

# Is It Better To Burn or Bury Waste for Clean Electricity Generation?

P. OZGE KAPLAN,<sup>\*,†</sup>  
JOSEPH DECAROLIS,<sup>‡</sup> AND  
SUSAN THORNELOE<sup>§</sup>

National Risk Management Research Laboratory, United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, and Department of Civil Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695

Received August 26, 2008. Revised manuscript received December 13, 2008. Accepted December 30, 2008.

The use of municipal solid waste (MSW) to generate electricity through landfill-gas-to-energy (LFGTE) and waste-to-energy (WTE) projects represents roughly 14% of U.S. nonhydro renewable electricity generation. Although various aspects of LFGTE and WTE have been analyzed in the literature, this paper is the first to present a comprehensive set of life-cycle emission factors per unit of electricity generated for these energy recovery options. In addition, sensitivity analysis is conducted on key inputs (e.g., efficiency of the WTE plant, landfill gas management schedules, oxidation rate, and waste composition) to quantify the variability in the resultant life-cycle emissions estimates. While methane from landfills results from the anaerobic breakdown of biogenic materials, the energy derived from WTE results from the combustion of both biogenic and fossil materials. The greenhouse gas emissions for WTE ranges from 0.4 to 1.5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh, whereas the most aggressive LFGTE scenario results in 2.3 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/MWh. WTE also produces lower NO<sub>x</sub> emissions than LFGTE, whereas SO<sub>x</sub> emissions depend on the specific configurations of WTE and LFGTE.

## Introduction

In response to increasing public concern over air pollution and climate change, the use of renewable energy for electricity generation has grown steadily over the past few decades. Between 2002 and 2006, U.S. renewable electricity generation—as a percent of total generation—grew an average of 5% annually (1), while total electricity supply grew by only 1% on average (2). Support mechanisms contributing to the growth of renewables in the United States include corporate partnership programs, investment tax credits, renewable portfolio standards, and green power markets. These mechanisms provide electric utilities, investment firms, corporations, governments, and private citizens with a variety of ways to support renewable energy development. With several competing renewable alternatives, investment and purchasing decisions should be informed, at least in part, by rigorous life-cycle assessment (LCA).

In 2005, a total of 245 million tons of MSW was generated in the United States, with 166 million tons discarded to

landfills (3). Despite the increase in recycling and composting rates, the quantity of waste disposed to landfills is still significant and expected to increase. How to best manage the discarded portion of the waste remains an important consideration, particularly given the electricity generation options. Although less prominent than solar and wind, the use of municipal solid waste (MSW) to generate electricity represents roughly 14% of U.S. nonhydro renewable electricity generation (1). In this paper we compare two options for generating electricity from MSW. One method, referred to as landfill-gas-to-energy (LFGTE), involves the collection of landfill gas (LFG) (50% CH<sub>4</sub> and 50% CO<sub>2</sub>), which is generated through the anaerobic decomposition of MSW in landfills. The collected LFG is then combusted in an engine or a turbine to generate electricity. A second method, referred to as waste-to-energy (WTE) involves the direct combustion of MSW, where the resultant steam is used to run a turbine and electric generator.

Clean Air Act (CAA) regulations require capture and control of LFG from large landfills by installing a gas collection system within 5 years of waste placement (4). The gas collection system is expanded to newer areas of the landfill as more waste is buried. Not all LFG is collected due to delays in gas collection from initial waste placement and leaks in the header pipes, extraction wells, and cover material. Collected gas can be either flared or utilized for energy recovery. As of 2005, there were 427 landfills out of 1654 municipal landfills in the United States with LFGTE projects for a total capacity of 1260 MW. It is difficult to quantify emissions with a high degree of certainty since emissions result from biological processes that can be difficult to predict, occur over multiple decades, and are distributed over a relatively large area covered by the landfill.

CAA regulations require that all WTE facilities have the latest in air pollution control equipment (5). Performance data including annual stack tests and continuous emission monitoring are available for all 87 WTE plants operating in 25 states. Since the early development of this technology, there have been major improvements in stack gas emissions controls for both criteria and metal emissions. The performance data indicate that actual emissions are less than regulatory requirements. Mass burn is the most common and established technology in use, though various MSW combustion technologies are described in ref 6. All WTE facilities in the United States recover heat from the combustion process to run a steam turbine and electricity generator.

Policy-makers appear hesitant to support new WTE through new incentives and regulation. Of the 30 states that have state-wide renewable portfolio standards, all include landfill gas as an eligible resource, but only 19 include waste-to-energy (7). While subjective judgments almost certainly play a role in the preference for LFGTE over WTE, there is a legitimate concern about the renewability of waste-to-energy. While the production of methane in landfills is the result of the anaerobic breakdown of biogenic materials, a significant fraction of the energy derived from WTE results from combusting fossil-fuel-derived materials, such as plastics. Countering this effect, however, is significant methane leakage—ranging from 60% to 85%—from landfills (8). Since methane has a global warming potential of 21 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>, the CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from LFGTE may be larger than those from WTE despite the difference in biogenic composition.

Although WTE and LFGTE are widely deployed and analyzed in the literature (9–13), side-by-side comparison of the life-cycle inventory (LCI) emission estimates on a mass

\* Corresponding author phone: (919) 541-5069; fax: (919) 541-7885; e-mail: kaplan.ozge@epa.gov.

<sup>†</sup> On Oak Ridge Institute for Research and Education postdoctoral fellowship with U.S. EPA.

<sup>‡</sup> North Carolina State University.

<sup>§</sup> U.S. EPA.

per unit energy basis is unavailable. LCI-based methods have been used to evaluate and compare solid waste management (SWM) unit operations and systems holistically to quantify either the environmental impacts or energy use associated with SWM options in the broad context of MSW management (14–16).

The purpose of this paper is to present a comprehensive set of life-cycle emission factors—per unit of electricity generated—for LFGTE and WTE. In addition, these emission factors are referenced to baseline scenarios without energy recovery to enable comparison of the emissions of LFGTE and WTE to those of other energy sources. While the methodology presented here is applicable to any country, this analysis is based on U.S. waste composition, handling, and disposal, with which the authors are most familiar. In addition, parametric sensitivity analysis is applied to key input parameters to draw robust conclusions regarding the emissions from LFGTE and WTE. The resultant emission factors provide critical data that can inform the development of renewable energy policies as well as purchasing and investment decisions for renewable energy projects in the prevailing marketplace.

### Modeling Framework

The LFGTE and WTE emission factors are based on the composition and quantity of MSW discarded in the United States in 2005 (Table S1 of Supporting Information (SI)). We excluded the estimated quantity and composition of recycled and composted waste.

The emission factors are generated using the life-cycle-based process models for WTE (17) and LF/LFGTE (18) embedded in the municipal solid waste decision support tool (MSW-DST). The MSW-DST was developed through a competed cooperative agreement between EPA's Office of Research and Development and RTI International (19–22). The research team included North Carolina State University, which had a major role in the development of the LCI database, process, and cost models as well as the prototype MSW-DST. While a summary is provided here, Table S2 (SI) provides a comprehensive set of references for those interested in particular model details. The MSW-DST includes a number of process models that represent the operation of each SWM unit and all associated processes for collection, sorting, processing, transport, and disposal of waste. In addition, there are process models to account for the emissions associated with the production and consumption of gasoline and electricity. The objective of each process model is to relate the quantity and composition of waste entering a process to the cost and LCI of emissions for that process. The LCI emissions are calculated on the basis of a combination of default LCI data and user-input data to enable the user to model a site-specific system. For example, in the landfill process model, one key exogenous input is the efficiency of the LFG collection system. The functional unit in each process model is 1 ton of MSW set out for collection. The MSW includes the nonhazardous solid waste generated in residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial sectors (3).

Each process model can track 32 life-cycle parameters, including energy consumption, CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, total greenhouse gases (CO<sub>2</sub>e), particulate matter (PM), CH<sub>4</sub>, water pollutants, and solid wastes. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are represented in two forms: fossil and biogenic. CO<sub>2</sub> released from anthropogenic activities such as burning fossil fuels or fossil-fuel-derived products (e.g., plastics) for electricity generation and transportation are categorized as CO<sub>2</sub>-fossil. Likewise, CO<sub>2</sub> released during natural processes such as the decay of paper in landfills is categorized as CO<sub>2</sub>-biogenic.

The management of MSW will always result in additional emissions due to collection, transportation, and separation

**TABLE 1. Inputs to the Landfill Process Model**

	LFG collection system efficiency <sup>a</sup> (%)	oxidation rate (%)
during venting	0	15
during first year of gas collection	50	15
during second year of gas collection	70	15
during third year and on of gas collection	80	15

<sup>a</sup> We assumed efficiency of the collection system based on the year of the operation and the ranges stated in U.S. EPA's AP-42 (8).

of waste. However, for this analysis, the configuration of the SWM system up through the delivery of the waste to either a landfill or WTE facility is assumed to be same.

**Electricity Grids.** While LFGTE and WTE provide emissions reductions relative to landfill scenarios without energy recovery, the generation of electricity from these sources also displaces conventional generating units on the electricity grid. The process models in MSW-DST can calculate total electricity generated and apply an offset analysis on the grid mix of fuels specific to each of the North American Electric Reliability Council (NERC) regions, an average national grid mix, or a user-defined grid mix. Because our focus is on the emissions differences between WTE and LFGTE technologies, the emissions factors reported here exclude the displaced grid emissions.

For reference purposes, emission factors for conventional electricity-generating technologies are reported along with the emission factors for WTE and LFGTE (23). These emission factors on a per megawatt hour basis include both the operating emissions from power plants with postcombustion air pollution control equipment and precombustion emissions due to extraction, processing, and transportation of fuel. The background LCI data are collected on a unit mass of fuel (23); when converted on a per unit of electricity generated basis, the magnitude of resultant emissions depends on the efficiency of the power plant. A sensitivity analysis was conducted on plant efficiencies to provide ranges for emission factors.

### Estimating Emission Factors for Landfill Gas-to-Energy.

The total LCI emissions from landfills are the summation of the emissions resulting from (1) the site preparation, operation, and postclosure operation of a landfill, (2) the decay of the waste under anaerobic conditions, (3) the equipment utilized during landfill operations and landfill gas management operations, (4) the production of diesel required to operate the vehicles at the site, and (5) the treatment of leachate (18). The production of LFG was calculated using a first-order decay equation for a given time horizon of 100 years and the empirical methane yield from each individual waste component (18, 24). Other model inputs include the quantity and the composition of waste disposed (Table S1, SI), LFG collection efficiency (Table 1), annual LFG management schedule (Figure 1), oxidation rate (Table 1), emission factors for combustion byproduct from LFG control devices (Table S3, SI), and emission factors for equipment used on site during the site preparation and operation of a landfill. While there are hundreds of inputs to the process models, we have modified and conducted sensitivity analysis on the input parameters that will affect the emission factors most significantly.

The emission factors are calculated under the following scenario assumptions: (1) A regional landfill subject to CAA is considered. (2) A single cell in the regional landfill is modeled. (3) Waste is initially placed in the new cell in year 0. (4) The landfill already has an LFG collection network in place. (5) An internal combustion engine (ICE) is utilized to generate electricity. (6) The offline time that is required for




FIGURE 1. Annual landfill gas management schedule assumed for alternative scenarios.

the routine maintenance of the ICE is not considered. (7) The LFG control devices are assumed to have a lifetime of 15 years. (8) The LFG will be collected and controlled until year 65. This assumption is based on a typical landfill with an average operating lifetime of 20 years in which LFG production decreases significantly after about 60 years from initial waste placement. This is based on the use of a first-order decay equation utilizing empirical data from about 50 U.S. LFG collection systems.

The timing of LFG-related operations has significant variation and uncertainty that will influence the total emissions from landfills as well as the emission factors per unit of electricity generated. To capture these uncertainties and variation, several different management schemes were tested. Figure 1 presents the different cases considered for LFGTE projects. Each case differs according to the management timeline of the LFG. For instance, LF-VENT 2-ICE 15 corresponds to no controls on LFG for the first two years, after which the LFG is collected and flared in the third and fourth years. From year 5 until year 19, for a period of 15 years, the LFG is processed through an ICE to generate electricity, after which the collected gas is flared until year 65. Finally from year 65 on, the LFG is released to the atmosphere without controls.

To quantify the emissions benefit from LFGTE and WTE, landfill emissions occurring in the absence of an energy recovery unit can serve as a useful comparison. Thus, three baseline scenarios without electricity generation were defined for comparison to the energy recovery scenarios: LF-VENT 100 (LFG is uncontrolled for the entire lifetime of the LF), LF-VENT 2 (LFG is uncontrolled for the first two years, and then the LFG is collected and flared until year 65), LF-VENT 4 (LFG is uncontrolled for the first four years, and then the LFG is collected and flared until year 65). Since emissions are normalized by the amount of electricity generated (MW h) to obtain the emission rates, an estimate of hypothetical electricity generation for the baseline scenarios must be defined. The average electricity generation from a subset of the energy recovery scenarios is used to calculate the baseline emission rates. For example, emission factors [g/(MW h)] for LF-VENT 2 are based on the average of electricity generated in LF-VENT 2-ICE 15, LF-VENT 2-ICE 30, LF-VENT 2-ICE 45, and LF-VENT 2-ICE 60. Additional sensitivity analysis was conducted on oxidation rates where scenarios were tested for a range of 10–35%.

**Estimating Emission Factors for Waste-to-Energy.** The total LCI emissions are the summation of the emissions associated with (1) the combustion of waste (i.e., the stack gas (accounting for controls)), (2) the production and use of limestone in the control technologies (i.e., scrubbers), and (3) the disposal of ash in a landfill (17).

Emissions associated with the manufacture of equipment such as turbines and boilers for the WTE facility are found to be insignificant (<5% of the overall LCI burdens) and, as a result, were excluded from this analysis (25). In addition, WTE facilities have the capability to recover ferrous material from the incoming waste stream and also from bottom ash with up to a 90% recovery rate. The recovered metal displaces the virgin ferrous material used in the manufacturing of steel. The emission offsets from this activity could be significant depending on the amount of ferrous material recovered. Total LCI emissions for WTE were presented without the ferrous offsets; however, sensitivity analysis was conducted to investigate the significance.

In the United States, federal regulations set limits on the maximum allowable concentration of criteria pollutants and some metals from MSW combustors (5). The LCI model calculates the controlled stack emissions using either the average concentration values at current WTE facilities based on field data or mass emission limits based on regulatory requirements as upper bound constraints. Two sets of concentration values (Table S4, SI) are used in calculations to report two sets of emission factors for WTE (i.e., WTE-Reg and WTE-Avg). The emission factors for WTE-Reg were based on the regulatory concentration limits (5), whereas the emission factors for WTE-Avg were based on the average concentrations at current WTE facilities.

The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated using basic carbon stoichiometry given the quantity, moisture, and ultimate analysis of individual waste items in the waste stream. The LCI model outputs the total megawatt hour of electricity production and emissions that are generated per unit mass of each waste item. The amount of electricity output is a function of the quantity, energy, and moisture content of the individual waste items in the stream (Table S1, Supporting Information), and the system efficiency. A lifetime of 20 years and a system efficiency of 19% [18000 Btu/(kW h)] were assumed for the WTE scenarios. For each pollutant, the following equation was computed:

$$LCI\_WTE_i = \sum_j \{ (LCI\_Stack_{ij} + LCI\_Limestone_{ij} + LCI\_Ash_{ij}) \times Mass_j \} / Elec \quad \text{for all } i \quad (1)$$

where  $LCI\_WTE_i$  is the LCI emission factor for pollutant  $i$  [g/(MW h)],  $LCI\_Stack_{ij}$  is the controlled stack gas emissions for pollutant  $i$  (g/ton of waste item  $j$ ),  $LCI\_Limestone_{ij}$  is the allocated emissions of pollutant  $i$  from the production and use of limestone in the scrubbers (g/ton of waste item  $j$ ),  $LCI\_Ash_{ij}$  is the allocated emissions of pollutant  $i$  from the disposal of ash (g/ton of waste item  $j$ ),  $Mass_j$  is the amount of each waste item  $j$  processed in the facility (ton), and  $Elec$  is the total electricity generated from MSW processed in the facility (MW h). In addition, the sensitivity of emission factors to the system efficiency, the fossil and biogenic fractions of MSW, and the remanufacturing offsets from steel recovery was quantified.

## Results and Discussion

The LCI emissions resulting from the generation of 1 MW h of electricity through LFGTE and WTE as well as coal, natural gas, oil, and nuclear power (for comparative purposes) were calculated. The sensitivity of emission factors to various inputs was analyzed and is reported. Figures 2–4 summarize the emission factors for total  $CO_2e$ ,  $SO_x$ , and  $NO_x$ , respectively.

Landfills are a major source of  $CH_4$  emissions, whereas WTE, coal, natural gas, and oil are major sources of  $CO_2$ -fossil emissions (Table S5, SI). The magnitude of  $CH_4$  emissions strongly depends on when the LFG collection system is installed and how long the ICE is used. For example, LF-VENT 2-ICE 60 has the least methane emissions among LFGTE alternatives because the ICE is operated the longest (Table S5, SI).  $CO_2e$  emissions from landfills were significantly higher than the emissions for other alternatives because of the relatively high methane emissions (Figure 2, Table S5).

The use of LFG control during operation, closure, and postclosure of the landfill as well as the treatment of leachate contributes to the  $SO_x$  emissions from landfills.  $SO_x$  emissions from WTE facilities occur during the combustion process and are controlled by wet or dry scrubbers. Overall, the  $SO_x$  emissions resulting from the LFGTE and WTE alternatives

are approximately 10 times lower than the  $SO_x$  emissions resulting from coal- and oil-fired power plants with flue gas controls (Figure 3). The  $SO_x$  emissions for WTE ranged from 140 to 730 g/(MW h), and for LFGTE they ranged from 430 to 900 g/(MW h) (Table 2, Table S5). In a coal-fired power plant, average  $SO_x$  emissions were 6900 g/(MW h) (Table S6 and S7, SI). Another important observation is that the majority of the  $SO_x$  emissions from natural gas are attributed to processing of natural gas rather than the combustion of the natural gas for electricity-generating purposes.

The  $NO_x$  emissions for WTE alternatives ranged from 810 to 1800 g/(MW h), and for LFGTE they ranged from 2100 to 3000 g/(MW h) (Figure 4, Table 2, Table S5). In a coal-fired power plant, average  $NO_x$  emissions are 3700 g/(MW h) (Tables S6 and S7, Supporting Information). The emission factors for other criteria pollutants were also calculated. Besides CO and HCl emissions, the emission factors for all LFGTE and WTE cases are lower than those for the coal-fired generators (Tables S5–S8, SI).

While we have provided a detailed, side-by-side comparison of life-cycle emissions from LFGTE and WTE, there is an important remaining question about scale: How big an impact can energy recovery from MSW make if all of the discarded MSW (166 million tons/year) is utilized? Hypothetically, if 166 million tons of MSW is discarded in regional landfills, energy recovery on average of ~10 TW h or ~65 (kW h)/ton of MSW of electricity can be generated, whereas a WTE facility can generate on average ~100 TW h or ~600 (kW h)/ton of MSW of electricity with the same amount of MSW (Table 3). WTE can generate an order of magnitude more electricity than LFGTE given the same amount of waste. LFGTE projects would result in significantly lower electricity generation because only the biodegradable portion of the MSW contributes to LFG generation, and there are significant inefficiencies in the gas collection system that affect the quantity and quality of the LFG.

Moreover, if all MSW (excluding the recycled and composted portion) is utilized for electricity generation, the WTE alternative could have a generation capacity of 14000 MW, which could potentially replace ~4.5% of the 313000 MW of current coal-fired generation capacity (26).






FIGURE 2. Comparison of carbon dioxide equivalents for LFGTE, WTE, and conventional electricity-generating technologies (Tables S5–S8, Supporting Information, include the full data set).



**FIGURE 3.** Comparison of sulfur oxide emissions for LFGTE, WTE, and conventional electricity-generating technologies (Tables S5–S8, Supporting Information, include the full data set).



**FIGURE 4.** Comparison of nitrogen oxide emissions for LFGTE, WTE, and conventional electricity-generating technologies (Tables S5–S8, Supporting Information, include the full data set).

A significant portion of this capacity could be achieved through centralized facilities where waste is transported from greater distances. The transportation of waste could result in additional environmental burdens, and there are clearly limitations in accessing all discarded MSW in the nation. Wanichpongpan studied the LFGTE option for Thailand and found that large centralized landfills with energy recovery performed much better in terms of cost and GHG emissions than small, localized landfills despite the increased burdens associated with transportation (13). To quantify these burdens for the United States, emission factors were also calculated for long hauling of the waste via freight or rail. Table S9 (SI) summarizes the emission factors for transporting 1 ton of MSW to a facility by heavy-duty trucks and rail.

Sensitivity analysis was also conducted on key inputs. With incremental improvements, WTE facilities could achieve efficiencies that are closer to those of conventional power plants. Thus, the system efficiency was varied from 15% to 30%, and Table 2 summarizes the resulting LCI emissions. The variation in efficiencies results in a range of 470–930 kW h of electricity/ton of MSW, while with the default heat rate; only 600 (kW h)/ton of MSW can be generated. The efficiency also affects the emission factors; for example, CO<sub>2</sub>-fossil emissions vary from 0.36 to 0.71 Mg/(MW h).

The emission savings associated with ferrous recovery decreased the CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions of the WTE-Reg case from 0.56 to 0.49 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/(MW h). Significant reductions were observed for CO and PM emissions (Table 2).

**TABLE 2. Sensitivity of Emission Factors for WTE to Plant Efficiency, Waste Composition, and Remanufacturing Benefits of Steel Recovery**

	baseline factors		Sensitivity on				
			system efficiency	waste composition		steel recovery	
			Input Parameters Varied <sup>a</sup>				
heat rate [Btu/(kW h)]	18000	18000	<i>[11000, 23000]</i>	18000	18000	18000	18000
efficiency (%)	19	19	<i>[15, 30]</i>	19	19	19	19
composition	default	default	default	<i>all biogenic</i>	<i>all fossil</i>	default	default
stack gas limits	reg	avg	<i>reg/avg</i>	reg	reg	<i>reg</i>	<i>avg</i>
steel recovery	excludes	excludes	excludes	excludes	excludes	<i>includes</i>	<i>includes</i>
<b>Results: Criteria Pollutants</b>							
CO [g/(MW h)]	790	790	<i>[500,1000]</i>	740	880	-110	-110
NO <sub>x</sub> [g/(MW h)]	1300	1500	<i>[810, 1800]</i>	1200	1400	1200	1400
SO <sub>x</sub> [g/(MW h)]	578	221	<i>[140, 730]</i>	550	620	450	90
PM [g/(MW h)]	181	60	<i>[38, 230]</i>	180	190	-190	-310
<b>Results: Greenhouse Gases</b>							
CO <sub>2</sub> -biogenic [Mg/(MW h)]	0.91	0.91	<i>[0.58, 1.2]</i>	1.5	0.03	0.91	0.91
CO <sub>2</sub> -fossil [Mg/(MW h)]	0.56	0.56	<i>[0.36, 0.71]</i>	0.02	1.5	0.49	0.49
CH <sub>4</sub> [Mg/(MW h)]	1.3E-05	1.3E-05	<i>[8.1E-06, 1.6E-05]</i>	1.6E-05	7.9E-06	-5.0E-05	-5.0E-05
CO <sub>2</sub> e [MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/(MW h)]	0.56	0.56	<i>[0.36, 0.71]</i>	0.02	1.45	0.49	0.49
<b>Results: Electricity Generation</b>							
TW h <sup>b</sup>	98	98	<i>[78, 160]</i>	61	37	98	98
(kW h)/ton	590	590	<i>[470, 930]</i>	470	970	590	590
GW <sup>c</sup>	12	12	<i>[9.7, 20]</i>	7.6	4.7	12	12

<sup>a</sup> For each sensitivity analysis scenario, the input parameters in italics were modified and resultant emission factors were calculated and are reported. <sup>b</sup> The values represent the TWh of electricity that could be generated from all MSW disposed into landfills. <sup>c</sup> 1 TWh/8000 h = TW; a capacity factor of approximately 0.91 was utilized.

**TABLE 3. Comparison of Total Power Generated**

	total electricity generated from 166 million tons of MSW, TW h	total power <sup>a</sup> , GW	electricity generated from 1 ton of MSW, (kW h)/ton
waste-to-energy	78-160	9.7-19	470-930
landfill-gas-to-energy	7-14	0.85-1.8	41-84

<sup>a</sup> 1 TW h/8000 h = TW; a capacity factor of approximately 0.91 was utilized.

The composition of MSW also has an effect on the emission factors. One of the controversial aspects of WTE is the fossil-based content of MSW, which contributes to the combustion emissions. The average composition of MSW as discarded by weight was calculated to be 77% biogenic- and 23% fossil-based (Table S1, SI). The sensitivity of emission factors to the biogenic- vs fossil-based waste fraction was also determined. Two compositions (one with 100% biogenic-based waste and another with 100% fossil-based waste) were used to generate the emission factors (Table 2). The CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from WTE increased from 0.56 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/(MW h) (WTE-Reg) to 1.5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/(MW h) when the 100% fossil-based composition was used (Table 2, Figure 2). However, the CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from WTE based on 100% fossil-based waste were still lower than the most aggressive LFGTE scenario (i.e., LF-VENT 2-ICE 60) whose CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions were 2.3 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/(MW h).

The landfill emission factors include the decay of MSW over 100 years, whereas emissions from WTE and conventional electricity-generating technologies are instantaneous. The operation and decomposition of waste in landfills continue even beyond the monitoring phases for an indefinite period of time. Reliably quantifying the landfill gas collection efficiency is difficult due to the ever-changing nature of

landfills, number of decades that emissions are generated, and changes over time in landfill design and operation including waste quantity and composition. Landfills are an area source, which makes emissions more difficult to monitor. In a recent release of updated emission factors for landfill gas emissions, data were available for less than 5% of active municipal landfills (27). Across the United States, there are major differences in how landfills are designed and operated, which further complicates the development of reliable emission factors. This is why a range of alternative scenarios are evaluated with plausible yet optimistic assumptions for LFG control. For WTE facilities, there is less variability in the design and operation. In addition, the U.S. EPA has data for all the operating WTE facilities as a result of CAA requirements for annual stack testing of pollutants of concern, including dioxin/furan, Cd, Pb, Hg, PM, and HCl. In addition, data are available for SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO from continuous emissions monitoring. As a result, the quality and availability of data for WTE versus LFGTE results in a greater degree of certainty for estimating emission factors for WTE facilities.

The methane potential of biogenic waste components such as paper, food, and yard waste is measured under optimum anaerobic decay conditions in a laboratory study (24), whose other observations reveal that some portion of

the carbon in the waste does not biodegrade and thus this quantity gets sequestered in landfills (28). However, there is still a debate on how to account for any biogenic "sequestered" carbon. Issues include the choice of appropriate time frame for sequestration and who should be entitled to potential sequestration credits. While important, this analysis does not assign any credits for carbon sequestered in landfills.

Despite increased recycling efforts, U.S. population growth will ensure that the portion of MSW discarded in landfills will remain significant and growing. Discarded MSW is a viable energy source for electricity generation in a carbon-constrained world. One notable difference between LFGTE and WTE is that the latter is capable of producing an order of magnitude more electricity from the same mass of waste. In addition, as demonstrated in this paper, there are significant differences in emissions on a mass per unit energy basis from LFGTE and WTE. On the basis of the assumptions in this paper, WTE appears to be a better option than LFGTE. If the goal is greenhouse gas reduction, then WTE should be considered as an option under U.S. renewable energy policies. In addition, all LFTGE scenarios tested had on the average higher NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, and PM emissions than WTE. However, HCl emissions from WTE are significantly higher than the LFGTE scenarios.

### Supporting Information Available

MSW composition, physical and chemical characteristics of waste items, detailed LCI tables and sensitivity results, and emission factors for long haul of MSW. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

### Literature Cited

- (1) Energy Information Administration. Renewable Energy Consumption and Electricity Preliminary 2006 Statistics. [www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/solar/renewables/page/prelim\\_trends/rea\\_prereport.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/solar/renewables/page/prelim_trends/rea_prereport.html) (accessed Aug 26, 2008).
- (2) Energy Information Administration. Annual Energy Review 2006. [www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/aer/elect.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/aer/elect.html) (accessed Aug 26, 2008).
- (3) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Municipal Solid Waste in the United States: 2005 Facts and Figures*; EPA/530/R06/011; U.S. EPA: Washington, DC, 2006.
- (4) Federal plan requirements for municipal solid waste landfills that commenced construction prior to May 30, 1991 and have not been modified or reconstructed since May 30, 1991; final rule. *Fed. Regist.* **1999**, *64* (215).
- (5) Standards of performance for new stationary sources and emission guidelines for existing sources: Large municipal waste combustors; final rule. *Fed. Regist.* **2006**, *71* (90).
- (6) Ruth, L. A. Energy from municipal solid waste: A comparison with coal combustion technology. *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* **1998**, *24*, 545–564.
- (7) Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy. Rules, Regulations, & Policies for Renewable Energy. <http://www.dsireusa.org/summarytables/reg1.cfm?&CurrentPageID=7&EE=0&RE=1> (accessed Aug 26, 2008).
- (8) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. AP-42 Fifth Edition. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors. <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chieff/ap42/ch02/index.html> (accessed Aug 26, 2008).

- (9) Cheng, H. F.; Zhang, Y. G.; Meng, A. H.; Li, Q. H. Municipal solid waste fueled power generation in China: A case study of waste-to-energy in Changchun City. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2007**, *41*, 7509–7515.
- (10) Eriksson, O.; Finnveden, G.; Ekvall, T.; Bjorklund, A. Life cycle assessment of fuels for district heating: A comparison of waste incineration, biomass- and natural gas combustion. *Energy Policy* **2007**, *35*, 1346–1362.
- (11) Jaramillo, P.; Matthews, H. S. Landfill-gas-to-energy projects: Analysis of net private and social benefits. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39*, 7365–7373.
- (12) Themelis, N. J.; Ulloa, P. A. Methane generation in landfills. *Renewable Energy* **2007**, *32*, 1243–1257.
- (13) Wanichpongpan, W.; Gheewala, S. H. Life cycle assessment as a decision support tool for landfill gas-to energy projects. *J. Cleaner Prod.* **2007**, *15*, 1819–1826.
- (14) Eriksson, O.; Carlsson Reich, M.; Frostell, B.; Bjorklund, A.; Assefa, G.; Sundqvist, J. O.; Granath, J.; Baky, A.; Thyselius, L. Municipal solid waste management from a systems perspective. *J. Cleaner Prod.* **2005**, *13*, 241–252.
- (15) Kaplan, P. O.; Ranjithan, S. R.; Barlaz, M. A. Use of life-cycle analysis to support solid waste management planning for Delaware. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, in press.
- (16) Thorneloe, S. A.; Weitz, K.; Jambeck, J. Application of the U.S. decision support tool for materials and waste management. *Waste Manage.* **2007**, *27*, 1006–1020.
- (17) Harrison, K. W.; Dumas, R. D.; Barlaz, M. A.; Nishtala, S. R. A life-cycle inventory model of municipal solid waste combustion. *J. Air Waste Manage. Assoc.* **2000**, *50*, 993–1003.
- (18) Camobreco, V.; Ham, R.; Barlaz, M.; Repa, E.; Felker, M.; Rousseau, C.; Rathle, J. Life-cycle inventory of a modern municipal solid waste landfill. *Waste Manage. Res.* **1999**, 394–408.
- (19) Harrison, K. W.; Dumas, R. D.; Solano, E.; Barlaz, M. A.; Brill, E. D.; Ranjithan, S. R. A decision support system for development of alternative solid waste management strategies with life-cycle considerations. *ASCE J. Comput. Civ. Eng.* **2001**, *15*, 44–58.
- (20) Kaplan, P. O.; Barlaz, M. A.; Ranjithan, S. R. Life-cycle-based solid waste management under uncertainty. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **2004**, *8*, 155–172.
- (21) Solano, E.; Ranjithan, S.; Barlaz, M. A.; Brill, E. D. Life cycle-based solid waste management—1. Model development. *J. Environ. Eng.* **2002**, *128*, 981–992.
- (22) RTI International. Municipal Solid Waste Decision Support Tool. <https://webdstmsw.rti.org/> (accessed Aug 26, 2008).
- (23) National Renewable Energy Laboratory. U.S. Life-Cycle Inventory Database. <http://www.nrel.gov/lci/about.html> (accessed Aug 26, 2008).
- (24) Eleazer, W. E.; Odle, W. S.; Wang, Y. S.; Barlaz, M. A. Biodegradability of municipal solid waste components in laboratory-scale landfills. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1997**, *31* (3), 911–917.
- (25) Environment Agency. *Life Cycle Inventory Development for Waste Management Operations: Incineration*; R&D Project Record P1/392/6; Environment Agency: Bristol, U.K., 2000.
- (26) U.S. Department of Energy. *Electric Power Annual 2005*; DOE/EIA-0348(2005); U.S. DOE: Washington, DC, 2006.
- (27) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Background Information Document for Updating AP42 Section 2.4 Municipal Solid Waste Landfills*; EPA/600/R-08-116; U.S. EPA: Washington, DC; <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chieff/ap42/ch02/draft/db02s04.pdf>.
- (28) Barlaz, M. A. Carbon storage during biodegradation of municipal solid waste components in laboratory-scale landfills. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **1998**, *12*, 373–380.

ES802395E