It also runs a highly valued technical work programme, comprising original independent research and investigations, and the provision of EI technical publications to provide the international industry with information and guidance on key current and future issues.

The EI promotes the safe, environmentally responsible and efficient supply and use of energy in all its forms and applications. In fulfilling this purpose the EI addresses the depth and breadth of energy and the energy system, from upstream and downstream hydrocarbons and other primary fuels and renewables, to power generation, transmission and distribution to sustainable development, demand side management and energy efficiency. Offering learning and networking opportunities to support career development, the EI provides a home to all those working in energy, and a scientific and technical reservoir of knowledge for industry.

This publication has been produced as a result of work carried out within the Technical Team of the EI, funded by the EI's Technical Partners. The EI's Technical Work Programme provides industry with cost-effective, value-adding knowledge on key current and future issues affecting those operating in the energy sector, both in the UK and internationally.

For further information, please visit http://www.energyinst.org

The EI gratefully acknowledges the financial contributions towards the scientific and technical programme from the following companies

BG Group	Nexen
BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd	Premier Oil
BP Oil UK Ltd	RWE npower
Centrica	Saudi Aramco
Chevron	Shell UK Oil Products Limited
ConocoPhillips Ltd	Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd
EDF Energy	Statoil Hydro
ENI	Talisman Energy (UK) Ltd
E. ON UK	Total E&P UK plc
ExxonMobil International Ltd	Total UK Limited
Kuwait Petroleum International Ltd	Valero
Maersk Oil North Sea UK Limited	World Fuel Services
Murco Petroleum Ltd	

However, it should be noted that the above organisations have not all been directly involved in the development of this publication, nor do they necessarily endorse its content.

Copyright © 2012 by the Energy Institute, London. The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003. Registered charity number 1097899, England All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, or transmitted or translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978 0 85293 628 3

Published by the Energy Institute

The information contained in this publication is provided for general information purposes only. Whilst the Energy Institute and the contributors have applied reasonable care in developing this publication, no representations or warranties, express or implied, are made by the Energy Institute or any of the contributors concerning the applicability, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein and the Energy Institute and the contributors accept no responsibility whatsoever for the use of this information. Neither the Energy Institute nor any of the contributors shall be liable in any way for any liability, loss, cost or damage incurred as a result of the receipt or use of the information contained herein.

Further copies can be obtained from: Portland Customer Services, Commerce Way, Whitehall Industrial Estate, Colchester CO2 8HP, UK. t: +44 (0)1206 796 351 e: sales@portland-services.com

Electronic access to El and IP publications is available via our website, **www.energypublishing.org** Documents can be purchased online as downloadable pdfs or on an annual subscription for single users and companies. For more information, contact the El Publications Team. e: **pubs@energyinst.org**

CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements						
Exe	cutive	summary	8			
1	Intro	Introduction				
	1.1	Background				
	1.2	Objectives				
	1.3	Scope of work				
	1.4	UK context				
2	Lite	Literature review				
	2.1	Physico-chemical properties of ethanol and butanol				
		2.1.1 Ethanol				
		2.1.2 Butanol				
	2.2	Fate and transport of ethanol-containing fuels in the subsurface				
		2.2.1 Partitioning				
		2.2.2 Biodegradation				
		2.2.3 Effects on persistence of gasoline constituents				
	2.3	Methane generation from use of ethanol-containing fuels				
	2.4	Risk to surface water from ethanol-containing fuels				
	2.5	Potential environmental risks from use of butanol-containing fuels				
	2.6	Conclusions from literature review				
	2.0	2.6.1 Effects of fate and transport of gasoline constituents				
		2.6.2 Risk from methane generation				
		2.6.3Risk to surface water				
3	Risk	modelling				
-	3.1	Previous modelling for MtBE				
	5.1	3.1.1 Model approach				
		3.1.2 Model results				
	3.2	Modelling approach for EBG				
	5.2	3.2.1 Risk to licensed potable water supply wells				
		3.2.2 Effect on benzene and MtBE plume length				
	3.3	Input parameters				
	5.5	3.3.1 Source concentrations				
		3.3.2 Source dimensions				
		3.3.3 Source zone aquifer properties				
		3.3.4 Contaminant properties				
		3.3.5 Remaining aquifer properties				
	3.4	Results				
	5.4	3.4.1 Risk to licensed potable water supply wells				
	2 5	1 5				
	3.5	Uncertainty analysis				
		3.5.1 Model approach				
	2 6	3.5.2 Input parameters				
	3.6	Discussion of results				

Contents cont Page					
4 Co	4 Conclusions				
4.			n the risk from other gasoline constituents in groundwater		
4.	2 Potenti	al for risk of	explosion from methane generation	54	
4.	3 Risk to	surface wat	er	54	
5 Co	onsideratio	ons		55	
6 Re	eferences			56	
Annexes					
Annex A	Literat	ure review	on fate and transport	64	
	A.1		tion		
	A.2				
	7.12	A.2.1	Partitioning		
		A.2.2	Biodegradation		
		A.2.3	Influence on biodegradation of gasoline components		
		/	A.2.3.1 Laboratory studies		
			A.2.3.2 Tank and lysimeter tests		
			A.2.3.3 Controlled release field tests.		
			A.2.3.4 Plume Surveys		
		A.2.4	Other potential effects of ethanol on mobility of gasoline		
			components	78	
			A.2.4.1 Cosolvency	78	
			A.2.4.2 Influence on NAPL mobility	78	
		A.2.5	Modelling effects of ethanol on fate and transport of gasoline	ć	
			constituents		
		A.2.6	Methane generation potential		
		A.2.7	Risk to surface water		
			A.2.7.1 Discharge of groundwater		
			A.2.7.2 Discharge via site drainage system		
	<u>م</u>	Dutanal	A.2.7.3 Spill of ethanol containing-fuel to surface water		
	A.3	Butanol			
		A.3.1 A.3.2	Partitioning		
		A.3.2 A.3.3	Influence on hydrocarbon biodegradation		
		A.3.3 A.3.4	Methane generation potential		
		A.3.4 A.3.5	Risk to surface water	07 פפ	
	A.4		ONS		
	~. -	A.4.1	Effects of fate and transport of gasoline constituents		
		A.4.2	Risk from methane generation		
		A.4.3	Risk to surface water		
Annex B	Model		dology		
	B.1		censed potable water supply wells		
	B.2		benzene and MtBE plume length		
			, 5		
Tables:					
Table 1:					
Table 2:					
Table 3:				39	
Table 4:	4: Predicted occurrence of MtBE in licensed potable water supply wells with and without use of ethanol		20		
	vvitri and	a vvilnout US		39	

Page

Table 5:	Predicted occurrence of benzene in licensed potable water supply wells	
	with and without use of ethanol	
Table 6:	Modelled plume lengths – alluvium aquifers	
Table 7:	Modelled plume lengths – fissure aquifers	
Table 8:	Modelled plume lengths – intergranular bedrock aquifers	
Table 9:	Input parameters used for Bioscreen modelling	
Table 10:	Results of Bioscreen modelling	
Table 11:	Results of Modflow/MT3DMS modelling	
Table 12:	Parameter values used for sensitivity analysis	.49
Table 13:	Effect of changing standard deviation for ethanol's source concentration	F 0
T-1-1- 1 4.	PDF on percentage of petrol stations with elevated ethanol concentrations	
Table 14:	Results of sensitivity analysis for abstraction well modelling	
Table 15:	Results of sensitivity analysis for plume length modelling	
Table A.1:	Reported biodegradation half-life data for ethanol in groundwater	. 68
Table A.2:	Aerobic biodegradation half-lives for BTEX components in the	
	presence and absence of ethanol as measured in laboratory microcosm studies by	70
T	Schaefer et al. (2010a)	.72
Table A.3:	Anaerobic biodegradation half-lives for BTEX components in the	
	presence and absence of ethanol as measured in laboratory microcosm studies by	72
	Schaefer et al. (2010a)	. 72
Table A.4:	Plume-scale anaerobic biodegradation half-lives for BTEX components reported for	70
	Vandenberg field experiments by Mackay et al. (2006)	. 76
Table A.5:	Plume-scale first-order biodegradation half-lives for BTEX components derived for	
	Borden field experiments by Freitas et al. (2011b,c)	
Table A.6:	Summary of predicted increase in benzene plume lengths from modeling studies	. 80
Table A.7:	Aerobic biodegradation half-lives for BTEX components in the	
	presence and absence of <i>iso</i> -butanol as measured in laboratory microcosm studies (Schaefer et al. 2010a)	86
Table A.8:	Anaerobic biodegradation half-lives for BTEX components in the	. 00
	presence and absence of <i>iso</i> -butanol as measured in laboratory microcosm studies	
	(Schaefer et al. 2010b)	. 87
Figures:		
Figure 1:	Structure of ethanol	1/
Figure 2:	Structure of <i>iso</i> -Butanol and <i>n</i> -Butanol	
Figure 3:	Cumulative frequency distribution of MtBE source concentrations	
Figure 4:	Cumulative frequency distribution of benzene source concentrations	
Figure 5:	Cumulative frequency distribution of ethanol source concentrations	
Figure 5:	Modelled groundwater source concentrations of benzene and MtBE versus ethanol.	
Figure 7:	Modelled frequency distributions of source width and thickness	
5		
Figure 8:	Modelled frequency distribution of K.i Relative percentages of aquifer types for petrol stations in model	. 57
Figure 9:		
	and those resulting in a predicted exceedence of the benzene drinking water	10
F :	standard with the use of EBG	.40
Figure 10:	Frequency distributions of modelled benzene and MtBE plume lengths in alluvium	42
F :	aquifers	.42
Figure 11:	Frequency distributions of modelled benzene and MtBE plume lengths in fissure	17
Figure 12	aquifers	.42
Figure 12:	Frequency distributions of modelled benzene and MtBE plume lengths	47
Figure 12	in intergranular bedrock aquifers	.43
Figure 13:	Predicted plume length of ethanol with diminishing sources of ethanol	10
	from releases of E10 to water table	.46

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was commissioned by the Energy Institute's (EI) Soil Waste and Groundwater Group and the work was undertaken by the Firth Consultants project team.

The project was steered by members of the EI Soil Waste and Groundwater Group:

Ruth Chippendale	Shell
Martyn Dunk	ExxonMobil
Beate Hildenbrand	Energy Institute
Chris Hughes	Chevron
Martyn Lambson	BP
Fraser Will	Total

The EI wishes to record its appreciation of the work carried out by the project team and also its gratitude for the valuable contributions made by the steering panel during the course of the project. In particular the EI would like to acknowledge Simon Firth as the principal author and express its thanks to him.

In addition the Institute would like to thank Brent Stafford from Shell, Jim Barker from the University of Waterloo, Steve Thornton from University of Sheffield and Phil Morgan from Sirius Geotechnical & Environmental Ltd for their contribution to the study.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Ethanol is broadly being used as both a fuel oxygenate in reformulated gasoline and as an alternative fuel/fuel supplement. In the UK, use of ethanol as a fuel/fuel supplement is currently limited with ethanol comprising 3 % of the total volume of petrol sold in the UK for road transport between April 2010 and April 2011¹. However this could rise in an effort to meet the requirements of the European Biofuels Directive (2003/30/EC) (EC, 2003) which sets targets for the percentage of road fuels supplied that are from renewable sources. This directive has been transposed to UK legislation in the form of the Renewable Transport Fuels Obligation (RTFO) which, in its most recent version (April 2009), sets a target of 5 % of sales comprising renewable fuels (such as bioethanol or biodiesel) in the UK by April 2013.

In 2000 and 2008, occurrence studies were undertaken by the EI to assess the risk posed by ether oxygenates² on drinking water supplies in the UK (IP & EA, 2000; EI, 2009). These studies concluded that ether oxygenates do not pose a widespread risk to potable water resources provided there is no major increase in usage. Indeed, it is likely that increased use of ethanol would result in a corresponding decrease in use of ether oxygenates as a gasoline component in the UK.

The potential risks to water resources from increased use of ethanol were not considered in these studies. Literature reviews (EI, 2008; API, 2010) have shown that ethanol from ethanol-containing fuel releases is unlikely to directly create significant risks to groundwater resources but that it has the potential to indirectly increase risk through its effect on the persistence of other fuel components. These reviews have also identified possible impacts to surface water and from methane generation (as a result of ethanol's degradation) as potential risks associated with use of ethanol as a fuel/fuel component.

Given the possibility of a future increase in use of ethanol as a fuel/fuel component there is a need to evaluate these potential risks further within the UK context to help ensure that any such risks are managed appropriately.

Although ethanol is the focus of this report, attention is also given to butanol. Technological developments could mean that butanol becomes a more cost effective and readily available biofuel than ethanol, resulting in future use of butanol exceeding that of ethanol as a gasoline component in the UK.

1.2 OBJECTIVES

The key objectives of this study were to:

- Improve the understanding of potential environmental risks associated with current and future use of ethanol in gasoline in the UK.
- Determine whether the current and future use of ethanol in gasoline alters the conclusions from previous El assessments on the risks posed by ether oxygenates usage in the UK (i.e. that ether oxygenates do not pose a widespread risk to potable water resources in the UK).

¹ Bioethanol accounted for approximeately 3 % (by volume) of UK petrol consumption in 2010/11 financial year, based on figures presented in DFT, 2011.

² Ether oxygenates considered in the study were MtBE, ethyl tertiary butyl ether (EtBE), tertiary amyl methyl ether (TAME) and di-isopropyl ether (DIPE)

Although the study has focused on ethanol, a further objective was to make overall conclusions with respect to risks from butanol if this were to become a common UK gasoline component in the future.

1.3 SCOPE OF WORK

The following work was undertaken to achieve these objectives:

- A literature review relating to ethanol and butanol focusing on the following themes was undertaken:
 - fate and transport of ethanol and butanol in the subsurface;
 - their effect on the fate and persistence of gasoline constituents (such as BTEX and MtBE;
 - the potential for methane generation from degradation of ethanol and butanol and the subsequent creation of explosive atmospheres, and
 - the risk to surface water from use of ethanol and butanol in gasoline.
 - A modelling study analogous to the one presented in the EI report on ether oxygenates (EI, 2009) was undertaken with the goal of:
 - evaluating the effects of ethanol-blended gasoline on enhanced migration of BTEX and ether oxygenates, and
 - predicting the vulnerability of drinking water receptors in the UK to incidental releases of ethanol-blended gasoline in the subsurface.
- This technical report describes the work undertaken and findings.

1.4 UK CONTEXT

The use of ethanol (or butanol) as a fuel component may increase in the UK to help meet the objectives of the RTFO. At this stage the use of 5 to 10 % v/v ethanol in gasoline is envisaged as this helps to meet the objective of the RTFO without the need to modify engines.

For the purposes of this report and to be consistent with American Petroleum Institute (API) terminology the term EBG is used for gasoline containing ethanol such as E5 (5 % ethanol), E10 (10 % gasoline) and E24 (24 % gasoline). Highly concentrated ethanol, such as E85 (85 % ethanol with 15 % gasoline) and denatured ethanol are termed FGE. In the UK, 1 % methanol and 10 ppm denatonium benzoate are added as the denaturant to ethanol used for fuel, whereas in the US 2 to 5 % gasoline is typically added as the denaturant.

Ethanol is miscible with water (See section 2.1) and this creates practical difficulties in the storage and transport of EBG, as the introduction of small amounts of water can result in ethanol partitioning to the water phase causing the fuel to fall out of specification. This makes transport over large distances by pipeline untenable and so denatured ethanol will likely be transported in the UK by tanker. Blending of ethanol and gasoline is expected to occur at the refinery or at bulk storage depots with subsequent transport of EBG to petrol stations.

Various release scenarios are plausible in which ethanol-containing fuel could be released to the environment:

- Spills or leaks of FGE from bulk storage facilities or refineries where ethanol is stored or manufactured. Relative to the number of petrol stations in the UK, the number of these facilities is small. Risks from loss of containment of fuel are assessed and managed under the IPPC permit for each site. Design measures will likely be onerous at these facilities to avoid loss of containment of denatured ethanol.

ETHANOL EFFECTS ON THE FATE AND TRANSPORT OF GASOLINE CONSTITUENTS IN THE UK

- Spills of FGE from road or rail tankers. Fuel tanker accidents are rare in the UK and although they do occasionally occur the effects are likely to be localised.
- Subsurface leaks of EBG from petrol stations. The EI study on ether oxygenates (EI, 2009) showed a high variability in the occurrence of MtBE below petrol stations in the UK. This is partly due to variability in the use of MtBE in the UK but is also a reflection of variability in nature and volume of releases that occur. For the vast majority of sites, leaks and spills will be relatively minor, with losses of less than one litre per day. Larger leaks may occur but losses of more than several litres per day will tend to be detected and repaired. Sudden catastrophic leaks of several hundred or thousand litres per day are rare. An on-going programme of infrastructure improvements at petrol stations across the UK means that the probability of loss of containment is declining.
- Surface spills of EBG at petrol stations. Spills of EBG that are not contained will enter the site drainage system. For some sites this will discharge via an oil interceptor to a nearby watercourse. Other than in exceptional circumstances are such spills likely to be greater than a small volume (a few litres or less).

FUEL GRADE ETHANOL VS ETHANOL-BLENDED GASOLINE

As will become apparent later in this report, the proportion of ethanol in a gasoline can have a marked effect on risk and it is therefore useful to distinguish between the two types of ethanol-containing fuel:

- FGE Fuel that is highly concentrated in ethanol, e.g. E85 or E95 (gasoline containing 85 % or 95 % ethanol by volume, respectively) and denatured ethanol (almost 100 % ethanol containing a small amount of denaturant).
- **EBG** Gasoline that contains some ethanol, e.g. E5 or E10 (gasoline containing 5 and 10 % of ethanol by volume, respectively).

Currently in the UK, the vast majority of ethanol used in road transport fuel is supplied as EBG such as E5 and this situation is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. The blending of gasoline with FGE to make EBG generally occurs at the refinery or distribution depots within the UK. Thus, releases of FGE are likely to be associated with these facilities or from road or rail tanker spills. Releases of EBG are likely to be associated with retail filling stations or road tanker spills. Given that there are around 10 000 retail filling stations in the UK compared to eight oil refineries and a similar number of distribution depots, releases of EBG from retail sites are expected to have a far greater influence on risk to water resources on a national level than releases of FGE.