


Generating Electricity from Waste: A Comparison to Coal

Opponents of Energy-from-Waste (EfW) facilities sometime make the claim that EfW facility emissions are “worse than coal.” However, the reality is that EfW facilities are not only cleaner than coal but represent an important tool in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) and other emissions from landfills, serving as an important source of carbon mitigation in the process.

EfW is a Source of GHG Mitigation

In 2016, coal generation alone accounted for 23.4 percent of our nation’s total CO₂ emissions.⁴ In stark contrast, EfW is a widely recognized source of GHG mitigation. EfW facilities reduce lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions by approximately one ton for every ton of municipal solid waste (MSW) diverted from landfills, on average.⁵ A prominent peer reviewed study written by U.S. EPA scientists, aptly named “Is It Better to Burn or Bury?” found GHG emissions from EfW to be significantly less than landfills, concluding “if the goal is greenhouse gas reduction, then EfW should be considered as an option under U.S. renewable energy policies.”⁶

In addition, many other governmental and nongovernmental organizations have formally recognized EfW for its role in reducing GHG emissions including the World Economic Forum (WEF)⁷, the European Union,^{8,9} the Center for American Progress,¹⁰ Columbia University scientists,¹¹ CalRecycle,¹² California Air Resources Board,¹³ and the Joint Institute for Strategic Energy Analysis (NREL).¹⁴ The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“IPCC”) called EfW a “key GHG mitigation technology.”¹⁵ It is recognized as a source of credits under the United Nations’ Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) where over 40 projects have been registered with a combined annual GHG reduction of 5 million metric tonnes of CO₂e a year.¹⁶ On a more local basis, two recent facility expansions in Florida, eligible because they represent new incremental EfW capacity, have been selling carbon offsets into the voluntary market.¹⁷ An additional facility in Honolulu has been successfully validated as an eligible project. EfW was also recognized as a compliance option for reducing GHG emissions from electricity generation in the final version of the U.S. EPA’s Clean Power Plan promulgated in 2015.¹⁸




Those who assert that EfW is worse than coal typically substantiate their claim by looking only at total stack CO₂ emissions on a per MWh basis, without consideration for the difference between biogenic and fossil CO₂ and failing to recognize that EfW facilities are multi-purpose, supplying both electricity and fulfilling a need for solid waste management. By managing solid wastes concurrently with generating energy, EfW facilities avoid significant landfill emissions of methane, a potent GHG 28 – 34 times as strong as CO₂ over 100 years.¹⁹ Landfills are the 3rd largest source of anthropogenic methane, a short-lived climate pollutant under increasing scrutiny. In contrast, coal plants, together with all fossil fuel fired electricity generation, do one thing, and one thing only: combust a fossil fuel for electrical generation.

Other Emissions


EfW outperforms coal on other emissions as well based on published data in peer-reviewed journals and regulatory agency documents. The aforementioned paper authored by U.S. EPA scientists found lifecycle emissions of EfW facilities to be lower on average than those for coal-fired facilities for SO₂, NO_x, and PM, even before the benefits of avoided landfill emissions were considered.

With regard to hazardous air pollutants, mercury emissions from U.S. EfW facilities are a fraction of those from coal plants. Over the period from 1990 to 2005, municipal waste combustors, as EfW facilities are called by the U.S. EPA, reduced their mercury emissions by 99 percent.²⁰ The most recent published data reveals that EfW facilities represented only 0.8 percent of the total 2014 U.S. mercury emissions.²¹

U.S. 2014 Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions



U.S. Dioxin & Furan Emissions Over Time



Historically, municipal waste combustors were a leading source of dioxin emissions. However, advancements in boiler design, operations, and air pollution control equipment have drastically reduced the footprint of the industry. In fact, according to recent peer-reviewed research by Columbia University scientists, the total dioxin emissions of all U.S. EfW plants in 2012 represented just 0.54 percent of total controlled combustion sources and less than one-tenth of one percent (0.09%) of total controlled and open burning sources of dioxin.²²

Contact us at 800.950.8749 or info@covanta.com for more information.

References

¹ Sathaye, J. et al. (2011) Renewable Energy in the Context of Sustainable Development. In *IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation* [O. Edenhofer et al. (eds)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. Available at: http://srren.ipcc-wg3.de/report/IPCC_SRREN_Ch09.pdf

² National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) *Life Cycle Assessment Harmonization* webpage, accessed 8/2015, <https://www.nrel.gov/analysis/life-cycle-assessment.html>

³ U.S. EPA, NC State University, RTI International (2014) Municipal Solid Waste Decision Support Tool (MSW-DST), <https://mswdst.rti.org/>

⁴ U.S. EPA (2018) *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 – 2016*, EPA 430-R-18-003. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-01/documents/2018_complete_report.pdf

-
- ⁵ See U.S. EPA Office of Solid Waste, *Air Emissions from MSW Combustion Facilities*, <https://archive.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/municipal/web/html/airem.html> and Center for American Progress (2013) *Energy from Waste Can Help Curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions* <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/EnergyFromWaste-PDF1.pdf>
- ⁶ Kaplan, P.O, J. DeCarolis, and S. Thorneloe, 2009, Is it better to burn or bury waste for clean electricity generation? *Environ. Sci. Technology* 43 (6) pp1711-1717. Available at: <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es802395e>
- ⁷ EfW identified as a key technology for a future low carbon energy system in World Economic Forum. *Green Investing: Towards a Clean Energy Infrastructure*. January 2009. Available at: <https://bnef.com/InsightDownload/7088/pdf/>
- ⁸ EU policies promoting EfW as part of an integrated waste management strategy have been an overwhelming success, reducing GHG emissions over 72 million metric tonnes per year, see European Environment Agency, *Greenhouse gas emission trends and projections in Europe 2009: Tracking progress towards Kyoto targets* https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/eea_report_2009_9/ghg-trends-and-projections-2009-summary.pdf
- ⁹ European Environmental Agency (2008) Better management of municipal waste will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Available at: http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/briefing_2008_1/EN_Briefing_01-2008.pdf
- ¹⁰ Center for American Progress (2013) *Energy from Waste Can Help Curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions* <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/EnergyFromWaste-PDF1.pdf>
- ¹¹ Matthews, E., N.J. Themelis (2007) Potential for Reducing Global Methane Emissions from Landfills, 2000-2030. *Sardinia 2007, Eleventh International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium* http://www.seas.columbia.edu/earth/EfWrt/sofos/Matthews_Themelis_Sardinia2007.pdf
- ¹² CalRecycle (2012) CalRecycle Review of Waste-to-Energy and Avoided Landfill Methane Emissions. Available at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/PublicNotices/Documents/2443>
- ¹³ See Table 5 of California Air Resources Board (2014) *Proposed First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework, Appendix C – Focus Group Working Papers, Municipal Solid Waste Thermal Technologies*. <https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/waste/mswthermaltech.pdf>
- ¹⁴ Joint Institute for Strategic Energy Analysis (2013) *Waste Not, Want Not: Analyzing the Economic and Environmental Viability of Waste-to-Energy (EfW) Technology for Site-Specific Optimization of Renewable Energy Options*. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy13osti/52829.pdf>
- ¹⁵ EfW identified as a “key mitigation measure” in IPCC, “Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Work Groups I, II, and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change” [Core Writing Team, Pachauri, R.K and Reisinger, A. (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 104 pp. Available at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/syr/>
- ¹⁶ CDM Project Database, project methodologies AM0025, ACM0022, accessed 6/9/2015, <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/projsearch.html>
- ¹⁷ Verified Carbon Standard Project Database, <http://www.vcsprojectdatabase.org/> See Project ID 290, Lee County Waste to Energy Facility 2007 Capital Expansion Project VCU, and Project ID 1036 Hillsborough County Waste to Energy (EfW) Facility 2009 Capital Expansion Unit 4.
- ¹⁸ See p64950 and 64953 of U.S. EPA (2015) Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units; Final Rule, *Federal Register*, **80**, 205, 64661 – 65120 (October 23, 2015).
- ¹⁹ See Table 8-7 of Myhre, G. et al. (2013) Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- ²⁰ U.S. EPA (2007) Letter from Walt Stevenson, OAQPS to Large MWC Docket, “Emissions from Large and Small MWC Units at MACT Compliance.” http://energyrecoverycouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ERC-070810_Stevenson_MWC_memo.pdf
- ²¹ Bourtsalas, A.C., N.J. Themelis (2019) Major sources of mercury emissions to the atmosphere: The U.S. case, *Waste Management*, **85**, 90-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.12.008>
- ²² Dwyer, H., Themelis, N.J. (2015) Inventory of U.S. 2012 dioxin emissions to atmosphere. *Waste Management*, **46**, 242-246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.08.009>