# PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Michelle Bonahoom (B.S. BE), Hannah Cook (B.S. BE), and Paige Hiday (B.S. BFPE)

### **Goals and Objectives**

**Goal:** To create a high fiber nutritional drink to meet the needs of the average adult in a market lacking such products.

#### **Objectives:**

- Provide higher amounts of fiber and protein than competitors
- Provide easy way for consumers in 18 24 age demographic to meet nutrition requirements

#### **Motivation**:

- Dietary fiber intake reduces risk of stroke, hypertension, diabetes, etc
- Most individuals in America consume less than half their recommended levels of dietary fiber

# **Market and Market Size**

- Purdue students, West Lafayette, Lafayette, and Indianapolis (1 million)
- The target demographic is primarily millennials, ages 18 24
- Millennials are largest group of consumers with 26% of population
- The 18 24 age demographic consumes more smoothie type drinks than any other demographic
- Beverage consumption data shows a 5.1% increase in nutritional drink sales between 2014 – 2015

### Constraints

- Competitors: Odwalla, Evolutions Fresh, Kombucha, Ensure, Boost
- Consumer preferences in IN
- Processing Time
- Availability of fresh ingredients

# Impact and Sustainability

- Spent grain makes up 85% of beer brewing byproducts
- Average water consumption during brewing is 5 - 6 L/beer
- Encourage consumption of
- obesity state

**Prototype Analysis** 

**Parameters:** Mixing speed, consistency, ingredient amounts, and taste

**Observations:** spinach particles, color, and semistable emulsion

#### **References:**

1. Mussatto SI, Dragone G, Roberto IC. 2005. Brewers' spent grain: generation, characteristics and potential applications. J Cereal Sci 43(1): 1-14. Accessed from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223756416 Brewers' Spent Grain Generation Characteristics and Potential Applications 2. Chemical Engineering (Jan. 2014). Economic indicators. Accessed from: https://mycourses.purdue.edu/bbcswebdav/pid-8398994-dt-content-rid-34588701 1/courses/wl 16002.201720/wl 19705.201710 ImportedContent 20160824041943/wl 16001.201620 ImportedContent 20160112010929/EconomicIndicators2014 xid-9105708 1.pdf

3. Mintel. 2016. Beverage Blurring (Market Breakdown) [online]. Mintel Group Ltd. Available from Mintel database with permission from Purdue University. Accessed 2016 October 3.

4. Mussatto SI, Dragone G, Roberto IC. 2005. Brewers' spent grain: generation, characteristics and potential applications. J Cereal Sci 43(1): 1-14. Accessed from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223756416 Brewers' Spent Grain Generation Characteristics and Potential Applications

# CAPSTONE/DESIGN EXPERIENCE 2017 High Fiber Nutrition Drink Agricultural Biological

# **Product Recipe**

Ingr	edient	Functionality	Amount per Batch (Ibs)
Ar	oples	Flavor/Nutrition	552
Ba	nanas	Flavor/Nutrition	552
Sp	inach	Nutrition	165
Сосоа	Powder	Flavor	11
N	/ater	Reduce Viscosity	2,370
F	°B2	Flavor/Protein	165
Sper	nt Grain	Fiber	88
	Oil	Emulsifier	552

nutrient dense food in a high





pinach

# **Processing Requirements**

	Amount	Unit
Produce/Powder Inputs	1,202	lbs
Spent Grain Input	88	lbs
Cycle Time	2	days
Wastes	300	lbs/batch
Water Req. for Product	75	L
Water Req. for Processing	1,000	L
Thermal Load	2,522.32	MJ
Monthly Production	150,000	bottles
Monthly Production	150,000	bottles

### **Technical Advisor and Instructor:** Dr. Martin Okos

Acknowledgements: Special thanks to Troy Tonner, Yvonne Hardebeck, and **Carol Weaver** 

For a serving size of 8 fluid ounces, we meet 33% of the daily recommended amount of fiber and 24% of the daily recommended amount of protein for an adult female.

Refrigerated Storage



	Process Schedule																							
a	y 1									Day 2														
2	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
 Day 3																								
24	1	. 2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24

### Alternatives

- Drying spent grain was considered, but was deemed a waste of energy
- Blending/Milling: food processor, blender
- Emulsification: high pressure homogenizer
- Pasteurization: UV, pulse light treatment, high speed pressure

Annual	Prod
Manufacturing Co	sts
1. Raw Materials	
2. Operating Lab	or
3. Direct Supervi	sory
4. Utilities	
5. Maintenance a	and H nlies
7. Laboratory Ch	arges
8. Patents and Ro	oyalti
B. Fixed Charges	
2 Local Taxes	
3. Insurance	
4. Rent	
5. Financing	
General Expenses	COST
A. Administrative	Costs
B. Distribution and	d Ma
C. Research and D	evelc •
	L
Years of Operation	Pro
1	
2	
<u> </u>	
5	
6	
12,000,000	
10,000,000	
10,000,000	
10,000,000 (	
10,000,000 8,000,000 (	
10,000,000 8,000,000 (5) 5 6,000,000 4,000,000	
10,000,000 8,000,000 (?) 5 6,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000	
10,000,000 8,000,000 6,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 -	
10,000,000 8,000,000 5 5 6,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 8,000,000 6,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 8,000,000 6,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 (5) to 6,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 8,000,000 6,000,000 4,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 8,000,000 6,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 8,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	
10,000,000 8,000,000 4,000,000 2,000,000 - 0	το
10,000,000 8,000,000 6,000,000 2,000,000 - 0 Determine r location for	nos

Create and implement public marketing strategies

Research additives to alter the finished appearance

Lower production costs

#### **PURDUE AGRICULTURE** PURDUE UNIVERSITY



## **Economic Analysis**

duction Cost, \$		Entity	Cost, \$
	6,487,500	Direct Costs	
osts	5,190,000	1. Purchased Equipment Delivered	280,898
	2,595,000	2. Purchased Equipment Installed	126,404
	865,000	3. Instrumentation and Controls	73.033
and Clerical Labor	86,500	4 Pining	87.078
	1,470,500	E Electrical Systems	28,000
Repairs	113,033		28,090
5	16,955	6. Buildings	81,460
S	129,750	7. Yard Improvements	33,708
ties	0	8. Service Facilities	154,494
	865,000	Total Direct Plant Cost	848,312
	141,292	Indirect Costs	
	58,989	1. Engineering and Supervision	89,887
	17,697	2. Construction Expenses	95,505
	480,000	3. Legal Expenses	11,236
	166,724	4. Contractor's Fee	53,371
ts	432,500	5. Contingency	103.932
	2,162,500	Total Indirect Plant Costs	252 021
S	173,000		333,331
arketing Costs	432,500	Fixed Capital Investment	1,1/9,772
opment Costs	432,500	1. Working Capital	210,674
	8,650,000	Total Capital Investment	1,412,917

oduction Capacity	Annual Revenue	Annual Product Costs	<b>Annual Cash Flow</b>	ROI
25%	2,475,000	3,112,310	-372,960	-26.4%
50%	4,950,000	5,044,817	12,694	0.9%
75%	7,425,000	6,840,470	439,405	31.1%
100%	9,900,000	8,644,618	863,567	61.1%
100%	9,900,000	8,617,483	871,707	61.7%
100%	9,900,000	8,595,657	878,255	62.2%



Costs Per Bottle	Cost, \$
Production Cost	4.73
Sale Price	5.50
Profit	0.77

Equipment	Cost, \$
Blending	34,182
Milling	13,673
Emulsification	36,193
Pasteurization	46,850
Packaging	150,000
Total Equipment Costs	280,898

### **Future Work**

st effective plant arket

Continue to evaluate process for bottlenecks and areas of improvement

Profitability of differently sized finished products

Develop defined roles for managerial positions





Purdue University is an equal opportunity/equal access institution.