Made available by Hasselt University Library in https://documentserver.uhasselt.be

Life cycle greenhouse gas emissions and costs of production of diesel and jet fuel from municipal solid waste Peer-reviewed author version

Suresh, Pooja; MALINA, Robert; Staples, Mark D.; LIZIN, Sebastien; OLCAY, Hakan; Blazy, Damian; Pearlson, Matthew N. & Barrett, Steven R. H. (2018) Life cycle greenhouse gas emissions and costs of production of diesel and jet fuel from municipal solid waste. In: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, 52 (21), p. 12055-12065.

DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.7b04277 Handle: http://hdl.handle.net/1942/27603

1	Life cycle greenhouse gas emissions and costs of
2	production of diesel and jet fuel from municipal
3	solid waste
4	ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION IN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
6	
8	Pooja Suresh,ª Robert Malina,* ^{a,b} Mark D. Staples,ª Sebastien Lizin, ^b Hakan Olcay, ^b Damian
9	Blazy, ^c Matthew N. Pearlson ^a and Steven R. H. Barrett ^a
10	
11	
12	a. Laboratory for Aviation and the Environment, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77
14	Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA,
15	b. Centre for Environmental Sciences, Hasselt University, Campus Diepenbeek, Agoralaan
16	Gebouw D, 3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium
17	c. Oliver Wyman, 55 23rd Street, Washington DC, 20037, USA
18	* E-mail: robert.malina@uhasselt.be

20 KEYWORDS

21 Biofuels; Aviation; Waste management; LCA; TEA; Uncertainty analysis

22 ABSTRACT

23 This paper quantifies and compares the life cycle GHG emissions and costs of production of diesel 24 and jet fuel derived from municipal solid waste (MSW) in the United States via three 25 thermochemical conversion pathways: conventional gasification and Fischer-Tropsch (FT middle 26 distillate, MD), plasma gasification and Fischer-Tropsch (Plasma FT MD) and, conventional 27 gasification, catalytic alcohol synthesis and alcohol-to-jet upgrading (ATJ MD). We use expanded 28 system boundaries to capture the change in existing MSW use and disposal, and account for 29 parameter uncertainty with Monte Carlo simulations. We estimate median life cycle GHG 30 emissions of 32.9, 62.3 and 52.7 gCO₂e/MJ for FT, Plasma FT and ATJ MD fuels, respectively, 31 compared to a baseline of 90 gCO₂e/MJ for conventional MD fuels. Median minimum selling 32 prices are estimated at 0.99, 1.78 and 1.20 \$ per litre with the probability of achieving a positive 33 net present value of fuel production at market prices of 14%, 0.1% and 7% for FT, Plasma FT and 34 ATJ MD fuels, respectively. If the societal perspective rather than an investor's perspective is 35 evaluated the probability of positive net present value of fuel production increases to 93%, 67% 36 and 92.5% for the FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD fuels, respectively



44 **1** Introduction

Transportation accounted for approximately 27% of total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the United States (US) in 2015,¹ with fossil fuels constituting over 95% of the sector's primary energy consumption.² Alternative fuels offer the potential to reduce GHG emissions from transportation compared to petroleum-derived fuels. Diesel and jet fuel make up approximately 35% of US transportation energy consumption, which is projected to increase to 44% in 2040,³ and federal agencies in the US have put in place mandates and goals specific to alternative diesel and jet fuel (e.g. ⁴⁻⁵).

52 Contrary to traditional crop-based feedstocks, waste-based feedstocks for alternative fuel 53 production do not require additional land and do not directly compete with food production. 54 Municipal solid waste (MSW), in particular, could offer a significant environmental advantage 55 because the conversion of MSW to fuels would not only displace petroleum-derived fuels, but also 56 avoid the GHG emissions associated with existing waste management strategies. In 2013, 34% of 57 the total generated MSW in the US was recycled and composted, while the remaining 150 million 58 tonnes (metric tons) of MSW, comprising food waste, residential rubbish and commercial waste, 59 were discarded.⁶ 80% of the discards were transferred to landfills,⁶ where waste of biogenic origin 60 releases anthropogenic methane, thereby making landfills the third-largest anthropogenic source of 61 methane emissions in the US.⁷

Finally, in contrast to fuels from other waste streams such as waste fats and greases,⁸ MSW derived fuels could replace relatively large shares of petroleum-derived MD fuel supply, as the energy content of the US national MSW discards in 2013 was equivalent to approximately 70% of same year US jet fuel consumption and 20% of the same year US transportation demand for all middle distillate fuels.^{2,6,9} 67 This analysis evaluates three thermochemical pathways that convert MSW to middle distillate 68 (MD), i.e. diesel and jet, fuel: conventional gasification and Fischer-Tropsch (FT MD), plasma 69 gasification and Fischer-Tropsch (Plasma FT MD) and, conventional gasification, catalytic alcohol 70 (ethanol) synthesis and alcohol-to-jet upgrading (ATJ MD). Figure S1 in the Supplemental 71 Information (SI) illustrates the major technologies in each of the conversion pathways. These 72 technologies are suited to the heterogeneity of MSW and have attracted commercial interest in 73 recent years. They not only produce MD fuels but also other products that include naphtha/gasoline, 74 higher alcohols (propanol and butanol), as well as electricity. The product slates vary based on the 75 technology and the data source, as indicated in the SI.

76 Despite the potential advantages and commercial interest in MSW MD fuels, only two peer-77 reviewed studies have assessed components of environmental and/or economic feasibility for a 78 limited number of pathways.¹⁰⁻¹¹ This is the first peer-reviewed analysis to quantify life cycle GHG 79 emissions and costs of production for the MSW to Plasma FT MD and the MSW to ATJ MD 80 pathways. Life cycle GHG emissions are reported in gCO_2e/MJ_{MD} , minimum selling price in $\frac{1}{2}M_{MD}$, 81 and net present value in billion US dollars (\$B) are the three impact assessment metrics utilized 82 throughout this paper. Furthermore, in contrast to previous studies, this study expands the system 83 boundary to capture the change in the overall MSW life cycle that results from using MSW to 84 produce MD fuels rather than its existing use. Therefore, we account for changes in GHG emissions 85 and costs associated with the replacement of existing waste management strategies, additional 86 recycling, end-of-life combustion and co-products. Additionally, we quantify the uncertainty 87 associated with the environmental and economic evaluation of these pathways through Monte 88 Carlo Simulations and present results as probability distributions.

89 2 Methods

90 2.1 System boundary and functional unit

91 The analysis quantifies the change in GHG emissions and costs resulting from diverting MSW 92 away from the prevailing waste management strategy to alternative MD fuel production.^{12,13} In this 93 respect, it differs from other biomass-to-fuel LCA studies. MSW has a pre-existing life cycle that 94 is altered when it is used as fuel feedstock, whereas in the case of crop-based biomass, additional 95 feedstock is cultivated for the purpose of fuel production. Therefore, this analysis excludes processes that occur irrespective of the waste management such as collection and existing sorting 96 97 for recycling and composting. The system boundary does include the effects of eliminating waste 98 management processes such as landfill, and accounts for the impacts of MSW conversion to MD 99 fuels and their end-use.

100 The system boundary is shown in Figure 1. The system boundary is set where the MSW discards 101 exit the sorting facility. Approximately 66% of the MSW generated in the US is discarded after the 102 recycling and compost streams are separated out,⁶ and only these discards are included in this 103 analysis. The composition of the discarded MSW is described in the SI under 3.1. The system 104 boundary also includes the impact of displacing the existing management strategy for discards, 105 which is a combination of landfill (approximately 80% of the discards) and incineration (the 106 remainder) in the US.⁶ The model accounts for transport of the feedstock to the fuel production 107 plant. At the plant, further classification is required to adjust the feedstock composition in order to 108 prevent contamination of equipment.¹¹ Non-combustibles such as metals, glass and other 109 inorganics are sorted out, resulting in a higher heating value feedstock, which is then sized to meet 110 the requirements of the gasifier. The pre-processing system is based on the Refuse Derived Fuel 111 (RDF) facility model presented by Jones *et al.*¹⁴ Assuming an average sorting efficiency of 90%,¹⁰
112 approximately 15% of the MSW feed is separated out during the pre-processing.

113 The recyclable scrap metals and glass removed from the feedstock are sold for recycling, and the 114 rejects are sent to landfill. The GHG emissions impacts, revenues and costs associated with material 115 recovery and disposal of rejects are included within the system boundary. The pre-processed 116 feedstock is then directed to the fuel production process. The material, energy and carbon balances 117 for the conversion technologies are incorporated into the model to account for inputs such as 118 utilities and catalysts, as well as the output fuels and co-products such as excess electricity, higher 119 alcohols, sulfur and slag. The electricity generated by the plant is used to satisfy its own utility 120 requirements, and any excess electricity is considered a co-product that can be sold to the grid. Slag 121 is sold as construction aggregates.¹⁵ Waste streams generated by the fuel production process, such 122 as spent catalysts and ash, are disposed in landfills, which are included in the system boundary. 123 Transportation and distribution, and combustion, of the finished MD product make up the last 124 stages of the fuel life cycle.

The functional units of this analysis are one megajoule (based on lower heating value) of middle distillate fuel for the GHG emissions lifecycle analysis, and one liter of middle distillate fuel for the economic analysis. Functional units were chosen in order to allow for comparison of results between pathways analyzed in this manuscript, and with existing studies on other middle distillate fuels. The lifecycle GHG emission analysis, techno-economic analysis and uncertainty assessment were performed using MATLAB.

132 **2.2** Conversion technology

133 We analyze three thermochemical pathways to convert MSW to MD fuels: FT MD, plasma 134 Plasma FT MD and ATJ MD. Of the technologies across the three pathways, conventional 135 gasification and FT in the FT MD fuel pathway are more mature, thereby typically achieving higher 136 fuel yields than the other technologies. Gasification refers to partial oxidation of the pre-processed 137 feedstock at elevated temperatures to produce syngas, which is then synthesized to fuels and wax 138 using a FT catalyst, and the products are refined to yield naphtha, jet and diesel. In the case of 139 plasma gasification, plasma torches are used to create the high temperatures necessary for 140 decomposing and oxidizing the feedstock. Plasma gasification is a less mature technology but 141 because it renders toxic substances non-hazardous and provides cleaner syngas with no tars, it has 142 received considerable interest in waste management. Relative to the first two pathways, the ATJ 143 MD pathway involves more conversion steps, with the syngas converted to ethanol followed by a 144 series of chemical upgrading steps to produce jet fuel, diesel and naphtha. Due to low ethanol yields 145 and losses in the additional conversion steps, the fuel yield is lower but catalytic synthesis of 146 alcohols is less capital-intensive than FT.

147 Although classification to remove inorganics, sizing, and drying of feedstock is necessary for 148 thermochemical pathways, these pre-processing steps can be less energy- and cost-intensive than 149 the pretreatment required for biochemical pathways, wherein the biodegradable and non-150 biodegradable content of MSW must be separated.¹⁶ The data to calculate the material and energy 151 balances (MEB) for each pathway are obtained from literature for a facility size of approximately 152 3000 tonnes per day (tpd) of raw MSW feed (2000 tpd of dry, processed MSW), based on the size 153 of large landfills in the US that receive more than 30% of the nation's MSW.⁹ A brief explanation 154 on each pathway and the references used to calculate their respective MEB can be found in the SI under 3.2. We use probability distributions to capture parameter uncertainty, as defined in TableS1.

157 **2.3** Life cycle GHG emission analysis

158 GHG emissions are calculated as mass of GHG per unit of energy (lower heating value). We 159 include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions. CH₄ and N₂O 160 emissions are converted into CO_2 equivalents (CO_2e) using the 100-year global warming potentials 161 of the three gases.¹⁷ Climate impacts of non-CO₂ MD fuel combustion emissions are not included 162 in the analysis and this may underestimate climate benefits particularly in aviation, since paraffinic 163 alternative jet fuels (such as those produced from FT synthesis) have been found to significantly 164 reduce black carbon emissions.¹⁸ We allocate GHG emissions amongst energy products on the basis 165 of their relative energy contents⁵⁹ for the baseline analysis. System expansion is assessed for 166 sensitivity analyses with regard to energy products. For non-energy products, i.e. elemental sulfur 167 and construction aggregates, we use system expansion. Market-based allocation is an alternative 168 method for allocating emissions between products that are used for different purposes (such as 169 energy- and non-energy products) ^{58,8} We assessed the effect of using market-based allocation to 170 allocate emissions between energy and non-energy products instead of system expansion, and 171 found the difference to be negligible. Details are presented in the SI in Table S11 and in Section 172 3.2.

The calculated mass and energy balances are integrated with life cycle inventories and databases to compute the GHG emissions. Fuel transportation and distribution emissions are obtained from Argonne National Laboratory's Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation model (GREET .NET 2015).¹⁹ We use jet and diesel fuel combustion CO₂ emission factors from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).²⁰ The MSW-related emission 178 factors for feedstock transportation, landfill, incineration and recycling, as well as the life cycle 179 GHG emissions for production of construction aggregates are obtained from the US EPA's Waste 180 Reduction Model (WARM) model.²¹ We use the default feedstock transport distance of 20 miles 181 from the WARM model for the baseline analysis, and assess the sensitivity of the results to 182 variations in the parameter. In order to capture the uncertainty associated with LCA parameters, 183 the probability distributions shown in Table S1 are employed.

184

185 **2.3.1 MSW feedstock characteristics**

186 When using the method presented by the US Energy Information Administration (EIA), the lower heating value (LHV) of the US average MSW discards is found to be approximately 13 MJ/kg.²² 187 188 The LHV of the pre-processed and dried MSW is approximately 20 MJ/kg. This value and the 189 LHV values calculated using other references are used to build the probability distribution for LHV.²³⁻²⁶ Similarly, we calculate carbon, ash (inorganic), moisture and sulfur content.²⁵⁻²⁹ One 190 191 distinction between MSW and biomass as feedstocks for alternative MD fuel is that a portion of 192 the carbon in MSW is not biogenic by origin, attributable to plastics and rubber.²² Therefore, the 193 non-biogenic proportion of carbon in the feedstock is calculated to determine the non-biogenic 194 share of process and combustion emissions that have to be counted in the analysis. We do not vary 195 the MSW composition for the stochastic analysis because we are considering the composition of 196 the total discards in the US as an average representation. Due to lack of uncertainty estimates, we 197 did not assign arbitrary bounds and instead, assess sensitivity of results to MSW composition in 198 different cases.

200 2.3.2 Replaced waste management strategy

201 Converting MSW to MD fuels avoids the GHG emissions that would have otherwise resulted 202 from landfilling and incinerating the MSW for energy recovery, but also eliminates existing GHG 203 emission benefits that currently occur if landfill gas is recovered and displaces fossil energy use. 204 Emission factors that account for all of the above effects are obtained from the WARM model for 205 each material type.²¹ The combustion emission factors for each material type take into account non-206 biogenic combustion CO₂ and N₂O emissions, transportation GHG emissions, avoided electric 207 utility GHG emissions, and avoided emissions due to steel recycling, if applicable.²³ For landfill 208 gas recovery we use the emission factors reported for US average landfill gas recovery rates, based 209 on the average landfill type mix. Even after accounting for GHG benefits from landfill gas recovery 210 and carbon sequestration, the net avoided landfill GHG emissions amount to 162 gCO₂e per tonne 211 of raw MSW and the net avoided combustion GHG emissions amount to 5 gCO₂e per tonne of raw 212 MSW.²¹ The sum of these is used as the GHG credit from the replaced waste management strategy 213 in this analysis. Lower and upper bounds for the GHG credit are applied for the stochastic analysis 214 based on IPCC guidance.³⁰

215

216 2.3.3 Classification and recycling

The energy requirements for classification and sizing of the MSW feedstock are derived from simulation models of refuse-derived fuel facilities by Pressley *et al.* and Caputo *et al.*^{10, 31-32} The inorganics stream that is separated from the MSW feed comprises approximately 55% metals and 30% glass. The composition breakdown by material (ferrous, aluminum etc.) and product type (cans, packaging, durable goods etc.) is used in conjunction with the appropriate GHG emission benefit factors from recycling in the WARM model.^{6, 21} For product types that have not been modeled in WARM we rely on similar products as proxies.³³ In order to capture the associated uncertainties we use a range of recycling rates. The rates vary from recycling only aluminum cans, steel cans and glass bottles at the lower bound (approximately 30% of total scrap by weight), to recycling approximately 80% of the total metals and glass by weight. The most likely estimate is assumed to correspond to recycling aluminum cans, aluminum in durable goods (as aluminum ingot), steel cans and glass bottles (approximately 40% of total scrap by weight).

229

230 2.3.4 Fuel production process

231 The MEB calculated for each conversion pathway are used to estimate the process-related GHG 232 emissions, the GHG emissions associated with production of inputs, and the allocation of emissions 233 amongst co-products. Process CO₂ emissions are calculated based on carbon balances. The carbon 234 converted to fuels, alcohols, tars and dissolved hydrocarbons is accounted for and any remaining 235 carbon from the input feedstock and catalysts is assumed to be converted to CO₂.³⁴ GHG emissions 236 associated with production of inputs are determined from the GREET model.¹⁹ The energy product 237 slate used for allocation of emissions by share of energy for each pathway is given in Table S2 in 238 the SI. Excess electricity generation is calculated from the literature, and correlated to fuel yield. 239 The result is an inversely proportional relationship since lower fuel yield implies that more 240 unconverted syngas can be combusted for electricity.35

If the simulation models used to calculate the energy balances for the conversion technologies are missing data on some of the material inputs and outputs, we estimate these with uncertainty ranges from other studies, referenced in Table S1 in the SI. Emissions associated with disposal of rejects, ash and spent catalysts in landfills are accounted for using the WARM model, and since these materials are inorganic they do not contribute to anthropogenic methane emissions.³⁶ The mass of rejects, ash, slag and sulfur are calculated from the feedstock composition based on sorting
efficiency (90%), the calculated inorganic content and sulfur content in pre-processed MSW, as
well as elemental sulfur recovery rates are from the literature.³⁷

- 249
- 250

2.4 Techno-economic analysis

251 The TEA calculates production costs and NPV from the plant perspective, and changes to the 252 MSW life cycle are accounted for if they lead to a change in the costs of inputs or to a change in 253 revenues. The replaced waste management strategy affects the feedstock cost because replacing 254 existing or new landfills may allow the plant to charge similar tipping fees for the MSW feedstock. 255 At the same time this could lead to the commodification of MSW and, in the long run, result in a 256 positive feedstock cost. MSW-to-fuel technologies have not entered large-scale commercial 257 production in the US yet. However, existing empirical evidence shows the emergence of long-term, 258 zero-cost MSW feedstock contracts.³⁸ We, therefore, follow Jones et al.¹⁴ and assume zero 259 feedstock cost for the baseline analysis but quantify the sensitivity of results to positive and 260 negative feedstock costs. To quantify the costs of production of MD fuels produced from MSW, 261 we calculate minimum selling prices (MSP) and net present value (NPV) of plant operation by 262 adopting the discounted cash flow rate of return (DCFROR) model from Pearlson et al for a 20-263 year plean.³⁹ All prices are expressed in 2014 USD. Further financial assumptions are listed in 264 Table S3. Facility capital cost estimates are obtained from the literature referenced for material and 265 energy balances for each pathway.^{11,14,57} In some cases, the estimates are supplemented with 266 additional capital costs of the processes that are not modeled in the particular studies, such as MSW 267 pre-processing, naphtha reforming to gasoline, and alcohol-to-jet conversion. The material and 268 energy balances calculated for the LCA are carried over to the TEA in order to calculate operating costs and sales revenues. More detail on the cost and revenue calculations and underlying data areprovided in Section 3.3 of the SI.

271

272 **2.5** Uncertainty assessment

273 We implement stochastic analysis using Monte Carlo simulations, wherein parameters are 274 randomly sampled from their probability distributions for 10,000 iterations. This translates the 275 uncertainty in the input parameters to uncertainty in the results. Parameter uncertainty in this 276 analysis stems primarily from data limitations. We assign uniform distributions when available 277 data are considered equally likely. For example, in the cases of LHV, carbon, ash, moisture and 278 sulfur content of the MSW feedstock, we calculate values using different methods from literature²². 279 ^{23-26, 25-29} (see 2.3.1). Since there is no data suggesting that one value is more likely than the other, 280 we assume that all the values are equally likely and assign uniform distributions. When data is 281 available to estimate minimum and maximum bounds, as well as a most likely value, we assign 282 triangular or pert distributions. A second type of parameter uncertainty in this analysis is statistical 283 uncertainty associated with availability of a large number of data samples, for example, availability 284 of historical data for commodity prices. In this case, the uncertainty distributions are dictated by 285 the samples, based on best fit using the Anderson-Darling test.⁴⁰ A detailed explanation of the 286 methods we use to quantify the uncertainties associated with the conversion efficiency of the 287 pathway, capital cost, and fuel and energy prices is provided in section 3.4 of the SI.

288 **3** Results

289 3.1 Life cycle GHG emissions

290 The results for net life cycle GHG emissions for the three MSW to MD fuels pathways are 291 summarized in Table 1. The median results of 32.86, 62.34 and 52.74 gCO₂e/MJ for FT, Plasma 292 FT, and ATJ MD fuels, respectively indicate that they have the potential to reduce life cycle GHG 293 emissions compared to the conventional MD baseline of 90 gCO₂e/MJ.⁴¹ However, parameter 294 uncertainty translates into ranges that 95% of the Monte Carlo simulation results lie within: 18.45 295 - 47.33, 43.55 - 81.47, and 26.44 - 79.32 gCO₂e/MJ, for FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD fuels, 296 respectively. The probability density functions of the life cycle GHG emissions are provided in the 297 upper part of Figure S2 in the SI. Cumulative probability curves of Figure S3 indicate that the 298 probability of MSW-derived FT, Plasma FT and ATJ MD fuels satisfying the minimum 60% 299 emissions reduction requirement (compared to conventional MD) under the US Renewable Fuel 300 Standard (RFS2) is 65.7, 0.1 and 10.2%, respectively. Note that the 60% threshold under RFS2 is 301 for cellulosic biomass. Based on the cellulosic content of the MSW, the produced fuels could be 302 categorized as cellulosic or advanced. In the case of the latter, a less stringent threshold of 50% 303 applies. Figure S4 compares the 95% confidence interval results with the life cycle GHG emissions 304 of other biofuels.

The conventional gasification and FT pathway has the highest fuel yield of the three pathways; approximately 50-57% of the input MSW energy (LHV) is converted to fuels (with 54% as the mode of the fuel yield probability distribution). The other two pathways have lower fuel yields, implying that more of the non-biogenic carbon in the MSW feedstock is converted to CO_2 during the process. Higher emissions during fuel production, which are then allocated over lower fuel and energy co-product yields, results in higher net life cycle GHG emissions for the other two pathways. Table S4 shows the results for each pathway broken out by life cycle step. The credits from the replaced waste management strategy and recycling are major contributors to the overall GHG emissions. These credits, as well as the emissions associated with feedstock transport, are the same for each of the three pathways on the basis of per tonne of input MSW, but vary when they are allocated over the fuel and energy co-product yield.

316 The fuel production and combustion steps are major sources of GHG emissions in all three 317 pathways. The Plasma FT MD pathway has the highest fuel production emissions per tonne of 318 input MSW. The mode of the fuel yield probability distribution for this pathway is approximately 319 38%. At this fuel yield, the pathway generates more excess electricity than the other pathways 320 (almost 9% of the input MSW LHV) but at the upper bound of fuel yield of 46%, the plant has to 321 import electricity to meet plasma power requirements. This results in increased net GHG emissions 322 due to the high carbon intensity of the US average grid mix (160.1 gCO₂e/MJ).¹⁹ The grid makeup 323 is described in Table S5. Fossil fuel inputs such as petroleum coke and natural gas further increase 324 the GHG emissions associated with fuel production in this pathway.

For the ATJ MD pathway, the fuel yields vary between 24 – 40% of the input MSW LHV with 31% as the mode, the lowest of the three pathways. Therefore, on a per MJ of MD fuel basis it has higher fuel production emissions, which are offset by higher credits per MJ from waste management strategy and additional recycling, resulting in a 15% lower median GHG emissions than the Plasma FT MD pathway. Fuel combustion emissions attributable to the non-biogenic portion of the MSW feedstock are similar for the three pathways and vary only because of the different proportions of diesel and jet fuel produced by each pathway.

In addition to the standard deviation measures listed in Table 1, we also quantify the contributionsof the parameters that are sampled for the stochastic analysis to the overall variance of the results

through a first-order sensitivity index analysis. Uncertainty associated with the non-biogenic proportion of carbon in the feedstock contributes approximately 47%, 41% and 41% of the total variance of life cycle GHG emissions for FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD fuels, respectively. This translates to larger standard deviations for the fuel production and combustion steps where the nonbiogenic share of emissions is counted. Other major contributions to variance are 39%, 34% and 38% from the recycling credit for FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD fuels, respectively. Detailed results are presented in Figure S5.

341 We also conduct sensitivity analyses to quantify variability within the pathways. Figure 2 shows 342 the five drivers that are assessed by varying each one in isolation. The parameter that produces the 343 largest change in results for all three pathways is the MSW composition, characterized by the non-344 biogenic proportion of carbon in the feedstock and the LHV of the feedstock. The 0% non-biogenic 345 case assumes absence of all plastics and rubber. This reduces the energy content of the feedstock 346 to approximately 8 MJ/kg, and is accompanied by a reduction of almost 40% in the quantity of fuel 347 produced per tonne of raw MSW, relative to the baseline. The absence of non-biogenic carbon 348 emissions during fuel production and combustion reduces the median life cycle GHG emissions by 349 180-320% overall, depending on the pathway. This is because the contribution to the life cycle 350 GHG emissions from the fuel combustion step is zero, and only emissions associated with input 351 utilities and chemicals are counted from the fuel production step. The primary remaining 352 contributors are the replaced waste management and further recycling credits.

The 65% non-biogenic case assumes the absence of food wastes, yard wastes and wood, and this reduces the replaced waste management credit since the landfill emissions due to these biogenic wastes are not avoided. Additionally, the non-biogenic CO_2 emissions from both fuel production and combustion are higher, resulting in a net increase of 60-100% in the median life cycle GHG emissions. These results reflect the sensitivity of life cycle GHG emissions of the MSW MD fuels
to variability in the composition of MSW that may occur in different geographic regions.

In the baseline case, US national average landfill gas recovery rates have been assumed in order to calculate the replaced waste management credit in the baseline stochastic analysis. Figure 2 shows two other potential cases: one with no landfill gas recovery (replaced waste management credit of 603 kgCO₂e per tonne of MSW) and the other with all replaced landfills assumed to have landfill gas recovery for energy with aggressive gas collection. In the latter case, replacing the waste management strategy results in GHG emissions of 23 kgCO₂e/tonne.²¹

For the conventional gasification and FT pathway, MEB are estimated for a larger facility scale from Larson *et al.*¹¹ and a different fuel yield case at the same 3000 tpd scale from Vliet *et al.*⁴² At the larger 7000 tpd feed capacity scale, a lower fuel yield of 34% (23% excess electricity) leads to higher life cycle GHG emissions by approximately 11 gCO₂e/MJ compared to the baseline median. On the other hand, generating additional excess electricity while maintaining high fuel yield (52% fuels and 8% excess electricity) at the 3000 tpd scale, results in lower net GHG emissions (31.5 gCO₂e/MJ).

In the case of the plasma gasification and FT pathway, the 1000 tpd facility with a fuel yield similar to the baseline generates additional excess electricity, and therefore has lower life cycle GHG emissions (by 8%).⁴³⁻⁴⁴ We assess the effect of increased fuel yield at the 3000 tpd scale that requires additional electricity to be imported from the grid,⁴⁴⁻⁴⁵ and find that this would result in 56% higher life cycle GHG emissions. Due to data limitations, we assess only the effect of different conversion efficiencies for the ATJ MD fuel pathway. The higher fuel yield is based on future projections by Mu *et al.*³⁴ and the lower fuel yield is based on a conservative estimate by Jones *et* *al.*,¹⁴ which also forms the lower bound in the uncertainty assessment. These cases and other
 conversion efficiency scenarios are detailed in Tables S6-S8 in the SI.

Using system expansion instead of energy allocation generates a carbon credit for the excess electricity exported to the grid, and the produced higher alcohols, making the Plasma FT and ATJ MD pathways more sensitive than the FT MD pathway to the emissions allocation method. Changing the feedstock transport distance based on literature estimates to 10 and 70 miles (16 and 113 km), respectively, reduces the associated emissions by 4-8%, respectively increases emissions by 21-37%.⁴⁶

387 3.2 MSP and NPV

388 The MSP and NPV results for the three MSW to MD fuels pathways are summarized in Table 1. 389 The median MSP results are 0.99, 1.78 and 1.20 \$ per liter for FT, Plasma FT and ATJ MD fuels, 390 respectively. Parameter uncertainty results in ranges of values that 95% of the Monte Carlo 391 simulation results lie within: 0.72 - 1.28, 1.24 - 2.39 and 0.68 - 1.75 \$ per liter for FT, Plasma FT, 392 and ATJ MD fuels, respectively. These results, even at the lower bound, are above the approximate 393 average US price of conventional middle distillate fuel in January 2016 of 0.27 \$ per liter (refiner 394 price).⁴⁷ However, there is volatility associated with fuel prices in the short and long term, and we 395 account for this volatility in the NPV calculations. We fit a normal distribution to the year-to-year 396 price variations of the past 20 years from 1996 to 2015. The short-term price volatility is predicted 397 by sampling from a normal distribution fitted to the year-to-year price variations of the past 20 398 years from 1996 to 2015. The probability of achieving positive NPV for the project is calculated 399 from the NPV results to be 14%, 0.1% and 7% for FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD fuels, respectively. 400 The probability density functions are given in the middle and lower part of Figure S2.

Table S9 and S10 give the results for each pathway, disaggregated by type of cost and type of revenue. Capital costs and fixed operating expenses, which are a function of the capital costs, are the major cost contributors for all three pathways, making up 70-75% of total expenses. The net capital costs are highest for the Plasma FT MD pathway and the lowest for the ATJ MD pathway, but when normalized to the MD fuel yield, the FT MD pathway has the lowest median capital cost per liter of \$0.89/L.

The variable operating expenses attributable to water, catalysts, cleaning chemicals and disposal of wastes are only 2-3% of MSP for all three pathways. Comparison of the results indicates that revenues from the sale of gasoline, and of scrap metals and glass, vary among the three pathways due to technology-specific differences in conversion process product slates and plant feed capacities. The Plasma FT and ATJ MD pathways have higher co-product revenues from higher export of excess electricity and sale of higher alcohols, respectively (see Table S10).

413 We also quantify first order contributions to variance for the MSP and NPV results. The major 414 contributions to variance of MSP are 73%, 70% and 54% from capital costs; 11%, 10% and 10% 415 from fixed operating costs; and 3%, 12% and 24% from fuel yield for FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ 416 MD fuels, respectively. The primary contributions to variance of NPV are 51%, 35% and 35% 417 from year-to-year fuel price variations; 21%, 14% and 15% from the analysis start year (2017) fuel 418 prices; 20%, 40% and 30% from capital costs; and 3%, 6% and 5% from fixed operating costs for 419 FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD fuels, respectively. Detailed results are presented Figures S6 and S7. 420 Figure S8 shows the probability of two of these technologies or all three of them to result in 421 identical values when individual contributions of these parameters are considered on the overall 422 variance. These joint probabilities range from 0 to 7.1%.

423 The majority of variance in the NPV results arises from uncertainty associated with fuel prices. 424 Since the fuel yields are higher for the FT MD pathway, the total variance and standard deviation 425 are also greater than that of the other two pathways. On the other hand, the MSP of the FT MD pathway has the lowest standard deviation (0.14 \$/L) of the three pathways because calculation of 426 427 the MSP divides the net costs over the fuel yield, thereby resulting in an inverse relationship. 428 Following from the fuel yields and the capital costs (shown in Table S1 and explained in Section 429 3.1), the FT MD fuel has the lowest median MSP and the Plasma FT MD fuel has the highest 430 median MSP of the three pathways. The ATJ MD pathway has the least negative median NPV 431 because the relative reduction of net capital costs outweighs other costs compared to the other two 432 pathways. However, to achieve a positive NPV, the ATJ MD pathway requires a higher selling 433 price for the fuel than the FT MD pathway, because the lower fuel yield implies that each unit of 434 fuel needs to be sold at a higher price.

435 Figure 3 presents the results of the sensitivity analysis for the MSP and NPV results in terms of 436 discount rate, income tax rate, feedstock cost, plant scale and associated technology parameters, 437 and carbon pricing as an example of a policy driver. The discount rate, which is dictated by the rate 438 of required return for equity and loan interest rate for debt, has the greatest impact on the results. 439 From an investor's perspective, Blazy et al. suggest that the discount rate could be up to 440 approximately 22% for novel alternative fuel technologies with significant associated risks.⁴⁸ This 441 reduces the probability of positive NPV to 0-0.4% and increases the MSP by 40-60% depending 442 on the conversion pathway. To assess sensitivity in the opposite direction, we use the social 443 opportunity cost of capital based on long-term treasury bond rates from the US Office of 444 Management and Budget as the discount rate (3.2% nominal).⁴⁹ This decreases the MSP by 50-445 70%, and increases the probability of positive NPV above 80% for the FT and ATJ MD pathways. 446 The plant scale and conversion yield cases assessed for NPV and MSP are the same as for the 447 LCA sensitivity analysis, except for the FT MD pathway, wherein the 3000 tpd case (other than 448 the baseline) evaluated for the economic sensitivity analysis is based on data from Zhu et al.⁵⁰ At 449 larger feed input capacities, economies of scale are achieved for the conversion technologies. At 450 the same feed capacity and level of capital investment, improvements in fuel yield increase the 451 probability of positive NPV to greater than 50%. In the case of the FT MD pathway, at the same 452 feed capacity, lower fuel yield (39%) and 8% higher capital costs than the baseline results in a 453 decrease of the probability of positive NPV to 0.4%.

454 In order to quantify the impact of feedstock cost, we use the 2013 US average landfill tipping 455 fees,⁶ first as a source of revenue that lowers the median MSP by 20-46% and raises the probability 456 of positive NPV to 2.5-55% and second, as a positive cost associated with the feedstock as it gains 457 value due to end-use as fuels, yielding the opposite effect. The latter increases the median MSP by 458 25-50% and lowers the probability of positive NPV to 0-2%. Income tax expenses have a similar 459 effect, raising the median MSP by 24-32% when the tax rate is raised to match the 2015 US 460 combined corporate income tax rate of 39%, as reported by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).⁵¹ In the discount rate and feedstock cost cases, the ATJ MD 461 462 pathway demonstrates the lowest median MSPs (\$0.34/L, \$0.64/L) and highest probability of positive NPV (87%, 55%) compared to the other two pathways. 463

We also present the result of implementing a carbon price of \$48.56/tonne (2014 dollars) based on the revised social cost of carbon guidance provided by the US Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon.⁵² This ties together the results of the LCA and TEA analyses. The carbon price improves the median MSP of the FT MD pathway by 11% compared to 3-4% for the other 468 two pathways because of its greater life cycle GHG savings potential of 63% compared to 30-40%469 (median estimates).

470 **4 Discussion**

471 The results from the LCA show that drawing a larger system boundary allows for analysis of the 472 change in GHG emissions that occurs due to conversion of MSW to fuels, relative to the existing 473 waste management strategy. Therefore, the total life cycle GHG emissions of the MSW MD fuels 474 are dependent on the waste management being replaced, credits from additional recycling, and 475 combustion emissions attributable to the non-biogenic content of the feedstock. We note that the 476 results in this paper represent the current US average characteristics of MSW feedstock; the MSW 477 composition and credit from replaced waste management strategies may vary significantly at 478 different spatial and temporal scopes.^{9,53} Furthermore, this work only quantifies life cycle GHG 479 emissions, whereas additional analyses could include criteria such as air quality and non-GHG 480 climate impacts.⁵⁴ We also note that we compare the GHG benefits of MSW MD fuels only to 481 conventional petroleum-derived fuels, and not to MSW-to-electricity or MSW-to-ethanol or other 482 alternative MD fuel pathways. The GHG benefits of different waste management strategies depend 483 on a number of factors, such as MSW composition, carbon intensity of the grid electricity, 484 conversion efficiencies and feedstock pretreatment requirements.⁵⁵⁻⁵⁶ The mature conventional 485 gasification and FT technologies demonstrate higher conversion efficiencies in the literature, 486 leading to the lowest median lifecycle GHG emissions of the three pathways. Improving fuel yields 487 while maintaining sufficient electricity generation to meet the plant's utility needs could reduce the 488 lifecycle GHG emissions of all three pathways.

The results of the TEA show that MSW MD fuels have higher costs of production than conventional MD fuels. The probability of positive NPV is less than 15% for all three pathways. 491 Based on capital costs and conversion yields, the conventional gasification and FT pathway has the 492 greatest probability of positive NPV (14%) and lowest median MSP (\$0.99/L). MSP can be 493 reduced, and NPV increased, by improving conversion efficiencies and the sale of recyclables for 494 all three pathways. The ATJ MD pathway has the lowest net capital costs for the scale considered. 495 and therefore, the least negative median NPV of -247 million USD. The sensitivity analysis shows 496 the significant impact of the perceived risk of the investment on NPV and MSP results. Several 497 policies and corporate agreements exist that can reduce investment risk and, therefore, increase the 498 economic performance of the different pathways.⁶⁰ These include, but are not limited to loan 499 guarantees, capital subsidies and offtake agreements.

500 Finally, the economic analysis in this study is conducted from the perspective of an investor. 501 Therefore, only actual financial streams were accounted for. We can complement this analysis with 502 a societal perspective which values resource streams instead of financial streams. This is done by 503 assuming the social opportunity cost of capital instead of an investor-driven discount rate, by 504 eliminating tax payments from the analysis as they do not constitute a resource stream, and by 505 valuing GHG emissions savings by means of carbon pricing as outlined in the sensitivity analysis. 506 If this societal perspective is taken, the probability of positive NPV increases to 93%, 67% and 507 92.5% for the FT, Plasma FT, and ATJ MD pathways, respectively.

508

509 Associated content

In the Supporting Information (SI) the reader can find 11 supporting tables, 5 supporting figures,
and 9 supporting text excerpts. The SI is available as a PDF file.

513 Acknowledgements

This work was made possible by funding from the US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Office of Environment and Energy under Project 1 of the ASCENT Center of Excellence for Alternative Jet Fuels and Environment under grant: 13-C-AJFE-MIT Amendment Nos. 003, 012 and 016). The authors would like to thank Daniel Williams for his FAA project management. The authors would also like to thank Dr. Wallace Tyner and Xin Zhao at Purdue University, and Dr. James Hileman at FAA for their guidance on technical matters. Any views or opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not of the FAA or other ASCENT sponsors.

521 References

United States Environmental Protection Agency Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions.
 https:// www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/sources/transportation.html (accessed July
 2017).

525 2. United States Energy Information Administration Total Energy. http://
526 www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/index.cfm#consumption (accessed July 2017).

527 3. United States Energy Information Administration Annual Energy Outlook 2015. http://
528 www.eia.gov/oiaf/aeo/tablebrowser/ (accessed March 2016).

529 4. United States Environmental Protection Agency Renewable Fuel Standard Program. http://
530 www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/renewablefuels/index.htm (accessed March 2016).

531 5. United States Federal Aviation Administration Destination 2025. https://
532 www.faa.gov/about/plans_reports/media/Destination2025.pdf (accessed March 2016).

533	6. United States Environmental Protection Agency Advancing Sustainable Materials
534	Management: Facts and Figures 2013; EPA530-R-15-002; 2015.
535	7. United States Environmental Protection Agency Overview of Greenhouse Gases. https://
536	www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/ch4.html (accessed March 2016).
537	8. Seber, G.; Malina, R.; Pearlson, M. N.; Olcay, H.; Hileman, J. I.; Barrett, S. R. H.,
538	Environmental and economic assessment of producing hydroprocessed jet and diesel fuel from
539	waste oils and tallow. Biomass and Bioenergy 2014, 67, 108-118.
540	9. Valkenburg, C.; Gerber, M. A.; Walton, C. W.; Jones, S. B.; Thompson, B. L.; Stevens, D.
541	J. Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) to Liquid Fuels Synthesis, Volume 1: Availability of Feedstock
542	and Technology; PNNL-18144; Pacific Northwest National Laboratory: 2008; pp 1-43.
543	10. Pressley, P. N.; Aziz, T. N.; DeCarolis, J. F.; Barlaz, M. A.; He, F.; Li, F.; Damgaard, A.,
544	Municipal solid waste conversion to transportation fuels: a life-cycle estimation of global warming
545	potential and energy consumption. Journal of Cleaner Production 70, 145-153.
546	11. Niziolek, A. M.; Onel, O.; Hasan, M. M. F.; Floudas, C. A., Municipal solid waste to liquid
547	transportation fuels - Part II: Process synthesis and global optimization strategies. Computers &
548	<i>Chemical Engineering</i> 2015, <i>74</i> , 184-203.
549	12. Chester, M.; Martin, E., Cellulosic Ethanol from Municipal Solid Waste: A Case Study of
550	the Economic, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Impacts in California. Environmental Science &

551 *Technology* **2009**, *43*, 5183-5189.

552 13. Ebner, J.; Babbitt, C.; Winer, M.; Hilton, B.; Williamson, A., Life cycle greenhouse gas
553 (GHG) impacts of a novel process for converting food waste to ethanol and co-products. *Applied*554 *Energy* 2014, *130*, 86-93.

555 14. Jones, S. B.; Zhu, Y.; Valkenburg, C. Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) to Liquid Fuels
556 Synthesis, Volume 2: A Techno-economic Evaluation of the Production of Mixed Alcohols; PNNL-

557 18482; Pacific Northwest National Laboratory: 2009.

558 15. Choudhry, V.; Hadley, S. R., Utilization of Coal Gasification Slag. In *Clean Energy from*

559 *Waste and Coal*, American Chemical Society: 1992; Vol. 515, pp 253-263.

560 16. Epstein, A. K.; Lewis, K. C.; Epstein, M.; Hernandez, R.; Kramer, S.; Lakeman, M.; Roth,

A. Developing efficient and cost-effective use of wastes as feedstocks; Commercial Aviation
Alternative Fuels Initiative: 2013.

563 17. Forster, P.; Ramaswamy, V.; Artaxo, P.; Berntsen, T.; Betts, R.; Fahey, D. W.; Haywood,

J.; Lean, J.; Lowe, D. C.; Myhre, G.; Nganga, J.; Prinn, R.; Raga, G.; Schulz, M.; Dorland, R. V.,

565 Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing. In Climate Change 2007: The

566 Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the

567 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Solomon, S.; Qin, D.; Manning, M.; Chen, Z.;

568 Marquis, M.; Averyt, K. B.; M.Tignor; Miller, H. L., Eds. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge,

569 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2007.

570 18. Speth, R. L.; Rojo, C.; Malina, R.; Barrett, S. R. H., Black carbon emissions reductions

571 from combustion of alternative jet fuels. *Atmospheric Environment* **2015**, *105*, 37-42.

572 19. Argonne National Laboratory The Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy
573 Use in Transportation Model (GREET.net) 2015 Release. https:// greet.es.anl.gov (accessed
574 November 2015).

575 20. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National
576 Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.
577 IGES: Japan, 2006; Vol. 2.

578 21. United States Environmental Protection Agency Waste Reduction Model (WARM)
579 Version 13 (updated March 2015). https:// www.epa.gov/warm.

580 22. United States Energy Information Administration *Methodology for Allocating Municipal*581 Solid Waste to Biogenic and Non-Biogenic Energy; 2007.

23. United States Environmental Protection Agency "Combustion" in Documentation for
Greenhouse Gas Emission and Energy Factors Used in the Waste Reduction Model (WARM)
Version 13. https:// www3.epa.gov/warm/pdfs/WARM_Documentation.pdf (accessed September
2015).

Williams, R. B.; Jenkins, B. M.; Nguyen, D. Solid Waste Conversion: A review and *database of current and emerging technologies*; IWM-C0172; California Integrated Waste
Management Board: 2003.

589 25. Guell, B. M.; Bugge, M.; Kempegowda, R. S.; George, A.; Paap, S. M. *Benchmark of* 590 *conversion and production technologies for synthetic biofuels for aviation*; SINTEF Energy 591 Research: 2012.

592	26. Doka, G. Life Cycle Inventories of Waste Treatment Services, ecoinvent report No. 13;
593	Swiss Centre for Life Cycle Inventories, Dübendorf: 2003.
594	27. Cherubini, F.; Bargigli, S.; Ulgiati, S., Life cycle assessment (LCA) of waste management
595	strategies: Landfilling, sorting plant and incineration. <i>Energy</i> 2009 , <i>34</i> (12), 2116-2123.
596	28. Chandrappa, R.; Das, D. B., Waste Quantities and Characteristics. In Solid Waste
597	Management: Principles and Practice, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg: 2012; pp 47-63.
598	29. Tchobanoglous, G.; Theisen, H.; Vigil, S. A., Integrated solid waste management:
599	engineering principles and management issues. McGraw-Hill: 1993.
600	30. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty
601	Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. IPCC/OECD/IEA/IGES: Hayama, Japan,
602	2000.
603	31. Pressley, P. N.; Levis, J. W.; Damgaard, A.; Barlaz, M. A.; DeCarolis, J. F., Analysis of
604	material recovery facilities for use in life-cycle assessment. Waste Management 2015, 35, 307-317.
605	32. Caputo, A. C.; Pelagagge, P. M., RDF production plants: I. Design and costs. Applied
606	<i>Thermal Engineering</i> 2002, 22, 423-437.
607	33. United States Environmental Protection Agency "Recycling" in Documentation for
608	Greenhouse Gas Emission and Energy Factors Used in the Waste Reduction Model (WARM)
609	Version 13. https:// www3.epa.gov/warm/pdfs/WARM_Documentation.pdf (accessed September
610	2015).

611	34. Mu, D.;	Seager,	T.; Rao, P.	S.; Zhao, F.,	Comparativ	e life cycle	assessment of
612	lignocellulosic	ethanol	production:	Biochemical	versus th	ermochemica	l conversion.
613	Environmental l	Manageme	ent 2010, 46, 5	65-578.			

614 35. Zhao, X.; Brown, T. R.; Tyner, W. E., Stochastic techno-economic evaluation of cellulosic
615 biofuel pathways. *Bioresource Technology* 2015, *198*, 755-763.

36. United States Environmental Protection Agency "Landfilling" in Documentation for
Greenhouse Gas Emission and Energy Factors Used in the Waste Reduction Model (WARM)
Version 13. https:// www3.epa.gov/warm/pdfs/WARM_Documentation.pdf (accessed September
2015).

37. Swanson, R. M.; Satrio, J. A.; Brown, R. C.; Platon, A.; Hsu, D. D. *Techno-Economic Analysis of Biofuels Production Based on Gasification*; NREL/TP-6A20-46587; National
Renewable Energy Laboratory: 2010.

38. Fulcrum BioEnergy Fulcrum BioEnergy proves trash-to-jet fuel method, gets DOD grant.
http:// biomassmagazine.com/articles/9039/fulcrum-bioenergy-proves-trash-to-jet-fuel-methodgets-dod-grant# (accessed March 2016).

39. Pearlson, M.; Wollersheim, C.; Hileman, J., A techno-economic review of hydroprocessed
renewable esters and fatty acids for jet fuel production. *Biofuels*, *Bioproducts and Biorefining* 2013,
7 (1), 89-96.

40. Stephens, M. A., EDF Statistics for Goodness of Fit and Some Comparisons. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1974, 69, 730-737.

41. Stratton, R. W.; Wong, H. M.; Hileman, J. I., Quantifying Variability in Life Cycle
Greenhouse Gas Inventories of Alternative Middle Distillate Transportation Fuels. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2011, 45 (10), 4637-4644.

42. van Vliet, O. P. R.; Faaij, A. P. C.; Turkenburg, W. C., Fischer–Tropsch diesel production
in a well-to-wheel perspective: A carbon, energy flow and cost analysis. *Energy Conversion and Management* 2009, *50* (4), 855-876.

43. Juniper Consultancy Services Limited *The Alter NRG/Westinghouse Plasma Gasification Process*; 2008.

44. Boerrigter, H.; Uil, H. d.; Calis, H.-P., Green Diesel from Biomass via Fischer-Tropsch
synthesis: New Insights in Gas Cleaning and Process Design. In *Pyrolysis and Gasification of Biomass and Waste, Expert Meeting*, Strasbourg, France, 2002.

45. Minutillo, M.; Perna, A.; Di Bona, D., Modelling and performance analysis of an integrated
plasma gasification combined cycle (IPGCC) power plant. *Energy Conversion and Management*2009, *50*, 2837-2842.

645 46. Offenhuber, D.; Lee, D.; Wolf, M. I.; Phithakkitnukoon, S.; Biderman, A.; Ratti, C., Putting
646 Matter in Place. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 2012, 78 (2), 173-196.

647 47. United States Energy Information Administration Refiner Petroleum Product Prices by
648 Sales Type. https:// www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_pri_refoth_dcu_nus_a.htm (accessed April 2016).

649 48. Blazy, D.; Pearlson, M. N.; Miller, B.; Bartlett, R. E., A Monte Carlo-based Methodology
650 for Valuing Refineries Producing Aviation Biofuel. In *Commercializing Biobased Products* :

651 *Opportunities, Challenges, Benefits, and Risks*, Snyder, S. W., Ed. The Royal Society of 652 Chemistry: 2016; pp 336-351.

653	49. United States Office of Management and Budget Circular A-94 Appendix C, Revised
654	November 2015, Discount rates for cost-effectiveness, lease purchase, and related analyses. https://
655	www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_a094/a94_appx-c (accessed March 2016).

- 50. Zhu, Y.; Tjokro Rahardjo, S. A.; Valkenburg, C.; Snowden-Swan, L. J.; Jones, S. B.;
 Machinal, M. A. *Techno-economic Analysis for the Thermochemical Conversion of Biomass to Liquid Fuels*; PNNL-19009; Pacific Northwest National Laboratory: 2011; p 152.
- 659 51. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Tax database, Table
- 660 II.1. Corporate income tax rate. http:// stats.oecd.org//Index.aspx?QueryId=58204 (accessed March
 661 2016).
- 52. United States Government Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon Technical
 Support Document: -Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact
 Analysis Under Executive Order 12866; 2013 (revised July 2015).
- 53. Themelis, N. J.; Mussche, C., Municipal solid waste management and waste-to-energy in
 the United States, China and Japan In *2nd International Academic Symposium on Enhanced Landfill Mining*, Houthalen-Helchteren, 2013.
- 54. Stratton, R. W.; Wolfe, P. J.; Hileman, J. I., Impact of Aviation Non-CO2 Combustion
 Effects on the Environmental Feasibility of Alternative Jet Fuels. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2011, 45 (24), 10736-10743.

671	55. Morris, J., Bury or burn North America MSW? LCAs provide answers for climate impacts
672	& carbon neutral power potential. Environmental Science & Technology 2010, 44 (20), 7944-9.
673	56. Kalogo, Y.; Habibi, S.; MacLean, H. L.; Joshi, S. V., Environmental Implications of
674	Municipal Solid Waste-Derived Ethanol. Environmental Science & Technology 2007, 41 (1), 35-
675	41.
676	57. Motycka, S. A. Techno Economic Analysis Of A Plasma Gasification Biomass To Liquids
677	Plant thesis, George Washington University, 2013.
678	58. Staples, M. D.; Malina, R.; Olcay, H.; Pearlson, M. N.; Hileman, J. I.; Boies, A.; Barrett,
679	S. R. H., Life cycle greenhouse gas footprint and minimum selling price of renewable diesel and
680	jet fuel from fermentation and advanced fermentation production technologies. Energy &
681	Environmental Science 2014, 7, 1545.
682	59. Wang, M.; Huo, H.; Arora, S., Methods of dealing with co-products of biofuels in life-cycle
683	analysis and consequent results within the U.S. context. Energy Policy 2011 , 39 (10), 5726-5736.
684	60 Bittner, A., Tyner, W.E., Zhao, X., Field to flight: A techno-economic analysis of the corn
685	stover to aviation biofuels supply chain. Biofuels, Bioproducts, & Biorefining 2015 , 9, 201-210.
686	

688 Figures



690

691

692 Figure 1. Expanded system boundary of the MSW to MD fuels life cycle (solid line boundary) and

693 fuel production process boundary (dashed line boundary).^a

⁶⁹⁴ ^aDouble lined arrows indicate the primary material flow path. Single line arrows indicate secondary

695 input and co-product material flows. Dotted line arrows connect to displaced processes. Processes

are indicated with grey background.





699 Figure 2. Life cycle GHG emissions sensitivity analysis showing the resultant median values.^b









^cThe variables and assumptions are listed on the left axis (low, baseline, high). On the right axis,
 the probability of positive NPV associated with each case (low, baseline, high) is listed.

706	Tables

	Conversion Pathway	Median	Mean	Std. Dev.
Life cycle GHG	FT MD	32.86	32.89	7.22
emissions	Plasma FT MD	62.34	62.51	9.48
(gCO_2e/MJ)	ATJ MD	52.74	52.88	13.22
Minimum selling	FT MD	0.99	1.00	0.14
price (\$/L)	Plasma FT MD	1.78	1.81	0.29
1	ATJ MD	1.20	1.22	0.27
Net present value	FT MD	-0.339	-0.344	0.312
(\$B)	Plasma FT MD	-0.753	-0.761	0.252
× /	ATI MD	-0.247	-0.247	0.163