

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Energy and economic sustainability of woodchip production by black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia* L.) plantations in Italy

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1616675> since 2016-11-25T14:32:38Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.fuel.2014.09.122

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Energy and economic sustainability of woodchip production by black locust**
2 **(*Robinia pseudoacacia* L.) plantations in Italy**

3
4
5 **Abstract**

6 Growing demand for energy has led to a rise in the price of fossil oil and an increased rate of
7 depletion of fossil resources. This situation has generated a strong interest in the use of
8 biofuel, and many studies have been undertaken on the worldwide potential for biofuel.
9 Among all renewable energy sources, biomass could contribute to meeting the EU's
10 renewable energy targets in 2020, especially short rotation coppice (SRC). In order to
11 evaluate the energy and economic sustainability of woodchip production by black locust SRC,
12 an *ad hoc* study was undertaken and a specific calculation model was developed. Data were
13 collected in a black locust SRC plantation site in North West Italy during the period 2006 to
14 2012. This involved an SRC duration of six years and a biomass ($10 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ DM per year}$)
15 harvest at the end of a cycle (six years). The results indicated that black locust plantations are
16 very desirable from an energy point of view since the output/input ratio results are higher than
17 20. Unfortunately, the results are not so positive from an economic point of view. In fact, in
18 order to obtain economic sustainability for woodchip production, the biomass price should be
19 at least $\text{€}103 \text{ Mg}^{-1} \text{ DM}$. Consequently, woodchip production by black locust SRC is only
20 possible with economic support for production and with optimisation of agricultural labour
21 and biomass production.

22 **Keywords**

23 Short rotation coppice; black locust; biomass; woodchip; production costs; energy
24 consumption

1 **1. Introduction**

2

3 Growing demand for energy has led to a rise in the price of fossil fuel and an increased rate of
4 depletion of fossil resources [1]. This situation has generated a strong interest in biofuel use,
5 which many governments support through subsidies, tax-exemptions and other incentives [2].

6 Many studies have been undertaken on the worldwide potential for biofuel. The US

7 Department of Energy recently released a major update regarding its biomass energy supply
8 potential over the next two decades [3]. Fischer et al. [4] conducted a similar study on the
9 European potential for biofuel production, while other authors have looked at biofuel
10 deployment for sub regions within Europe [5-6] and Asia [7–10].

11 Among all renewable energy sources, biomass could contribute to meeting the EU's

12 renewable energy targets in 2020 [11–12], especially short rotation coppice [13]. There has
13 been increased interest in biofuels in Italy in the last 10 years. In fact, crop cultivation for
14 biomass production has been included in the cultural plans of several farms, particularly in
15 Northern Italy; farmers take advantage of the low input requirement and the added possibility
16 of exploiting reserved areas [14].

17 At present there are two different methods of cultivation: very short rotation coppice (vSRC),
18 with very high density, from 5500 to 6700 plants ha⁻¹ and harvested with a rotation period of
19 one to three years, and short rotation coppice (SRC) with a high density from 1000 to 2000
20 plants ha⁻¹ and harvested with a rotation period of five to seven years [15-16]. In Europe,
21 farmers generally prefer the vSRC cultivation model [17-21]; however, in Italy, farmers
22 prefer the SRC method because it improves biomass quality (high calorific value) and market
23 opportunity as a result of a better wood/bark ratio and the possible production of different
24 wood types [22-25]. Furthermore, it is also preferred because, in rural development plans for
25 the main regions of Northern Italy, the establishment of this cultural model is financed by the
26 local government.

1 Fast-growing wood crops such as willows, poplars, and black locust have traditionally been
2 considered to produce local fuel wood, wood material, and, more recently, energy [26-27].
3 These crops have potential for feedstock because of high yields, low costs, opportunities for
4 use on lower-quality lands and biodiversity support at the local level. Most of the studies
5 carried out in Italy to date have focused only on woodchip production from poplar [28-31],
6 and willow [32-33] SRC, as they are spread more throughout the territory; few studies have
7 yet examined black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia* L.) [34-35].

8
9 In order to improve knowledge about woodchip production by black locust plantations,
10 economic and energy evaluations were performed for short rotation coppice of black locust.

11

12 **2. Materials and methods**

13

14 A series of data was collected in a black locust SRC plantation near the experimental farm
15 “MEZZI” of CRA-PLF, close to Casale Monferrato (AL) in the North West of Italy, during
16 the period from 2006 to 2012. Because of the soil characteristics of the land chosen for the
17 trials, a black locust of Italian origin was planted [36]. All the cultural operations for black
18 locust cultivation were analysed. The working time and manpower requirements were
19 recorded in the field, according to Magagnotti and Spinelli (2012) [37].

20 The developed model allowed the determination of manpower and energy requirements, as
21 well as costs, regarding different biomass production. The model considered a continuous
22 black locust SRC plantation: the whole acreage was divided into different “modules”, each
23 corresponding to one year of the crop cycle, thereby enabling all costs to be considered on an
24 annual basis. For the economic and energy evaluations, a six-year rotation was considered,
25 with harvesting carried out at the end of the cycle and with a starting plant density of 1100 per
26 hectare, with a 3.00 × 3.00 m spacing and a mean production of 10 Mg ha⁻¹DM per year [36,
27 38]. For all post-emergence treatment, traditional 4RM tractors were used, with a maximum

1 width of 2.2 m. For planting the nursery and the black locust SRC, the soil was prepared by
2 ploughing at a depth of 0.4 m after seed bed fertilisation – 500 kg ha⁻¹ of PK 8-24.
3 Secondary tillage was carried out with two harrowing interventions, while for rooting plants
4 (0.5 - 0.6 m in height), an Allasia R1 planter was used (Fig. 1) [39]. The cultural operations
5 for the SRC cultivation and nursery only involved weed control necessary for a high
6 production of biomass [40-41]. In contrast to poplar plantations, in black locust plantations,
7 fertilisation for each year of cultivation was not considered [42]. A heavy cultivator was used
8 for stump removal (at the end of the cycle) (Tables 1-2).
9 For biomass harvesting, a tractor of 190 kW Case Magnum 260 EP equipped with a chipper
10 prototype Gandini Bio-harvester was used (Fig. 2). The Bio-harvester Gandini was chosen for
11 this experiment because it is the only machine that is capable of cutting and chipping trees
12 simultaneously and has a large diameter (up to 300 mm). The working capacity of the Gandini
13 Bio-harvester is about 60 Mg h⁻¹ (about 100 plants h⁻¹) [43]. This value is high when
14 compared with other machines used in vSRC harvesting [44] because the prototype is used in
15 a small experimental area [44]. Two tractors with trailers were used for biomass
16 transportation to the farm (a distance of about 400 metres). The manpower requirement was
17 determined considering the number of operators and the working time to carry out every
18 cultural operation.
19 Energy consumption was determined considering both direct costs (fuel and lubricant
20 consumption) and primary energy (machine, equipment and mineral fertiliser energy contents)
21 (Table 3) [45]. The energy output of the black locust plantation was calculated as a function
22 of the biomass production and the primary energy biomass content (Table 3). Machine fuel
23 consumption was determined by refilling the machine tank at the end of each working phase.
24 The tank was refilled using a two litre glass pipe with 0.02 litre graduations, corresponding to
25 the accuracy of the measurements. The lubricant consumption was determined as a function
26 of the fuel consumption using a specific algorithm developed by Piccarolo [46].

1 The human work was expressed in manpower hour requirements for each field activity, but it
2 was not considered from an energy point of view.

3 The economic evaluation was determined for every cultural operation considering both the
4 machine costs and production factors costs (fertilisers, fuel) (Table 4). The hourly cost rate for
5 each machine was calculated using the method proposed by Miyata [47], with prices updated
6 to 2014. The average cost of the Gandini Bio-harvester was determined considering contractor
7 costs. Labour cost was set at €18.5 per hour. Fuelcost was assumed to be €0.9 per kg
8 (subsidised fuel for agricultural use). An annual utilisation of at least 500 hours (with the
9 tractor also being used for other operations) was assumed for tractors; the power requirement
10 was calculated by taking into consideration the data recorded during experimentation and the
11 drawbar pull and power requirement in the different operating conditions. In addition, the
12 tractor hourly cost was determined by the methodology proposed by Miyata [47].

13 In order to evaluate economic sustainability, the Net Present Value (NPV) was determined
14 which indicates the difference between total income and total cost considering a biomass
15 value of €100 Mg⁻¹DM. This calculation was undertaken for different land rent costs [48].

16

17 **3. Results**

18

19 Nearly 17 hours per year of manpower were required for a hectare of black locust SRC
20 cultivation. The biomass harvesting required more than 58% of the total time, while the
21 chemical weed control applications required 0.6% (Fig. 3).

22 Energy consumption for the cultivation and management of 100 ha of black locust SRC was
23 9.3 GJ ha⁻¹ per year and represents about 5% of the biomass energy production (about 190 GJ
24 ha⁻¹ per year). The output/input ratio was close to 20. The largest part of energy input (33%)
25 was linked to soil fertilisation. Harvesting and biomass transportation represented about 27%
26 of the total energy requirements (Fig. 4).

1 Thus, for arable land between 50 and 200 ha, the total energy cost was found to be between
2 4.8% and 5.1% of the energy produced. Overall, the direct energy costs were 1.8%, while
3 indirect energy costs were 2.9% for a 50 ha SRC cultivation, and 3.1% for a 200 ha SRC
4 cultivation.

5 The production costs of SRC with a six-year cycle were closely associated with both the
6 cultivated surface and the level of production. Considering a biomass production of
7 60 Mg DM ha⁻¹ per cycle, equivalent to about 120 Mg WB ha⁻¹, the production cost was close
8 to €103 Mg⁻¹ DM for SRC surfaces of 100 ha (Fig. 5), a value higher than the actual Italian
9 market price of wood chips (€100 Mg⁻¹ DM).

10 The cultural operations that had the greatest impact on total production costs were the
11 biomass harvesting and transportation to the farm (nearly 23.6%) (Fig. 6). Planting showed an
12 impact on the cost greater than post-emergence treatment (weed control) and soil fertilisation,
13 but these operations were necessary for high biomass production. In addition, land rent cost
14 also had a high impact on the total cost. For example, considering a 100 ha SRC surface with
15 10 Mg DM ha⁻¹ per year of biomass production and a land use cost of €200 ha⁻¹ per year, the
16 biomass production cost was €103 Mg⁻¹ DM. In the case of land use cost of €400 ha⁻¹ per
17 year, the biomass production cost was €123 Mg⁻¹ DM. In these cases, the land rent cost had an
18 impact on total production costs of 19 and 30% respectively (Fig. 7). The biomass
19 transportation cost represented 3% and 18% of the total cost for distances of 5km and 50 km
20 respectively (Fig. 8).

21

22 **4. Discussion**

23

24 In general, biomass production from a black locust plantation is lower (10 Mg ha⁻¹DM per
25 year) than for poplar plantations (12-18 Mg ha⁻¹DM per year) [36, 38, 49]. These results were

1 obtained by using the most appropriate type of black locust for the soil characteristics of the
2 land used for planting.

3 The black locust SRC plantation, in the conditions outlined (six year rotation with harvesting
4 carried out at the end of the cycle), is very interesting in terms of energy. In fact, the
5 output/input ratio results are higher than 20. This value is two points higher than that
6 calculated for a poplar SRC by Manzone et al. [42]. The better results are to be attributed to
7 the minor energy consumption for SRC management because a black locust plantation does
8 not require top dressing, irrigation and disease control. The largest part of energy input (33%)
9 is linked to soil fertilisation carried out at the beginning of a cycle where it is necessary to
10 have high biomass production (10 Mg DM ha⁻¹ per year) [50]. In contrast, the lowest input is
11 linked to chemical weed control activity (0.7%). On balance, the energy input per unit of
12 biomass produced was 5% of the energy output. This value is similar to that found in another
13 analysis in Italy on poplar SRC [25, 42] and in Sweden on willow SRC [51].

14 Another advantage of black locust cultivation, in comparison with poplar plantations,
15 concerns the manpower requirement. In fact, the value obtained in this study (17 hours per
16 year) is about 40% lower than that calculated for a poplar SRC with the same characteristics
17 [42].

18 However, the SRC economic evaluation is negative because the market price of the
19 woodchips is lower when compared with biomass production costs. In fact, for SRC economic
20 sustainability, the biomass price should be at least €115 Mg¹DM (€15 more than the current
21 market price). Similar results were obtained in other work undertaken in North West Italy
22 [52].

23 It needs to be pointed out that this evaluation was not performed in ideal working conditions.
24 In fact, these results were obtained considering a low biomass market value [53] and only one
25 planting rotation. This has a significant impact on cost because ploughing, planting and stump
26 removal represent 25% of the total cost (Fig. 6).

1 Nevertheless, using this cultivation model, six year-old trees with a diameter at chest height of
2 150-200 mm were grown. The base of the trunk, up to two to four metres in width, can be
3 used to produce firewood with a value for energy use higher than for woodchips (up to 200
4 Mg^{-1}DM). In this case, the economic balance becomes positive although the harvesting
5 methods for firewood are more expensive (in this case, only a chainsaw can be used).
6 Furthermore, since the tree has a large diameter (> 100 mm), these plantations produce
7 woodchips of high quality with a high fibre content (85–90%) and favourable particle-size
8 distribution; this contrasts with vSRC where the biofuel produced shows a high bark content
9 ($> 20\%$) and mediocre particle-size distribution, and is often too rich in fines ($> 10\%$) [34].
10 This consideration is very important; material with a low bark content has a high market price
11 because it has a high heating value and a low ash content [54-56].
12 In addition, black locust SRC, as a result of its low energy input, produces better results
13 compared with poplar cultivation in ethanol production, mainly in terms of environmental
14 aspects [57]. However, black locust is a spontaneous species and shows a tendency to form
15 pioneer forests. This situation raises biodiversity conservation issues regarding the future
16 development of these habitats [58-59].
17 For poplar plantations, tree planting is a difficult operation due to the reduced available time
18 (March and April) and because the planters used have a low working rate and high manpower
19 is required [60].

20

21 **5. Conclusions**

22

23 Woodchip production by black locust SRC plantations is possible only with economic support
24 for their cultivation, or with the optimisation of agricultural labour and biomass production in
25 order to reduce production costs.

1 The choice by Italian farmers to favour the SRC cultivation model over the vSRC model is to
2 be applauded, because, from a six year-old tree, it is possible to obtain an assortment of wood
3 (firewood) with an economic value for energy use higher than for wood chips.
4 Furthermore, SRC cultivation can contribute to solving the problems of traditional cultivation
5 and to improving the relations between agriculture and the environment. In addition, since the
6 black locust tree is a tougher species than the poplar tree, it could also be cultivated in less
7 productive land which is not normally used for other crops.

8

9 **References**

- 10 [1] Lillieblad L, Szpila A, Strand M, Pagels J, Rupar-Gadd K, Gudmundsson A, et al. (2004)
11 Boiler operation influence on the emissions of submicrometer-sized particles and
12 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from biomass-fired grate boilers. *Energy Fuel* 18:410–
13 417
- 14 [2] Stupak A, Asikainen A, Jonsel M, Karlton E, Lunnan A, Mizaraite D, et al. (2007)
15 Sustainable utilization of forest biomass for energy possibilities and problems: policy,
16 legislation, certification, and recommendations and guidelines in the Nordic, Baltic, and
17 other European countries. *Biomass Bioenergy* 31:666-684
- 18 [3] Perlack RD, Stokes BJ, Lead Authors (2001) US Billion-Ton Update: Biomass Supply for
19 a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry. Oak Ridge (TN); Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
20 August. 227 p. ORNL/TM-2011/224. Prepared of the USDOE under contract DE-AC05-
21 00OR22725
- 22 [4] Fischer Gn, Prieler S, Van Velthuisen H, Berdes Gr, Faaij A, Londo M, et al. (2011)
23 Biofuel production potentials in Europe: sustainable use of cultivated lad and pastures,
24 Part II: Land use scenarios. *Biomass Bioenergy* 34:440-448

- 1 [5] Koponen K, Soimakallio S, Tsupari E, Thun R, Antikainen R (2013) GHG emission
2 performance of various liquid transportation biofuels in Finland in accordance with the
3 EU sustainability criteria. *Appl Energy* 102:440–448
- 4 [6] Sacchelli S, De Meo I, Paletto A (2013) Bioenergy production and forest
5 multifunctionality: a trade-off analysis using multiscale GIS model in a case study in
6 Italy. *Appl Energy* 104:10–20
- 7 [7] Matsumoto N, Sano D, Elder M (2009) Biofuel initiatives in Japan: strategies, policies,
8 and future potential. *Appl Energy* 86(1):S69–76
- 9 [8] Yang J, Huang J, Qiu H, Rozelle S, Sombilla MA (2009) Biofuels and the Greater
10 Mekong Subregion: assessing the impact on prices, production and trade. *Appl Energy*
11 86(1):S37–46
- 12 [9] Ali T, Huang J, Yang J (2013) Impact assessment of global and national biofuels
13 developments on agriculture in Pakistan. *Appl Energy* 104:466–474
- 14 [10] Jupesta J (2012) Modeling technological changes in the biofuel production system in
15 Indonesia. *Appl. Energy* 90:211-217
- 16 [11] Dornburg V, van Vuuren D, van de Ven G, Langeveld H, Meeusen M, Banse M, et al.
17 (2010) Bioenergy revisited: Key factors in global potentials of bioenergy. *Energy*
18 *Environ Sci* 3:258-267
- 19 [12] Kalt G, Kranzl L (2011) Assessing the economic efficiency of bioenergy technologies in
20 climate mitigation and fossil fuel replacement in Austria using a technoeconomic
21 approach. *Appl Energy* 88:3665-3684
- 22 [13] Srirangan K, Akawi L, Moo-Young M, Chou CP (2012) Towards sustainable production
23 of clean energy carriers from biomass resources. *Appl Energy* 100:172-186
- 24 [14] Di Muzio Pasta V, Negri M, Facciotto G, Bergante S, Maggiore TM (2007) Growth
25 dynamic and biomass production of 12 poplar and two willow clones in a short rotation
26 coppice in northern Italy. In: 15^o European biomass conference & exhibition, from

- 1 research to market deployment. Proceedings of the international conference held in
2 Berlin, Germany.
- 3 [15] Bergante S, Facciotto G (2006) Impianti annuali, biennali, quinquennali. SHERWOOD –
4 Foreste ed Alberi Oggi 128(11):25-36
- 5 [16] Facciotto G., Nervo G., Vietto L (2008) Biomass production with fast growing woody
6 plants for energy purposes in Italy. ASO Funded Project Workshop 'Increased biomass
7 production with fast-growing tree species in short rotation forestry: impact of species and
8 clone selection and socio-economic impacts'. 17-21 November, Bulgaria.
- 9 [17] Armstrong A, Johns C, Tubby I (1999) Effect of spacing and cutting cycle on the yield of
10 poplar grown as an energy crop. Biomass Bioenergy 17(4):305-314
- 11 [18] Kauter D, Lewandowski I, Claupein W (2003) Quantity and quality of harvestable
12 biomass from Populus short rotation coppice for solid fuel use a review on the
13 physiological basis and management influences. Biomass Bioenergy 24(6):411-427
- 14 [19] Laureysens I, Deraedt W, Inderherberge T, Ceulemans R (2003) Population dynamics in
15 a six-year old coppice culture of poplar. I. Clonal differences in stool mortality, shoot
16 dynamics and shoot diameter distribution in relation biomass production. Biomass
17 Bioenergy 24(2):81-95
- 18 [20] Mitchell CP, Stevens EA, Watters MP (1999) Short Rotation Forestry operations,
19 productivity and cost based on experience gained in the UK. Forest Ecol Manag 121(1-
20 2):123-136
- 21 [21] Proe MF, Griffiths JH, Craig J (2002) Effects of spacing, species and copping on leaf
22 area, light interception and photosynthesis in short rotation forestry. Biomass Bioenergy
23 23(5):315-26
- 24 [22] Paris p, Facciotto G, Nervo G, Minotta G, Sabatti M, Scaravonati A, et al. (2010) Short
25 rotation forestry of poplars in Italy: current situation and prospective. In: Book of abstract
26 of fifth international poplar symposium, poplars and willow: from research models to

- 1 multipurpose trees for a bio-based society held in Orvieto, Italy.
- 2 [23] Benomar L, Des Rocher A, Larocque Gr (2012) The effect of spacing on growth,
3 morphology and biomass production and allocation in two hybrid poplar clones growing
4 in the boreal region of Canada. *Trees: Struct Funct* 26(3):939-949
- 5 [24] Phelps JE, Isebrands JG, Jowett D (1982) Raw material quality of short rotation
6 intensively cultured *Populus* clones. I. A comparison of stem and branch properties at
7 three spacing. *IAWA Bulletin*; pp 193-200
- 8 [25] Manzone M, Airoidi G, Balsari P (2009) Energetic and economic evaluation of a poplar
9 cultivation for the biomass production in Italy. *Biomass Bioenergy* 33:1258-1264
- 10 [26] Tome´ M, Verwijst T (1996) Modelling competition in short rotation forests. *Biomass*
11 *Bioenergy* 11(2-3):177-187
- 12 [27] Hamelinck CN, van Hooijdonk G, Faaij APC (2005) Ethanol from lignocellulosic
13 biomass: techno-economic performance in short-, middle- and long-term. *Biomass*
14 *Bioenergy* 28(4):384-410
- 15 [28] Gasol CM, Gabarrell X, Anton A, Rigola M, Carrasco J, Ciria P, et al. (2009) LCA of
16 poplar bioenergy system compared with *Brassica carinata* energy crop and natural gas in
17 regional scenario. *Biomass Bioenergy* 33(1):119-129
- 18 [29] Gasol CM, Martı´nez S, Rigola M, Rieradevall J, Anto´n A, Carrasco J, et al. (2009)
19 Feasibility assessment of poplar bioenergy systems in the Southern Europe. *Renew Sust*
20 *Energ Rev* 13(4):801-812
- 21 [30] Spinelli R, Nati C, Sozzi L, Magagnotti N, Picchi G (2011) Physical characterization of
22 commercial woodchips on the Italian energy market. *Fuel* 90(6):2198-2202
- 23 [31] Spinelli R., Schweier J., De Francesco F (2012) Harvesting techniques for non-industrial
24 biomass plantations. *Biosyst Eng* 113:319-324

- 1 [32] Guidi W, Piccioni E, Bonari E (2008) Evapotranspiration and crop coefficient of poplar
2 and willow short-rotation coppice used as vegetation filter. *Bioresource technology*
3 99:4832-4840
- 4 [33] Martin PJ, Stephens W (2006) Willow growth in response to nutrients and moisture on a
5 clay landfill cap soil. II: water use. *Bioresource technology* 97:449-458
- 6 [34] Gonzalez-García S, Moreira MT, Feijoo G, Murphy RJ (2012) Comparative life cycle
7 assessment of ethanol production from fast-growing wood crops (black locust, eucalyptus
8 and poplar). *Biomass Bioenergy* 39:378-388
- 9 [35] Gonzalez-García S, Gasol CM, Moreira MT, Gabarell X, Pons JR, Feijoo G (2011)
10 Environmental assessment of black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia* L.) – based ethanol as
11 potential transport fuel. *The international Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 16(5):465-
12 477
- 13 [36] Facciotto G, Bergante S, Gras M (2005) Black locust For SRF: Economic and production
14 evaluation. *Proceeding of 14th European Biomass Conference, 17-21 October, Paris,*
15 *France*
- 16 [37] Maganotti N, Spinelli R (2012). Good practice guidelines for biomass production studies.
17 COST Action FP-0902. CNR IVALSIA, Florence, Italy
- 18 [38] Facciotto G, Bergante S, Lioia C, Mughini G, Rosso L, Nervo G (2005) Come scegliere e
19 coltivare le colture da biomassa, *Suppl Forlener Inform Agrario* 34:27-30
- 20 [39] Balsari P, Facciotto G, Manzone M (2007) *Trapiantatrici a confronto per cedui a breve*
21 *rotazione. Suppl Inform Agrario* 33:11-15
- 22 [40] Buhler DD, Netzer DA, Riemenschneider DE, Hartzler RG (1998) Weed management
23 in short rotation poplar and herbaceous perennial crops grown for biofuel production.
24 *Biomass Bioenergy* 14:385-394
- 25 [41] Friedrich E (1995) *Produktionsbedingungen fuer die bewirtschaftung schnellwachsender*
26 *baumarten im stockausschlagtrieb in kurzen umtriebszeiten auf landwirtschaftlichen*

- 1 flaechen, statusseminar schnellwachsende baumarten-tagungsband 23-24 oktober.
2 Guelzow: Kassel Fachagentur Nachwachsende Rohstoffe e.V. pp 101
- 3 [42] Manzone M, Bergante S, Facciotto G (2014) Energy and economic evaluation of a poplar
4 plantation for woodchips production in Italy. *Biomass Bioenergy* 60:164-170
- 5 [43] Spinelli R, Magagnotti N, Picchi G, Lombardini C, Nati C (2011) Upsized harvesting
6 technology for coping with the new trends in short-rotation coppice. *Applied Engineering*
7 *in Agriculture* 27(4):551-557
- 8 [44] Manzone M (2009) The mechanization of Short Rotation Forestry for biomass
9 production to energy use. [Ph.D. thesis], University of Torino, pp 335
- 10 [45] Jarach M (1985) Sui valori di equivalenza per l'analisi ed il bilancio energetico in
11 agricoltura. *Riv. di Ing. Agraria* 2:02-114
- 12 [46] Piccarolo P (1989) Criteri di scelta e di gestione delle macchine agricole. *Macchine e*
13 *Motori Agricoli* 12:37-57
- 14 [47] Miyata ES (1980) Determining fixed and operating costs of logging equipment [General
15 Technical Report NC-55]. St. Paul, MN: Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment
16 Station. pp 14
- 17 [48] Povellato A (1997) Prospettive incerte per il mercato degli affitti. *L'informatore Agrario*
18 44:27-30
- 19 [49] Rosso L, Facciotto G, Bergante S, Vietto L, Nervo G (2013) Selection and testing of
20 *populus alba* and *Salix spp.* as bioenergy feedstock: preliminary results. *Applied Energy*
21 102:87-92
- 22 [50] Dimitriou I, Rosenqvist H (2011) Sewage sludge and wastewater fertilisation od short
23 Rotation Coppice (SRC) for increased bioenergy production – Biological and economic
24 potential. *Biomass Bioenergy* 35:835-842

- 1 [51] Borjesson PII (1996) Energy analysis of biomass production and transportation. *Biomass*
2 *Bioenergy* 11(4):305-318
- 3 [52] Gasol MC, Brun F, Mosso A, Rieradevall J, Gabarell X (2010) Economic assessment and
4 comparison of acacia energy crop with annual traditional crops in Southern Europe.
5 *Energy Policy* 38:592-597
- 6 [53] Spinelli R, Ivorra L, Magagnotti N, Picchi G (2011) Performance of a mobile mechanical
7 screen to improve the commercial quality of wood chips for energy. *Bioresource*
8 *Technology* 102(15):7366-7370
- 9 [54] Klasnja B, Kopitovic S, Orlovic S (2002) Wood and bark of some poplar and willow
10 clones as fuelwood. *Biomass Bioenergy* 23(6):427-432
- 11 [55] García R, Pizarro C, Lavín AG, Bueno JL (2012) Characterization of Spanish biomass
12 wastes for energy use. *Bioresour Technol* 103:249-258
- 13 [56] Guidi W, Piccioni E, Ginanni M, Bonari E (2008) Bark content estimation in poplar
14 (*populus deltoides* L.) short rotation coppice in Central Italy. *Biomass Bioenergy* 32:518-
15 524
- 16 [57] González-García S, Moreira MT, Feijoo G, Murphy RJ (2012) Comparative life cycle
17 assessment of ethanol production from fast-growing wood crops (black locust, eucalyptus
18 and poplar). *Biomass Bioenergy* 39:378-388
- 19 [58] Sitzia T, Campagnaro T, Dainese M, Cierjacks A (2012) Plant species diversity in alien
20 black locust stands: A paired comparison with native stands across a north-Mediterranean
21 range expansion. *Forest Ecol Manag* 285:85-91
- 22 [59] Radtke A, Ambraß S, Zerbe S, Tonon G, Fontana V, Ammer C (2013) Traditional
23 coppice forest management drives the invasion of *Ailanthus altissima* and *Robinia*
24 *pseudoacacia* into deciduous forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 291:308-317

- 1 [60] Manzone M, Balsari P (2014) Planters performance during a very Short Rotation
- 2 Coppice planting. Biomass e Bioenergy 67:188-192
- 3