



# AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

# Biomass availability and quality produced by vineyard management during a period of 15 years

This is the author's manuscript
Original Citation:
Availability:
This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1616498 since 2016-11-25T10:57:56Z
Published version:
DOI:10.1016/j.renene.2016.07.031
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)

# Biomass availability and quality produced by vineyard management during a period of 15 years

3

### 4 Abstract

5 Agricultural residue could become a potential biomass source for energy production 6 because it is available every year in areas accessible to tractors and vehicles. The aim of 7 this work was to quantify the biomass available and its fuel characteristics, considering 8 pruning residue from management of five main vine varieties planted in northwest Italy 9 (barbera, dolcetto, cortese, cabernet sauvignon, and moscato) for a period of 15 years 10 (from 2000 to 2014). Throughout the test period, pruning residue production ranged between 0.45 and 1.34 kg (1850–5360 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) per plant. The average higher heating 11 value of the five vine varieties tested ranged from 17.92 to 18.02 MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>, whereas the 12 13 lower calorific value ranged between 7.34 and 7.96 MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>. The average ash content was 14 approximately 3.85%. No statistical difference in biofuel characteristics was found between 15 the vine varieties considered. This study highlights the high potential of vineyard pruning 16 residue as a biofuel for energy production. In contrast, it is of considerable importance to 17 know that biomass production can vary considerably between vine varieties and between 18 years. This latter aspect is very important because, according to reference years, it is 19 possible to under- or overestimate biomass production.

20

Keywords: vineyards; pruning residues; productivity; moisture content; calorific value; ash
 content

23

#### 24 1. Introduction

25 In recent years, thanks to political strategies aimed at reducing environmental pollution, 26 renewable energy production in European countries has increased [1]. Of all renewable 27 energy sources, biomass seems to be one which highlights better results for energy and 28 thermal energy production [2]. Under this profile, agricultural residue could become a potential biomass source for energy production in other European countries [3-4], 29 30 especially in Italy [5–6]. In fact, that biomass source is available every year and is 31 produced in areas accessible to tractors and vehicles [7]. In addition, the use of 32 agricultural waste shows a low environmental impact compared to dedicated plantations 33 (short rotation coppices) [8]. In detail, vineyard pruning residue, being their flue gas 34 emissions comparable to those obtained from wood chips, can be a suitable fuel for 35 energy production [9], especially in southern Europe which is the location of three major 36 wine producers of the world: France, Italy and Spain [10]. In fact, vines are agricultural 37 crops more diffused in Europe, especially in Italy (about 700,000 ha) [11]. In contrast to orchards, in order to improve the quality and quantity of vine production, vinevards require 38 a substantial pruning of all plants every year, which produces a significant amount of 39 40 residue [12].

At present, this residue becomes mulched into the vineyards or piled outside the vineyards
and burned [13]. Both solutions present problems in terms of time consumption, economic
sustainability, and environmental impact. Mulching, as well as contributing to maintaining
organic matter, nutrients and moisture content in the soil, is very dangerous for
proliferation of disease [4], while burning, besides being labour-intensive, is low cost [14],
but produces significant particulate emissions in the atmosphere [15].

As an alternative, pruning residue, similar to other agricultural and forestry wood biomass,
could be used as a fuel in substitution for fossil oil for electrical energy production [16] or in
small-scale boilers for thermal energy production [9]. In addition this fuel, being
characterised by a positive energy balance and low-pollution emissions, is able to offer
higher benefits in environmental protection [17].

52 Until now, studies carried out on this topic were mainly focused on technology available for 53 harvesting residue directly in the field [18-19] or on fuel emissions during combustion [20]. 54 Little was made of the biomass present and available in the vineyards in the course of the 55 years. In fact, the experimentations performed on biomass quantification up to now 56 considering different shape of vine stock [21], crop geographic position [19] and different 57 vine variety [21] showed a duration of only one year. This aspect is very important 58 because, during the drawing up of a power station business plan, this value is a key 59 parameter to verify its feasibility and economic sustainability on the long-time [22-23].

In order to verify eventual difference on biomass production and fuel characteristics in the
course of the years, the aim of this work was to analyse the amount of the biomass
available and its fuel characteristics, by management of five main vine varieties planted in
northwest Italy over a long period of (15 years).

64

### 65 2. Materials and methods

The study was carried out on the Tenuta Cannona farm situated in north-western Italy, near the town of Alessandria (44.68 N; 8.62 E). The tests were carried out for a period of 15 years (from 2000 to 2014) in a vineyard growing barbera, dolcetto, cortese, cabernet sauvignon, and moscato vines. These are the main vine varieties of north-western Italy and five of the main vine varieties cultivated in Italy [24]. The vineyard chosen for the tests was 15 years old and had an area of 1.5 ha (0.3 ha for each vine variety) with a northeastern exposure. It had a slope of 20% and a plant layout of  $2.5 \text{ m} \times 1.0 \text{ m}$  (4000 plants per hectare). In detail, each vine variety was represented by 6 rows 200 m in length. All vine varieties were trained using the Guyot system.

75 For each vine variety, pruning residue was harvested in three different areas (plots) and in 76 each area three measurements (replications) were performed. Each area had a surface of 100 m<sup>2</sup> (50 plants) and was allocated in representative zones with a distance at least 20 m 77 from the head of the field. That precaution was performed in order to eliminate an eventual 78 79 'board effect' caused by different environmental conditions (e.g. different sun exposure). The sampling areas were individuated at the beginning of the experiment (2000) and were 80 81 maintained for the whole period studied (15 years). The complete experimental design 82 constituted 675 replications.

In each area, in addition to pruning residue, grape bunches were also harvested in order to verify a potential correlation between biomass and fruit production. In this study, biomass and fruit production were expressed in terms of unit surface area (ha) and single plants. In the first case, the value obtained for the sample area (3000 m<sup>2</sup>) was extended to a hectare using an arithmetical proportion, and in the second case the value was obtained by dividing the sample area production by the number of plants present in the area (50).

Pruning residue was collected immediately after cutting using a manual method.
Successively, it was weighed by a dynamometer (Sicutool® SCU 4488B) adopting an
accuracy of 0.02 N for all measurements.

92 The moisture content of the biomass was estimated using the gravimetric method following
93 European Standard UNI EN 14774-2 [25]. It was performed on 1 kg samples dried in a
94 ventilated oven.

95 Grape bunches were weighed using an Atex Signum® Ex Supreme digital scale (0.01 kg96 accuracy).

97 In order to compare the energy potential of the biomass for the different vine varieties, ash 98 content and calorific values were determined. In fact, ash content is a key parameter for 99 biofuel classification because it indicates the amount of non-combustible material present 100 in the biomass, and a high value can affect the useful life of equipment (slag presence) 101 [26]. The ash content was measured following European Standard UNI EN 14775 [27]. In 102 detail, 20 g of dried biomass was incinerated at 570 °C for a period of 5 h, using a muffle 103 furnace (Sinergica® ZE). Samples were weighed before and after incineration using a 104 digital scale with an accuracy of 0.0001 g (PCE® AB 100). The ash content was expressed 105 as a percentage of the initial value [28] and calculated according to the formula: 106 107  $Ac = Wf / Wi \times 100$ 108 109 where: 110 Ac = Ash content (%)111 Wf = Weight of the sample after incineration (g)112 Wi = Weight of the sample before incineration (g)113 114 Finally, following European Standard UNI EN 14918 [29], the heating value was

115 measured. In particular, the higher heating value (HHV) of the biomass was determined

using an oxygen bomb calorimeter (IKA® C200) on 1 g of dried wood sample.

117 Subsequently, the lower heating value (LHV) was calculated on based on the HHV and the

118 moisture content of the biomass, following the formula:

LHV = HHV(1 - M) - KM

- 121
- 122 where:
- 123 LHV = lower heating value (MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>)
- 124 HHV = higher heating value (MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>)
- 125 M = wet basis moisture content (%)
- 126 K = latent heat of water vaporisation (constant:  $2.447 \text{ MJ kg}^{-1}$ )
- 127
- 128 For the whole test period, a weather station was mounted near the vineyard and the air
- temperature (°C), air humidity (%) and precipitation (mm) were monitored at 1 h intervals.
- 130 All measuring devices were fixed at a height of 1.8 to 2.1 m.
- 131 The data were processed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS (2014) statistical software,
- using an ANOVA procedure and adopting a significance level of  $\alpha$  = 0.05. Eventual
- 133 differences between treatments were checked with the Ryan–Einot–Gabriel–Welsch
- 134 (REGW) test because it has a higher statistical power given this data distribution [30]. The
- 135 REGW-F is a multiple step-down procedure used when all simple means are equal. This
- test is more powerful than Duncan's multiple range test and Student-Newman-Keuls
- 137 (which are also multiple step-down procedures).
- 138
- 139 3. Results
- 140 3.1. Weather conditions

Data analysis showed that over the course of the test period (2000–2014), the annual average air temperature ranged from 12.2 to 15.2 °C, with a mean value of 13.7 °C. The relative humidity values were also fairly constant, with an annual average between 58% and 78% (Table 1). In contrast, precipitation values were inhomogeneous, ranging from
615.4 to 1408.6 mm. It is important to highlight that in all years, in the period available to
prune the vines and harvest the residue (October–February), about 50% of the annual
precipitation was observed.

148

149 3.2. Pruning residue production

150 Over the whole test period, pruning residue production ranged from 0.45 kg of fresh matter per plant (1850 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of fresh matter considering a planting density of 4000 plants per 151 152 hectare) – observed for the dolcetto variety in 2003 – and 1.34 kg of fresh matter per plant  $(5360 \text{ kg ha}^{-1} \text{ of fresh matter})$  – obtained for the cabernet sauvignon variety during 2002. 153 154 That biomass production difference can be mitigated if average values calculated for the 155 whole investigation period are considered. In fact, in that case, production for the dolcetto 156 variety increased to 0.61 kg of fresh matter per plant, while that for the cabernet sauvignon 157 variety decreased to 1.04 kg of fresh matter per plant. In addition, a considerable data 158 dispersion over the years was observed for the cortese vine variety (coefficient of variation 159 (CV) = 24%), while variation for the other vine varieties was never greater than 20%. 160 Significant differences in pruning residue production using the REGW test were found only 161 for cabernet sauvignon (Table 2). Furthermore, no data correlation between weather conditions and pruning residue production was found ( $R^2 < 0.3$ ). In detail, correlations 162 163 were checked comparing the biomass production to monthly average, monthly total, 164 annual average, annual total, seasonal average, seasonal total and coupling the values of 165 the singular month of air temperature, rain events, and relative humidity.

166

167 varieties, with an average value of 3.70 kg of fresh matter per plant. The lowest value168 (1.93 kg) was recorded for the cabernet sauvignon variety. In addition, this study

- 169 highlighted a correlation between grape and biomass production. In fact, ratios were
- 170 statistically different as a function of the vine variety considered: about 3.85 for cortese,
- 171 dolcetto and moscato, and only 1.77 for cabernet sauvignon. The highest value was
- 172 obtained for the barbera vine variety with a value of 4.59.
- 173 CV values calculated for the whole period considered ranged between 14 and 19 (Table
- 174 3).
- 175
- 176 3.3. Moisture content
- 177 The pruning residue produced from the different vine varieties during harvesting displayed
- a similar moisture content for the whole period considered: approximately 50%. In fact, no
- 179 statistical difference was found between the vine varieties and the years investigated180 (Table 4).
- 181
- 182 3.4. Heating value
- 183 The HHV of the five vine varieties tested ranged from 17.92 to 18.02 MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>
- 184 (Table 5), whereas the LHV ranged between 7.34 and 7.96 MJ kg<sup>-1</sup> (Table 6). Data
- 185 processing highlighted no significant difference between the vine varieties tested and the
- annual production of each vine variety, considered both in terms of HHV and LHV.
- 187
- 188 3.5. Ash content
- 189 The average ash content calculated for the whole period considered (2000–2014) was
- 190 approximately 3.85%. The lowest value (3.80%) was obtained for dolcetto, while the
- 191 highest value (3.93%) was observed for moscato biomass. Also, for this parameter

192 statistical analysis did not show any difference between the vine varieties for annual 193 production investigated, adopting a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$  (Table 7).

194

# 195 4. Discussion

The pruning residue production observed during the test (from  $1.85 \text{ t} \text{ ha}^{-1}$  to  $5.36 \text{ t} \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ) is 196 197 in line with other studies carried out in Chile [28] and Italy [13], which considered other 198 vine varieties. In this study, a high variability ( $CV \le 16$ ) of annual biomass production for 199 four vine varieties (cortese, dolcetto, barbera, and moscato) over the course of the years 200 investigated is also highlighted. In some cases the biomass availability could vary by up to 201 50%. This could become a big problem for drawing up a power station business plan 202 because a fuel variation of 50% could cause an interruption in energy production or the 203 need to have a large reserve of material. In this regard, however, readers must remember 204 that wood biomass storage could in turn cause energy losses and higher costs [31].

Furthermore, in an absence of correlation between annual biomass production and weather conditions, and the high variability of the grape/biomass ratio, it is very difficult to estimate the amount of biomass available, not only for future years, but also for the current year.

In addition, another problem linked to a high variety of biomass production in different
years is the difficulty of calculating the real potential of the vineyard considered because,
depending on the reference year, it is possible to overestimate or underestimate biomass
production.

The moisture content values obtained in this work are more homogenous than those obtained in other studies conducted with other vine varieties [18, 28, 32-33]. These differences could be caused by the different geographic areas in which the trials were

carried out (Spain [31], Chile [28], and Saudi Arabia [32]), the different seasons in which
the tests were performed (August [28], January–February [18], December [32]), or the
different amount of time between cutting and moisture content determination (immediately
in this work, but not accountable for other works). In this experiment, no variation in
moisture content was observed between the vine varieties tested during the whole 15 year
period. This result highlights that it is possible to predict the initial biomass moisture
content with good accuracy.

Moisture content values found in this study (approximately 50%) were lower than poplar
wood (approximately 60%) [34] and higher than black locust wood (approximately 45%)
[30], the main tree species used for woodchip production in northwest Italy [31].
Nevertheless, the values are 30% greater than the commercial value admitted for dried
wood biomass used as a biofuel.

The HHV of the pruning residue observed in this study is in line with that found in other works [18, 32-33]. The average value ( $18.00 \text{ MJ kg}^{-1}$ ) obtained for all vine varieties tested was similar to that of hardwood tree species ( $18.04 \text{ MJ kg}^{-1}$ ) [34], but lower than that of softwood forest trees ( $20.20 \text{ MJ kg}^{-1}$ ) [35]. This variation could be due to the high resin content of conifer wood [36].

Many researchers have determined the ash content of pruning residue, and its value
ranged from 2.4% to 5.3% [18, 20, 32–33], as did the values found in this work
(approximately 3.86%). In contrast to other experiments, in which authors studied different
vine varieties, in this work low data variability was found between the vine varieties tested.
This situation could be caused not only by different vine residue types but also by their
contamination with inert materials like soil dust or small stones [37]. Nevertheless, it
highlights that the agricultural residue shows an ash content greater than forestry wood

(about 1%) [38]. Unfortunately, this physical characteristic of vineyard pruning residue
makes it less suitable for use in boilers or stoves because ash accumulation can cause
some problems in biomass combustion [39].

243

#### 244 **5. Conclusions**

245 This study has highlighted the good potential of vineyard pruning residue as a biofuel for 246 energy production because it presents values of moisture content (during harvesting) and 247 calorific value in line with those obtainable from woodchips produced by dedicate 248 plantations (SRC). In addition, its physical characteristics do not change as a function of 249 the vine varieties considered or over the course of time. In contrast, biomass production 250 can show sensible variation between vine varieties and between years. This latter aspect 251 is very important because, according to the reference year considered, it is possible to 252 under- or overestimate the real biomass production of the vineyard considered in the 253 years.

254

# 255 References

[1] Muench S, Guenther E. A systematic review of bioenergy life cycle assessments.

257 Applied Energy 2013;112:257–273.

[2] Guo M, Song W, Buhain J. Bioenergy and biofuel: history, status and perspective.

259 Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 2015;42:712–725.

[3] Velazquez-Marti B, Fernandez-Gonzales E, Lopez-Cortez I, Salazar-Hernandez DM.

- 261 Quantification of the residual biomass obtained from pruning of trees on
- 262 Mediterranean olive groves. Biomass & Bioenergy 2001;35:3208–3217.

- [4] Scarlat N, Blukdea V, Dallemand JF. Assessment of the availability of agricultural and
   forest residues for bioenergy production in Romania. Biomass & Bioenergy
   2011;35:1995–2005.
- [5] Bernetti I, Fagarazzi C, Fratini R. A methodology to analyze the potential development
- 267 of biomass energy sector: an application in Tuscany. Forest Policy and Economics
  268 2004;6:415–432.
- [6] Beccali M, Columba P, D'Aleberti V. Assessment of bioenergy potential in Sicily: a GISbased support methodology. Biomass & Bioenergy 2009;33:79–87.
- [7] Magagnotti N, Pari L, Picchi G, Spinelli R. Technology alternatives for tapping the
- pruning residue resource. Bioresource Technology 2013;128:697–702.
- [8] Gonzalez-Garcia S, Dias AC, Clermidy S, Benoist A, Maurel VB, Gasol AM, Gabarell X,
- Arroja L. Comparative environmental and energy profiles of potential bioenergy
- production chains in Southern Europe. Journal of Cleaner Production 2014;76:42–54.
- [9] Picchi G, Silvestri S, Cristoforetti A. Vineyard residues as a fuel for domestic boilers in
- 277 Trento province (Italy): comparison to wood chips and means of polluting emission
- 278 control. Fuel 2013;113:43–49.
- [10] OIC. Statistical report on world vitiviniculture. Paris, France: International Organisation
  of Vine and Wine; 2013.
- [11] FAOSTAT. Production crops area harvested, 2009 data. Food and Agriculture
   Organization of the United Nations; 2011.
- [12] Di Blasi C, Tanzi V, Lanzetta M. A study on the production of agricultural residues in
  Italy. Biomass & Bioenergy 1997;12:321–331.
- [13] Spinelli R, Lombardini C, Pari L, Sadauskiene L. An alternative to field burning of
- pruning residues in mountain vineyards. Ecological Engineering 2014;70:212–216.
- [14] Magagnotti N, Nati C, Spinelli R, Vieri M. Technical protocol for the utilization of
- pruning residues from vineyards and olive groves. In: The forest-wood-energy chain:

- results from the international project woodland energy. Florence, Italy: ARSIA diRegione Toscana; 2009.
- [15] Keshtkar H, Ashbaugh L. Size distribution of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
   particulate emission factors from agricultural burning. Atmospheric Research

293 2007;41:2729–2739.

- [16] Jones G, Joeffler D, Calkin D, Chung W. Forest treatment residues for thermal energy
   compared with disposal by onsite burning: emissions and energy return. Biomass &
   Bioenergy 2010;34:737–746.
- [17] Gonzalez-Garcia S, Dias AC, Clermidy S, Benoist A, Bellon Maurel V, Gasol CM,
- 298 Gabarell X, Arroja L. Comparative environmental and energy profiles of potential
- bioenergy production chains in Southern Europe. Jurnal of Cleaner Production2014;76:42-64.
- [18] Spinelli R, Nati C, Pari L, Mescalchin E, Magagnotti N. Production and quality of
   biomass fuels from mechanised collection and processing of vineyard pruning

303 residues. Applied Energy 2012;80:374–379.

- [19] Cavalaglio G, Cotana S. Recovery of Wineyard Pruning residues in an agroenergetic
   chain, 15<sup>th</sup> European Biomass Conference and Exhibition, (2007).
- 306 [20] Garcia-Maraver A, Zamorano M, Fernandes U, Rabacal M, Costa M. Relationship
- between fuel quality and gaseous and particulate matter emissions in a domestic
  pellet-fired boiler. Fuel 2014;119:141–152.
- 309 [21] Velazquez-Marti B, Fernandez-Gonzales E, Lopez-Cortez I, Salazar-Hernandez DM.
- 310 Quantification of the residual biomass obtained from pruning of vineyards in
- 311 Mediterranean area. Biomass & Bioenergy 2011;35:3453–3464.
- 312 [22] Corona G, Nicoletti G. Renewable energy from the production residues on vineyards
- and wine: evaluation of a business case. New Medit 2010;4:41-47.

- 314 [23] Scarlat N, Blujdea V, Dallemand JF. Assessment of the availability of agricultural and
- forest residues for bioenergy production in Romania. Biomass & Bioenergy
  2011;35:1995-2005.
- 317 [24] ISTAT 2010. Italian National Institute of Statistics; 2010.
- 318 [25] UNI EN 14774-2. Solid biofuels, determination of moisture content oven dry method,
- 319 Part 2: total moisture simplified method 2010. Italian Organization for
- 320 Standardization; 2010.
- 321 [26] Saidur R, Abdelaziz EA, Demirbas A, Hossain MS, Mekhlilef S. A review on biomass
- as a fuel for boilers. Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews 2011;15(5):2262–
- 323 2289.
- 324 [27] UNI EN 14775. Solid biofuels, determination of ash content. Italian Organization for
   325 Standardization; 2010.
- 326 [28] Fernandez-Puratich H, Hernandez D, Tenreiro C. Analysis of energetic performance
- of vine biomass residues as an alternative fuel for Chilean wine industry. Renewable
  Energy 2015;83:1260–1267.
- [29] UNI EN 14918. Solid biofuels, determination of calorific value. Italian Organization for
   Standardization; 2010.
- [30] Einot I, Gabriel KR. A study of the powers of several methods of multiple
- comparisons. Journal of the American Statistical Association 1975;70(351):574–583.
- 333 [31] Manzone M, Balsari P, Spinelli R. Small-scale storage techniques for fuel chips from
  334 short rotation forestry. Fuel 2013;109:687–692.
- 335 [32] Nasser AR, Salem MZM, Al-Mefarrej HA, Abdel-Aal MA, Soliman SS. Fuel
- 336 characteristics of vine prunings (Vitis vinifera L.) as a potential source for energy
- 337 production. BioResources 2014;9(1):482–496.

- 338 [33] Mendivil MA, Munoz P, Morales MP, Juarez MC, Garcia-Escudero E. Chemical
- 339 characterization of pruned vine shoots from La Rioja (Spain) for obtaining solid bio-
- fuel. Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy 2013;5(3):1–13.
- [34] Manzone M. Energy and moisture losses during poplar and black locust logwood
- 342 storage. Fuel Processing Technology 2015;138:194–201.
- 343 [35] Spinelli R, Nati C, Sozzi L, Magagnotti N, Picchi G. Physical characterization of
   344 commercial woodchips on the Italian energy market. Fuel 2011;90:2198–2202.
- 345 [36] Naik S, Goud V, Rout P, Jacobson K, Dalai A. Characterization of Canadian biomass
  346 for alternative renewable biofuel. Renewable Energy 2010;35:1624–1631.
- 347 [37] Garba MU, Ingham DB, Ma L, Degereji MU, Pourkashanian M, Williams A. Modelling
- of deposit formation and sintering for the co-combustion of coal with biomass. Fuel2013;113:863–872.
- [38] Munalula F, Meicken M. An evaluation of South African fuel wood with regards to
- 351 calorific value and environmental impact. Biomass & Bioenergy 2009;33(5):415–420.
- [39] Nunes LJR, Matias JCO, Catalao JPS. Biomass combustion system: a review on the
- 353 physical and chemical properties of the ashes. Renewable and Sustainable Energy
- 354 Reviews 2016;53:235–242.