



PERGAMON

Biomass and Bioenergy 19 (2000) 229–244

**BIOMASS &
BIOENERGY**

www.elsevier.com/locate/biombio

Bamboo: an overlooked biomass resource?

J.M.O. Scurlock^{a,*}, D.C. Dayton^b, B. Hames^b

^a*Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Bethel Valley Road, P.O. Box 2008, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6407, USA*

^b*National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 1617 Cole Boulevard, MS 3311, Golden, CO 80401, USA*

Received 4 January 2000; accepted 16 May 2000

Abstract

Bamboo is the common term applied to a broad group (1250 species) of large woody grasses, ranging from 10 cm to 40 m in height. Already in everyday use by about 2.5 billion people, mostly for fiber and food within Asia, bamboo may have potential as a bioenergy or fiber crop for niche markets, although some reports of its high productivity seem to be exaggerated. Literature on bamboo productivity is scarce, with most reports coming from various parts of Asia. There is little evidence overall that bamboo is significantly more productive than many other candidate bioenergy crops, but it shares a number of desirable fuel characteristics with certain other bioenergy feedstocks, such as low ash content and alkali index. Its heating value is lower than many woody biomass feedstocks but higher than most agricultural residues, grasses and straws. Although non-fuel applications of bamboo biomass may be actually more profitable than energy recovery, there may also be potential for co-production of bioenergy together with other bamboo processing. A significant drawback is the difficulty of selective breeding, given the lack of knowledge of flowering physiology. Further research is also required on propagation techniques, establishment and stand management, and mechanized harvesting needs to be developed. Published by Elsevier Science Ltd.

Keywords: Bamboo; Bioenergy; Biofuel; Fuel analysis; Productivity

1. Introduction

It may be observed cynically that every 5–10 years a new “magic feedstock” appears on the bioenergy scene, a new Philosopher’s Stone about which great claims are made concerning its productivity, its ease of integration into existing markets for growing and fuel supply, its life-cycle analysis, and so on. Some of these novel candidate feedstocks may not be so new

— they may have been considered and dismissed 20 years ago, or they may be already in widespread use outside the industrialized world. Bamboo is such a candidate, carrying with it a degree of Eastern mysticism: yet remarkably little is known about this entire sub-family of tall graminaceous plants, despite its everyday utilization, mostly for fiber and food, by about 2.5 billion people – over 40% of the world’s population.

This review evaluates bamboo as a potential bioenergy feedstock, and tackles some of the myths and facts surrounding it — its “prodigious” productivity, its “disastrous” flowering, its multiple uses, etc.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: 001-865-241-5926; fax: 001-865-574-4665.

E-mail address: npq@ornl.gov (J.M.O. Scurlock).

A limited range of bamboo species are characterized with respect to fuel quality, and a number of research recommendations are concluded.

2. What is bamboo?

Bamboo is the vernacular or common term for members of a particular taxonomic group of large woody grasses (subfamily Bambusoideae, family Andropogoneae/Poaceae). Bamboos encompass 1250 species within 75 genera, most of which are relatively fast-growing, attaining stand maturity within five years, but flowering infrequently. Dwarf bamboos may be as little as 10 cm in height, but stands of tall species may attain 15–20 m, and the largest known (e.g. *Dendrocalamus giganteus*) grow up to 40 m in height and 30 cm in culm (stem) diameter. Bamboos are distributed mostly in the tropics, but occur naturally in subtropical and temperate zones of all continents except Europe, at latitudes from 46°N to 47°S and from sea level to 4000 m elevation [1–3]. Asia accounts for about 1000 species, covering an area of over 180,000 km² (the size of Missouri, half the size of Germany, or about 2% of US total land area). Most of this comprises natural stands of native species rather than plantations or introductions. China alone has about 300 species in 44 genera, occupying 33,000 km² or 3% of the country's total forest area [4]. Another major bamboo-producing country is India, with 130 species covering 96,000 km² or about 13% of the total forested area [5]. Other nations with significant bamboo production and utilization include Bangladesh, Indonesia and Thailand.

The taxonomy of bamboos is still poorly understood, at least in part because of the infrequent flowering of many species (at intervals of 30–60 years). Major economic species include the following:

Dendrocalamus strictus — native to India. Solid culms, of greatest economic importance in India, where only about 10 out of more than 100 bamboo species are commercially exploited. Used mostly for paper-making and construction.

Dendrocalamus asper — thought to be native to Thailand. Thailand intends to propagate plantlets of this species since much of the present edible bamboo shoot production is from natural forests and not sustainable [1].

Thyrsostachys siamensis — native to Thailand. Used for construction in both rural and urban areas of Thailand; also cultivated for edible shoots.

Phyllostachys pubescens — sometimes described as *Phyllostachys edulis*. Originally from China, where it occurs extensively (20,000 km² or 60% of total bamboo cover); introduced to Japan in about 1750. The largest of the *Phyllostachys* genus, this species is harvested for both poles and edible shoots throughout South-East Asia. This species requires a climate with precipitation of 1200–1800 mm, mean annual temperature of 13–20°C and monthly mean minimum temperatures not lower than freezing [4].

Phyllostachys bambusoides — native to China, but extensively cultivated in Japan since 1866. The largest and most commercially valuable of this genus after *Phyllostachys pubescens*, producing good-quality wood. Hardier and more cold-tolerant than the latter [6].

Bamboo has been neglected or ignored in the past by tropical foresters, who tend to concentrate on timber trees at the expense of traditional multi-purpose woody species such as bamboo and rattan [1]. Literature on the dynamics and productivity of natural bamboo stands is meagre, and reports from plantation stands are almost non-existent [5]. Bamboo has been used for handicrafts and building material in India and China for thousands of years, yet its potential contribution to sustainable natural resource management has only recently been recognized. Unfortunately, most bamboo is harvested from forest stands at a rate which exceeds natural growth, so current utilization is anything but sustainable [1,2].

3. Commercial applications of various bamboo species

Many Asian species of bamboo have strong, light and flexible woody stems, which lend themselves to applications as a construction material — one of the most notable modern uses being temporary scaffolding poles which are often seen surrounding the most modern of high-rise buildings in Asian countries. Bamboo utilization in South America is modest by comparison, except in certain local areas where indigenous species have been used for centuries, and where some Asian bamboos have been introduced (notably an

international project for bamboo housing in Costa Rica). African use of bamboo is more limited and recent, since there are few native species except in Madagascar, although indigenous and introduced bamboo has been used in Kenya for soil stabilization, construction and fuel [1] and in Tanzania for water pipes [7]. Worldwide commercial bamboo utilization is reported to be 20 million ton per annum. It is unclear whether this figure represents dry weight or (more likely) harvested weight at about 15% moisture content — but this number is considered unreliable since about 80% of bamboo is used locally and statistics are hard to obtain. More than half of this amount is harvested and utilized by poor people in rural areas. Total revenues from bamboo and its products were estimated in the 1980s at \$4.5 billion [1].

Approximately 1500 commercial applications of bamboo have been identified — mostly in Asia, except where noted below. They may be divided up into the following broad categories:

Construction and reinforcing fibers — these include agricultural and fishing tools, handicrafts, musical instruments, furniture, civil engineering (bridges, scaffolding poles), domestic building (house frames, walls, window frames, roofs, interior dividers).

Paper, textiles and board — (including rayon, plywood, oriented strand board, laminated flooring). Bamboo fibers are relatively long (1.5–3.2 mm) and thus ideal for paper production [8]. Paper production in China dates back 2000 years, whilst in India, 2.2 million ton of bamboo per year are processed into pulp, making up about two-thirds of total pulp production [1,9]. At least eight North American suppliers are importing and marketing tongue-and-groove flooring made from laminated bamboo, which is said to be as hard, durable and dimensionally stable as oak or other hardwood flooring (e.g. *Plyboo America Inc., Kirkville, NY*). Bamboo culms are sliced into strips, which are boiled to remove starch, dried, and laminated into solid boards using urea–formaldehyde adhesives. The boards may be treated with preservatives such as boric acid, before or after laminating, or both, and a darker amber color may be produced by pressure-steaming the bamboo to carbonize it. Although the adhesive tends to emit formaldehyde for a long time after production, the amount of urea–formaldehyde resin in a laminated product is much less than in a panel board product [10].

Food — bamboo shoots of a number of species are a well-known feature of Chinese and other Asian cuisine, generally imported into the USA in canned form (one estimate suggests 30,000 t year⁻¹ in the early 1990s). Exports from Taiwan are worth \$50 million annually, and those from Thailand \$30 million, with much of this going to meet Japanese demand.

Combustion and other bioenergy applications — a preliminary literature search found no references to the use of bamboo as an energy feedstock, although anecdotal descriptions of bamboo as a fuel are commonplace. Molini and Irizarry [11] proposed the use of bamboo as a fuel for power generation in Puerto Rico in preference to sugar cane, since its lower moisture content at harvest obviates the need for drying, but they provide few data in support of their case. Limited experience has been gained using de-lignified bamboo pulp as a substrate for ethanolic fermentation [12]. Early work on preparing a diesel-like fuel from bamboo culms [13] is cited by Tewari [2]; the process appears to have been the pyrolysis of “black liquor” from bamboo pulping, but does not seem to have progressed beyond the laboratory scale [13].

4. Physiological characteristics

Bamboos vary across a wide range of physiological characteristics, so the following information is merely illustrative, and mostly concerns the tall bamboos of likely interest as biomass resources. In general, bamboos can be classified as sympodial (clumped) or monopodial (spreading): tropical bamboos are sympodial, whereas temperate species can be of either category [8]. Although some bamboos can adapt to varying environments, most require relatively warm and humid conditions (e.g. mean annual temperature of at least 15–20°C and annual precipitation of at least 1000–1500 mm).

Shoot buds appear as swellings on the side of the underground rhizomes, which generally occupy the top 30–50 cm of soil and may spread for tens of metres. With the onset of warm spring weather, the bud lengthens and develops into a compact upright shoot which forms a sharp point and penetrates the ground surface. After emergence there is little radial growth of the shoot, with “growth” taking the form of massive elongation of internodes, as much as 0.5 m week⁻¹ in

the case of tall bamboos, until the shoot is approximately of the same height as the rest of the stand. At this point, sheaths are shed and leafy branches emerge from the internodes near the top of the shoot. Further growth over the next few years comprises thickening of the walls of the stem and increases in wood density [14]. Compared with other tall flowering plants, this pattern of growth may give a misleading impression of high productivity — in fact, all that may be observed is an (albeit rapid) re-distribution of previously stored reserves.

The reported leaf area index of mature stands is generally high, e.g. 8.02 for *P. pubescens* and 11.6 for *P. bambusoides* [4,15]. Such a dense canopy may absorb up to 95% of incident solar radiation [4].

The reported pattern of leaf fall for most bamboos is semi-deciduous, with leaves shed at the end of the growing season (e.g. *Bambusa sp.* growing at Auburn, Alabama [14]) or during the following growing season. *P. pubescens* renews its leaves on a 2-year cycle, with most leaf fall taking place in the spring, beginning with the second growing season after shoot emergence. This biennial pattern of leaf renewal may be reflected in a biennial pattern of shoot emergence, with alternating “good” and “poor” years of new shoot production [3,4].

The pattern of flowering in bamboos varies with species. A few (e.g. *Bambusa atra*, native to the Andaman Islands of the eastern Indian Ocean) are known to flower frequently, even annually. Others, such as *Bambusa vulgaris*, flower a few culms at a time. However, the majority — for example, *Dendrocalamus strictus* — display gregarious flowering, whereby an entire clump at one location produces flowers and then dies back over the course of 2–3 years. This happens typically every 30–40 years (more than 60 years in some cases), and is therefore observed quite rarely, so the physiology of flowering is still little understood. Clear-cutting does not appear to halt stand mortality, although some species can be induced to develop new shoots for a year or two before finally dying altogether. As a consequence of the rarity of flowering, the taxonomy of bamboos is still confused and based largely on vegetative features such as leaf anatomy, arrangement of vascular bundles in leaf sheaths and culms, etc. [2,3].

A few genera, e.g. *Phyllostachys* and *Arundinaria*, have been reported to recover after flowering [2]. For

example, *P. bambusoides* collected from China in 1926 and grown at Byron, Georgia, USA, began to flower in 1989, but recovered with vigorous vegetative growth by 1993 [16]. The threat of catastrophic flowering need not pose an economic problem for bamboo growers, as long as uneven-aged propagation material is maintained, and entire stands are replaced before they approach flowering age.

Unlike other highly productive members of the Andropogoneae/Poaceae family (e.g. sugar cane, switchgrass, miscanthus), the entire bamboo sub-family (Bambusoideae) lacks the C₄ photosynthetic pathway and anatomy [17]. In the absence of this feature (which may lead to higher water-use and nutrient-use efficiencies under high light conditions), the maximum possible productivity of bamboos such as *P. pubescens* is unlikely to greatly exceed that of other bioenergy crops with C₃ photosynthesis such as short-rotation willow coppice.

5. Fuel characteristics

5.1. Description of samples

Nine bamboo samples were obtained from G.R. Lovell, Bamboo Curator for the US Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS) at the University of Georgia Plant Genetic Resources Conservation Unit in Griffin, Georgia. Three different ages of three different bamboo species were sampled for analysis to determine the fuel characteristics of the bamboo samples in relation to other biomass feedstocks with potential for electricity and fuel production, and to determine how the fuel properties change as the plant grows under carefully controlled conditions. What follows is a description of each of the bamboos analyzed. All bamboo stands were established on Norfolk Loamy fine sand soils with slight slope (< 5°), following their transfer from Savannah, Georgia, around 1978.

Phyllostachys nigra, cultivar Henon (Fig. 1): These rhizomes originated in Nagasaki, Japan and were obtained in 1909 from a Japanese bamboo grower by W.D. Hills, an agricultural explorer. This monopodial bamboo grows to a maximum height of 20 m with an 11 cm culm diameter, and is a much larger cultivar of the common black bamboo species whose culms do



Fig. 1. Stand (clonal repository) of *Phyllostachys nigra*, cultivar Henon, at the USDA-ARS/ University of Georgia Plant Genetic Resources Conservation Unit in Griffin, Georgia, USA. Maximum culm diameter is about 11 cm, although this size has not been achieved in the stand pictured. Photograph taken August 1999 by G.R. Lovell, Bamboo Curator.

not turn black. It is cold hardy down to -20°C , has dense dark green foliage and a gray waxy film on many culms that makes this species a striking ornamental plant. It also has straight, strong culms that make it useful for construction purposes. 1, 2, and 4.5-year-old samples of this bamboo species were obtained.

Phyllostachys bambusoides, cultivar White Crookstem: Rhizomes were collected near Yeunguk in the Lungtau Mountains of the Peoples Republic of China in 1926 by F.A. McClure, an agricultural explorer with the US Bureau of Plant Industry. This monopodial bamboo grows to a maximum height of 11 m with a 5 cm culm diameter, and is cold hardy to -18°C . This cultivar differs from the common form in having culms that are curved in a serpentine manner at the base. It also has deposits of white powder on the culms which persists and often completely obscures the green color in older culms. 1, 2, and 4.5-year-old samples of this bamboo species were obtained.

Phyllostachys bissetii: Rhizomes were collected from Szechuan Province, Peoples Republic of China, in 1941 by John Tee-Van of the New York Zoological Society. This bamboo grows to a maximum height of 7 m with a 2.5 cm culm diameter. With a cold hardiness of -23°C , it is one of the most cold hardy samples cultivated by the USDA-ARS, and is the first to send up shoots in the spring — it is also the fastest growing and the most invasive. This bamboo

is named after D. Bisset, the Superintendent of the USDA Plant Introduction Station at Savannah, Georgia, from 1924 to 1957. 1, 2, and 4-year-old samples of this bamboo species were obtained.

5.2. Sample preparation

The following preparation was performed to obtain samples which were representative of each bamboo stand. Each of the nine bamboo samples comprised 6–9 representative culms with 2–3 nodes. Culms were split into pieces 1.3 cm wide using a knife or wood chisel, and cut into blocks about 7.5 cm long to facilitate milling. Approximately one-half of each sample was processed whole, meaning that the nodes and internodes were milled together. The other half of the sample was separated into node samples and internode samples prior to milling. The node samples included the complete node plus less than one inch of culm on either side of the node. Each internode sample contained all of the pieces of culm not used in the node sample. Overall, 27 analyses were performed, representing whole bamboo, nodes and internodes for each of the nine samples listed earlier. Milling and homogenization was performed to assure that the chemical analysis was performed on material which represented that average of each sample. Samples were milled using a Standard Whiley knife mill with a 2 mm screen.

Material < 2 mm was sieved for 5 min using a 20 mesh sieve. Any material > 20 mesh was milled until it passed the 20 mesh screen. The < 20 mesh material was homogenized by cone and quartering four times.

5.3. Fuel analyses

The proximate, ultimate and elemental ash analyses for the nine bamboo samples collected for this study are summarized in Table 1. The moisture contents of the samples ranged from 8 to 23% with no correlation between the amount of moisture and the sample or the age of the sample. The moisture content of the *P. nigra* and *P. bissetii* samples increased with age of the harvested plant, while the moisture content of the *P. bambusoides* sample decreased as the age of the harvested plant increased. The ash contents of all of the bamboo samples were 1% or less and no correlation between ash content and bamboo sample or age of sample was apparent. Compared to other biomass feedstocks, these ash contents are comparable to what is found in woody biomass materials. Many herbaceous biomass materials, grasses and straws have higher ash contents. The volatiles content of the bamboo samples ranged from 63 to 75% with no correlation between volatiles content and bamboo sample or sample age. The remainder of the bamboo samples was fixed carbon. The fixed carbon content of the bamboo samples ranged from 12 to 17% of the samples "as received". All of the bamboo samples had very similar higher heating values, ranging from 19.09–19.57 GJ t⁻¹ on a dry basis (Tables 1 and 2).

These heating values are comparable to, but slightly lower than, most woody biomass feedstocks and higher than most grasses and straws [18]. The carbon and hydrogen contents of the bamboo samples were all very similar, at about 52% C and 5% H. The variation in the nitrogen content of the bamboo samples was larger, ranging from 0.2 to 0.5%. From a combustion perspective, this is a very low N content and would be beneficial in terms of minimal fuel-bound nitrogen conversion to NO_x if bamboo were used as a boiler fuel. If bamboo were used as a co-firing fuel, this could offset some of the input fuel-bound N, because the bamboo samples tested here had lower N contents than many coals used for power production. Co-firing with bamboo may also have other NO_x benefits caused by differences in flame structure

and temperature that reduce thermal NO_x formation. Likewise, the sulfur content of the bamboo samples is very low compared to coal, and like many woody biomass materials, is also lower than many herbaceous biomass feedstocks, grasses, and straws (Tables 1 and 2). Changes in the %C, %H, %N, and %S do not correlate with the different bamboo samples or maturity of the samples.

There does appear to be some variation in the composition of the ash between each of the bamboo samples and with the maturity of the individual species. The silicon content of the *P. nigra* samples appears to increase with the maturity of the sample and while the overall ash content of the 4.5-year-old *P. nigra* is lower than the younger samples, the silicon content of the ash is greater by a factor of 4. A similar increase in ash silicon content is also observed for the *P. bisetii* samples, and a more gradual increase for the *P. bambusoides* samples. The aluminum content of all the bamboo samples is very similar and in all cases the amount of titanium in the samples was below the detection limits of the measurements. The iron oxide contents of the bamboo samples are also quite low. The amount of alkaline earth oxides, CaO and MgO, in the bamboo samples appears to increase as the bamboo plants mature. This is evident for all three samples. Conversely, the amount of alkali metal oxides appears to decrease as the bamboo plants mature. The amount of K₂O in the bamboo ashes ranges from 30 to 50%, however, the overall ash contents of the bamboo samples is low and this amounts to only 0.2–0.6% K₂O in the dry samples. The phosphorus content of the bamboo ashes is relatively high, however, given the low ash contents of the samples the phosphorus content of the dry materials ranges from 0.1 to 0.2%. The percentage of phosphorus in the bamboo ash appears to increase as the bamboo plants mature.

The low ash and chlorine contents of the bamboo samples make them attractive for use in biomass combustion applications for electricity production. As a feedstock for combustion applications, the potassium contents of these bamboo samples are also quite low. In fact, the alkali index of these samples (defined as kg alkali oxide per GJ energy content) ranges from 0.1 to 0.3, generally below the empirical limit of 0.17–0.34 kg GJ⁻¹ known to cause adverse fouling

Table 1
Fuel analyses for selected bamboo samples

	<i>Phyllostachys nigra</i>			<i>Phyllostachys bambusoides</i>			<i>Phyllostachys bissetii</i>		
	1 year	2 year	4.5 year	1 year	2 year	4.5 year	1 year	2 year	4 year
Proximate analysis (% as received)									
Moisture	8.42	8.79	13.62	22.61	12.92	9.54	8.52	10.66	21.97
Ash	0.86	0.87	0.41	0.66	0.84	0.53	1.14	0.78	0.9
Volatiles	73.94	73.66	72.27	62.93	70.51	75.55	73.18	72.24	64.99
Fixed carbon	16.78	16.68	13.7	13.8	15.73	14.38	17.16	16.32	12.14
Higher heating value (GJ t ⁻¹ dry basis)									
	19.57	19.48	19.27	19.49	19.53	19.09	19.42	19.50	19.51
Alkali index (kg alkali oxide GJ ⁻¹)									
	0.21	0.24	0.08	0.20	0.21	0.09	0.30	0.19	0.20
Ultimate analysis (% dry matter)									
C	51.89	51.19	51.39	52.28	51.84	50.85	51.22	51.7	51.07
H	5.21	5.29	5.25	5.09	5.18	5.40	4.90	5.00	4.51
N	0.4	0.29	0.21	0.59	0.6	0.38	0.55	0.3	0.32
S	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.05
Cl	0.19	0.14	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.06
Ash	0.94	0.95	0.47	0.85	0.96	0.59	1.25	0.87	1.15
O*	41.52	42.12	42.61	41.10	41.33	42.75	41.98	42.11	42.91
Ash elemental** (% dry matter)									
SiO ₂	0.045	0.046	0.077	0.039	0.047	0.045	0.057	0.061	0.158
Al ₂ O ₃	0.004	0.005	0.002	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.005	0.004	0.011
TiO ₂	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Fe ₂ O ₃	0.019	0.002	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.006
CaO	0.015	0.018	0.024	0.018	0.021	0.037	0.029	0.024	0.073
MgO	0.021	0.023	0.031	0.027	0.030	0.075	0.045	0.041	0.076
Na ₂ O	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002
K ₂ O	0.415	0.475	0.158	0.378	0.411	0.180	0.578	0.371	0.382
P ₂ O ₅	0.130	0.105	0.097	0.125	0.180	0.123	0.155	0.107	0.181
SO ₃	0.028	0.024	0.011	0.018	0.022	0.019	0.052	0.025	0.033
Cl	0.034	0.027	0.003	0.009	0.008	0.002	0.025	0.006	0.007
CO ₂	0.072	0.112	0.016	0.060	0.062	0.028	0.129	0.094	0.056
Undetermined	0.155	0.110	0.046	0.166	0.174	0.075	0.171	0.133	0.166
Ash elemental (% ash, 600°C)									
SiO ₂	4.74	4.89	16.30	4.61	4.87	7.64	4.52	7.04	13.74
Al ₂ O ₃	0.40	0.56	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.48	0.43	0.49	0.99
TiO ₂	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
Fe ₂ O ₃	2.06	0.23	0.42	0.43	0.16	0.39	0.16	0.25	0.48
CaO	1.59	1.90	5.06	2.17	2.17	6.34	2.33	2.74	6.35
MgO	2.22	2.44	6.66	3.12	3.10	12.70	3.62	4.71	6.62
Na ₂ O	0.27	0.15	0.71	0.35	< 0.01	0.21	0.16	0.10	0.19
K ₂ O	44.20	50.00	33.60	44.50	42.80	30.50	46.20	42.70	33.20
P ₂ O ₅	13.80	11.02	20.70	14.69	18.74	20.80	12.36	12.25	15.71
SO ₃	2.94	2.51	2.32	2.13	2.27	3.18	4.17	2.93	2.83
Cl	3.63	2.87	0.59	1.10	0.84	0.26	2.03	0.65	0.58
CO ₂	7.68	11.83	3.42	7.00	6.47	4.77	10.35	10.83	4.89
Undetermined	16.47	11.60	9.80	19.48	18.16	12.73	13.67	15.31	14.42

Table 2
Comparison of selected fuel properties of bamboo with other bioenergy crops

Fuel property	Bamboo (range of three <i>Phyllostachys</i> species) ^a	“Bamboo” (species not given) ^b	“Bamboo” (species not given) ^c	Miscanthus (<i>Miscanthus x giganteus</i>) ^d	Switchgrass (<i>Panicum virgatum</i>) ^e
Gross heating value (dry; GJ t ⁻¹)	19.1–19.6	15.85	18.96	17.1–19.4	18.3
Moisture content (%)	8.4–22.6 (samples as received after shipping)	10.4 (at harvest?)	2.94 (after drying?)	15 (at harvest)	15 (at harvest)
Ash content (%)	< 1.0	3.98	2.04	1.5–4.5	4.5–5.8
Sulfur content (%)	0.03–0.05	N/A	0.15	0.1	0.12

^aPresent study.

^bRef. [8, Table 3.8, p. 30].

^cC.E. Pugh (1981) laboratory report for Northeast Louisiana University, cited in [38].

^dData for miscanthus from [39].

^eData for switchgrass from [40]. See also [18] for a review of bioenergy fuel characteristics.

and slagging in combustion systems [19,20]. Chlorine in biomass has been shown to increase the volatility of alkali metals during combustion [21], and the low chlorine content of the bamboo samples suggests that the potassium that is present is unlikely to be volatile, and therefore not problematic in terms of ash deposition. The low chlorine content of the bamboo samples means that burning them is unlikely to enhance high temperature corrosion in biomass combustion systems.

5.4. Wet chemical analysis

All bamboo samples were analyzed using American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard methods for whole biomass analysis, as listed below:

ASTM E1690 Test Method for the Determination of Ethanol Extractives in Biomass.

ASTM E1721 Test Method for the Determination of Acid Insoluble Residue in Biomass.

ASTM E1756 Test Method for the Determination of Total Solids in Biomass.

ASTM E1757 Preparation of Biomass for Compositional Analysis.

ASTM E1758 Standard Method for Determination of Carbohydrates in Biomass by High-Performance Liquid Chromatography.

US National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Bagasse Standard Reference Material

8491 was analyzed with each batch of bamboo samples, as a quality-assurance reference for the determination of extractives, lignin and carbohydrates. Aqueous and ethanolic extractions were performed in duplicate on the milled, homogenized samples. Each extractives-free sample was analyzed in duplicate for lignin and carbohydrate content, giving a total of four separate determinations for each bamboo sample.

Table 3 shows the complete wet chemical analysis of the 27 bamboo samples. Total mass closure for all samples was greater than 99%, indicating that the analysis is complete and no significant biomass fractions were excluded. The values obtained are similar to those reported by Higuchi [22] for samples of mature bamboo (Table 4). Direct measurement of the protein content of these samples was not performed, but the protein content can be estimated from the nitrogen elemental analysis [23] and varies only slightly with age in the range 1.4–3.8%. Interference from acid-insoluble protein may introduce a slight additional error in the lignin analysis. The lignin values of 25–30% place bamboo at the high end of the normal range of 11–27% reported for non-woody biomass [24], and more closely resemble the ranges reported for softwoods (24–37%) and hardwoods (17–30%) [25,26]. This would suggest that bamboo should have similar physical properties and uses to conventional softwoods and hardwoods [27]. Indeed, its high lignin

Table 3
Wet chemical analysis of selected bamboo samples

Sample	Fraction	(%) ash	(%) Ethanol extractives	(%) Total lignin	(%) glucan	(%) xylan	(%) mannan	(%) arabinan	(%) galactan	Total
<i>P. bissetii</i> 1 yr	Whole	1.2	1.4	28.2	42.2	24.0	0.5	1.1	1.1	99.7
<i>P. bissetii</i> 1 yr	Nodes	0.6	2.1	28.5	41.9	24.5	0.0	2.1	2.1	101.8
<i>P. bissetii</i> 1 yr	Internodes	1.4	1.6	27.9	43.7	24.6	0.5	1.0	1.0	101.8
<i>P. bissetii</i> 2 yrs	Whole	1.0	3.1	27.9	40.7	23.6	0.6	1.1	1.2	99.2
<i>P. bissetii</i> 2 yrs	Nodes	0.7	1.9	28.4	42.3	25.7	0.0	2.0	2.1	103.1
<i>P. bissetii</i> 2 yrs	Internodes	0.9	1.5	28.3	43.6	25.9	0.5	1.0	1.0	102.7
<i>P. bissetii</i> 4 yrs	Whole	1.2	2.2	27.1	41.9	22.8	0.8	1.2	1.2	98.3
<i>P. bissetii</i> 4 yrs	Nodes	0.8	3.0	27.0	41.3	23.3	0.0	2.0	2.0	102.3
<i>P. bissetii</i> 4 yrs	Internodes	1.1	1.4	26.2	47.2	24.1	0.4	1.1	1.1	102.7
Average		1.0	2.0	27.7	42.8	24.3	0.4	1.4	1.4	101.3
Standard deviation		0.3	0.6	0.8	1.9	1.0	0.3	0.5	0.5	1.7
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 1 yr	Whole	0.9	2.0	26.8	41.8	24.1	0.8	1.2	1.3	99.0
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 1 yr	Nodes	0.3	1.8	27.0	40.9	23.9	0.7	1.3	1.3	97.3
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 1 yr	Internodes	1.3	1.6	26.2	44.5	26.0	0.5	1.1	1.1	102.3
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 2 yrs	Whole	0.9	1.9	26.8	40.8	24.1	0.7	1.2	1.2	97.5
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 2 yrs	Nodes	0.4	1.6	27.4	40.3	24.9	0.8	1.3	1.4	98.0
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 2 yrs	Internodes	1.3	1.3	26.2	44.4	27.0	0.4	1.2	1.2	102.9
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 4.5 yrs	Whole	0.6	1.1	25.5	44.9	24.0	0.6	1.3	1.3	99.3
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 4.5 yrs	Nodes	0.2	1.5	25.3	44.0	23.3	0.8	1.3	1.4	97.8
<i>P. bambusoides</i> 4.5 yrs	Internodes	0.8	1.1	24.3	48.1	24.0	0.5	1.1	1.1	101.0
Average		0.7	1.5	26.2	43.3	24.6	0.6	1.2	1.3	99.4
Standard deviation		0.4	0.3	1.0	2.6	1.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	2.1
<i>P. nigra</i> 1 yr	Whole	0.8	2.3	28.3	41.3	24.4	0.5	1.4	1.4	100.4
<i>P. nigra</i> 1 yr	Nodes	0.2	1.7	27.9	40.7	23.1	0.7	1.4	1.5	97.2
<i>P. nigra</i> 1 yr	Internodes	0.1	1.7	28.6	41.3	24.0	0.5	1.4	1.4	99.0
<i>P. nigra</i> 2 yrs	Whole	0.8	2.2	27.8	42.7	24.2	0.6	1.2	1.2	100.7
<i>P. nigra</i> 2 yrs	Nodes	0.9	1.4	27.9	42.8	24.6	0.6	1.3	1.3	100.7
<i>P. nigra</i> 2 yrs	Internodes	0.6	1.6	27.5	43.1	23.4	0.5	1.2	1.2	99.0
<i>P. nigra</i> 4.5 yrs	Whole	0.4	1.9	25.2	46.4	23.0	0.6	1.1	1.1	99.7
<i>P. nigra</i> 4.5 yrs	Nodes	0.4	1.6	25.5	46.0	24.0	0.6	1.2	1.2	100.6
<i>P. nigra</i> 4.5 yrs	Internodes	0.2	1.5	25.5	46.2	22.9	0.5	1.1	1.2	99.1
Average		0.5	1.8	27.1	43.4	23.7	0.6	1.3	1.3	99.6
Standard deviation		0.3	0.3	1.3	2.3	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.2
NIST reference material #8491 (<i>bagasse</i>)										
Average		1.8	4.4	23.1	41.7	24.7	0.7	1.6	1.6	99.5
Standard deviation		0.3	1.0	0.5	1.2	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.2	2.0

content contributes to the relatively high heating value of bamboo, and its structural rigidity makes it a valuable building material. Similarly, the glucan contents of 40–48% compare to the reported cellulose content of softwoods (40–52%) and hardwoods (38–56%). Cellulose contents in this range make bamboo a useful feedstock for paper production and for processes which convert cellulose to fuels, chemicals and other bio-based materials.

The average and standard deviation of 27 independent analyses of the standard reference material are shown at the foot of Table 3. The reproducibility and total mass closure indicate the precision that can reasonably be expected from these methods of analysis. Differences between bamboo samples smaller than the standard deviation of the reference material will not be significant. The average total mass closure for the NIST bagasse reference samples was $99.5 \pm 1.2\%$,

Table 4
Previous chemical analysis of bamboo [22]

Species	(%) ash	(%) Ethanol–benzene extractives	(%) Lignin	(%) Cellulose	(%) Pentosan	Total
<i>Phyllostachys heterocycla</i>	1.3	4.6	26.1	49.1	27.7	108.82
<i>P. nigra</i>	2.0	3.4	23.8	42.3	24.1	95.61
<i>P. reticulata</i>	1.9	3.4	25.3	41.0	26.5	98.15

indicating that no significant biomass fractions were excluded from the analysis.

The lignin, glucan and xylan contents all showed variances with age comparable to the 1–5% reported for softwood [27]. There is a slight trend toward lower lignin with increased age (Table 3), although it is only significant in the 4 and 4.5 year old bamboo samples. This trend is confirmed by a slight increase in the independently determined glucan content. These changes occur in both the node and internode fractions, being only slightly more pronounced in the internode segments. However, the magnitude of the compositional differences is small and is not expected to result in significant variations in heating value or physical properties.

Differences between the composition of node and internode fractions are also small, 1–4%, and compare to those reported for the natural variance in wood [27]. The small differences in chemical composition between node and internode samples for these bamboo samples suggest that neither the number of nodes nor the length of internode segments would be critical to the utilization of bamboo for energy conversion, chemical production or as a building material (Table 3).

6. Stand establishment and management

Since most bamboos flower very infrequently, plantation stands are usually established from vegetative material rather than from seedlings, although the latter approach is a possibility. Rhizome propagation involves cutting 30–50 cm lengths of rhizomes, 1–2 years old with nodes and buds present — however, low multiplication rates make it difficult to establish large plantations by this method [8]. Older rhizomes, with

fewer roots and buds present, do not propagate well [14]. Adamson et al. [9] used existing farm machinery (ploughs, etc.) to propagate bamboo from nursery fields. Rows of 2-year-old bamboo were cut at a height of about 2 feet (60 cm), the rhizomes dug up with a turning plough, and then the plants separated by hand. February (early spring in the US South-East) was the optimum time for propagating. Propagating from entire plants (about six nodes of stem material and a foot (30 cm) of attached rhizome) was more successful than propagating from rhizomes alone. Fertilization and weed control in nursery fields and young stands is desirable, but weed control with herbicides was preferable to disturbing the soil [14]. Adamson et al. [9] reported low multiplication rates (annual doubling): 1 h of 2-year-old nursery field was only enough to plant a 4-h stand. Traditional methods for propagation also include branch and stem cuttings and seedlings, where available [1].

In India, tissue culture techniques have been used for the rapid large-scale production of planting stocks from selected vigorous seedlings of *Dendrocalamus strictus* [28]. Cultured seedlings of several bamboo species have also been induced to flower and seed precociously using cytokinins and control of pH, suggesting that hybridization may be possible in the future. Nadgauda et al. [28] review 34 published English-language reports of tissue culture in a variety of bamboo species.

Seven or eight years may be required after establishing a stand of tall bamboo before the culms are large enough and sufficiently “woody” to be harvested. Some weaker shoots may die back before reaching maturity. The ultimate stand height may not be achieved until 15–20 years [14]. Adamson et al. [9] agree that yields are likely to be low during an initial establishment period of up to 8 years.

Avoidance or control of flowering may comprise an important but yet undeveloped aspect of management, since this generally results in the die-back of entire stands. A few rhizome buds may remain viable, but the re-establishment of a new stand from surviving rhizomes or from seed would be required over the course of following 5–10 years. Bamboo re-growing after seeding requires thinning and selection of the strongest shoots [14].

Recommended fertilizer levels based on *Dendrocalamus* trials in India (cited in [8]) are N:P:K 100:50:50 kg ha⁻¹, similar to the levels suggested below by Sturkie et al. [14]. Fertilization at the beginning of the growing season can result in up to a three-fold increase in above-ground productivity [8].

Harvesting of traditionally grown bamboo is un-mechanized and labor-intensive. Traditionally, only the most mature poles (about 8 years old) are removed selectively, although it is feasible to harvest a range of ages of poles, sorting them later on the basis of density. Research in India suggests that clear-cutting does not significantly damage bamboo stands [8], so it may be possible to use machinery such as modified sugar-cane harvesters.

Some problems have been reported in restricting the spread of hardy monopodial bamboos [14].

7. Productivity of bamboo in Asia and South America

As was suggested in Section 2 above, literature on bamboo productivity is scarce, with most reports coming from various parts of Asia. All the data reviewed here are reported as oven-dry biomass, and are summarized in Table 5.

Above-ground net primary productivity (ANPP), including leaf turnover, for *Phyllostachys bambusoides* in central Japan (latitude 35°N) was reported at 24.6 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ over a 6-year period [15]. Woody biomass increment, excluding leaf turnover, was 15.5 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹. Above-ground biomass of this mature stand (which last flowered 16–22 years previously) was 131 t ha⁻¹, of which 112 t ha⁻¹ comprised culms. A related study on *Phyllostachys pubescens* in Japan found ANPP of 18.1 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹; although total NPP was high (33 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹), allocation to roots and rhizomes was substantial [29].

Above-ground biomass of this mature stand (age not given) was 138 t ha⁻¹ (117 t ha⁻¹ in culms).

Above-ground woody biomass increments averaging 7.7 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (8.8 and 6.6 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ in 1986 and 1987, respectively) are reported for a semi-natural lowland stand of *Phyllostachys pubescens* in Zhejiang Province, China (latitude 30°N; elevation 100 m; mean annual temperature and rainfall, 16°C and 1800 mm). This mature stand, which was subject to harvesting of poles over 8 years old, had an above-ground biomass of 56 t ha⁻¹, and a maximum height of 15–20 m [4].

ANPP of *Thyrsostachys siamensis* in Thailand (14°N; elevation 60 m; mean annual temperature and rainfall, 28°C and 950 mm) ranged from 1.6 to 8.1 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ according to site quality (mean 4.3 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹). Above-ground biomass of stands varied from 11 to 54 t ha⁻¹, with a mean value of 32 t ha⁻¹, and mean stand height ranged from 5.5 to 9.9 m [30].

A tropical plantation of *Bambusa bambos* in southern India (approx. 11°N; elevation 540 m; mean annual temperature and rainfall, 31°C and 600 mm), grown from tissue culture stock with fertilization and irrigation, attained an above-ground biomass of 286 t ha⁻¹ in its first 6 years. This is equivalent to an average above-ground productivity of 47 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ [5].

At a site in northern India (approx. 25°N; mean annual temperature and rainfall, 26°C and 830 mm), total NPP of *Dendrocalamus strictus* savanna was estimated at 15.8–19.3 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹. However, about half of total ecosystem NPP was accounted for by below-ground turnover, and after accounting for other woody and herbaceous species, above-ground woody biomass increment of bamboo was only 2.2 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for a mature stand and 1.1 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for a recently harvested stand [31].

Veblen et al. [32] estimated the biomass and productivity of a stand of montane *Chusquea culeou* in Chile (latitude 39.5°S, elevation 700 m, annual rainfall 4000 mm). ANPP was 10–11 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹, and above-ground biomass about 160 t ha⁻¹, with a maximum stand height of about 9 m. Lower productivities and biomass are reported for montane forest understorey bamboos in central China (approx. 32°N) by Taylor and Qin [33]. Here, the most productive species, *Fargesia spathacea* (now renamed

Table 5
Reported maximum above-ground productivity of bamboo stands

Location (latitude, where available)	Mean annual temperature and precipitation, where available	Total ANPP ^a (maximum figure reported); t ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹	Above-ground wood productivity (average reported); t ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹	Special stand features (elevation, management) and other remarks	Ref.
Southern India (11°N)	31°C; 600 mm	47.0	N/A	highland (540 m); fertilized and irrigated	[5]
Central Japan (35°N)	N/A	24.6	15.5		[15]
Japan	N/A	18.1	N/A		[29]
Georgia, USA (32°N)		N/A	9.1	“sustainable yield”	[9]
central Chile (40°S)	4000 mm	10.5	6.2	montane (700 m)	[32]
Zhejiang, China (30°N)	16°C; 1800 mm	10.5	7.7	managed by harvesting	[4]
Alabama, USA (32°N)		N/A	7.4	Probably fertilized	[14]
Thailand (14°N)	28°C; 950 mm	8.1	N/A		[30]
northern India (25°N)	26°C; 830 mm	7.7	2.2		[31]
central China (32°N)	1200 mm	4.5	3.1	montane (2750 m); ANPP ^a figure corrected for grazing	[33]

^aANPP = above-ground net primary productivity. All data are reported as oven-dry biomass.

F. robusta), growing at 2500–3000 m elevation with annual rainfall of 1200 mm, had ANPP of about 3.6 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (or 4.5 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹, corrected for grazing losses to giant pandas). Above-ground biomass was nearly 24 t ha⁻¹, with maximum stand height about 2.5–3.0 m.

El Bassam [8] cites above-ground (air-dry) yields of native bamboo stands ranging from 1.5–2.5 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for *Thyrsostachys siamensis* in Thailand to 10–14 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for *Phyllostachys*

bambusoides in Japan, and 18 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for managed trial plots of *Dendrocalamus strictus* in India.

8. Limited experience with bamboo in the USA

Since there is a paucity of literature on US experience with bamboos, most of the available information has been gathered together in one section covering history, applications and productivity.

According to Sturkie et al. [14] and Adamson et al. [9] “oriental” bamboo was introduced to the US in about 1860, and the former US Department of Agriculture (USDA) collection at Savannah, Georgia, dates back to 1919. After a brief resurgence of interest in bamboo as a potential bioenergy crop during the 1970s, the Savannah station was closed around 1978. The national bamboo collection (including 21 species of *Phyllostachys* and 17 other genera) is presently maintained at Byron, Georgia, with funding from the Agricultural Experiment Station at Griffin, Georgia (now the USDA Plant Genetic Resources Conservation Unit). The USDA concluded that many other crops would out-produce bamboo under the majority of US conditions, and that most of the land not already used for food production in southern states such as Florida was unsuitable for bamboo. However, large-scale trials were never conducted [16].

Interest in bamboo as a crop in Alabama dates back to the rise of angling in the 1930s and attempts by local growers to meet the demand for fishing poles [14]. Trial plots of bamboo were initiated at the Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn, in 1933, using nursery materials from the US Plant Introduction Station at Savannah, Georgia. Development of the south-eastern paper and pulp industry in the late 1950s and 1960s led to more extensive USDA trials at Camden, Alabama (latitude 32°N), but these were discontinued in 1965. Bamboos found in Alabama include *Bambusa* sp. from the Gulf Coast, *Phyllostachys* sp. (introduced “Japanese bamboo”) and the sole native *Arundinaria* sp. (sometimes described as two species; *A. gigantea* and *A. tecta*) which used to occur abundantly throughout the US South-East in stands known as “cane-brakes”. Some hardy bamboos are reported to grow as far North as Pennsylvania (40–42°N), and *Phyllostachys bambusoides* is also known to grow in central northern California (40°N).

In the early 1960s, the USDA evaluated the paper pulping characteristics of 21 bamboo species, including five tropical sympodial (clumped) bamboos from Puerto Rico (latitude 18°N). All were found to be suitable for paper-making using either the Kraft or the Raitt processes, with long fibers (1.4–2.3 mm) [9]. Some experience with applications of bamboo also appears to have been obtained at the Engineering Experiment Station, Clemson College, South Carolina (quoted in [14]).

Sturkie et al. [14] report a cumulative above-ground “yield” of 121 t ha⁻¹ dry matter (48 t acre⁻¹) for *Phyllostachys rubromarginata* at Auburn, Alabama (latitude about 32°N), for stands aged 14–20 years, or an average of 6.1–8.6 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹. These figures exclude leaf biomass, with branches accounting for 14% of above-ground dry matter. This cumulative yield is also reported as up to 54 short tons per acre (1 short ton=2000 lb), which may account for some of the misleading figures quoted for bamboo productivity in the USA. The maximum productivity recorded for any natural ecosystem is 88 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (for floodplain grass in the Amazon [34]), which is close to the maximum figure reported for crops (about 88–91 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for above-ground yield of fertilized sugar cane [35,36]). Both of these examples represent roughly the maximum possible plant productivity with the advantages of C₄ photosynthesis and no nutrient limitations, and are equivalent to about 39–40 short tons (35–36 imperial or long tons) per acre per year.

The most productive bamboo stand reported by Sturkie et al. [14] was probably fertilized; recommended applications, assumed to be annual, were N:P:K 80:35:50 lb acre⁻¹ (91:40:57 kg ha⁻¹). Other *Phyllostachys* species achieved lower annual yields (2.0–5.8 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹, or 0.8–2.3 t acre⁻¹ year⁻¹, including up to 21% in the form of branches). In trials at Camden, Alabama (1959–1966, plots 65 m × 65 m, plants spaced 2.4 m × 2.4 m), *Phyllostachys bambusoides* out-performed *Pinus taeda* (Loblolly pine) by a factor of nearly 2:1, in terms of above-ground dry matter production over the first 7 years of growth (stems and branches, bark-free in the case of *P. taeda*). The bamboo produced 12.4 t acre⁻¹ (1.8 t acre⁻¹ year⁻¹ or 4.4 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) compared with pine productivity of 7.1 t acre⁻¹ (1.0 t acre⁻¹ year⁻¹ or 2.5 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹).

Adamson et al. [9] found that shoot production of various *Phyllostachys* species at Savannah, Georgia (latitude 32°N), varied greatly between years in response to environmental factors. They estimated that sustained yields of over 4 short tons acre⁻¹ year⁻¹ (9.1 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) were attainable for established stands of *P. bambusoides*. In trials with cutting this species on 5, 6 and 7-year cycles, yields were 3.9–4.4 short tons acre⁻¹ year⁻¹ (9.0–9.9 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹), although one 3-year cycle produced 5.9 short tons acre⁻¹ year⁻¹ (13.5 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹). Newly estab-

lished stands responded positively to N fertilizer, especially when applied in early spring.

9. Potential for new applications in the Americas

Assuming that markets can be identified and established for domestically grown bamboo products (e.g. fresh or canned bamboo shoots, bamboo poles, bamboo flooring) there may be some commercial potential for certain bamboo species (notably *Phyllostachys spp.*) in the warmer, wetter parts of the US. As indicated by previous USDA interest, the US South-East is a likely candidate region, although the prevalence of frost in the southern Appalachian mountains may set a northern limit to the commercial growing of bamboo. Widespread growing for bioenergy production is unlikely, though, both for reasons of climate limitation and because bamboo productivity is no greater than, and in many cases less than, other candidate bioenergy crops.

Based upon the figures available from overseas, as well as the limited trials conducted in the US, intensively managed bamboo stands with fertilization may be capable of producing over 10 tonnes ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (4 metric ton per acre per year), but a combination of variable soils and uneven management could significantly reduce this figure over large plantation areas. Nevertheless, bamboo appears to share a number of desirable fuel characteristics with other bioenergy feedstocks, including a low moisture content at the time of harvest (Table 2). The waste products from bamboo processing for other purposes may also be suitable for energy recovery using established biomass feedstock handling equipment.

Elsewhere in the America, notably Central America, there has been interest expressed in building upon local agricultural experience with management of bamboo stands, in order to provide fuel for conventional steam-generation power plants [37]. Under these conditions, the local skills base may prove more significant in determining project success than the potential productivity of the bioenergy feedstock.

10. Conclusions

Bamboo may indeed have potential as a bioenergy or fiber crop for niche markets, but little experi-

ence has been gained outside Asia since the 1960s in selecting well-adapted species/genotypes, or in estimating the productivity of the crop under US conditions. Reports of high productivity appear to emanate from small-scale trials in the 1950s–1960s in Alabama, but there is little evidence overall that bamboo is significantly more productive than other candidate bioenergy crops. Bamboo has good fiber quality for paper-making, and it shares a number of desirable fuel characteristics with certain other bioenergy feedstocks, such as low ash content and alkali index. Its heating value is lower than many woody biomass feedstocks but higher than most agricultural residues, grasses and straws. In common with certain other potential energy crops, non-fuel applications of bamboo biomass may be actually more profitable than energy recovery, although these other applications might be used as a means of supplementing the income of bamboo bioenergy growers. Alternatively, bioenergy might provide a market for utilization of waste materials from thinning/harvesting of bamboo stands grown for other purposes. Drawbacks include the near-impossibility of selective breeding, given the poor state of knowledge on bamboo reproduction.

Further research is clearly required on propagation techniques to increase multiplication rates, although recent studies in India appear promising. Large-scale trials are needed in order to develop recommendations for cost-effective establishment and stand management, and mechanized harvesting needs to be developed for countries with high labor costs. The economics of bamboo production require thorough evaluation, both for single-use and multiple-product scenarios.

Acknowledgements

Jonathan Scurlock was supported by the US Department of Energy under contract DE-AC05-96OR22464 with Lockheed Martin Energy Research Corporation. David Dayton and Bonnie Hames thank the Solar Thermal, Biomass Power, and Hydrogen Technologies Division of the US Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, and Dr. Richard Bain and Dr. Ralph Overend of the National Renewable Laboratory, for support of this work.

References

- [1] Williams JT, Dransfield J, Ganapathy PM, Liese W, Nor SM, Sastry CB, editors. Research needs for bamboo and rattan to the year 2000. Tropical Tree Crops Program, International Fund for Agricultural Research/International Network for Bamboo and Rattan, Singapore, 1991. 81 pp.
- [2] Tewari DN. A monograph on bamboo. Dehra Dun, India: International Book Distributors, 1992. 498 pp.
- [3] Liese W. Bamboos: biology, silvics, properties, utilization. Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), 1985. 132 pp.
- [4] Qiu GX, Shen YK, Li DY, Wang ZW, Hudang QM, Yang DD, Gao AX. Bamboo in sub-tropical eastern China. In: Long SP, Jones MB, Roberts MJ, editors. Primary productivity of grass ecosystems of the tropics and sub-tropics. London: Chapman & Hall, 1992, pp. 159–88.
- [5] Shanmughavel P, Francis K. Above ground biomass production and nutrient distribution in growing bamboo (*Bambusa bambos* (L.) Voss). *Biomass and Bioenergy* 1996;10:383–91.
- [6] Chao CS. A guide to bamboos grown in Britain. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, UK, 1989. 47 pp.
- [7] Lipangile TN. Bamboo and wooden water pipes. *Ambio* 1987;16:299–301.
- [8] El Bassam N. Energy plant species: their use and impact on environment and development. London: James and James, 1998. 321 pp.
- [9] Adamson WC, White GA, Derigo HT, Hawley WO. Bamboo production research at Savannah, Georgia, 1956–77. USDA-ARS-S-176. US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Savannah, Georgia, 1978. 17 pp.
- [10] Environmental Building News. Bamboo flooring. Citation from Environmental Building News, West River Communications, Brattleboro, Vermont, USA, Vol. 6(10), November 1997. *Forest Products Journal* 1999;49(1):6.
- [11] Molini AE, Irizarry JG. Bamboo as a renewable energy resource. Proceedings of the First Pan American Congress on Energy and Second National Conference on Renewable Energy Technologies, 1–7 August, 1982, San Juan, Puerto Rico. Report No. CONF-8308231, Center for Energy and Environment Research, San Juan, 1983. p. 1–18.
- [12] Ram MS, Seenayya G. Production of ethanol from straw and bamboo pulp by primary isolates of *Clostridium thermocellum*. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* 1991;7:372–8.
- [13] Piatti L. Flüssige brennstoff aus bambus (liquid fuel from bamboo). *Schweizer Archiv für Angewandte Wissenschaft und Technik* 1947;13:370–6.
- [14] Sturkie DG, Brown VL, Watson WJ. Bamboo growing in Alabama. Bulletin No. 387, USDA Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University, Alabama, 1968. 30 pp.
- [15] Isagi Y, Kawahara T, Kamo K. Biomass and net production in a bamboo *Phyllostachys bambusoides* stand. *Ecological Research* 1993;8:123–33.
- [16] Lovell GR, University of Georgia, USA, personal communication.
- [17] Jones CA. *C₄ grasses and cereals: growth, development and stress response*. New York: Wiley, 1985. 419 pp.
- [18] Nordin A. Chemical elemental characteristics of biomass fuels. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 1994;6:339–47.
- [19] Miles TR, Miles Jr. TR, Baxter LL, Bryers RW, Jenkins BM, Oden LL. Boiler deposits from firing biomass fuels. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 1996;10:125–38.
- [20] Baxter LL, Miles TR, Miles Jr. TR, Jenkins BM, Milne T, Dayton D, Bryers RW, Oden LL. The behavior of inorganic materials in biomass-fired power boilers: field and laboratory experiences. *Fuel Processing Technology* 1998;54:47–78.
- [21] Dayton DC, Milne TA. Laboratory measurements of alkali metal containing vapors released during biomass combustion. In: Baxter L, DeSollar R, editors. Application of advanced technologies to ash-related problems in boilers. New York: Plenum Press, 1996. p. 161–85.
- [22] Higuchi H. Biochemical studies of lignin formation, III. *Physiologia Plantarum* 1957;10:633–48.
- [23] Phillips M. *Journal of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists* 1939;22:422.
- [24] Bagby MO, Nelson GH, Helman EG, Clark TF. Determination of lignin in non-wood plant fiber sources. *Tappi* 1971;54:1876–8.
- [25] Fengel D, Wegener G. *Wood: chemistry, ultrastructure, reactions*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Publishers, 1984. p. 56–9.
- [26] Dence CW. The determination of lignin. In: Lin SY, Deuce CW, editors. *Methods in lignin chemistry*. Berlin: Springer, 1992. p. 35–57.
- [27] Panshin AJ, de Zeeuw C. *Textbook on wood technology: structure, identification, properties, and uses of the commercial woods of the United States and Canada*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980. p. 268–9.
- [28] Nadgauda RS, John CK, Joshi MS, Parasharami VA, Mascarenhas AF. Application of in vitro techniques for bamboo improvement. In: Chapman GP, editor. *The bamboos: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, London, 25–29 March 1996, Linnean Society Symposium Series No. 19. San Diego: Academic Press for the Linnean Society of London, 1997. p. 163–77.
- [29] Isagi Y, Kawahara T, Kamo K, Ito H. Net production and carbon cycling in a bamboo *Phyllostachys pubescens* stand. *Plant Ecology* 1997;130:41–52.
- [30] Suwannapinunt W. A study on the biomass of *Thyrsostachys siamensis* (Gamble) forest at Hin-Lap, Kanchanaburi. *Journal of Bamboo Research* 1983;2:227–37.
- [31] Tripathi SK, Singh KP. Productivity and nutrient cycling in recently harvested and mature bamboo savannas in the dry tropics. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 1994;31:109–24.
- [32] Veblen TT, Schlegel FM, Escobar B. Dry matter production of two species of bamboo (*Chusquea culeou* and *C. tenuiflora*) in south-central Chile. *Journal of Ecology* 1980;68:397–404.
- [33] Taylor AH, Qin ZS. Culm dynamics and dry matter production of bamboos in Wolong and Tanajiahe Giant Panda Reserves, Sichuan, China. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 1987;24:419–33.

- [34] Piedade MTF, Junk WJ, Long SP. The productivity of the C₄ grass *Echinochloa polystachya* on the Amazon floodplain. *Ecology* 1991;72:1456–63.
- [35] Alexander AG, Allison W, Gonzalez-Molina C, Ortiz-Velez J, Ramirez G, Velez-Santiago J, Velez A, Chu TL. Production of sugarcane and tropical grasses and as renewable energy source. Final Report (01-Jun-77 to 31-May-82) to US Department of Energy. Center for Energy and Environment Research, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Pedras, 1982.
- [36] Giamalva MJ, Clarke SJ, Stein JM. Sugarcane hybrids for biomass. *Biomass* 1984;6:61–8.
- [37] Alger J, consultant; Fielden D, Commonwealth Development Corporation; Wagner V, International Bamboo Development Company; personal communications.
- [38] Woods JE. Bamboo: agribusiness opportunities. Proposals presented to ORNL Bioenergy Feedstock Development Program by West Wind Technology, Inc., Athens, Tennessee, 1996.
- [39] Scurlock JMO. Miscanthus: a review of European experience with a novel energy crop. ORNL Technical Memorandum TM-13732, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1999. 18 pp.
- [40] McLaughlin SB, Samson R, Bransby D, Wiseloge A. Evaluating physical, chemical and energetic properties of perennial grasses as biofuels. *Bioenergy '96, Proceedings of the 7th National Bioenergy Conference*, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, September 1996. p. 1–8.