Recent Advances in Seaweed Aquaculture for Nutrient Bioextraction & Ecosystem Services: Lessons Learned from the US MARINER Program, ARPAe (DOE)

Charles Yarish*^{1,2}

J.K. Kim^{1,3}, G. Kraemer⁴, S. Lindell², M. Stekoll⁵, M. Marty-Rivera¹, D. Bailey², Y. Li¹, M. Aydlet², C.A. Goudey⁶, D. Manganelli⁶, K. Barbery⁷ & B. Smith⁷

> ¹University of Connecticut <u>charles.yarish@uconn.edu</u>

²Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
³Incheon National University, Korea
⁴Purchase College, Purchase, NY
⁵University of Alaska, Juneau, AK,
⁶C.A. Goudey & Associates, Newburyport, MA
⁷GreenWave, New Haven, CT



USA ESTIMATED SEAWEED MARKET (2022)



SOURCE	ESTIMATED DRY POUNDS	
Net Imports	1,600,000	
Domestic Aquaculture	106,390 - 130,000	
Domestic Wild	30,000 – 1,600,000	
Total	1,736,390 – 1,765,000	

Source (US)	Estimated Wet Pounds	Equivalent Dry Pounds
Aquaculture	1,063,900-1,300,000	106,390- 130,000
Wild	300,000 - 350,000	30,000 - 35,000
16 r	nillion (2022; Seaweed Hub)	1,600,000 -(2,000,000?)
Total	17,363,900 – 17,650,000	1,736,390 – 1,765,000

~95-98% of edible seaweed products found in the U.S. are currently imported

Long Island Sound Estuary



Nutrient bioextraction in urban waters

The removal of nutrients from an aquatic ecosystem through the harvest of enhanced biological production (aquaculture of seaweed and/or shellfish)



How does nutrient bioextraction work?

- Cultivation and harvest of macroalgae and shellfish
- Nutrients are taken up either directly (seaweed-inorganic nutrients such as nitrate and ammonium) or indirectly (shellfish, via plankton-organically bound nutrients)
- Removal of biomass removes nutrients from the ecosystem



Frequency of Hypoxia in Long Island Sound Bottom Waters (CT DEEP and EPA Long Island Sound Study)



Ecosystem services approach to overcome NIMBY

2020 Long Island Sound Grades





Why was nutrient bioextraction being conducted in Long Island Sound & Bronx River estuary (East River)?

- Longtime focus of nitrogen management has been on point sources (i.e., wastewater treatment plant upgrades)
- Growing recognition that nonpoint source pollution is also a substantial problem that needs to be addressed
- Nutrient bioextraction may also address legacy pollution in the water column and sediments

Long Island Sound Estuary (US EPA's LISS)

Sources of N Pollution



Major project sponsors and participants

- U.S. EPA Long Island Sound Study's Long Island Sound Futures Fund, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- Connecticut Sea Grant College Program
- NOAA SBIR I and II
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture ((NIFA)



- University of Connecticut
- Purchase College
- Bridgeport Regional Aquaculture Science and Technology Center
- Rocking the Boat
- Thimble Island Oyster Co.



Gracilaria tikvahiae (red seaweed, a summer crop)*

- Growing season: June Oct. (> 15 °C)
- Commercial value of Gracilaria ~ \$1 billion annual value, FAO 2021



Rocha et al. 2019. Characterization of agar from cultivated *Gracilaria tikvahiae*:... Food Hydrocolloids 89:260-271. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2018.10.048</u>.



Kim et al. 2014, Aquaculture, 433:148-156.



>16.5 % per day14 days: 1,700 lb

Nitrogen Removal (site and season)

Bronx (2011 & 2012) LIS (2011)



Kim et al. 2014, Aquaculture, 433:148-156.



Nitrogen Removal (hypothetical one ha Gracilaria farm)



Estimated LIS Production Potential for Gracilaria

Suitability Level	Hectares	Annual Production (wet weight, t/y)	Total Dry Production (t/y)	Total Value (assuming \$669.57 per Hectare)
Not Suitable	81,795.00	0.00	0.00	0
Suitable	61,566.10	349,510.75	52,426.61	\$41,222,814
On Eastern Beds (State-managed)	8,875.40	50,385.64	7,557.85	\$5,942,701
TOTAL	70,441.49	399,896.39	59,984.46	\$47,165,514

Gracilaria (based upon western LIS site) 72.9 kg FW per 100 meter 4 meters between longlines 1,823 kg/ha/year

Saccharina (sugar kelp, brown seaweed, a winter crop)

- Kelp is the most widely cultivated species in the world (~\$5.53 billion annual value)
- Human food and source of alginates (colloid & biomedical)
- Growing season: Nov. May (< 15 °C)
- Nutrient bioextraction (ecosystem services)
- Biofuels







Productivity

~ 1,752 kg per 100 m longline (Dec. – May growing season)





Productivity (sugar kelp)

*19.3 – 36.8 MT FW ha⁻¹ (Dec. – May growing season)









Nutrient Bioextraction by Kelp

Nitrogen Removal

CO₂ Removal



Kim et al. 2015, Marine Ecol. Prog. Series



Estimated LIS Production Potential for Saccharina

Suitability Level	Hectares	Annual Production (wet weight, t/y)
Not Suitable	81,795.00	0.00
Suitable	61,566.10	1,188,225.73
On Eastern Beds (State-managed)	8,875.40	171,295.20
TOTAL	70,441.49	1,359,520.93

Kelp 18 kg FW per meter 10 meters between longlines 19.3 tons/ha/year

Nutrient Bioextraction by Seaweeds

Nitrogen Removal

CO₂ Removal



Nutrient bioextraction: comparison





The ARPA-E MARINER Program (MacroAlgae Research Inspiring Novel Energy Resources ~ \$62 Million, 20+ projects)



MARINER is focused on scalable, cost-competitive, and sustainable biomass production

Scalable to hundreds of millions of tons of dry biomass Cost-competitive with terrestrial biomass Energy requirement not higher than for cellulosic biomass US Total Land Area=9,158,022 sq. km; US EEZ = 11,351,000 sq. km

ARPA-E estimates the United States has suitable conditions and geography to produce at least 500 million dry metric tons of macroalgae per year. Such production could yield ~10% of the nation's annual transportation energy demand.



Technical Barriers for Macroalgae



- To be market relevant it is necessary to dramatically increase the scale of biomass production.
- To reach the necessary scales macroalgae farms must move offshore. This requires farm structures that can **survive open**ocean conditions.
- This requires a fundamental change to the way farm structures are designed, manufactured, and operated.
- Macroalgae farms need to maximize their biomass yield to optimize the structures that are deployed.
- To reduce costs, increased automation, biomass sensing, and remote diagnosis tools are needed.



MARINER Program Structure





MARINER Tech-to-Market: Where are the Opportunities?



* Coproduct Opportunities: Prior to anaerobic digestion to biogas/ other chemicals, higher value compounds (e.g., proteins) can be extracted. Digestion residue can be used as fertilizer rich in P, K and possibly N 30







Development of Scalable Coastal and Offshore Macroalgal Farming

Project Vision

Develop replicable farm system for seaweed production that when combined with innovative seed planting and harvesting technologies results in affordable biomass production

Project Impact

An affordable pathway to produce temperate kelps at a scale that will have meaningful impact on both near-term seaweed mariculture practices and future US energy needs











Project Team

PI - Michael Stekoll University of Alaska msstekoll@alaska.edu

Co-Pls, Partner Organizations

Scott Lindell, WHOI <u>slindell@whoi.edu</u> Hauke Kite-Powell, WHOI Bren Smith, GreenWave Clifford Goudey, C.A. Goudey & Assoc. Loretta Roberson, MBL Beau Perry, Blue Evolution **Charles Yarish, University of Connecticut** David Fredriksson, US Naval Academy Andrew Drach, Callentis Consulting Group Julie Decker, Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation Stefan Kraan, Aquaceuticals

+ farmers in AK









Project Team – the kelp farmers





Nick Mangini Kodiak Island Sustainable Seaweed Alf Pryor Kodiak Kelp Co.



Michael Stekoll, University of Alaska

Technology Progress in Alaska

- Improved seeding techniques; away from meiospores
- Improved modeling to aid with farm design
- Modification of farm (18,300m-60,000')
 - Doubling the length of growlines
 - Variable spacing of growlines
 - Adding flotation
 - Addition of tensioning deadeyes
- New Harvest Methods
 - Use of harvest bags
 - "Kelp Buddy"
 - Large vessel modifications





Comparison Between Years

			1	1
		<u>2019-20</u>	<u>2020-21</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Growing Days (days)		211-236	191-217	-8.7
Fa	rm Size			
	Between Spar Buoys (ha)	0.77	1.35	+75
	Anchor Footprint (ha)	5.05	7.46	+48
An	nount of Growline (m)	3,323	7,622	+129
На	rvest Yield (kg)	26,751	39,284	+47
Est	timated Harvest Yield (kg)	26,751	55,232	+106
Yie	eld per Meter (kg/m)	8.2	7.37	-10
Yie	eld per Hectare			
	Between Spar Buoys (kg/ha)	34,742	40,912	+18
	Anchor Footprint (kg/ha)	5,297	7,404	+40

TEA Output

Growth rate, dry content have the largest

impact on biomass yield and cost. Second tier factors are grow-line length and crew costs.

Path to \$80/dry tonne:

- Increase wet harvest yield per meter
 - Breeding (ref. Cat 5 project)
 - Grow rope diameter
- Increase dry content
- Increase harvest efficiency

6/22/2022



Selective Breeding Technologies for Scalable Offshore Seaweed Farming



Advanced Research Projects Agency • ENERGY

PI – Scott Lindell

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

Project Vision

Develop tools to identify and breed superior sugar kelp cultivars, improving productivity 10 to 20% per generation.

Project Impact

Tools and methodologies created and tested will be broadly applicable to rapid improvement of seaweed breeding and cultivation in the U.S.





University of Alaska USDA/ Cornell University HudsonAlpha, NOAA Fisheries NEFSC







Mao, X., Augyte, S., Huang, M., ...(2020). Population genetics of sugar kelp in the Northwest Atlantic region using genome-wide markers. Front. Mar. Sci., 21 August 2020 | https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00694 .

Multi-seasons farm testing

- 2018-2019 random crosses to cover diversity
- 2019-2020 random crosses to cover diversity
- 2020-2021 crosses made based on the prediction from the genomic selection model
- >300 Crosses were made for the Gulf of Maine farm (GOM) located in Newcastle, New Hampshire. All crosses were made from isolates derived from GOM.
- >80 Crosses were made for the Southern New England farm (SNE) located in Connecticut and derived from SNE.



The GOM performed better than SNE





Yield Traits: Wet Weight and Dry Weight (kg/m)

> 2 X Commercial Average

Top Ranked Plot 28 kg/m wet wt. 4 kg/m dry wt.



Harvesting at UNH





Phenotyping-Tissues

& CHN Analyses

- Sugar Analyses (Total Sugars, Fucose, Mannitol, Glucose, Xylose, Mannose, Arabinose, Galactose, Rhamnose, Glucuronic Acid, Galacturonic Acid, Mannuronic Acid, Guluronic Acid)
- & Proximate Analysis (Moisture, Protein, Fat, Fiber, Ash)



& Ash Analyses

8

Elements (B, Na, Mg, Al, P, S, K, Ca, Fe, Mn, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Se, Rb, Sr, Mo, Cd)

42

Database construction



SugarKelpBase https://sugarkelpbase.org

A comprehensive breeding database and website powered by Breedbase

Contains information about:

- Germplasm
- Locations
- Farm trials
- Founder population collections
- Gametophyte maintenance
- Phenotypic characteristics

Future work on the genomic tools

Improve the genomic prediction 4. Mean of the progeny sporophytes equals to the mean of 1. Random mating of model gametophytes breeding value the gametophytes generate distribution of sporophytes Increasing the gametophytes 5. Crossing designs for higher collections performance sporophytes Preferred sugar kelp sporophyte performance Improved database, genotypic and phenotypic data 6. The gametophytes 3. Select the derived from better gametophytes with performed sporophytes highest breeding **High yield strains** have higher breeding value value than past gametophytes GWAS 2. Use genomic tools estimating the gametophytes breeding values Jean-Luc Jannink, 2018 Marker development

Seaweed Bio-refinery

Bio-active compounds



Courtesy: J. Forster

Human food – fresh or dried





What's Next in Coastal Management? Bioextraction technologies

In nutrient rich coastal waters (LIS) we can use extractive organic aquaculture of shellfish and extractive inorganic aquaculture of seaweed to provide invaluable ecosystem services and produce unique suite of commodities!





Acknowledgements

- U.S. Dept. of Energy ARPA-E (Contracts: DE-AR0000912; **DE-AR0000911; and DE-AR000915**)
- Connecticut, Maine & MASS Sea Grant College Programs
- NOAA SBIR I and II (Ocean Approved)
- U.S. EPA Long Island Sound Study's Long Island Sound Futures Fund, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- Maine Aquaculture Innovation Center



U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food











