

Quality analysis of perennial grasses for use as bioenergy feedstock



Introduction

Perennial grasses have potential for use as dedicated bioenergy crops in the Northeastern (NE) region of the US. Replicated small plot trials of both cool and warm season perennial grasses were established in 2007 in diverse locations in New York (NY). Currently, very little is known about the variability in biomass quality components in these grasses that may be important for emerging bioenergy industry conversion technologies. An objective of this project is to obtain information on the compositional characteristics of perennial grasses grown in different environments in NY.



Fig. 1. Replicated warm season perennial grass trial

Table 1. Common and scientific names of warm season perennial grasses established in small plot trials in NY.

Common name	Species
big bluestem	<i>Andropogon gerardii</i>
coastal panic grass	<i>Panicum amarulum</i>
eastern gamagrass	<i>Tripsacum dactyloides</i>
indiangrass	<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>
switchgrass	<i>Panicum virgatum</i>

Materials & Methods

Replicated perennial grass trials were established in 2007 in four counties in NY. Seed of five warm season and four cool season grass species (Tables 1 and 2) were planted with a Carter (Carter Manufacturing Co., Brookston, ID) small plot seeder. Twelve switchgrass varieties, four big bluestem, two indiagrass, one coastal panic grass and one eastern gamagrass variety were used for the study (Fig.1). Three wheatgrass varieties and two varieties each of tall fescue, reed canary and bromegrass were evaluated in the cool season grass trial (Fig.2). Perennial grass samples harvested from trials were oven dried, ground to a 1 mm particle size and scanned on a Foss NIR Systems spectrophotometer (Foss NIR Systems, Model 5000, Silver Spring, MD). Approximately 10% of the samples were selected for calibration by principal component analysis method using WINISI II software (Infrasoft International, Port Matilda, PA). These calibration samples were analyzed through wet-chemistry by Dairy One Forage Testing Laboratory, Ithaca, NY. NIR equations were then developed for the sample set using ISI software (Infrasoft International, CAL version 1.5 and higher, Port Matilda, PA) to predict values of all perennial grass samples.



Fig. 2. Replicated cool season perennial grass trial

Table 3. Yield dry tons/acre (dt/a) data of warm season perennial grasses, listed by variety and common name from plots harvested in Jefferson, Chemung, Tompkins and Genesee Counties in New York in 2008.

Variety	Common name	Yield (dt/a)				
		Jefferson 17-Sep	Big Flats Chemung 24-Sep	Ithaca Tompkins 24-Sep	Pavilion Genesee 7-Oct	
Bonanza	big bluestem	1.18	1.23	1.68	1.08	
Goldmine	big bluestem	0.84	1.16	1.79	1.42	
Nagara	big bluestem	0.90	1.48	1.29	1.23	
Atlantic	coastal panic	1.00	2.31	3.86	1.44	
Pete	e.gamagrass	0.56	1.21	1.37	0.63	
Blackwell	switchgrass	2.27	2.75	4.26	2.39	
Carthage	switchgrass	1.63	2.95	4.05	1.71	
CIR	switchgrass	1.51	2.77	4.49	1.86	
CIRP	switchgrass	1.99	3.25	4.31	1.55	
Forensburg	switchgrass	0.84	1.12	2.04	1.10	
Karlow	switchgrass	1.08	1.59	4.33	1.49	
Rainfinder	switchgrass	1.84	2.98	3.97	1.79	
Shawnee	switchgrass	1.38	2.54	5.00	2.10	
Shelter	switchgrass	1.84	2.98	3.97	1.79	
Surbarus	switchgrass	0.81	1.25	1.79	1.74	
Traiblazer	switchgrass	1.82	1.88	4.17	1.58	
Nebraska 54	Indiangrass	2.47	1.52	3.17	1.80	
Nebraska 28	switchgrass	0.74	1.34	2.49	0.83	
Rumley	Indiangrass	1.35	1.13	2.48	1.42	
Pawnee	big bluestem	0.89	1.14	1.71	0.95	
Mix1	CIR/Bonanza	1.48	2.37	4.61	1.91	
Mix2	Surbarus/Nagara	0.78	1.38	1.89	1.08	
Mix3	CIR/Rock/Pete	1.33	2.60	5.03	2.14	
Mix4	Nagara/Pete	0.60	1.30	0.89	0.89	
Average		1.25	1.78	3.02	1.46	
LSD (0.05)		0.70	0.68	0.81	0.45	

CR: Cave-in-Rock was established prior to planting

Results & Discussion

There was a significant genotype by location interaction on warm season grass yields most likely due to differences in weed pressure at the field sites. The highest yields (average 3.02 dt/a) were obtained at the Tompkins County location in Ithaca, NY (Table 3). Tables 4 and 5 show ranking (top five from each trial location) of compositional characteristics of warm season grass varieties as predicted by PCA method using WINISI II software (Infrasoft International, Port Matilda, PA). Switchgrass varieties generally contained higher levels of lignin (L) (Key - Table 6), non-fibrous carbohydrates (NFC), and water soluble carbohydrates (WSC) than other warm season grasses evaluated. While big bluestem and indiagrass varieties had higher levels of cellulose (C) and hemi-cellulose (HC). Plant varieties showed a considerable amount of diversity in characteristics evaluated but for the most part had the same ranking for characteristics at the different locations. This indicates that genetics may have a greater influence on important quality characteristics than environment.

Cool season grasses evaluated had higher yields (Table 7) than the warm season grasses. However, cool season grasses were managed in a two-cut harvest system versus a one-cut for warm season grasses and nitrogen was applied after the first harvest. Cool season grasses had higher nitrogen, ash and mineral contents than the warm season grasses (Tables 8 and 9) and lower lignin.

Table 7. Yield dry tons/acre (dt/a) data of cool season perennial grasses, listed by variety and common name from plots harvested Tompkins County New York in 2008.

Variety	Common name	Yield (dt/a)		
		19-Jun	25-Sep	Season
Alkar	wheatgrass	2.66	1.52	4.18
Jose	wheatgrass	2.63	1.57	4.20
Largo	wheatgrass	2.56	1.98	4.54
Alkar	wheatgrass	2.62	1.58	4.49
Enhance	tall fescue	3.25	3.01	6.27
Bull	tall fescue	3.08	2.74	5.82
Bellevue	reed canary	2.59	2.75	5.34
Chiefton	reed canary	2.62	2.51	5.13
Peak	brome	3.05	2.07	5.12
York	brome	3.04	2.14	5.19
Trial Mean (DT/A)		2.83	2.20	5.03
LSD (0.05)		0.32	0.26	0.45

Tables 4 and 5. Biomass quality components of warm season grass trials established in four locations in NY

Mean - Tompkins County													
% N	% C	% H	% L	% HC	% NFC	% WSC	% ADF	% NDF	% CP	% TDN	% DM	% OM	% ME
0.09	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.10	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.11	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.12	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.13	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

Mean - Jefferson County													
% N	% C	% H	% L	% HC	% NFC	% WSC	% ADF	% NDF	% CP	% TDN	% DM	% OM	% ME
0.08	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.09	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.10	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.11	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.12	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

Table 6. Compositional analysis key

Mean - Tompkins County (Percent)													
% N	% C	% H	% L	% HC	% NFC	% WSC	% ADF	% NDF	% CP	% TDN	% DM	% OM	% ME
0.09	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.10	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.11	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.12	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
0.13	34.0	5.8	28.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

Tables 8 and 9. Biomass quality components of cool season grass trials established in Tompkins County, NY

Mean - Tompkins County (Percent)													
% N	% C	% H	% L	% HC	% NFC	% WSC	% ADF	% NDF	% CP	% TDN	% DM	% OM	% ME
0.15	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.16	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.17	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.18	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.19	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0

Mean - Tompkins County (Percent)													
% N	% C	% H	% L	% HC	% NFC	% WSC	% ADF	% NDF	% CP	% TDN	% DM	% OM	% ME
0.15	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.16	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.17	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.18	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
0.19	45.0	8.0	35.0	2.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project is supported in part by Cornell University, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, the New York Farm Viability Institute, and the Northern New York Agricultural Development Program.