



**FutureMetrics™ LLC**

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

## **An Integrated Process Review of Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) Sources from Thermally Treated biomass Pellets and their Release into Runoff**

Quantifying the issue and outlining pathways to minimize the cost of treatment



**April 2026**

**Principal Author: Laurenz Schmidt**



## Table of Content

### Contents

<b>Table of Content</b> .....	2
<b>List of Tables, Figures, and Equations</b> .....	5
<b>Glossary</b> .....	6
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	8
<b>1.1 New Research and Analysis</b> .....	9
<b>1.2 Output</b> .....	9
<b>2 The Challenge and the Scope of this Report</b> .....	9
<b>2.1 Scope of the Report</b> .....	9
<b>2.2 Definitions</b> .....	9
<b>3 Characteristics of the different thermal treatments</b> .....	10
<b>3.1 Steam-Exploded Pellets (SE)</b> .....	10
<b>3.2 Torrefied Pellets (TBP)</b> .....	11
<b>3.3 Torrefaction After Pelletization (TAP)</b> .....	11
<b>3.4 Hot Water Treated Pellets</b> .....	12
<b>3.5 Drivers for COD</b> .....	12
<b>3.6 COD produced by our samples</b> .....	13
<b>3.7 Pellet leachates, pellets, and coarse filters after 24h of agitated leaching</b> .....	15
<b>4 Composition of COD in Pellet Runoff</b> .....	16
<b>5 COD Release Behavior</b> .....	18



# FutureMetrics™ LLC

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

<b>5.1 Laboratory Leaching Tests</b> .....	18
<b>5.2 Release Mechanisms</b> .....	19
<b>5.2.1 Wash-off</b> .....	19
<b>5.2.2. Diffusion</b> .....	19
<b>5.2.3 Chemical transformation and physical changes</b> .....	21
<b>5.2.4 Summary of release mechanisms</b> .....	21
<b>5.3 Release tests on SE, TBP, and TAP material</b> .....	22
<b>5.3.1 Mass-Balance Formulation</b> .....	22
<b>5.3.2 Measured COD Concentrations</b> .....	23
<b>5.3.3 Post-Replacement COD (Carryover Concentration)</b> .....	24
<b>5.3.4 Release Rates (Mass-Balance Corrected)</b> .....	25
<b>5.3.5 Cumulative COD Release</b> .....	27
<b>5.3.6 Mobilization</b> .....	28
<b>6 Site Conditions Affecting Runoff</b> .....	32
<b>6.1 Influence of Environmental Conditions</b> .....	32
<b>6.2 Pile Design</b> .....	32
<b>6.3 Pile Management Practices</b> .....	33
<b>7 Runoff Model</b> .....	34
<b>7.1 Water Balance</b> .....	34
<b>7.2 COD Load Calculation</b> .....	34
<b>7.3 Graphical presentation COD and runoff profiles of our hypothetical example</b> .....	40
<b>7.3.1 Monte Carlo Simulation Discussion</b> .....	42
<b>8 Regulatory Requirements and Directions</b> .....	45
<b>8.1 regional requirements</b> .....	45
<b>8.2 Special Considerations and Directions</b> .....	45
<b>9 Treatment Technologies</b> .....	46
<b>9.1 Passive Solutions</b> .....	46



# FutureMetrics™ LLC

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

9.2 Biological Treatment .....	47
9.3 Physico-Chemical Treatment.....	48
9.4 Combined Treatment Systems .....	48
10 Treatment Technology Comparison .....	49
10.1 Efficiency profiles by technology .....	50
10.2 Technology Suitability by Pellet Type .....	52
10.3 System-Level Efficiency Comparison.....	52
10.4 Solution options .....	52
11. Economic Assessment .....	53
11.1 CAPEX Estimation .....	53
11.1.1 Approximate CAPEX breakdown .....	53
11.1.2 Lagoon type 12,000 m <sup>3</sup> SBR basin capacity cost in \$/m <sup>3</sup> capacity .....	54
11.1.3 Model assumptions.....	55
Annual consumption .....	55
11.1.4 2026 base CAPEX/OPEX estimates for pile runoff (model) .....	55
11.2 Inflation assumption .....	56
11. 3 Tech-specific notes .....	56
12. Recommended Scenario Evaluation Methodology.....	57
13 Summary and Conclusions.....	59
13.1 Pellets .....	59
13.2 Pile .....	60
13.3 Treatment methods.....	60
13.4 CAPEX/OPEX.....	61
13.5 Disclaimer .....	61
14 Bibliography.....	62
15 Acknowledgment .....	63



## List of Tables, Figures, and Equations

Table 1: Runoff Properties and Release Behavior .....	12
Table 2: SUVA <sub>254</sub> vs. Biodegradability .....	16
Table 3: SUVA <sub>254</sub> from SE, TBP, and TAP samples .....	17
Table 4: COD Measurements as shown in Figure 3.....	23
Table 5: Post Replacement Measurements as shown in Figure 4.....	24
Table 6: Release Rate per L of Leachate vs. Time Interval .....	25
Table 7: Cumulative Release of COD vs. Time.....	27
Table 8: COD Release in mg/L Leachate per Interval .....	28
Table 9: Mobilization Coefficient per Interval.....	28
Table 10: COD Behavior and Runoff Risk by Pellet Type .....	30
Table 11: General Control Entries .....	35
Table 12: Input Table for COD and Runoff Calculation.....	35
Table 13: Pile Area, Runoff Profile, and exposed Pellet Masses by Month .....	36
Table 14: COD released and COD Concentration in Runoff .....	36
Table 15: Treatment Technology Comparison .....	50
Table 16: CAPEX Fractions for an SBR System.....	54
Table 17: Comparative Cost (2020) for different Basin Designs.....	54
Table 18: CAPEX/OPEX Estimates for a Treatment System for our Example .....	55
Figure 1: COD Ranges and Averages from tested SE, TBP and TAP Pellets .....	13
Figure 2: Pictures of Leachates, Pellets and Filters .....	15
Figure 3: Measured COD in Leachate vs. Time .....	23
Figure 4: Post Replacement COD in Leachate vs. Time Intervals.....	24
Figure 5: Release Rate of COD vs. Time Interval.....	25
Figure 6: log(10) Release Rate of COD vs. Time Interval.....	26
Figure 7: Cumulative Release of COD per kg of Pellets.....	27
Figure 8: Mobilization of COD in four One Hour Intervals.....	30



# FutureMetrics™ LLC

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

Figure 9: Mobilization Coefficient ..... 30

Figure 10: Monthly COD Release in kg by Pellet Category ..... 40

Figure 11: COD released per kg wetted Pellets and Runoff Concentration ..... 41

Figure 12: Pile Tonnage and Runoff Volume (Pile and Gross) by Month ..... 41

Figure 13: Simulation - Annual Total COD in kg for our Example..... 42

Figure 14: Simulation - Contribution to Total COD ..... 43

Figure 15: Simulation - September Precipitation Impact on Total Annual COD ..... 44

Figure 16: Simulation - Total Annual COD with full Mix exposure and w./o. SE Pellets..... 44

Figure 17: Efficiency Profile of Treatment Technologies ..... 51

Figure 18: Suitability Profile for Treatment Technologies ..... 53

Figure 19: Cost Efficiency Profile of Treatment Technologies ..... 53

  

Equation 1: Cumulative COD mass at step n..... 19

Equation 2: COD Release vs. time, fast Release and Higuchi Domain ..... 20

Equation 3: Total COD Mass released from all Release Terms..... 21

Equation 4: Mass Fraction COD released at Interval i..... 22

## Glossary

BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand	mg/L
CAPEX	Capital Expenditures	
CENER	National Renewable Energy Center of Spain	
Cl <sup>-</sup>	Chlorine Ion	
CO	Carbon monoxide	
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide	
CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	Carbonate Ion	
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand	mg/L
d.b.	dry base (for moisture calculation)	
DOC	Dissolved Organic Carbon	
ECN	Energy Research Center of the Netherlands	
EFB	Empty Fruit Bunches from palm oil production	
EPA300	EPA method for chromatographic measurements of anions and cations in water	
ET <sub>0</sub>	Actual Evapotranspiration (Penman-Monteith)	



## *FutureMetrics™ LLC*

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization with water standards)
FIFO	First IN- First OUT
FOG	Fats, Oils, Greases
GAC	Granulated Activated Carbon
Hach 8000	Dichromate-based spectrophotometric COD determination
HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	Bicarbonate Ion
HMF	Hydroxymethylfurfural
HW	Hot water treated biomass fibers, then pelletized (typ. 210°C)
IEA	International Energy Agency
LIFO	Last IN - First OUT
MBBR	Moving Bed Bio Reactor
OH <sup>-</sup>	Hydroxyl Radical
OPEX	Operations Expenses
Ozone:AOP	Ozone: Advanced Oxidation Processes (H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> , UV)
PET	Potential Evapotranspiration(Thorntwaite)
pH	Measurement of acidity and alkalinity
PSA	Pressure Swing Absorption (oxygen generation)
SBR	Sequencing Bio Reactor
SE Pellets	Pellets made from Steam-exploded biomass fibers
SECTOR Deliverable 6.7	EU-funded Report on Production of Solid Sustainable Energy Carriers
SEW	SE pellets from biomass that was washed after SE
SUVA <sub>254</sub>	Specific UV Absorption at 254 nm wavelength = UV <sub>A254</sub> /DOC
TAP	White pellets that were torrefied after pellet formation
TBP	Pellets made from torrefied biomass fibers
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
UmU	University of Umeå
UVA <sub>254</sub>	UV Absorption at 254 nm wavelength
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds



## *FutureMetrics™ LLC*

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

### **1 Introduction**

Over the past several years, the issue of COD in runoff from open-air storage piles of so-called “black” pellets has gained increasing importance and scrutiny. The matter is of great importance in areas with high sensitivity to water pollution and the well-being of marine life. The early developers of torrefaction and steam treatment technologies initially treated the problem as a lower-tier issue.

All of them have realized that it is a first-order problem that needs to be addressed if a coal substitute in the form of black pellets is to achieve a higher adoption rate.

FutureMetrics conducted a study and offers our findings in a high-level engineering report structure for a COD-targeted pellet runoff assessment that regulators, engineers, and project developers can use. It reflects the reality that different black pellet technologies produce different COD signatures, and that meteorology, storage design, and treatment strategy determine the economics of the final solution.

The structure follows a logic chain used in environmental engineering studies:

Pellet type → COD generation → site conditions → runoff formation → treatment options → techno-economic optimization.

FutureMetrics observed that the issue of COD in runoff from black pellet piles remains insufficiently addressed. Specifically, variations among pellet types and factors such as weather conditions, water penetration into the pile, the chemistry of COD-causing substances, pile management, treatment options, and fuel type selection warrant a comprehensive review, as many variables interact.

This report discusses these variables and aims to assist decision-makers in the pellet manufacturing industry to determine the feasibility of a project, narrow the choices, and to design targeted tests tailored to their specific situation. The results of these tests enable cost-optimized decisions about fuel selection, pile management, and runoff treatment to support full compliance with local regulations. The combination of these activities leads to a substantial derisking of the budget and schedule for any planned project.

**The report is, in many ways, the first of its kind in terms of practical application to the emerging black pellet sector.**

This report does not provide a “silver bullet” to solve all COD issues uniformly but informs the reader what to look for and how to consider the variables in their decision process.

We show experimentally verified data from various fuel types and suppliers and illustrate how to approach the selection of the appropriate treatment process.



## **FutureMetrics™ LLC**

8 Airport Road  
Bethel, ME 04217, USA

***The information provided is a generic guideline, not a specific set of instructions for solving a specific project's challenges. Each project's fuel mix, fuel yard design, local precipitation and temperature parameters, generation profiles, and other critical variables will contribute to the determination of the best and most cost-effective solution for meeting regulatory requirements.***

### **1.1 New Research and Analysis**

- Assessment of COD generation from different pellet types
- Key findings on COD release behavior
- Summary of recommended management and treatment strategy
- Estimated cost range for the suitable solution(s)

### **1.2 Output**

- COD release ranges (mg/L, kg/t of pellets, and kg/month for given pellet piles)
- COD sensitivity to pellet mix in the pile
- Required treatment capacity
- Recommended treatment pathway