







 Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act - passed in 2021 • Brazilian mandate to blend Ethanol into fuel supply - passed in 1930s

# **Anhydrous Ethanol Production Using Membrane Technology**

## Schulich School of Engineering, University of Calgary Department of Chemical Engineering

### Rojda Timocin, Karen Florez, Mohammed Baessa, Thomson Midzi, Sara Ahad



Figure 5. Advantages of Membrane Dehydration Compared to Cyclohexane

(USD/L)

As summarized, the Whitefox membranes show extended benefits in terms of economics, safety and operability. This is due to multiple factors:

(MJ/kg EtOH)

(kg/kg EtOH)

• The higher equipment cost for dehydration using cyclohexane entrainer (~\$3 million **USD**) can be attributed towards the material of equipment required due to the toxic properties of cyclohexane. Additionally, cyclohexane entrainer systems call for a more complex plant layout with additional equipment (distillation columns, recovery columns, etc.) in comparison to the Proton Pioneers' plant that utilizes membrane dehydration technology (equipment cost of \$2.8 million USD)

• Membrane dehydration shows lower cost of production (\$0.51 USD/L) mainly due to the evident difference in energy and steam consumptions. Moreover, membrane dehydration systems are shown to require less maintenance than cyclohexane entrainer systems (cost of production ~\$2.40 USD/L). This is due to the comparatively simplistic design and fewer equipment in membrane dehydration

 Dehydration using cyclohexane entrainer has higher energy and steam consumption (13.7 MJ/ Kg EtOH, 24.9 Kg steam/kg EtOH) than the membrane unit (2.48 MJ/ Kg EtOH, 6.95 Kg steam/kg EtOH). This difference is due to the high thermal energy requirement in the distillation process and the additional energy needed for the recovery and recycling for the entrainer.

• Membrane separation is safer than dehydration using cyclohexane because it minimizes the risk of chemical exposure and environmental emissions