7. Waste

Waste management and treatment activities are sources of greenhouse gas emissions (see Figure 7-1). Landfills accounted for approximately 20.2 percent of total U.S. anthropogenic methane (CH$_4$) emissions in 2014, the third largest contribution of any CH$_4$ source in the United States. Additionally, wastewater treatment and composting of organic waste accounted for approximately 2.0 percent and less than one percent of U.S. CH$_4$ emissions, respectively. Nitrous oxide (N$_2$O) emissions from the discharge of wastewater treatment effluents into aquatic environments were estimated, as were N$_2$O emissions from the treatment process itself. Nitrous oxide emissions from composting were also estimated. Together, these waste activities account for 1.7 percent of total U.S. N$_2$O emissions. Nitrogen oxides (NO$_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), and non-CH$_4$ volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs) are emitted by waste activities, and are addressed separately at the end of this chapter. A summary of greenhouse gas emissions from the Waste chapter is presented in Table 7-1 and Table 7-2.

Figure 7-1: 2014 Waste Chapter Greenhouse Gas Sources (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)

Box 7-1: Methodological Approach for Estimating and Reporting U.S. Emissions and Sinks

In following the UNFCCC requirement under Article 4.1 to develop and submit national greenhouse gas emission inventories, the emissions and sinks presented in this report and this chapter are organized by source and sink categories and calculated using internationally-accepted methods provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2006). Additionally, the calculated emissions and sinks in a given year for the United States are presented in a common manner in line with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines for the reporting of inventories under this international agreement. The use of consistent methods to calculate emissions and sinks by all nations providing their inventories to the UNFCCC ensures that these reports are comparable. In this regard,

---

2 See <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf#page=2>.
U.S. emissions and sinks reported in this Inventory report are comparable to emissions and sinks reported by other countries. The manner that emissions and sinks are provided in this Inventory is one of many ways U.S. emissions and sinks could be examined; this Inventory report presents emissions and sinks in a common format consistent with how countries are to report inventories under the UNFCCC. Emissions and sinks provided in the current Inventory do not preclude alternative examinations, but rather presents emissions and sinks in a common format consistent with how countries are to report inventories under the UNFCCC. The report itself, and this chapter, follows this standardized format, and provides an explanation of the IPCC methods used to calculate emissions and sinks, and the manner in which those calculations are conducted. The UNFCCC incorporated the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories as the standard for Annex I countries at the Nineteenth Conference of the Parties (Warsaw, November 11-23, 2013). This chapter presents emission estimates calculated in accordance with the methodological guidance provided in these guidelines.

Overall, in 2014, waste activities generated emissions of 171.4 MMT CO₂ Eq., or 2.5 percent of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions.

**Table 7-1: Emissions from Waste (MMT CO₂ Eq.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>195.6</td>
<td>171.8</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>161.5</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>161.1</td>
<td>164.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>144.4</td>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>148.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.3</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td>165.7</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td>171.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

**Table 7-2: Emissions from Waste (kt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>7,823</td>
<td>6,871</td>
<td>6,377</td>
<td>6,459</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>6,445</td>
<td>6,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>7,182</td>
<td>6,161</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>5,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂), CH₄, and N₂O emissions from the incineration of waste are accounted for in the Energy sector rather than in the Waste sector because almost all incineration of municipal solid waste (MSW) in the United States occurs at waste-to-energy facilities where useful energy is recovered. Similarly, the Energy sector also includes an estimate of emissions from burning waste tires and hazardous industrial waste, because virtually all of the combustion occurs in industrial and utility boilers that recover energy. The incineration of waste in the United States in 2014 resulted in 9.7 MMT CO₂ Eq. emissions, more than half of which is attributable to the combustion of plastics. For more details on emissions from the incineration of waste, see Section 7.4.

---

3 For example, see <http://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting/ghgrp-methodology-and-verification>.
On October 30, 2009, the U.S. EPA published a rule for the mandatory reporting of greenhouse gases from large greenhouse gas emissions sources in the United States. Implementation of 40 CFR Part 98 is referred to as EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP). 40 CFR Part 98 applies to direct greenhouse gas emitters, fossil fuel suppliers, industrial gas suppliers, and facilities that inject CO₂ underground for sequestration or other reasons and requires reporting by 41 industrial categories. Reporting is at the facility level, except for certain suppliers of fossil fuels and industrial greenhouse gases. In general, the threshold for reporting is 25,000 metric tons or more of CO₂ Eq. per year.

EPA’s GHGRP dataset and the data presented in this Inventory report are complementary and, as indicated in the respective planned improvements sections for source categories in this chapter, EPA is analyzing how to use facility-level GHGRP data to improve the national estimates presented in this Inventory. Most methodologies used in EPA’s GHGRP are consistent with IPCC, though for EPA’s GHGRP, facilities collect detailed information specific to their operations according to detailed measurement standards. This may differ with the more aggregated data collected for the Inventory to estimate total, national U.S. emissions. It should be noted that the definitions for source categories in EPA’s GHGRP may differ from those used in this Inventory in meeting the UNFCCC reporting guidelines. In line with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines, the Inventory report is a comprehensive accounting of all emissions from source categories identified in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (IPCC 2006). Further information on the reporting categorizations in EPA’s GHGRP and specific data caveats associated with monitoring methods in EPA’s GHGRP has been provided on the EPA’s GHGRP website.⁴

EPA presents the data collected by EPA’s GHGRP through a data publication tool that allows data to be viewed in several formats including maps, tables, charts and graphs for individual facilities or groups of facilities.⁵

### 7.1 Landfills (IPCC Source Category 5A1)

In the United States, solid waste is managed by landfilling, recovery through recycling or composting, and combustion through waste-to-energy facilities. Disposing of solid waste in modern, managed landfills is the most commonly used waste management technique in the United States. More information on how solid waste data are collected and managed in the United States is provided in Box 7-1. The municipal solid waste (MSW) and industrial waste landfills referred to in this section are all modern landfills that must comply with a variety of regulations as discussed in Box 7-3. Disposing of waste in illegal dumping sites is not considered to have occurred in years later than 1980 and these sites are not considered to contribute to net emissions in this section for the timeframe of 1990 to the current Inventory year. MSW landfills, or sanitary landfills, are sites where MSW is managed to prevent or minimize health, safety, and environmental impacts. Waste is deposited in different cells and covered daily with soil; many have environmental monitoring systems to track performance, collect leachate, and collect landfill gas. Industrial waste landfills are constructed in a similar way as MSW landfills, but accept waste produced by industrial activity, such as factories, mills, and mines.

After being placed in a landfill, organic waste (such as paper, food scraps, and yard trimmings) is initially decomposed by aerobic bacteria. After the oxygen has been depleted, the remaining waste is available for consumption by anaerobic bacteria, which break down organic matter into substances such as cellulose, amino acids, and sugars. These substances are further broken down through fermentation into gases and short-chain organic compounds that form the substrates for the growth of methanogenic bacteria. These methane (CH₄) producing anaerobic bacteria convert the fermentation products into stabilized organic materials and biogas consisting of approximately 50 percent biogenic carbon dioxide (CO₂) and 50 percent CH₄ by volume. Landfill biogas also

---

⁴ See <http://www.ccdsupport.com/confluence/display/ghgp/Detailed+Description+of+Data+for+Certain+Sources+and+Processes>.

⁵ See <http://ghgdata.epa.gov>.
contains trace amounts of non-methane organic compounds (NMOC) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) that either result from decomposition by-products or volatilization of biodegradable wastes (EPA 2008).

Methane and CO₂ are the primary constituents of landfill gas generation and emissions. However, the 2006 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Guidelines set an international convention to not report biogenic CO₂ released due to landfill decomposition in the Waste sector (IPCC 2006). Carbon dioxide emissions from landfills are estimated and reported under the Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry (LULUCF) sector (see Box 7-4). Additionally, emissions of NMOC and VOC are not estimated because they are considered to be emitted in trace amounts. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from the disposal and application of sewage sludge on landfills are also not explicitly modeled as part of greenhouse gas emissions from landfills. Nitrous oxide emissions from sewage sludge applied to landfills as a daily cover or for disposal are expected to be relatively small because the microbial environment in an anaerobic landfill is not very conducive to the nitrification and denitrification processes that result in N₂O emissions. Furthermore, the 2006 IPCC Guidelines did not include a methodology for estimating N₂O emissions from solid waste disposal sites “because they are not significant.” Therefore, only CH₄ generation and emissions are estimated for landfills under the Waste sector.

Methane generation and emissions from landfills are a function of several factors, including: (1) the total amount of waste-in-place, which is the total waste landfilled annually over the operational lifetime of a landfill; (2) the characteristics of the landfill receiving waste (e.g., composition of waste-in-place, size, climate, cover material); (3) the amount of CH₄ that is recovered and either flared or used for energy purposes; and (4) the amount of CH₄ oxidized as the landfill gas passes through the cover material into the atmosphere. Each landfill has unique characteristics, but all managed landfills practice similar operating practices, including the application of a daily and intermediate cover material over the waste being disposed of in the landfill to prevent odor and reduce risks to public health. Based on recent literature, the specific type of cover material used can affect the rate of oxidation of landfill gas (RTI 2011). The most commonly used cover materials are soil, clay, and sand. Some states also permit the use of green waste, tarps, waste derived materials, sewage sludge or biosolids, and contaminated soil as a daily cover. Methane production typically begins within the first year after the waste is disposed of in a landfill and will continue for 10 to 60 years or longer as the degradable waste decomposes over time.

In 2014, landfill CH₄ emissions were approximately 148.0 MMT CO₂ Eq. (5,919 kt), representing the third largest source of CH₄ emissions in the United States, behind natural gas systems and enteric fermentation. Emissions from MSW landfills accounted for approximately 95 percent of total landfill emissions, while industrial landfills accounted for the remainder. Approximately 1,900 to 2,000 operational MSW landfills exist in the United States, with the largest landfills receiving most of the waste and generating the majority of the CH₄ emitted (EPA 2015b; EPA 2015c). Conversely, there are approximately 3,200 MSW landfills in the United States that have been closed since 1980 (for which a closure data is known, [EPA 2015b; WBJ 2010]). While the number of active MSW landfills has decreased significantly over the past 20 years, from approximately 6,326 in 1990 to approximately 2,000 in the 2010s, the average landfill size has increased (EPA 2015c; BioCycle 2010; WBJ 2010). The exact number of active and closed dedicated industrial waste landfills is not known at this time, but the Waste Business Journal total for landfills accepting industrial and construction and demolition debris for 2010 is 1,305 (WBJ 2010). Only 176 facilities with industrial waste landfills reported under Subpart TT (Industrial Waste Landfills) of EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) since reporting began in 2011, indicating that there may be several hundreds of industrial waste landfills that are not required to report under EPA’s GHGRP, or that the actual number of industrial waste landfills in the United States is relatively low compared to MSW landfills.

The estimated annual quantity of waste placed in MSW landfills increased 39 percent from approximately 205 MMT in 1990 to 226 MMT in 2000 and then decreased by 11 percent to 262 MMT in 2014 (see Annex 3.14). The annual amount of waste generated and subsequently disposed in MSW landfills varies annually and depends on several factors (e.g., the economy, consumer patterns, recycling and composting programs, inclusion in a garbage collection service). The total amount of MSW generated is expected to increase as the U.S. population continues to grow, but the percentage of waste landfilled may decline due to increased recycling and composting practices. The estimated quantity of waste placed in industrial waste landfills (from the pulp and paper, and food processing sectors) has remained relatively steady since 1990, ranging from 9.7 MMT in 1990 to 11.3 MMT in 2014.

Net CH₄ emissions have decreased since 1990, and have fluctuated around 6 MMT over the past few years (see Table 7-4). This slowly decreasing trend since the 1990’s can be mostly attributed to an approximately 21 percent reduction in the amount of decomposable materials (i.e., paper and paperboard, food scraps, and yard trimmings) discarded in MSW landfills over the time series (EPA 2015c) and an increase in the amount of landfill gas collected.
and combusted (i.e., used for energy or flared) at MSW landfills, resulting in lower net CH$_4$ emissions from MSW landfills. For instance, in 1990, approximately 0.7 MMT of CH$_4$ were recovered and combusted from landfills, while in 2014, approximately 7.5 MMT of CH$_4$ were recovered and combusted, representing an average annual increase in the quantity of CH$_4$ recovered and combusted at MSW landfills from 1990 to 2014 of 11 percent (see Annex 3.14). Landfill gas collection and control is not accounted for at industrial waste landfills in this chapter (see the Methodology discussion for more information).

The quantity of recovered CH$_4$ that is either flared or used for energy purposes at MSW landfills has continually increased as a result of 1996 federal regulations that require large MSW landfills to collect and combust landfill gas (see 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart Cc 2005 and 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart WWW 2005). Voluntary programs that encourage CH$_4$ recovery and beneficial reuse, such as EPA’s Landfill Methane Outreach Program (LMOP) and federal and state incentives that promote renewable energy (e.g., tax credits, low interest loans, and Renewable Portfolio Standards), have also contributed to increased interest in landfill gas collection and control. In 2014, an estimated 10 new landfill gas-to-energy (LFGTE) projects (EPA 2015a; EPA 2015b) and 3 new flares began operation. While the amount of landfill gas collected and combusted continues to increase every year, the rate of increase in collection and combustion no longer exceeds the rate of additional CH$_4$ generation from the amount of organic MSW landfilled as the U.S. population grows.

**Table 7-3: CH$_4$ Emissions from Landfills (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSW Landfills</td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>287.0</td>
<td>321.0</td>
<td>325.2</td>
<td>328.6</td>
<td>332.0</td>
<td>335.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Landfills</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>(131.8)</td>
<td>(179.5)</td>
<td>(181.2)</td>
<td>(187.0)</td>
<td>(188.2)</td>
<td>(187.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxidized</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(16.0)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(16.0)</td>
<td>(16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>144.4</td>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>148.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Includes oxidation at municipal and industrial landfills.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

**Table 7-4: CH$_4$ Emissions from Landfills (kt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSW Landfills</td>
<td>8,214</td>
<td>11,482</td>
<td>12,839</td>
<td>13,008</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td>13,280</td>
<td>13,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Landfills</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered</td>
<td>(718)</td>
<td>(5,272)</td>
<td>(7,178)</td>
<td>(7,249)</td>
<td>(7,480)</td>
<td>(7,529)</td>
<td>(7,507)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxidized</td>
<td>(798)</td>
<td>(685)</td>
<td>(632)</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>(632)</td>
<td>(641)</td>
<td>(658)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,182</td>
<td>6,161</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>5,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Includes oxidation at municipal and industrial landfills.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

**Methodology**

Methane emissions from landfills were estimated as the CH$_4$ produced from MSW landfills, plus the CH$_4$ produced by industrial waste landfills, minus the CH$_4$ recovered and combusted from MSW landfills, minus the CH$_4$ oxidized before being released into the atmosphere:

\[
\text{CH}_4,\text{Solid Waste} = [\text{CH}_4,\text{MSW} + \text{CH}_4,\text{Ind} - R] - \text{Ox}
\]

where,

- \(\text{CH}_4,\text{Solid Waste}\) = CH$_4$ emissions from solid waste
- \(\text{CH}_4,\text{MSW}\) = CH$_4$ generation from MSW landfills
- \(\text{CH}_4,\text{Ind}\) = CH$_4$ generation from industrial landfills
- \(R\) = CH$_4$ recovered and combusted (only for MSW landfills)
- \(\text{Ox}\) = CH$_4$ oxidized from MSW and industrial waste landfills before release to the atmosphere

The methodology for estimating CH$_4$ emissions from landfills is based on the first order decay (FOD) model described by the 2006 *IPCC Guidelines*. Methane generation is based on nationwide MSW generation data, to
which a national average disposal factor is applied; it is not landfill-specific. The amount of CH₄ recovered, however, is landfill-specific, but only for MSW landfills due to a lack of data specific to industrial waste landfills. Values for the CH₄ generation potential (Lₒ) and the decay rate constant (k) used in the first order decay model were obtained from an analysis of CH₄ recovery rates for a database of 52 landfills and from published studies of other landfills (RTI 2004; EPA 1998; SWANA 1998; Peer, Thorneloe, and Epperson 1993). The decay rate constant was found to increase with average annual rainfall; consequently, values of k were developed for three ranges of rainfall, or climate types (wet, arid, and temperate). The annual quantity of waste placed in landfills was apportioned to the three ranges of rainfall based on the percent of the U.S. population in each of the three ranges. Historical census data were used to account for the shift in population to more arid areas over time (U.S. Census Bureau 2015). An overview of the data sources and methodology used to calculate CH₄ generation and recovery is provided below, while a more detailed description of the methodology used to estimate CH₄ emissions from landfills can be found in Annex 3.14.

States and local municipalities across the United States do not consistently track and report quantities of MSW generated or collected for management, nor are end-of-life disposal methods reported to a centralized system. Therefore, national MSW landfill waste generation and disposal data are obtained from secondary data, specifically the State of Garbage (SOG) surveys, published approximately every two years, with the most recent publication date of 2014. The SOG survey is the only continually updated nationwide survey of waste disposed in landfills in the United States and is the primary data source with which to estimate nationwide CH₄ generation from MSW landfills. The SOG surveys use the principles of mass balance where all MSW generated is equal to the amount of MSW landfilled, combusted in waste-to-energy plants, composted, and/or recycled (BioCycle 2010; Shin 2014). This approach assumes that all waste management methods are tracked and reported to state agencies. Survey respondents are asked to provide a breakdown of MSW generated and managed by landfilling, recycling, composting, and combustion (in waste-to-energy facilities) in actual tonnages as opposed to reporting a percent generated under each waste disposal option. The data reported through the survey have typically been adjusted to exclude non-MSW materials (e.g., industrial and agricultural wastes, construction and demolition debris, automobile scrap, and sludge from wastewater treatment plants) that may be included in survey responses. In the most recent survey, state agencies were asked to provide already filtered, MSW-only data. Where this was not possible, they were asked to provide comments to better understand the data being reported. All state disposal data are adjusted for imports and exports across state lines where imported waste is included in a particular state’s total while exported waste is not. Methodological changes have occurred over the time frame the SOG survey has been published, and this has affected the fluctuating trends observed in the data (RTI 2013).

The SOG survey is voluntary and not all states provide data for each survey year. Where no waste generation data are provided by a state in the SOG survey, the amount generated is estimated by multiplying the waste per capita from a previous SOG survey by that particular state’s population. If that particular state did not report any waste generation data in the previous SOG survey, the average nationwide waste per capita rate for the current SOG survey is multiplied by that particular state’s population. The quantities of waste generated across all states are summed and that value is then used as the nationwide quantity of waste generated in a given reporting year. Additionally, because the SOG survey does not account for waste generated in U.S. Territories, waste generation for the territories was estimated using population data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau (2014) and national per capita solid waste generation from the SOG survey (Shin 2014).

State-specific landfill waste generation data and a national average disposal factor for 1989 through 2008 were obtained from the SOG survey every two years (i.e., 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008 as published in BioCycle 2006, and 2008 as published in BioCycle 2010). The most recent SOG survey provides data for 2011 (Shin 2014). State-specific landfill waste generation data for the years in-between the SOG surveys (e.g., 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2013, and 2014) were either interpolated or extrapolated based on the SOG data and the U.S. Census population data. Because the most recent SOG survey was published in 2014 for the 2011 year, the annual quantities of waste generated for the years 2012 to 2014 were extrapolated based on the 2011 data and population growth. Waste generation data for 2012 through 2014 will be updated as new SOG surveys are published.

Estimates of the quantity of waste landfilled from 1989 to 2014 are determined by applying an average national waste disposal factor to the total amount of waste generated (i.e., the SOG data). A waste disposal factor is determined for each year an SOG survey is published and equals the ratio of the total amount of waste landfilled in the United States to the total amount of waste generated in the United States. The waste disposal factor is interpolated or extrapolated for the years in-between the SOG surveys, as is done for the amount of waste generated for a given survey year.
Estimates of the annual quantity of waste landfilled for 1960 through 1988 were obtained from EPA’s *Anthropogenic Methane Emissions in the United States, Estimates for 1990: Report to Congress* (EPA 1993) and an extensive landfill survey by the EPA’s Office of Solid Waste in 1986 (EPA 1988). Although waste placed in landfills in the 1940s and 1950s contributes very little to current CH₄ generation, estimates for those years were included in the FOD model for completeness in accounting for CH₄ generation rates and are based on the population in those years and the per capita rate for land disposal for the 1960s. For calculations in the current Inventory, wastes landfilled prior to 1980 were broken into two groups: wastes disposed in landfills (Methane Conversion Factor, MCF, of 1) and those disposed in dumps (MCF of 0.6). All calculations after 1980 assume waste is disposed in managed, modern landfills. See Annex 3.14 for more details.

Methane recovery is currently only accounted for at MSW landfills. Data collected through EPA’s GHGRP for industrial waste landfills (Subpart TT) show that only two of the 176 facilities, or 1 percent of facilities, have active gas collection systems (EPA 2015b). EPA’s GHGRP is not a national database and comprehensive data regarding gas collection systems have not been published for industrial waste landfills. Assumptions regarding a percentage of landfill gas collection systems, or a total annual amount of landfill gas collected for the non-reporting industrial waste landfills have not been made for the Inventory methodology.

The estimated landfill gas recovered per year (R) at MSW landfills was based on a combination of four databases and including recovery from flares and/or landfill gas-to-energy projects:

- EPA’s GHGRP dataset for MSW landfills (EPA 2015b);
- A database developed by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) for the voluntary reporting of greenhouse gases (EIA 2007);
- A database of LFGTE projects that is primarily based on information compiled by the EPA LMOP (EPA 2015a); and
- The flare vendor database (contains updated sales data collected from vendors of flaring equipment).

The same landfill may be included one or more times across these four databases. To avoid double- or triple-counting CH₄ recovery, the landfills across each database were compared and duplicates identified. A hierarchy of recovery data is used based on the certainty of the data in each database. In summary, the GHGRP > EIA > LFGTE > flare vendor database. The rationale for this hierarchy is described below.

EPA’s GHGRP MSW landfills database was first introduced as a data source for the 1990 to 2013 Inventory. EPA’s GHGRP MSW landfills database contains facility-reported data that undergoes rigorous verification, thus it is considered to contain the least uncertain data of the four databases. However, as mentioned earlier, this database is unique in that it only contains a portion of the landfills in the United States (although, presumably the highest emitters since only those landfills that meet a certain CH₄ generation threshold must report) and only contains data for 2010 and later. Directly reported values for CH₄ recovery to the GHGRP database were used for years 2010 through 2014. Methane recovery prior to 2010 has been estimated using an Excel forecasting function so that the GHGRP data source can be applied to the entire time series (1990 to 2014) instead of 2010 to 2014 only. If a landfill in EPA’s GHGRP was also in the LFGTE or EIA databases, the landfill gas project information, specifically the project start year, from either the LFGTE or EIA databases was used as the cutoff year for the estimated CH₄ recovery in the GHGRP database. For example, if a landfill reporting under EPA’s GHGRP was also included in the LFGTE database under a project that started in 2002 that is still operational, the CH₄ recovery in the GHGRP database was back-calculated to the year 2002 only. This method, although somewhat uncertain, can be refined in future Inventory years after further investigating the landfill gas project start years for landfills in the GHGRP database.

If a landfill in the GHGRP MSW landfills database was also in the EIA, LFGTE, and/or flare vendor database, the avoided emissions were only based on EPA’s GHGRP MSW landfills database to avoid double or triple counting the recovery amounts. In other words, the recovery from the same landfill was not included in the total recovery from the EIA, LFGTE, or flare vendor databases.

If a landfill in the EIA database was also in the LFGTE and/or the flare vendor database, the CH₄ recovery was based on the EIA data because landfill owners or operators directly reported the amount of CH₄ recovered using gas flow concentration and measurements, and because the reporting accounted for changes over time. However, as the EIA database only includes facility-reported data through 2006, the amount of CH₄ recovered for years 2007 and later were assumed to be the same as in 2006 for landfills that are in the EIA database, but not in the GHGRP or LFGTE databases. This quantity likely underestimates flaring because the EIA database does not have information
on all flares in operation for the years after 2006. However, nearly all (93 percent) of landfills in the EIA database also report to the GHGRP, which means that only seven percent of landfills in the EIA database are counted in the total recovery.

If both the flare data and LFGTE recovery data were available for any of the remaining landfills (i.e., not in the EIA or GHGRP databases), then the avoided emissions were based on the LFGTE data, which provides reported landfill-specific data on gas flow for direct use projects and project capacity (i.e., megawatts) for electricity projects. The LFGTE database is based on the most recent EPA LMOP database (published annually). The remaining portion of avoided emissions is calculated by the flare vendor database, which estimates CH$_4$ combusted by flares using the midpoint of a flare’s reported capacity. New flare vendor sales data were unable to be obtained for the current Inventory year. Given that each LFGTE project is likely to also have a flare, double counting reductions from flares and LFGTE projects in the LFGTE database was avoided by subtracting emission reductions associated with LFGTE projects for which a flare had not been identified from the emission reductions associated with flares (referred to as the flare correction factor). A further explanation of the methodology used to estimate the landfill gas recovered can be found in Annex 3.14.

The destruction efficiencies reported through EPA’s GHGRP were applied to the landfills in the GHGRP MSW landfills database. The median value of the reported destruction efficiencies was 99 percent for all reporting years (2010 through 2014). A destruction efficiency of 99 percent was applied to CH$_4$ recovered to estimate CH$_4$ emissions avoided due to the combusting of CH$_4$ in destruction devices (i.e., flares) in the EIA, LFGTE, and flare vendor databases. The 99 percent destruction efficiency value selected was based on the range of efficiencies (86 to greater than 99 percent) recommended for flares in EPA’s AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Draft Section 2.4, Table 2.4-3 (EPA 2008). A typical value of 97.7 percent was presented for the non-CH$_4$ components (i.e., volatile organic compounds and non-methane organic compounds) in test results (EPA 2008). An arithmetic average of 98.3 percent and a median value of 99 percent are derived from the test results presented in EPA (2008). Thus, a value of 99 percent for the destruction efficiency of flares has been used in the Inventory methodology.

Other data sources supporting a 99 percent destruction efficiency include those used to establish New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for landfills and in recommendations for shutdown flares used by the EPA LMOP.

Emissions from industrial waste landfills were estimated from industrial production data from 2013 extrapolated to 2014 (ERG 2014), waste disposal factors, and the FOD model. The Inventory methodology assumes over 99 percent of the organic waste placed in industrial waste landfills originates from the food processing (meat, vegetables, fruits) and pulp and paper sectors (EPA 1993), thus estimates of industrial landfill emissions focused on these two sectors. There are currently no data sources that track and report the amount and type of waste disposed of in the universe of industrial waste landfills in the United States. EPA’s GHGRP provides some insight into waste disposal in industrial waste landfills and supports the focus of the Inventory on the two selected sectors, but is not comprehensive. Therefore, the amount of waste landfilled is assumed to be a fraction of production that is held constant over the time series as explained in Annex 3.14. The composition of waste disposed of in industrial waste landfills is expected to be more consistent in terms of composition and quantity than that disposed of in MSW landfills.

The amount of CH$_4$ oxidized by the landfill cover at both municipal and industrial waste landfills was assumed to be 10 percent of the CH$_4$ generated that is not recovered (IPCC 2006; Mancinelli and McKay 1985; Czepiel et al. 1996). To calculate net CH$_4$ emissions, both CH$_4$ recovered and CH$_4$ oxidized were subtracted from CH$_4$ generated at municipal and industrial waste landfills.

**Uncertainty and Time-Series Consistency**

Several types of uncertainty are associated with the estimates of CH$_4$ emissions from MSW and industrial waste landfills. The primary uncertainty concerns the characterization of landfills. Information is not available on two fundamental factors affecting CH$_4$ production: the amount and composition of waste placed in every MSW and industrial waste landfill for each year of a landfill’s operation. The SOG survey is the only nationwide data source that compiles the amount of MSW disposed at the state-level. The surveys do not include information on waste composition and there are no comprehensive data sets that compile quantities of waste disposed or waste composition by landfill. EPA’s GHGRP allows facilities to report annual quantities of waste disposed by composition, but most MSW landfills report annual waste disposed as bulk MSW versus the detailed waste
composition data. Some MSW landfills have conducted detailed waste composition studies, but the data are scarce over the time series and across the country. EPA is currently compiling the waste composition studies and data that have been performed in the past decade and may revise the default waste composition applied to MSW landfilled in the FOD model in future Inventory estimates.

The approach used in the solid waste emission estimates assumes that the CH₄ generation potential (L₉) and the rate of decay that produces CH₄ from MSW, as determined from several studies of CH₄ recovery at MSW landfills, are representative of conditions at U.S. MSW landfills. When this top-down approach is applied at the nationwide level, the uncertainties are assumed to be less than when applying this approach to individual landfills and then aggregating the results to the national level. In other words, the Inventory methodology is not facility-specific modeling and while this approach may over- or under-estimate CH₄ generation at some landfills if used at the facility-level, the end result is expected to balance out because it is being applied nationwide. There is also a high degree of uncertainty and variability associated with the FOD model, particularly when a homogeneous waste composition and hypothetical decomposition rates are applied to heterogeneous landfills (IPCC 2006).

The lack of landfill-specific information regarding the number and type of industrial waste landfills in the United States is a primary uncertainty with respect to the industrial waste generation and emissions estimates. The approach used here assumes that the majority (99 percent) of industrial waste disposed of in industrial waste landfills consists of waste from the pulp and paper and food processing sectors. However, because waste generation and disposal data are not available in an existing data source for all U.S. industrial waste landfills, a straight disposal factor is applied over the entire time series to the amount of waste generated to determine the amounts disposed. Industrial waste facilities reporting under EPA’s GHGRP do report detailed waste stream information, and these data have been used to improve, for example, the DOC value used in the Inventory methodology for the pulp and paper sector.

Aside from the uncertainty in estimating landfill CH₄ generation, uncertainty also exists in the estimates of the landfill gas oxidized. A constant oxidation factor of 10 percent as recommended by the IPCC for managed landfills is used for both MSW and industrial waste landfills regardless of climate, the type of cover material, and/or presence of a gas collection system. The number of published field studies measuring the rate of oxidation has increased substantially since the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were published and, as discussed in the Potential Improvements section, efforts are being made to review the literature and revise this value based on recent, peer-reviewed studies.

Another significant source of uncertainty lies with the estimates of CH₄ recovered by flaring and gas-to-energy projects at MSW landfills. The GHGRP MSW landfills database was added as a fourth recovery database in the 1990 through 2013 Inventory report. Relying on multiple databases for a complete picture introduces uncertainty because the coverage and characteristics of each database differs, which increases the chance of double counting avoided emissions. Additionally, the methodology and assumptions that go into each database differ. For example, the flare database assumes the midpoint of each flare capacity at the time it is sold and installed at a landfill; in reality, the flare may be achieving a higher capacity, in which case the flare database would underestimate the amount of CH₄ recovered.

The LFGTE database is updated annually. The flare database is populated by the voluntary sharing of flare sales data by select vendors and is not able to be obtained annually, which likely underestimates recovery for landfills not included in the three other recovery databases used by the Inventory. The EIA database has not been updated since 2006 and has, for the most part, been replaced by the GHGRP MSW landfills database. To avoid double counting and to use the most relevant estimate of CH₄ recovery for a given landfill, a hierarchical approach is used among the four databases. GHGRP data are given precedence because CH₄ recovery is directly reported by landfills and undergoes a rigorous verification process; the EIA data are given second priority because facility data were directly reported; the LFGTE data are given third priority because CH₄ recovery is estimated from facility-reported LFGTE system characteristics; and the flare data are given fourth priority because this database contains minimal information about the flare, no site-specific operating characteristics, and includes smaller landfills not included in the other three databases (Bronstein et al. 2012). The coverage provided across the databases most likely represents the complete universe of landfill CH₄ gas recovery; however, the number of unique landfills between the four databases does differ.

The IPCC default value of 10 percent for uncertainty in recovery estimates was used for two of the four recovery databases in the uncertainty analysis where metering of landfill gas was in place (for about 64 percent of the CH₄ estimated to be recovered). This 10 percent uncertainty factor applies to the LFGTE database; 12 percent to the EIA database; and 1 percent for the GHGRP MSW landfills dataset because of the supporting information provided and
rigorous verification process. For flaring without metered recovery data (the flare database), a much higher uncertainty value of 50 percent is used. The compounding uncertainties associated with the four databases in addition to the uncertainties associated with the FOD model and annual waste disposal quantities leads to the large upper and lower bounds for MSW landfills presented in Table 7-5. Industrial waste landfills are shown with a lower range of uncertainty due to the smaller number of data sources and associated uncertainty involved. For example, three data sources are used to generate the annual quantities of MSW waste disposed over the 1940 to current year timeframe, while industrial waste landfills rely on two data sources.

The results of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Approach 2 quantitative uncertainty analysis are summarized in Table 7-5. In 2014, landfill CH$_4$ emissions were estimated to be between 86.4 and 230.0 MMT CO$_2$ Eq., which corresponds to a range of 38 percent below to 64 percent above the 2014 emission estimate of 148.0 MMT CO$_2$ Eq.

**Table 7-5: Approach 2 Quantitative Uncertainty Estimates for CH$_4$ Emissions from Landfills (MMT CO$_2$ Eq. and Percent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>2014 Emission Estimate (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)</th>
<th>Uncertainty Range Relative to Emission Estimate$^a$ (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>CH$_4$</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>86.4 230.0</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>+64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>CH$_4$</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>72.5 216.7</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>+73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>CH$_4$</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.4 18.7</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>+25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Range of emission estimates predicted by Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation for a 95 percent confidence interval.

Methodological recalculations were applied to the entire time-series to ensure time-series consistency from 1990 through 2014. Details on the emission trends through time-series are described in more detail in the Methodology section, above.

**QA/QC and Verification**

A Quality Assurance/Quality Control analysis was performed for data gathering and input, documentation, and calculation. QA/QC checks are performed for the transcription of the published data set used to populate the Inventory data set, including the published GHGRP and LFGTE databases, but are not performed on the data itself against primary data used. A primary focus of the QA/QC checks was to ensure that CH$_4$ recovery estimates were not double-counted and that all LFGTE projects and flares were included in the respective project databases. Both manual and electronic checks were used to ensure that emission avoidance from each landfill was calculated only once. The primary calculation spreadsheet is tailored from the IPCC waste model and has been verified previously using the original, peer-reviewed IPCC waste model. All model input values were verified by secondary QA/QC review.

**Recalculations Discussion**

Four major methodological recalculations were performed for the current Inventory.

First, a rigorous review of the flare and LFGTE projects across the four recovery databases was conducted. Extensive corrections were made to avoid double counting of projects across the recovery databases. The largest change compared to the previous Inventory was in the LFGTE database where an additional 382 projects were matched to facilities reporting under the GHGRP (note that a landfill may have multiple projects and new facilities have reported under the GHGRP for the first time since the initial landfill matching exercise in 2012). This additional matching results in a decrease in total recovery compared to the previous Inventory by approximately 1 MMT. The second largest change compared to the previous Inventory was in the flare database where 79 flare projects were matched to facilities reporting under the GHGRP or included in the LFGTE database. These projects, which were double-counted in previous Inventories, account for approximately 0.44 MMT of avoided emissions. Oftentimes, the name of a landfill and/or address differs between the databases and additional Internet searching allows for the landfills to be matched. Additionally, several facilities in the LFGTE database were removed because
they were not in the published LMOP database for the current or past two years (EPA 2015a). The LFGTE is an enhanced version of the LMOP database and if a landfill is no longer in the LMOP database, the Inventory assumes it was added erroneously. These revisions resulted in larger than expected changes to the annual quantities of the annual CH₄ recovery estimates used in the net CH₄ emissions compared to the previous Inventory, and, in turn, an increase in net CH₄ emissions across the time series.

Second, the GHGRP CH₄ recovery data were back-calculated for landfills in the GHGRP database for years prior to the first GHGRP reporting year (typically 2010 for most landfills). In the previous Inventory, there was a significant change in the total recovery between years 2009 and 2010. This methodological change was made to smooth the recovery data for years prior to 2009. An Excel forecast function was used to back-calculate recovery to an assumed project start year based on four years of reported recovery data for each landfills and project information contained in the LFGTE and EIA databases.

Third, the flare correction factor was revised. This effort included reviewing the 27 flare projects included in the flare correction factor to identify them with landfills in the GHGRP, LFGTE, or EIA databases, or match them to existing operational or closed landfills through and Internet search (RTI 2015a). The number of flares included in the flare correction factor decreased from 27 to 19. The impact on CH₄ recovery varies by year and is a modest amount.

Fourth, the DOC value for landfilled pulp and paper waste was revised from 0.20 to 0.15 based a literature review of pulp and paper waste characterization studies (RTI 2015b) and data reported under the GHGRP. A representative DOC value is likely to be within the range of 0.15 to 0.16 as calculated using the facility-specific DOC values reported under Subpart TT and data presented in Heath et al. (2010). However, a lower DOC value of 0.10 was calculated when considering only the 21 out of 76 pulp and paper facilities that provided waste-stream-specific DOC values in their 2013 annual reports. Further refined data may be available in future GHGRP reporting years as additional facilities choose to perform waste stream-specific analyses. Revising the DOC value for pulp and paper waste to 0.15 at this time is a conservative approach. This value will be re-assessed in future Inventory years as more information becomes available.

The overall impact to the Inventory from these changes resulted in an average increase of nearly 14 percent across the time series. A significant increase in net CH₄ emissions for the years 2010 through 2013 ranging from 20 to 52 percent higher in the current Inventory compared to the 1990 to 2013 Inventory.

**Planned Improvements**

Improvements being examined for future Inventory estimates include: (1) investigating alternative data sources for nationwide MSW disposal; (2) incorporating additional data from recent peer-reviewed literature to modify the default oxidation factor applied to MSW and industrial waste landfills (currently 10 percent); (3) either modifying the bulk MSW DOC value or estimating emissions using a waste-specific approach in the FOD model using data from the GHGRP and peer-reviewed literature; (4) reviewing waste-stream specific DOC and decay rate constant (k) value data reported for industrial waste landfills (specifically pulp and paper waste) as reported under EPA’s GHGRP; and (5) increasing communications with flare vendors to obtain methane recovery data for landfills not reporting to EPA’s GHGRP or providing information to LMOP.

The EPA has relied on a top-down approach to calculate CH₄ generation for MSW landfills. The SOG survey has been used in the current and previous Inventories, but is not anticipated to be published as routinely as it has been in the past. EPA is investigating whether a bottom-up approach can be used in future Inventories by supplementing the GHGRP annual waste disposal data with other relevant datasets (e.g., LMOP, state data) to provide the annual waste disposal data needed for the FOD model. EPA’s GHGRP requires landfills meeting or exceeding a threshold of 25,000 metric tons of CH₄ generation per year to report a variety of facility-specific information, including historical and current waste disposal quantities by year, CH₄ generation, gas collection system details, CH₄ recovery, and CH₄ emissions. The landfills reporting to the GHGRP are considered the largest emitters, but not all landfills are required to report. However, when this dataset is supplemented with others, such as the EPA LMOP data (incorporated into the Inventory through the LFGTE database), or the Waste Business Journal data, a complete data set of the annual quantity of waste landfilled may be represented.

In the draft for the 1990 through 2014 Inventory released for its public comment period, the EPA incorporated year-to-year, facility-level waste disposal quantities as reported to EPA’s GHGRP, supplemented with data from LMOP.
The FOD model was then applied using a bulk waste DOC value of 0.20, as has been utilized as the best methodological approach for previous Inventory emission estimates. This recalculation resulted in a large increase in estimated CH₄ emissions from landfills over the time series of the Inventory. During the public comment period on the draft Inventory, the EPA received comments from the waste industry that, while the 0.20 DOC is appropriate for MSW bulk waste, there is a substantial amount of inert waste disposed in addition to that MSW bulk waste which should instead be assigned a DOC value of zero because it does not contribute to CH₄ generation. According to these waste industry comments, the addition of inert is a trend that has been occurring for many years at MSW landfills. Despite the use of the same FOD methodology and same assumptions on DOC for estimating emissions from MSW landfills, the EPA had not received this information from the waste industry during previous public comment periods on prior draft Inventory reports. The EPA has determined that further review of the waste disposal quantities and DOC values reported to EPA’s GHGRP using the approved reporting requirements is necessary in light of the waste industry comments on the draft Inventory. As such, the recalculation presented in the draft Inventory using the GHGRP waste disposal data was not incorporated for the final Inventory report. The integration of the GHGRP data will be explored further with additional waste industry stakeholder input so that it may be used, and so that recalculated emission estimates can be provided in the 1990 through 2015 Inventory.

A standard CH₄ oxidation factor of 10 percent has been used for both industrial and MSW landfills in prior Inventory reports and is currently recommended as the default for well-managed landfills in the latest IPCC Guidelines (2006). Recent comments on the Inventory methodology indicated that a default oxidation factor of 10 percent may be less than oxidation rates achieved at well-managed landfills with gas collection and control. As a first step toward revising this oxidation factor, a literature review was conducted in 2011 (RTI 2011). In addition, facilities reporting under EPA’s GHGRP have the option to use an oxidation factor other than 10 percent (e.g., 0, 25, or 35 percent) if the calculated result of CH₄ flux calculations warrants it. Various options are being investigated to incorporate this facility-specific data for landfills reporting under EPA’s GHGRP and/or the remaining facilities.

The standard oxidation factor (10 percent) is applied to the total amount of waste generated nationwide. Changing the oxidation factor and calculating the amount of CH₄ oxidized from landfills with gas collection and control requires the estimation of waste disposed in these types of landfills over the entire time series. Although EPA’s GHGRP does not capture every landfill in the United States, larger landfills are expected to meet the reporting thresholds and are reporting waste disposal information by year. At this time, data are available to calculate the amount of waste disposed of at landfills with and without gas collection systems in the United States for landfills reporting under EPA’s GHGRP. After investigating the landfills not reporting under EPA’s GHGRP to determine the presence of a landfill gas collection and control system and waste disposal data, a modification to the Inventory waste model to apply different oxidation factors depending on the presence of a gas collection system may be possible.

Other potential improvements to the methodology may be made in the future using other portions of the GHGRP dataset, specifically for inputs to the FOD equation. The approach used in the Inventory to estimate CH₄ generation assumes a bulk waste-specific DOC value that may not accurately capture the changing waste composition over the time series (e.g., the reduction of organics entering the landfill environment due to increased composting, see Box 7-2). Using data obtained from EPA’s GHGRP and any publicly available landfill-specific waste characterization studies in the United States, the methodology may be modified to incorporate a waste composition approach, or revisions may be made to the bulk waste DOC value currently used. Additionally, GHGRP data could be analyzed and a weighted average for the CH₄ correction factor (MCF), fraction of CH₄ (F) in the landfill gas, the destruction efficiency of flares, and the decay rate constant (k) could replace the values currently used in the Inventory. At this time, the majority of landfills reporting under EPA’s GHGRP select bulk MSW for their waste composition.

In addition to MSW landfills, industrial waste landfills at facilities emitting CH₄ in amounts equivalent to 25,000 metric tons or more of CO₂ Eq. were required to report their GHG emissions beginning in September 2012 through EPA’s GHGRP. Similar data for industrial waste landfills as is required for the MSW landfills are being reported. Any additions or improvements to the Inventory using reported GHGRP data will be made for the industrial waste landfill source category. As mentioned in the recalculation discussion, the DOC value for pulp and paper waste will be reviewed against new GHGRP data to determine if further revisions to the DOC value of 0.15 are necessary. Another potential improvement includes a revision to the waste disposal factor currently used by the Inventory for the pulp and paper sector using production data from pulp and paper facilities that reported annual production and annual disposal data under EPA’s GHGRP. The addition of industrial sectors other than pulp and paper and food processing (e.g., metal foundries, petroleum refineries, and chemical manufacturing facilities) to the Inventory may also be investigated.
Lastly, voluntary flare sales data was not able to be obtained from vendors who have previously provided this data. The impacts on the Inventory are minimal considering the coverage of EPA’s GHGRP and LMOP, but is necessary to provide a representative picture of the extent of CH₄ recovery in the United States.

**Box 7-3: Nationwide Municipal Solid Waste Data Sources**

Municipal solid waste generated in the United States can be managed through landfilling, recycling, composting, and combustion with energy recovery. There are two main sources for nationwide solid waste management data in the United States:

- The BioCycle and Earth Engineering Center of Columbia University’s State of Garbage (SOG) in America surveys; and
- The EPA’s *Municipal Solid Waste in The United States: Facts and Figures* reports.

The SOG surveys collect state-reported data on the amount of waste generated and the amount of waste managed via different management options: landfilling, recycling, composting, and combustion. The survey asks for actual tonnages instead of percentages in each waste category (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, construction and demolition, organics, tires) for each waste management option. If such a breakdown is not available, the survey asks for total tons landfilled. The data are adjusted for imports and exports across state lines so that the principles of mass balance are adhered to, whereby the amount of waste managed does not exceed the amount of waste generated. The SOG reports present survey data aggregated to the state level.

The EPA *Facts and Figures* reports use a materials flow methodology, which relies heavily on a mass balance approach. Data are gathered from industry associations, key businesses, similar industry sources, and government agencies (e.g., the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Census Bureau) and are used to estimate tons of materials and products generated, recycled, or discarded nationwide. The amount of MSW generated is estimated by adjusting the imports and exports of produced materials to other countries. MSW that is not recycled, composted, or combusted is assumed to be landfilled. The data presented in the report are nationwide totals.

The SOG surveys are the preferred data source for estimating waste generation and disposal amounts in the Inventory because they are considered a more objective, numbers-based analysis of solid waste management in the United States. However, the EPA *Facts and Figures* reports are useful when investigating waste management trends at the nationwide level and for typical waste composition data, which the SOG surveys do not request.

In this Inventory, emissions from solid waste management are presented separately by waste management option, except for recycling of waste materials. Emissions from recycling are attributed to the stationary combustion of fossil fuels that may be used to power on-site recycling machinery, and are presented in the stationary combustion chapter in the Energy sector, although the emissions estimates are not called out separately. Emissions from solid waste disposal in landfills and the composting of solid waste materials are presented in the Landfills and Composting chapters in the Waste sector of this report. In the United States, almost all incineration of MSW occurs at waste-to-energy (WTE) facilities or industrial facilities where useful energy is recovered, and thus emissions from waste incineration are accounted for in the Incineration chapter of the Energy sector of this report.

**Box 7-4: Overview of the Waste Sector**

As shown in Figure 7-2 and Figure 7-3, landfilling of MSW is currently and has been the most common waste management practice. A large portion of materials in the waste stream are recovered for recycling and composting, which is becoming an increasingly prevalent trend throughout the country. Materials that are composted and recycled would have normally been disposed of in a landfill.
Figure 7-2: Management of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States, 2013


Figure 7-3: MSW Management Trends from 1990 to 2013


Table 7-6 presents a typical composition of waste disposed of at a typical MSW landfill in the United States over time. It is important to note that the actual composition of waste entering each landfill will vary from that presented in Table 7-6. Understanding how the waste composition changes over time, specifically for the degradable waste types, is important for estimating greenhouse gas emissions. For certain degradable waste types (i.e., paper and paperboard), the amounts discarded have decreased over time due to an increase in waste recovery, including recycling and composting (see Table 7-6 and Figure 7-4) do not reflect the impact of backyard composting on yard
trimming generation and recovery estimates. The recovery of food trimmings has been consistently low. Increased recovery of degradable materials reduces the CH$_4$ generation potential and CH$_4$ emissions from landfills.

Table 7-6: Materials Discarded in the Municipal Waste Stream by Waste Type from 1990 to 2013 (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper and Paperboard</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber and Leather</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other$^a$</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Scraps$^b$</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard Trimmings$^c$</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Inorganic Wastes</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Includes electrolytes in batteries and fluff pulp, feces, and urine in disposable diapers. Details may not add to totals due to rounding (EPA 2015c).

$^b$ Data for food scraps were estimated using sampling studies in various parts of the country in combination with demographic data on population, grocery store sales, restaurant sales, number of employees, and number of prisoners, students, and patients in institutions (EPA 2015c).

$^c$ Data for yard trimmings were estimated using sampling studies, population data, and published sources documenting legislation affecting yard trimmings disposal in landfills (EPA 2015c).

Figure 7-4: Percent of Recovered Degradable Materials from 1990 to 2013 (Percent)

Source: EPA 2015c
Modern, managed landfills are well-engineered facilities that are located, designed, operated, and monitored to ensure compliance with federal, state, and tribal regulations. Municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills must be designed to protect the environment from contaminants which may be present in the solid waste stream. Additionally, many new landfills collect and destroy landfill gas through flares or landfill gas-to-energy projects. Requirements for affected MSW landfills may include:

- Siting requirements to protect sensitive areas (e.g., airports, floodplains, wetlands, fault areas, seismic impact zones, and unstable areas);
- Design requirements for new landfills to ensure that Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) will not be exceeded in the uppermost aquifer (e.g., composite liners and leachate collection systems);
- Leachate collection and removal systems;
- Operating practices (e.g., daily and intermediate cover, receipt of regulated hazardous wastes, use of landfill cover material, access options to prevent illegal dumping, use of a collection system to prevent stormwater run-on/run-off, record-keeping);
- Air monitoring requirements (explosive gases);
- Groundwater monitoring requirements;
- Closure and post-closure care requirements (e.g., final cover construction); and
- Corrective action provisions.

Specific federal regulations that affected MSW landfills must comply with include the 40 CFR Part 258 (Subtitle D of RCRA), or equivalent state regulations and the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) 40 CFR Part 60 Subpart WWW. Additionally, state and tribal requirements may exist.6

7.2 Wastewater Treatment (IPCC Source Category 5D)

Wastewater treatment processes can produce anthropogenic methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions. Wastewater from domestic and industrial sources is treated to remove soluble organic matter, suspended solids, pathogenic organisms, and chemical contaminants.7 Treatment may either occur on site, most commonly through septic systems or package plants, or off site at centralized treatment systems. Centralized wastewater treatment systems may include a variety of processes, ranging from lagooning to advanced tertiary treatment technology for removing nutrients. In the United States, approximately 20 percent of domestic wastewater is treated in septic systems or other on-site systems, while the rest is collected and treated centrally (U.S. Census Bureau 2013).

Soluble organic matter is generally removed using biological processes in which microorganisms consume the organic matter for maintenance and growth. The resulting biomass (sludge) is removed from the effluent prior to discharge to the receiving stream. Microorganisms can biodegrade soluble organic material in wastewater under aerobic or anaerobic conditions, where the latter condition produces CH₄. During collection and treatment, wastewater may be accidentally or deliberately managed under anaerobic conditions. In addition, the sludge may be further biodegraded under aerobic or anaerobic conditions. The generation of N₂O may also result from the treatment of domestic wastewater during both nitrification and denitrification of the nitrogen (N) present, usually in the form of urea, ammonia, and proteins. These compounds are converted to nitrate (NO₃⁻) through the aerobic process of nitrification. Denitrification occurs under anoxic conditions (without free oxygen), and involves the

6 For more information regarding federal MSW landfill regulations, see <http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/municipal/landfill/msw_regs.htm>.

7 Throughout the Inventory, emissions from domestic wastewater also include any commercial and industrial wastewater collected and co-treated with domestic wastewater.
biological conversion of nitrate into dinitrogen gas (N\textsubscript{2}). Nitrous oxide can be an intermediate product of both processes, but has typically been associated with denitrification. Recent research suggests that higher emissions of N\textsubscript{2}O may in fact originate from nitrification (Ahn et al. 2010). Other more recent research suggests that N\textsubscript{2}O may also result from other types of wastewater treatment operations (Chandran 2012).

The principal factor in determining the CH\textsubscript{4} generation potential of wastewater is the amount of degradable organic material in the wastewater. Common parameters used to measure the organic component of the wastewater are the Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) and Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD). Under the same conditions, wastewater with higher COD (or BOD) concentrations will generally yield more CH\textsubscript{4} than wastewater with lower COD (or BOD) concentrations. BOD represents the amount of oxygen that would be required to completely consume the organic matter contained in the wastewater through aerobic decomposition processes, while COD measures the total material available for chemical oxidation (both biodegradable and non-biodegradable). Because BOD is an aerobic parameter, it is preferable to use COD to estimate CH\textsubscript{4} production. The principal factor in determining the N\textsubscript{2}O generation potential of wastewater is the amount of N in the wastewater. The variability of N in the influent to the treatment system, as well as the operating conditions of the treatment system itself, also impact the N\textsubscript{2}O generation potential.

In 2014, CH\textsubscript{4} emissions from domestic wastewater treatment were 9.0 MMT CO\textsubscript{2} Eq. (361 kt CH\textsubscript{4}). Emissions remained fairly steady from 1990 through 1997, but have decreased since that time due to decreasing percentages of wastewater being treated in anaerobic systems, including reduced use of on-site septic systems and central anaerobic treatment systems (EPA 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2004; U.S. Census 2013). In 2014, CH\textsubscript{4} emissions from industrial wastewater treatment were estimated to be 5.7 MMT CO\textsubscript{2} Eq. (227 kt CH\textsubscript{4}). Industrial emission sources have generally increased across the time series through 1999 and then fluctuated up and down with production changes associated with the treatment of wastewater from the pulp and paper manufacturing, meat and poultry processing, fruit and vegetable processing, starch-based ethanol production, and petroleum refining industries. Table 7-7 and Table 7-8 provide CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O emission estimates from domestic and industrial wastewater treatment.

With respect to N\textsubscript{2}O, the United States identifies two distinct sources for N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from domestic wastewater: emissions from centralized wastewater treatment processes, and emissions from effluent from centralized treatment systems that has been discharged into aquatic environments. The 2014 emissions of N\textsubscript{2}O from centralized wastewater treatment processes and from effluent were estimated to be 0.3 MMT CO\textsubscript{2} Eq. (1.1 kt N\textsubscript{2}O) and 4.5 MMT CO\textsubscript{2} Eq. (15.2 kt N\textsubscript{2}O), respectively. Total N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from domestic wastewater were estimated to be 4.8 MMT CO\textsubscript{2} Eq. (16.2 kt N\textsubscript{2}O). Nitrous oxide emissions from wastewater treatment processes gradually increased across the time series as a result of increasing U.S. population and protein consumption.

**Table 7-7: CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O Emissions from Domestic and Industrial Wastewater Treatment (MMT CO\textsubscript{2} Eq.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH\textsubscript{4}</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N\textsubscript{2}O</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Industrial activity includes the pulp and paper manufacturing, meat and poultry processing, fruit and vegetable processing, starch-based ethanol production, and petroleum refining industries.*

*Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.*
### Table 7-8: CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Domestic and Industrial Wastewater Treatment (kt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Industrial activity includes the pulp and paper manufacturing, meat and poultry processing, fruit and vegetable processing, starch-based ethanol production, and petroleum refining industries. Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.*

### Methodology

#### Domestic Wastewater CH₄ Emission Estimates

Domestic wastewater CH₄ emissions originate from both septic systems and from centralized treatment systems, such as publicly owned treatment works (POTWs). Within these centralized systems, CH₄ emissions can arise from aerobic systems that are not well managed or that are designed to have periods of anaerobic activity (e.g., constructed wetlands), anaerobic systems (anaerobic lagoons and facultative lagoons), and from anaerobic digesters when the captured biogas is not completely combusted. Methane emissions from septic systems were estimated by multiplying the U.S. population by the percent of wastewater treated in septic systems (about 20 percent) and an emission factor (10.7 g CH₄/capita/day), and then converting the result to kt/year. Methane emissions from POTWs were estimated by multiplying the total BOD₅ produced in the United States by the percent of wastewater treated centrally (about 80 percent), the relative percentage of wastewater treated by aerobic and anaerobic systems, the relative percentage of wastewater facilities with primary treatment, the percentage of BOD₅ treated after primary treatment (67.5 percent), the maximum CH₄-producing capacity of domestic wastewater (0.6), and the relative MCFs for well-managed aerobic (zero), not well managed aerobic (0.3), and anaerobic (0.8) systems with all aerobic systems assumed to be well-managed. Methane emissions from anaerobic digesters were estimated by multiplying the amount of biogas generated by wastewater sludge treated in anaerobic digesters by the proportion of CH₄ in digester biogas (0.65), the density of CH₄ (662 g CH₄/m³ CH₄), and the destruction efficiency associated with burning the biogas in an energy/thermal device (0.99). The methodological equations are:

\[
\text{Emissions from Septic Systems} = A = \text{US}_\text{POP} \times (\% \text{ onsite}) \times (\text{EF}_{\text{SEPTIC}}) \times 1/10^9 \times \text{Days}
\]

\[
\text{Emissions from Centrally Treated Aerobic Systems} = B
= [(\% \text{ collected}) \times (\text{total BOD}_5 \text{ produced}) \times (\% \text{ aerobic}) \times (\% \text{ aerobic w/out primary}) + (\% \text{ collected}) \times (\text{total BOD}_5 \text{ produced}) \times (\% \text{ aerobic}) \times (\% \text{ aerobic w/primary}) \times (1-\% \text{ BOD removed in prim. treat.})] \times (\% \text{ operations not well managed}) \times (\text{B}_0) \times (\text{MCF-aerobic not well man})
\]

\[
\text{Emissions from Centrally Treated Anaerobic Systems} = C
= [(\% \text{ collected}) \times (\text{total BOD}_5 \text{ produced}) \times (\% \text{ anaerobic}) \times (\% \text{ anaerobic w/out primary}) + (\% \text{ collected}) \times (\text{total BOD}_5 \text{ produced}) \times (\% \text{ anaerobic}) \times (\% \text{ anaerobic w/primary}) \times (1-\% \text{ BOD removed in prim. treat.})] \times (\text{B}_0) \times (\text{MCF-anaerobic})
\]

\[
\text{Emissions from Anaerobic Digesters} = D
= [(\text{POTW flow AD}) \times (\text{digester gas})/(\text{per capita flow})] \times \text{conversion to m}^3 \times (\text{FRAC_CH}_4) \times (365.25) \times (\text{density of CH}_4) \times (1-\text{DE}) \times 1/10^9
\]

Total CH₄ Emissions (kt) = A + B + C + D

where,

\[
\text{US}_\text{POP} = \text{U.S. population}
\]
% onsite = Flow to septic systems / total flow
% collected = Flow to POTWs / total flow
% aerobic = Flow to aerobic systems / total flow to POTWs
% anaerobic = Flow to anaerobic systems / total flow to POTWs
% aerobic w/out primary = Percent of aerobic systems that do not employ primary treatment
% anaerobic w/primary = Percent of anaerobic systems that employ primary treatment
% aerobic w/primary = Percent of aerobic systems that employ primary treatment
% aerobic w/out primary = Percent of aerobic systems that do not employ primary treatment
% anaerobic w/out primary = Percent of anaerobic systems that do not employ primary treatment
EFSEPTIC = Methane emission factor (10.7 g CH₄/capita/day) – septic systems
Days = days per year (365.25)
Total BOD₅ produced = kg BOD/capita/day × U.S. population × 365.25 days/yr
Bₐ = Maximum CH₄-producing capacity for domestic wastewater (0.60 kg CH₄/kg BOD)
1/10⁶ = Conversion factor, kg to kt
MCF-aerobic_not_well_man. = CH₄ correction factor for aerobic systems that are not well managed
MCF-anaerobic = CH₄ correction factor for anaerobic systems
DE = CH₄ destruction efficiency from flaring or burning in engine (0.99 for enclosed flares)
POTW_flow_AD = Wastewater influent flow to POTWs that have anaerobic digesters (MGD)
digester gas = Cubic feet of digester gas produced per person per day (1.0 ft³/person/day)
per capita flow = Wastewater flow to POTW per person per day (100 gal/person/day)
conversion to m³ = Conversion factor, ft³ to m³ (0.0283)
FRAC_CH₄ = Proportion CH₄ in biogas
density of CH₄ = 662 (g CH₄/m³ CH₄)
1/10³ = Conversion factor, g to kt

U.S. population data were taken from the U.S. Census Bureau International Database (U.S. Census 2016) and include the populations of the United States, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Table 7-9 presents U.S. population and total BOD₅ produced for 1990 through 2014, while Table 7-10 presents domestic wastewater CH₄ emissions for both septic and centralized systems in 2014. The proportions of domestic wastewater treated onsite versus at centralized treatment plants were based on data from the 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013 American Housing Surveys conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau (U.S. Census 2013), with data for intervening years obtained by linear interpolation and data for 2014 forecasted using 1990 to 2013 data. The percent of wastewater flow to aerobic and anaerobic systems, the percent of aerobic and anaerobic systems that do and do not employ primary treatment, and the wastewater flow to POTWs that have anaerobic digesters were obtained from the 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2004 Clean Watershed Needs Survey (EPA 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2004). Data for intervening years were obtained by linear interpolation and the years 2004 through 2014 were forecasted from the rest of the time series. The BOD₅ production rate (0.09 kg/capita/day) and the percent BOD₅ removed by primary treatment for domestic wastewater were obtained from Metcalf and Eddy (2003). The maximum CH₄-producing capacity (0.6 kg CH₄/kg BOD₅) and both MCFs used for centralized treatment systems were taken from IPCC (2000), while the CH₄ emission factor (10.7 g CH₄/capita/day) used for septic systems were taken from Leverenz et al. (2010). The CH₄ destruction efficiency for methane recovered from sludge digestion operations, 99 percent, was selected based on the range of efficiencies (98 to 100 percent) recommended for flares in AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Chapter 2.4 (EPA 1998), efficiencies used to establish New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for landfills, along with data from CAR (2011), Sullivan (2007), Sullivan (2010), and UNFCCC (2012). The cubic feet of digester gas produced per person per day (1.0 ft³/person/day) and the proportion of CH₄ in biogas (0.65) come from Metcalf and Eddy (2003). The wastewater flow to a POTW (100 gal/person/day) was taken from the Great Lakes–Upper Mississippi River Board of State and Provincial Public Health and Environmental Managers, "Recommended Standards for Wastewater Facilities (Ten-State Standards)" (2004).
Table 7-9: U.S. Population (Millions) and Domestic Wastewater BOD$_5$ Produced (kt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>BOD$_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>8,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>10,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>10,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>10,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>10,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau (2016); Metcalf & Eddy (2003).

Table 7-10: Domestic Wastewater CH$_4$ Emissions from Septic and Centralized Systems (2014, MMT CO$_2$ Eq. and Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH$_4$ Emissions (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)</th>
<th>% of Domestic Wastewater CH$_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Septic Systems</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Systems</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including anaerobic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sludge digestion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Industrial Wastewater CH$_4$ Emission Estimates

Methane emission estimates from industrial wastewater were developed according to the methodology described in IPCC (2006). Industry categories that are likely to produce significant CH$_4$ emissions from wastewater treatment were identified and included in the Inventory. The main criteria used to identify these industries are whether they generate high volumes of wastewater, whether there is a high organic wastewater load, and whether the wastewater is treated using methods that result in CH$_4$ emissions. The top five industries that meet these criteria are pulp and paper manufacturing; meat and poultry processing; vegetables, fruits, and juices processing; starch-based ethanol production; and petroleum refining. Wastewater treatment emissions for these sectors for 2014 are displayed in Table 7-11 below. Table 7-12 contains production data for these industries.

Table 7-11: Industrial Wastewater CH$_4$ Emissions by Sector (2014, MMT CO$_2$ Eq. and Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH$_4$ Emissions (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)</th>
<th>% of Industrial Wastewater CH$_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat &amp; Poultry</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp &amp; Paper</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit &amp; Vegetables</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Refineries</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol Refineries</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.
Table 7-12: U.S. Pulp and Paper, Meat, Poultry, Vegetables, Fruits and Juices, Ethanol, and Petroleum Refining Production (MMT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pulp and Paper*</th>
<th>Meat (Live Weight Killed)</th>
<th>Poultry (Live Weight Killed)</th>
<th>Vegetables, Fruits and Juices</th>
<th>Ethanol</th>
<th>Petroleum Refining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>702.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>818.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>848.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>126.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>858.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>856.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>878.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>120.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>903.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pulp and paper production is the sum of woodpulp production plus paper and paperboard production.

Sources: Lockwood-Post (2002); FAO (2016); USDA (2016a); RFA (2016); EIA (2016).

Methane emissions from these categories were estimated by multiplying the annual product output by the average outflow, the organics loading (in COD) in the outflow, the maximum CH₄ producing potential of industrial wastewater (Bₒ), and the percentage of organic loading assumed to degrade anaerobically in a given treatment system (MCF). Ratios of BOD:COD in various industrial wastewaters were obtained from EPA (1997a) and used to estimate COD loadings. The Bₒ value used for all industries is the IPCC default value of 0.25 kg CH₄/kg COD (IPCC 2006).

For each industry, the percent of plants in the industry that treat wastewater on site, the percent of plants that have a primary treatment step prior to biological treatment, and the percent of plants that treat wastewater anaerobically were defined. The percent of wastewater treated anaerobically on site (TA) was estimated for both primary treatment (%TAᵣ) and secondary treatment (%TAₛ). For plants that have primary treatment in place, an estimate of COD that is removed prior to wastewater treatment in the anaerobic treatment units was incorporated. The values used in the %TA calculations are presented in Table 7-13 below.

The methodological equations are:

\[
\text{CH}_4 \text{ (industrial wastewater)} = [P \times W \times COD \times \%TA_p \times B_o \times MCF] + [P \times W \times COD \times \%TA_s \times B_o \times MCF]
\]

\[
\%TA_p = \left[\%\text{Plants}_o \times \%\text{WW}_{a,p} \times \%\text{COD}_{p}\right]
\]

\[
\%TA_s = \left[\%\text{Plants}_a \times \%\text{WW}_{a,s} \times \%\text{COD}_{s}\right] + \left[\%\text{Plants}_{t} \times \%\text{WW}_{a,t} \times \%\text{COD}_{s}\right]
\]

where,

- CH₄ (industrial wastewater) = Total CH₄ emissions from industrial wastewater (kg/year)
- P = Industry output (metric tons/year)
- W = Wastewater generated (m³/metric ton of product)
- COD = Organics loading in wastewater (kg/m³)
- %TAᵣ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically on site in primary treatment
- %TAₛ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically on site in secondary treatment
- %Plantsᵣ = Percent of plants with onsite treatment
- %WWᵣ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in primary treatment
- %CODᵣ = Percent of COD entering primary treatment
- %Plantsₛ = Percent of plants with anaerobic secondary treatment
- %WWₛ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in anaerobic secondary treatment
- %CODₛ = Percent of COD entering secondary treatment
- Bₒ = Maximum CH₄ producing potential of industrial wastewater (default value of 0.25 kg CH₄/kg COD)
- MCF = CH₄ correction factor, indicating the extent to which the organic content (measured as COD) degrades anaerobically
Alternate methodological equations for calculating $%TA$ were used for secondary treatment in the pulp and paper industry to account for aerobic systems with anaerobic portions. These equations are:

$$%TA_a = [%Plants_a \times %WW_{as} \times %COD_s] + [%Plants_{at} \times %WW_{at} \times COD_s]$$

$$%TA_{at} = [%Plants_{at} \times %WW_{as} \times %COD_s]$$

where,

$%TA_a$ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically on site in secondary treatment

$%TA_{at}$ = Percent of wastewater treated in aerobic systems with anaerobic portions on site in secondary treatment

$%Plants_a$ = Percent of plants with anaerobic secondary treatment

$%Plants_{at}$ = Percent of plants with partially anaerobic secondary treatment

$%WW_{as}$ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in anaerobic secondary treatment

$%WW_{at}$ = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in other secondary treatment

$%COD_s$ = Percent of COD entering secondary treatment

As described below, the values presented in Table 7-13 were used in the emission calculations and are described in detail in ERG (2008), ERG (2013a), and ERG (2013b).

**Table 7-13: Variables Used to Calculate Percent Wastewater Treated Anaerobically by Industry (percent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$%TA_p$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%TA_s$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%TA_a$</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%TA_{at}$</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%Plants_o$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%Plants_a$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%Plants_{at}$</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%WW_{as}$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%WW_{at}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%COD_p$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%COD_s$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%COD_{at}$</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ERG (2008); ERG (2013a); and ERG (2013b).

**Pulp and Paper.** Wastewater treatment for the pulp and paper industry typically includes neutralization, screening, sedimentation, and flotation/hydrocycloning to remove solids (World Bank 1999; Nemerow and Dasgupta 1991). Secondary treatment (storage, settling, and biological treatment) mainly consists of lagooning. In determining the percent that degrades anaerobically, both primary and secondary treatment were considered. In the United States, primary treatment is focused on solids removal, equalization, neutralization, and color reduction (EPA 1993). The vast majority of pulp and paper mills with on-site treatment systems use mechanical clarifiers to remove suspended solids from the wastewater. About 10 percent of pulp and paper mills with treatment systems use settling ponds for primary treatment and these are more likely to be located at mills that do not perform secondary treatment (EPA 1993). However, because the vast majority of primary treatment operations at U.S. pulp and paper mills use mechanical clarifiers, and less than 10 percent of pulp and paper wastewater is managed in primary settling ponds that are not expected to have anaerobic conditions, negligible emissions are assumed to occur during primary treatment.

Approximately 42 percent of the BOD passes on to secondary treatment, which consists of activated sludge, aerated stabilization basins, or non-aerated stabilization basins. Based on EPA’s *OAQPS Pulp and Paper Sector Survey*, 5.3 percent of pulp and paper mills reported using anaerobic secondary treatment for wastewater and/or pulp
condensates (ERG 2013a). Twenty-eight percent of mills also reported the use of quiescent settling ponds. Using engineering judgment, these systems were determined to be aerobic with possible anaerobic portions. For the truly anaerobic systems, an MCF of 0.8 is used, as these are typically deep stabilization basins. For the partially anaerobic systems, an MCF of 0.2 is used, which is the IPCC suggested MCF for shallow lagoons.

A time series of CH₄ emissions for 1990 through 2001 was developed based on production figures reported in the Lockwood-Post Directory (Lockwood-Post 2002). Data from the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) database FAOSTAT were used for 2002 through 2014 (FAO 2016). The overall wastewater outflow varies based on a time series outlined in ERG (2013a) to reflect historical and current industry wastewater flow, and the average BOD concentrations in raw wastewater was estimated to be 0.4 gram BOD/liter (EPA 1997b; EPA 1993; World Bank 1999). The COD:BOD ratio used to convert the organic loading to COD for pulp and paper mills was 2 (EPA 1997a).

Meat and Poultry Processing. The meat and poultry processing industry makes extensive use of anaerobic lagoons in sequence with screening, fat traps, and dissolved air flotation when treating wastewater on site. About 33 percent of meat processing operations (EPA 2002) and 25 percent of poultry processing operations (U.S. Poultry 2006) perform on-site treatment in anaerobic lagoons. The IPCC default Bₒ of 0.25 kg CH₄/kg COD and default MCF of 0.8 for anaerobic lagoons were used to estimate the CH₄ produced from these on-site treatment systems. Production data, in carcass weight and live weight killed for the meat and poultry industry, were obtained from the USDA Agricultural Statistics Database and the Agricultural Statistics Annual Reports (USDA 2016a). Data collected by EPA’s Office of Water provided estimates for wastewater flows into anaerobic lagoons: 5.3 and 12.5 m³/metric ton for meat and poultry production (live weight killed), respectively (EPA 2002). The loadings are 2.8 and 1.5 g BOD/liter for meat and poultry, respectively. The COD:BOD ratio used to convert the organic loading to COD for both meat and poultry facilities was 3 (EPA 1997a).

Vegetables, Fruits, and Juices Processing. Treatment of wastewater from fruits, vegetables, and juices processing includes screening, coagulation/settling, and biological treatment (lagooning). The flows are frequently seasonal, and robust treatment systems are preferred for on-site treatment. Effluent is suitable for discharge to the sewer. This industry is likely to use lagoons intended for aerobic operation, but the large seasonal loadings may develop limited anaerobic zones. In addition, some anaerobic lagoons may also be used (Nemerow and Dasgupta 1991). Consequently, 4.2 percent of these wastewater organics are assumed to degrade anaerobically. The IPCC default Bₒ of 0.25 kg CH₄/kg COD and default MCF of 0.8 for anaerobic treatment were used to estimate the CH₄ produced from these on-site treatment systems. The USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (USDA 2016a) provided production data for potatoes, other vegetables, citrus fruit, non-citrus fruit, and grapes processed for wine. Outflow and BOD data, presented in Table 7-14, were obtained from EPA (1974) for potato, citrus fruit, and apple processing, and from EPA (1975) for all other sectors. The COD:BOD ratio used to convert the organic loading to COD for all fruit, vegetable, and juice facilities was 1.5 (EPA 1997a).

**Table 7-14: Wastewater Flow (m³/ton) and BOD Production (g/L) for U.S. Vegetables, Fruits, and Juices Production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Wastewater Outflow (m³/ton)</th>
<th>BOD (g/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>1.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vegetables</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citrus</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes (for wine)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: EPA (1974); EPA (1975).

Ethanol Production. Ethanol, or ethyl alcohol, is produced primarily for use as a fuel component, but is also used in industrial applications and in the manufacture of beverage alcohol. Ethanol can be produced from the fermentation of sugar-based feedstocks (e.g., molasses and beets), starch- or grain-based feedstocks (e.g., corn, sorghum, and beverage waste), and cellulosic biomass feedstocks (e.g., agricultural wastes, wood, and bagasse). Ethanol can also be produced synthetically from ethylene or hydrogen and carbon monoxide. However, synthetic ethanol comprises...
only about 2 percent of ethanol production, and although the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) predicts cellulosic ethanol to greatly increase in the coming years, currently it is only in an experimental stage in the United States. Currently, ethanol is mostly made from sugar and starch crops, but with advances in technology, cellulosic biomass is increasingly used as ethanol feedstock (DOE 2013).

Ethanol is produced from corn (or other starch-based feedstocks) primarily by two methods: wet milling and dry milling. Historically, the majority of ethanol was produced by the wet milling process, but now the majority is produced by the dry milling process. The dry milling process is cheaper to implement, and has become more efficient in recent years (Rendleman and Shapouri 2007). The wastewater generated at ethanol production facilities is handled in a variety of ways. Dry milling facilities often combine the resulting evaporator condensate with other process wastewaters, such as equipment wash water, scrubber water, and boiler blowdown and anaerobically treat this wastewater using various types of digesters. Wet milling facilities often treat their steepwater condensate in anaerobic systems followed by aerobic polishing systems. Wet milling facilities may treat the stillage (or processed stillage) from the ethanol fermentation/distillation process separately or together with steepwater and/or wash water. Methane generated in anaerobic digesters is commonly collected and either flared or used as fuel in the ethanol production process (ERG 2006).

Available information was compiled from the industry on wastewater generation rates, which ranged from 1.25 gallons per gallon ethanol produced (for dry milling) to 10 gallons per gallon ethanol produced (for wet milling) (Ruocco 2006a; Ruocco 2006b; Merrick 1998; Donovan 1996; NRBP 2001). COD concentrations were also found to be about 3 g/L (Ruocco 2006a; Merrick 1998; White and Johnson 2003). The amount of wastewater treated anaerobically was estimated, along with how much of the CH₄ is recovered through the use of biomethanators. Biomethanators are anaerobic reactors that use microorganisms under anaerobic conditions to reduce COD and organic acids and recover biogas from wastewater (ERG 2006). Methane emissions were then estimated as follows:

\[
\text{Methane} = \left[ \text{Production} \times \text{Flow} \times \text{COD} \times 3.785 \times \left( \% \text{Plants}_o \times \% \text{WW}_{a,p} \times \% \text{COD}_p \right) + \left( \% \text{Plants}_a \times \% \text{WW}_{a,a} \times \% \text{COD}_a \right) \right] \times B \times \text{MCF} \times \% \text{Not Recovered} + \left( \% \text{Plants}_t \times \% \text{WW}_{a,t} \times \% \text{COD}_t \right) \times B \times \text{MCF} \times (\% \text{Recovered}) \times (1 - \text{DE}) \times 1/10^9
\]

where,

- \text{Production} = \text{gallons ethanol produced (wet milling or dry milling)}
- \text{Flow} = \text{gallons wastewater generated per gallon ethanol produced (1.25 dry milling, 10 wet milling)}
- \text{COD} = \text{COD concentration in influent (3 g/L)}
- 3.785 = \text{conversion, gallons to liters}
- \% \text{Plants}_o = \text{percent of plants with onsite treatment (100%)}
- \% \text{Plants}_a = \text{percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in primary treatment (0%)}
- \% \text{COD}_p = \text{percent of COD entering primary treatment (100%)}
- \% \text{Plants}_t = \text{percent of plants with anaerobic secondary treatment (33.3% wet, 75% dry)}
- \% \text{WW}_{a,s} = \text{percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in anaerobic secondary treatment (100%)}
- \% \text{WW}_{a,t} = \text{percent of wastewater treated anaerobically in other secondary treatment (0%)}
- \% \text{COD}_s = \text{percent of COD entering secondary treatment (100%)}
- B = \text{maximum methane producing capacity (0.25 g CH}_4/g \text{COD)}
- \text{MCF} = \text{methane conversion factor (0.8 for anaerobic systems)}
- \% \text{Recovered} = \text{percent of wastewater treated in system with emission recovery}
- \% \text{Not Recovered} = 1 - \% \text{wastewater treated in system with emission recovery}
- \text{DE} = \text{destruction efficiency of recovery system (99%)}
- 1/10^9 = \text{conversion factor, g to kt}

A time series of CH₄ emissions for 1990 through 2014 was developed based on production data from the Renewable Fuels Association (RFA 2016).

**Petroleum Refining.** Petroleum refining wastewater treatment operations have the potential to produce CH₄ emissions from anaerobic wastewater treatment. EPA’s Office of Air and Radiation performed an Information Collection Request (ICR) for petroleum refineries in 2011.⁸ Of the responding facilities, 23.6 percent reported using

---

⁸ Available online at <https://refineryicr.rti.org/>.
non-aerated surface impoundments or other biological treatment units, both of which have the potential to lead to anaerobic conditions (ERG 2013b). In addition, the wastewater generation rate was determined to be 26.4 gallons per barrel of finished product (ERG 2013b). An average COD value in the wastewater was estimated at 0.45 kg/m$^3$ (Benyahia et al. 2006).

The equation used to calculate CH$_4$ generation at petroleum refining wastewater treatment systems is presented below:

\[
\text{Methane} = \text{Flow} \times \text{COD} \times \text{TA} \times B_o \times \text{MCF}
\]

where,
- Flow = Annual flow treated through anaerobic treatment system (m$^3$/year)
- COD = COD loading in wastewater entering anaerobic treatment system (kg/m$^3$)
- TA = Percent of wastewater treated anaerobically on site
- $B_o$ = maximum methane producing potential of industrial wastewater (default value of 0.25 kg CH$_4$/kg COD)
- MCF = methane conversion factor (0.3)

A time series of CH$_4$ emissions for 1990 through 2014 was developed based on production data from the Energy Information Association (EIA 2016).

**Domestic Wastewater N$_2$O Emission Estimates**

Nitrous oxide emissions from domestic wastewater (wastewater treatment) were estimated using the IPCC (2006) methodology, including calculations that take into account N removal with sewage sludge, non-consumption and industrial/commercial wastewater N, and emissions from advanced centralized wastewater treatment plants:

- In the United States, a certain amount of N is removed with sewage sludge, which is applied to land, incinerated, or landfilled ($N_{\text{SLUDGE}}$). The N disposal into aquatic environments is reduced to account for the sewage sludge application.

- The IPCC methodology uses annual, per capita protein consumption (kg protein/person-year). For this Inventory, the amount of protein available to be consumed is estimated based on per capita annual food availability data and its protein content, and then adjusts that data using a factor to account for the fraction of protein actually consumed.

- Small amounts of gaseous nitrogen oxides are formed as byproducts in the conversion of nitrate to N gas in anoxic biological treatment systems. Approximately 7 g N$_2$O is generated per capita per year if wastewater treatment includes intentional nitrification and denitrification (Scheehle and Doorn 2001). Analysis of the 2004 CWNS shows that plants with denitrification as one of their unit operations serve a population of 2.4 million people. Based on an emission factor of 7 g per capita per year, approximately 21.2 metric tons of additional N$_2$O may have been emitted via denitrification in 2004. Similar analyses were completed for each year in the Inventory using data from CWNS on the amount of wastewater in centralized systems treated in denitrification units. Plants without intentional nitrification/denitrification are assumed to generate 3.2 g N$_2$O per capita per year.

Nitrous oxide emissions from domestic wastewater were estimated using the following methodology:

\[
N_2O_{\text{TOTAL}} = N_2O_{\text{PLANT}} + N_2O_{\text{EFFLUENT}}
\]

\[
N_2O_{\text{PLANT}} = N_2O_{\text{NIT/DENIT}} + N_2O_{\text{WOUT NIT/DENIT}}
\]

\[
N_2O_{\text{NIT/DENIT}} = \left(\left(\text{USPOP} \times \text{EF}_2 \times \text{FIND-\text{COM}}\right) \times 1/10^9\right)
\]

\[
N_2O_{\text{WOUT NIT/DENIT}} = \left(\left(\text{USPOP} \times \text{WWTP} - 0.9 \times \text{USPOPND}\right) \times \text{PROTEIN} \times \text{FNP} \times \text{FNON-\text{CON}} \times \text{FIND-\text{COM}}\right) \times N_{\text{SLUDGE}} \times \text{EF}_3 \times 44/28 \times 1/10^9
\]

\[
N_2O_{\text{EFFLUENT}} = \left(\left(\left(\text{USPOP} \times \text{WWTP} - 0.9 \times \text{USPOPND}\right) \times \text{PROTEIN} \times \text{FNP} \times \text{FNON-\text{CON}} \times \text{FIND-\text{COM}}\right) \times N_{\text{SLUDGE}} \times \text{EF}_3 \times 44/28 \times 1/10^9\right)
\]

where,
- $N_2O_{\text{TOTAL}}$ = Annual emissions of N$_2$O (kt)
U.S. population data were taken from the U.S. Census Bureau International Database (U.S. Census 2016) and include the populations of the United States, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The fraction of the U.S. population using wastewater treatment plants is based on data from the 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013 American Housing Survey (U.S. Census 2013). Data for intervening years were obtained by linear interpolation and data from 2014 were forecasted using 1990 to 2013 data. The emission factor (EF<sub>1</sub>) used to estimate emissions from wastewater treatment for plants without intentional denitrification was taken from IPCC (2006), while the emission factor (EF<sub>2</sub>) used to estimate emissions from wastewater treatment for plants with intentional denitrification was taken from Scheehle and Doorn (2001). Data on annual per capita protein intake were provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service (USDA 2016b). Protein consumption data for 2011 through 2014 were extrapolated from data for 1990 through 2010. An emission factor to estimate emissions from effluent (EF<sub>3</sub>) has not been specifically estimated for the United States, thus the default IPCC value (0.005 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg sewage-N produced) was applied (IPCC 2006). The fraction of N in protein (0.16 kg N/kg protein) was also obtained from IPCC (2006). The factor for non-consumed protein and the factor for industrial and commercial co-discharged protein were obtained from IPCC (2006). Sludge generation was obtained from EPA (1999) for 1988, 1996, and 1998 and from Beecher et al. (2007) for 2004. Intervening years were interpolated, and estimates for 2005 through 2014 were forecasted from the rest of the time series. The amount of nitrogen removed by denitrification systems was taken from EPA (2008). An estimate for the N removed as sludge (N<sub>SLUDGE</sub>) was obtained by determining the amount of sludge disposed by incineration, by land application (agriculture or other), through surface disposal, in landfills, or through ocean dumping (US EPA 1993b; Beecher et al. 2007; McFarland 2001; US EPA 1999). In 2014, 289 kt N was removed with sludge. Table 7-15 presents the data for U.S. population, population served by biological denitrification, population served by wastewater treatment plants, available protein, protein consumed, and nitrogen removed with sludge.

### Table 7-15: U.S. Population (Millions), Population Served by Biological Denitrification (Millions), Fraction of Population Served by Wastewater Treatment (percent), Available Protein (kg/person-year), Protein Consumed (kg/person-year), and Nitrogen Removed with Sludge (kt-N/year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Population%</th>
<th>WWTP Population</th>
<th>Available Protein</th>
<th>Protein Consumed</th>
<th>N Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>214.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>261.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>276.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>279.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier A QA/QC analysis was performed on activity data, documentation, and emission calculations.

QA/QC and Verification above.

Methodological recalculations were applied to the entire time series to ensure time series consistency from 1990 through 2014. Details on the emission trends through time are described in more detail in the Methodology section, above.

**Uncertainty and Time-Series Consistency**

The overall uncertainty associated with both the 2014 CH4 and N2O emission estimates from wastewater treatment and discharge was calculated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Approach 2 methodology (IPCC 2006). Uncertainty associated with the parameters used to estimate CH4 emissions include that of numerous input variables used to model emissions from domestic wastewater, and wastewater from pulp and paper manufacture, meat and poultry processing, fruits and vegetable processing, ethanol production, and petroleum refining. Uncertainty associated with the parameters used to estimate N2O emissions include that of sewage sludge disposal, total U.S. population, average protein consumed per person, fraction of N in protein, non-consumption nitrogen factor, emission factors per capita and per mass of sewage-N, and for the percentage of total population using centralized wastewater treatment plants.

The results of this Approach 2 quantitative uncertainty analysis are summarized in Table 7-16. Methane emissions from wastewater treatment were estimated to be between 9.0 and 15.0 MMT CO2 Eq. at the 95 percent confidence level (or in 19 out of 20 Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulations). This indicates a range of approximately 39 percent below to 2 percent above the 2014 emissions estimate of 14.7 MMT CO2 Eq. Nitrous oxide emissions from wastewater treatment were estimated to be between 1.1 and 10.1 MMT CO2 Eq., which indicates a range of approximately 76 percent below to 108 percent above the 2014 emissions estimate of 4.8 MMT CO2 Eq.

Table 7-16: Approach 2 Quantitative Uncertainty Estimates for CH4 Emissions from Wastewater Treatment (MMT CO2 Eq. and Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>2014 Emission Estimate (MMT CO2 Eq.)</th>
<th>Uncertainty Range Relative to Emission Estimatea (MMT CO2 Eq.)</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>N2O</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-76%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-76%</td>
<td>+108%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Range of emission estimates predicted by Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation for a 95 percent confidence interval.

Methodological recalculations were applied to the entire time-series to ensure time-series consistency from 1990 through 2014. Details on the emission trends through time are described in more detail in the Methodology section, above.

**QA/QC and Verification**

A QA/QC analysis was performed on activity data, documentation, and emission calculations. This effort included a Tier 1 analysis, including the following checks:

- Checked for transcription errors in data input;
- Ensured references were specified for all activity data used in the calculations;
- Checked a sample of each emission calculation used for the source category;
- Checked that parameter and emission units were correctly recorded and that appropriate conversion factors were used;
- Checked for temporal consistency in time series input data for each portion of the source category;
- Confirmed that estimates were calculated and reported for all portions of the source category and for all years;
- Investigated data gaps that affected emissions estimates trends; and
- Compared estimates to previous estimates to identify significant changes.
All transcription errors identified were corrected. The QA/QC analysis did not reveal any systemic inaccuracies or incorrect input values.

**Recalculations Discussion**

Production data were updated to reflect revised U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) datasets. Updates to meat and poultry data based on changes to the 2012 Census for Agriculture and 2013 and 2014 annual revisions resulted in animal population changes for beef from 2008 to 2013, veal from 2009 to 2013, and lamb and muttons in 2009 (Bertramsen 2016). In addition, the most recent USDA Economic Research Service (ERS) data were used to update protein data values from 1990 through 2010. The updated ERS data also resulted in changes in forecasted values from 2011 (Cooper 2014).

The estimated number of ethanol plants using dry milling versus wet milling were updated for 1990 to 2014 with data provided by Renewable Fuels Association (RFA) (Cooper 2014). This change resulted in updated values for ethanol produced (both dry and wet) for the entire time series.

**Planned Improvements**

Due to circumstances, only very limited improvements were made to the wastewater treatment section of this Inventory. As a result, the planned improvements detailed previously will continue to be investigated for possible inclusion in a future Inventory. Below is a brief summary of ongoing investigations.

- EPA is continuing its evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) reports for improvements to activity data and for verifying methodologies currently in use in the Inventory to estimate emissions.
- EPA is working with the National Council of Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) to determine if there are sufficient data available to update the estimates of organic loading in pulp and paper wastewaters treated on-site.
- EPA is investigating the inclusion of constructed and semi-natural treatment wetlands in Inventory calculations using IPCC’s 2013 wetlands supplement (IPCC 2014) using CWNS treatment system data or other data sources.
- EPA is continuing its review of other industrial wastewater treatment sources for those industries believed to discharge significant loads of BOD and COD, including dairy processing wastewater.

Over the longer term, potential sources for updating inventory data continue to be monitored, including:

- Updated sources of activity data for wastewater treatment system type to distinguish between aerobic, anaerobic, and aerobic systems with the potential to generate CH₄;
- Water Environment Federation (WEF) biosolid data as a potential source of digester, sludge, and biogas data from POTWs;
- Reports based on international research and other countries’ inventory submissions to inform potential updates to the Inventory’s emission factors, methodologies, or included industries;
- Research by groups such as the Water Environment Research Federation (WERC) on emissions from various types of municipal treatment systems, country-specific N₂O emission factors, and flare efficiencies;
- Sources of data for development of a country-specific methodology for N₂O emissions associated with on-site industrial wastewater treatment operations, including the appropriateness of using IPCC’s default factor for domestic wastewater (0.005 kg N₂O-N/kg N);
- Data collected by WERF that indicate septic soil systems are a source of N₂O for the potential development of appropriate emission factors for septic system N₂O emissions;
- Additional data sources for improving the uncertainty of the estimate of N entering municipal treatment systems; and
- Data to update the value used for N content of sludge, the amount of sludge produced, and sludge disposal practices, along with increasing the transparency of the fate of sludge produced in wastewater treatment.

See Section 7.2 of the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 through 2013* for full detail of these planned improvements.
7.3 Composting (IPCC Source Category 5B1)

Composting of organic waste, such as food waste, garden (yard) and park waste, and wastewater treatment sludge and/or biosolids, is common in the United States. Advantages of composting include reduced volume of the waste, stabilization of the waste, and destruction of pathogens in the waste. The end products of composting, depending on its quality, can be recycled as a fertilizer and soil amendment, or be disposed of in a landfill.

Composting is an aerobic process and a large fraction of the degradable organic carbon in the waste material is converted into carbon dioxide (CO$_2$). Methane (CH$_4$) is formed in anaerobic sections of the compost, which are created when there is excessive moisture or inadequate aeration (or mixing) of the compost pile. This CH$_4$ is then oxidized to a large extent in the aerobic sections of the compost. The estimated CH$_4$ released into the atmosphere ranges from less than one percent to a few percent of the initial carbon (C) content in the material (IPCC 2006). Depending on how well the compost pile is managed, nitrous oxide (N$_2$O) emissions can be produced. The formation of N$_2$O depends on the initial nitrogen content of the material and is mostly due to nitrogen oxide (NO$_x$) denitrification during the later composting stages. Emissions vary and range from less than 0.5 percent to 5 percent of the initial nitrogen content of the material (IPCC 2006). Animal manures are typically expected to generate more N$_2$O than, for example, yard waste; however, data are limited.

From 1990 to 2014, the amount of waste composted in the United States has increased from 3,810 kt to 20,533 kt, an increase of approximately 439 percent. The amount of material composted in the United States in the last decade has increased by approximately 11 percent. Emissions of CH$_4$ and N$_2$O from composting have increased by the same percentage. In 2014, CH$_4$ emissions from composting (see Table 7-17 and Table 7-18) were 2.1 MMT CO$_2$ Eq. (82 kt), and N$_2$O emissions from composting were 1.8 MMT CO$_2$ Eq. (6 kt). The wastes composted primarily include yard trimmings (grass, leaves, and tree and brush trimmings) and food scraps from the residential and commercial sectors (such as grocery stores; restaurants; and school, business, and factory cafeterias). The composted waste quantities reported here do not include backyard composting or agricultural composting.

The growth in composting since the 1990s and specifically over the past decade is attributable to primarily three factors: (1) the enactment of legislation by state and local governments that discouraged the disposal of yard trimmings in landfills, (2) yard trimming collection and yard trimming drop off sites provided by local solid waste management districts/divisions, and (3) an increased awareness of the environmental benefits of composting. Most bans on the disposal of yard trimmings were initiated in the early 1990s by state or local governments (U.S. Composting Council 2010). By 2010, 25 states, representing about 50 percent of the nation’s population, had enacted such legislation (BioCycle 2010). An additional 16 states are known to have commercial-scale composting facilities (Shin 2014). Despite these factors, the total amount of waste composted exhibited a downward trend after peaking in 2008 (see Table 7-17 and Figure 7-5), but has been increasing since 2010 and the annual quantity composted is now on par with the 2008 quantity composted. While there is no definitive reason for the decreasing trend in the amount of waste composted, it is most likely a result of the recession and the fact that the quantities composted are estimated using a mass balance approach on the municipal waste stream across the entire United States. As presented in Figure 7-5, the quantity of CH$_4$ and N$_2$O emitted from composting operations across the time-series parallels the trends for the quantities composted, although the trend in emissions has a much lower slope compared to the quantities composted.

**Table 7-17: CH$_4$ and N$_2$O Emissions from Composting (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_2$O</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

**Table 7-18: CH$_4$ and N$_2$O Emissions from Composting (kt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_2$O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Methane and \(N_2O\) emissions from composting depend on factors such as the type of waste composted, the amount and type of supporting material (such as wood chips and peat) used, temperature, moisture content (e.g., wet and fluid versus dry and crumbly), and aeration during the composting process.

The emissions shown in Table 7-17 and Table 7-18 were estimated using the IPCC default (Tier 1) methodology (IPCC 2006), which is the product of an emission factor and the mass of organic waste composted (note: no \(CH_4\) recovery is expected to occur at composting operations in the emission estimates presented):

\[
E_i = M \times EF_i
\]

where,

- \(E_i\) = \(CH_4\) or \(N_2O\) emissions from composting, \(kt\ \)\(CH_4\) or \(N_2O\)
- \(M\) = mass of organic waste composted in \(kt\)
- \(EF_i\) = emission factor for composting, \(4\ t\ CH_4/kt\ \)of waste treated (wet basis) and \(0.3\ t\ N_2O/kt\ \)of waste treated (wet basis) (IPCC 2006)
- \(i\) = designates either \(CH_4\) or \(N_2O\)

Estimates of the quantity of waste composted (\(M\)) are presented in Table 7-19. Estimates of the quantity composted for 1990, 2005 and 2007 through 2009 were taken from EPA’s Municipal Solid Waste in the United States: 2010 Facts and Figures (EPA 2011); estimates of the quantity composted for 2006 were taken from EPA’s Municipal Solid Waste In The United States: 2006 Facts and Figures (EPA 2007); estimates of the quantity composted for 2011 through 2012 were taken from EPA’s Municipal Solid Waste In The United States: 2012 Facts and Figures (EPA 2014); estimates of the quantity composted for 2013 was taken from EPA’s Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures 2013 (EPA 2015); and estimates of the quantity composted for 2014 were
extrapolated using the 2013 quantity composted and a ratio of the U.S. population in 2013 and 2014 (U.S. Census Bureau 2015).

### Table 7-19: U.S. Waste Composted (kt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Composted</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>18,643</td>
<td>18,298</td>
<td>18,661</td>
<td>19,351</td>
<td>20,358</td>
<td>20,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uncertainty and Time-Series Consistency

The estimated uncertainty from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is ±50 percent for the Approach 1 methodology. Emissions from composting in 2014 were estimated to be between 1.9 and 5.8 MMT CO$_2$ Eq., which indicates a range of 50 percent below to 50 percent above the actual 2014 emission estimate of 3.9 MMT CO$_2$ Eq. (see Table 7-20).

### Table 7-20: Approach 1 Quantitative Uncertainty Estimates for Emissions from Composting (MMT CO$_2$ Eq. and Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>2014 Emission Estimate (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)</th>
<th>Uncertainty Range Relative to Emission Estimate (MMT CO$_2$ Eq.)</th>
<th>(%  )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>CH$_4$, N$_2$O</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodological recalculations were applied to the entire time-series to ensure time-series consistency from 1990 through 2014. Details on the emission trends through time-series are described in more detail in the Methodology section, above.

### QA/QC and Verification

A QA/QC analysis was performed for data gathering and input, documentation, and calculation. A primary focus of the QA/QC checks was to ensure that the amount of waste composted annually was correct according to the latest EPA Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures report.

### Recalculations Discussion

The estimated amount of waste composted in 2013 was updated based on new data contained in EPA’s Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures 2013 report (EPA 2015) relative to the previous report. The amounts of CH$_4$ and N$_2$O emission estimates presented in Table 7-17 and Table 7-18 were revised accordingly.

### Planned Improvements

For future Inventories, additional efforts will be made to improve the estimates of CH$_4$ and N$_2$O emissions from composting. For example, a literature search on emission factors and their drivers (e.g., the type of composting system, material composition, management technique, impact of varying climatic regions) is underway. The purpose of this literature review is to compile all published emission factors to determine whether the emission factors used in the current methodology should be revised, or expanded to account for various composting system, material composition, management techniques, and/or geographical/climatic differences. For example, composting systems that primarily compost food waste may generate CH$_4$ at different rates than composting yard trimmings because the food waste may have a higher moisture content and more readily degradable material. Further cooperation with estimating emissions in the Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry (LULUCF) Other section will also be investigated.
7.4 Waste Incineration (IPCC Source Category 5C1)

As stated earlier in this chapter, carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), nitrous oxide (N$_2$O), and methane (CH$_4$) emissions from the incineration of waste are accounted for in the Energy sector rather than in the Waste sector because almost all incineration of municipal solid waste (MSW) in the United States occurs at waste-to-energy facilities where useful energy is recovered. Similarly, the Energy sector also includes an estimate of emissions from burning waste tires and hazardous industrial waste, because virtually all of the combustion occurs in industrial and utility boilers that recover energy. The incineration of waste in the United States in 2014 resulted in 9.7 MMT CO$_2$ Eq. emissions, over half of which (4.9 MMT CO$_2$ Eq.) is attributable to the combustion of plastics. For more details on emissions from the incineration of waste, see Section 3.3 of the Energy chapter.

Additional sources of emissions from waste incineration include non-hazardous industrial waste incineration and medical waste incineration. As described in Annex 5 of this report, data are not readily available for these sources and emission estimates are not provided. An analysis of the likely level of emissions was conducted based on a 2009 study of hospital/medical/infectious waste incinerator (HMIWI) facilities in the United States (RTI 2009). Based on that study’s information of waste throughput and an analysis of the fossil-based composition of the waste, it was determined that annual greenhouse gas emissions for medical waste incineration would be below 500 kt CO$_2$ Eq. per year and considered insignificant for the purposes of Inventory reporting under the UNFCCC. More information on this analysis is provided in Annex 5.

7.5 Waste Sources of Indirect Greenhouse Gases

In addition to the main greenhouse gases addressed above, waste generating and handling processes are also sources of indirect greenhouse gas emissions. Total emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO$_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), and non-CH$_4$ volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs) from waste sources for the years 1990 through 2014 are provided in Table 7-21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO$_x$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous$^a$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous$^a$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMVOCs</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous$^a$</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Does not exceed 0.5 kt.

$^a$Miscellaneous includes TSDFs (Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [42 U.S.C. § 6924, SWDA § 3004]) and other waste categories.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.
Methodology

Emission estimates for 1990 through 2014 were obtained from data published on the National Emission Inventory (NEI) Air Pollutant Emission Trends web site (EPA 2015), and disaggregated based on EPA (2003). Emission estimates for 2014 for non-electric generating unit (EGU) and non-mobile sources are held constant from 2011 in EPA (2015). Emission estimates of these gases were provided by sector, using a “top down” estimating procedure—emissions were calculated either for individual sources or for many sources combined, using basic activity data (e.g., the amount of raw material processed) as an indicator of emissions. National activity data were collected for individual categories from various agencies. Depending on the category, these basic activity data may include data on production, fuel deliveries, raw material processed, etc.

Uncertainty and Time-Series Consistency

No quantitative estimates of uncertainty were calculated for this source category. Methodological recalculations were applied to the entire time-series to ensure time-series consistency from 1990 through 2014. Details on the emission trends through time are described in more detail in the Methodology section, above.