Title: Most Landfill Methane Emissions Escape Detection in EPA21 Surface Emission Monitoring Surveys

Authors and Affiliations:

1. Athar Omidi, Corresponding Author, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, aomidi@stfx.ca
2. Evelise Bourlon, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, ebourlon@stfx.ca
3. Afshan Khaleghi, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, akhaleghi@stfx.ca
4. Nadia Tarakki, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, ntarakki@stfx.ca
5. Rebecca Martino, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, rmartino@stfx.ca
6. Jordan Stuart, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, jstuart@stfx.ca
7. David Risk, Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, drisk@stfx.ca

This paper is a non-peer reviewed preprint submitted to EarthArXiv and concurrently under peer review at Waste Management. It has not been peer-reviewed yet.

Journal Submission: Submitted to Waste Management for peer review.

Most Landfill Methane Emissions Escape Detection in EPA21 Surface Emission Monitoring Surveys

Athar Omidi[1], Evelise Bourlon[2], Afshan Khaleghi[2], Nadia Tarakki[2], Rebecca Martino[2], Jordan Stuart[2], David Risk[2]

[1] Corresponding author: Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada, aomidi@stfx.ca

[2] Department of Earth and Environment Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada

Abstract

We measured emissions from ten landfills using mobile surveys and Surface Emission Monitoring (SEM) to determine what fraction of emissions that be identified by SEM surveys. Using mobile methane measurements and a back-trajectory attribution and rate estimation method, we measured overall site emissions and those of individual landfill components (active face, closed cells, leachate, etc). We evaluated each component's contribution to the total emissions and compared how much of emissions captured by mobile surveys could be covered by the walking SEM survey. We found that SEM was effective for closed sites, achieving on-average 67% rate coverage. However, SEM missed relevant emission sources at open landfill sites, most notably from the active face, reducing its rate percent coverage to 17% or. The limited rate coverage of SEM suggests that using SEM alone is insufficient for measurement-informed management of total landfill emissions. We recommend that SEM be augmented by other methods to fill monitoring gaps and provide a more comprehensive assessment of landfill methane emissions.

Keywords: Landfill methane emission, surface emission monitoring, Gaussian dispersion, methane, Regulation, mobile methane survey.

1 Introduction

The waste sector is the third largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions globally (Ritchie et al., 2020). To minimize methane (CH_4) emissions from municipal solid waste (MSW), several countries, such as the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom, have implemented guidelines for monitoring emissions at ground level (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2016; Environment Protection Authority Victoria, 2018; United Kingdom Government, 2024).

Walking Surface Emission Monitoring (SEM) is the most widely used ground-level monitoring method that measures fugitive CH_4 emissions in landfills (Bogner et al., 1997; Scheutz et al., 2009). Technicians walk through the study area in ~30 m grids using a hand-held closed-path detector equipped with an air collection nozzle that collects CH_4 concentration data a few centimetres above the ground. SEM surveys are required mainly to address the problem of CH_4 escaping through the landfill cover in closed and covered cells. Studies by Zhang et al. (2012) and Wang et al. (2015) demonstrated emissions in these types of capped area. SEM measurements have been used to identify major emission sources and to estimate total emissions across a landfill site (Abichou et al., 2011; Bel Hadj Ali, et al., 2020; Kormi et al., 2018). A SEM itself cannot quantify total emissions, although Abichou et al. (2023) showed that SEM data correlate to surface CH_4 fluxes with reasonable uncertainty. On the other hand, Ute-Röwer et al. (2016) and Mønster et al. (2019) found that SEM surveys were unable to fully capture the heterogeneous nature of landfill covers and localized emitting hotspots. These hotspots include components such as active faces, gas collection systems, compost, and leachate management systems, all of which have been identified as emissions sources (Scheutz et al., 2011; Akerman et al., 2007; Olaguer et al., 2022) that could be challenging for SEM to cover. For open landfills with active faces, a large portion of CH_4 can escape from the active face due to the rapid decay of food waste and other residues (Krause et al., 2023; Bogner et al., 2011; Kormi et al., 2018; Goldsmith et al., 2012; Kumar et al., 2023; Innocenti et al., 2017; Cambaliza et al., 2017). Recently, Scarpelli et al. (2024) found that on average 79% of American landfill CH_4 emissions were from the active (work) face of the landfill.

For 40 years regulators have mandated that walking SEM be used to monitor landfill emissions without fully understanding which parts of a landfill produce the most emissions. Until recently, many landfill operators and regulators incorrectly believed that the covered parts of the landfill were the major sources of emissions.

Given our new appreciation of landfill emission patterns, we sought to test what fraction of landfill emissions, on average, was captured by SEM, and were therefore under measurement-informed management in jurisdictions where SEM surveys and follow up are required. To our knowledge, our study is the first to evaluate this decades-old technique. We do so by using mobile surveys to evaluate each landfill component's contribution and we then compare how much of those emissions were measured by walking SEM surveys. Specifically, we compare the SEM areal and rate percent coverage, calculated from mobile survey measurements of landfill emission components. In the end, we assess how effectively ground-based walking surveys captured landfill emissions. We hope our results will serve as scientific evidence for policy makers and stakeholders when drafting new legislation in Canada and globally.

2 Methodology and Materials

2.1 Surface Emission Monitoring Surveys

For the walking SEM surveys, we engaged a third-party contractor to conduct walking surveys in ten Canadian landfills, with seven landfills surveyed twice and three landfills surveyed once. Characteristics of each landfill are listed in Table 1. We provided no special instructions or requests to the contractor; we simply asked that all surveys represent industry norms and that the measurements reflect standard practice.

For each SEM survey, the CH_4 mixing ratios were recorded in parts per million by volume (ppmv) at designated grid points, with each point representing a 30×30 m^2 grid square. The contractor used a serpentine walking pattern along the predefined grid squares holding the scanner upright with the extension rod contacting the ground surface. Stationary readings were taken for at least 3 s at each grid point. In cases where the instrument did not stabilize, minimum and maximum mixing ratios were recorded and averaged. Figure 1 presents an example of measured SEM points at one landfill, cross-referenced with photographs.



Figure 1. Examples of source types and locations from SEM surveys.

2.2 Mobile Measurements

For our mobile laboratory, we equipped a sports utility vehicle with a Gill Ultrasonic Anemometer, compass, GPS, and gas analyzers attached via tubing for sampling. A Los Gatos Research Ultra-Portable Greenhouse Gas Analyzer or an LGR-ICOS Microportable Gas Analyzer (GLA131 Series) with a precision of 1.4 ppb for CH_4 measured the CH_4 concentrations in ppmv. An anemometer, compass, and GPS collected wind data and the location of the vehicle. Before each day's mobile measurements, we verified instrument accuracy and precision and calibrated the compass toward the four compass directions.

We measured each landfill for 5 to 12 days during winter and summer. During each field day, we drove all accessible areas of the landfill continuously for about seven hours, collecting about 50,000 geolocated concentrations measurements. During each day, and between days, winds would shift, so we intercepted plumes in different locations as we travelled the accessible landfill roads, allowing us to triangulate emission sources.



Figure 2 (a) Examples of on site mobile measurements at LF3. The colors on the map represent different CH_4 concentrations, with red indicating the highest values and dark blue showing the lowest or background levels. (b) A map of CH_4 hotspots identified using triangulation, with landfill components tagged. A wind rose in the top-left corner illustrates wind speed and direction (mainly from the west) during the mobile measurements.

Figure 2 (a) shows an example of data measured from a mobile survey of LF3. We depicted the operational features of the landfills on landfill maps using polygons. The polygons represented the active face, closed cells with intermediate and final covers, leachate and gas collection systems, composting sites, and other infrastructure of each landfill. To identify the source of emissions and to quantify the fluxes, we attributed all peaks in our measured CH_4 time series to potential point sources, determined from triangulation, within the polygons. Starting from the location of a CH_4 concentration peak in the time series, we traced the wind direction to identify all upwind path intersections as potential origins of the plume (Omidi et al, 2024). We applied a Kernel Density Estimate (KDE) to smooth the distribution of the triangulated points, weighted by the measured concentrations, and mapped them across the landfill's geographic area (Figure 2(b)).

We identified local maxima and used the Gaussian dispersion model represented in Equation (1) at the maximum concentration to quantify the emissions (Turner, 1970). We assumed we had measured directly downwind from the emission source (y=0):

$$Q = 2\pi\ \sigma_y \sigma_z U C(x, 0, z)(e^{\frac{(z-H)^2}{2\sigma_z^2}})$$

(1)

where

Q = pollutant emission rate (g s^{-1})

σ_z= vertical standard deviation of the concentration distribution (m)

σ_z= crosswind standard deviation of the concentration distribution (m)

U= mean horizontal wind velocity at pollutant release height (m s^{-1})

$C(x, 0, z)$= concentration at location (x,0,z) (g m^{-3})

H = pollutant release height (m)

Table S.1 (Supplementary Materials) lists the emission rates for the landfill components averaged over the monitoring period. We estimated fluxes from the mobile transects, keeping in mind that the Gaussian estimation from truck measurement could underestimate actual emission rates (Hossian et al., 2024).

2.3 SEM Areal and Rate Coverage Estimation

We found the areal coverage ratio of component i measured by SEM by

$$C_{areal}^{i} = \frac{n_i \times 30 \times 30}{A_i};$$

where A_i is the total area of component i in m^2; n_i is the total number of SEM measurements; and 30×30 is the grid cell size in m^2.

To estimate how much the SEM data contributed to the total component emissions, we multiplied the SEM areal coverage (C_{areal}^{i}) by the component emission rate, measured by the mobile survey (Q_{mobile}^{i}). We calculated the proportion of the total landfill emission rate covered by the SEM measurements of that component using the formula

$$C_{rate}^{i} = \frac{Q_{mobile}^{i} \times C_{areal}^{i}}{\sum_{i \in S} Q_{mobile}^{i}}.$$

S represents the set of all the components of the landfill. The overall SEM emission rate coverage for the landfill was

$$C_{rate} = \sum_{i \in S} \frac{Q_{mobile}^{i} \times C_{areal}^{i}}{\sum_{i \in S} Q_{mobile}^{i}}.$$

We compared the proportion of total landfill emissions captured by SEM measurements to the emissions estimated with mobile measurement data across all landfill components. Details of the measured components for each landfill are in Table S.1 of the Supplementary Materials.

3 Results and Discussion

Table 1 contains the estimated fluxes from the landfill transects. We used Gaussian dispersion models to quantify the aggregate CH_4 emission rate for each landfill.

Landfill ID	Operational Status	GCCS	Surface Area (~ha)	Cumulative Total Waste Disposal (Mt)	2023 ECCC Methane Generation Estimate (t yr^{-1})	Mobile Survey Estimate (t yr^{-1}) using transects
LF1	Closed	None	53	4.49	1584	1391
LF2	Open	Existing	60	2.47	3969	2160
LF3	Open	None	23	1.32	3070	3537
LF4	Open	None	47	4.46	5588	1068
LF5	Open	None	57	3.58	3759	987
LF6	Closed	None	66		6350	11522
LF7	Open	None	107	0.60	879	924
LF8	Open	Existing	42	1.28	2610	3545
LF9	Open	Existing	27	0.95	1252	1523
LF10	Open	Existing	64	0.93	2387	4737

Table 1. Site Descriptions and total site emissions estimates. ECCC is Environment Climate Change Canada and GCCS stands for Gas Collection and Control System. Cumulative total waste disposal data for Site LF6 were unavailable.

3.1 Area and Rate Percent Coverage

Fewer than 1% of the SEM sample points over all the surveys exceeded the 500 ppm regulated threshold, which is low given the effort involved. For those landfills surveyed more than once, we also noticed variations in CH_4 levels between visits, indicating possible fluctuations in emissions due to seasonality and different atmospheric conditions (e.g., wind patterns).

Figure 3 shows the mapped interpolated SEM points for both visits for some of the landfills (also Figure S.1 in Supplementary Materials). We used Akima's bivariate interpolation method (Gebhardt et al., 2022). Landfill components like composting areas, gas collection systems, and leachate/flare systems, which showed emissions from mobile survey data, were not covered by the SEM surveys. We excluded the limited number of SEM measurements from the active face from Figure 3 and from the areal and rate coverage analysis in this section because Canadian government regulations do not require fresh waste gas monitoring (Government of Canada, 2024)



Figure 3. SEM maps of surveyed landfills LF1 (closed), LF2, LF3, and LF5 from Visit 1, conducted between August and September 2023, and Visit 2, conducted between October and November 2023. The colored areas represent the SEM CH_4 survey; the SEM concentrations were interpolated. The black borders outline the landfill perimeters and the component areas. Red borders highlight active face zones, identified as major contributors to emissions at most sites. These active areas are typically not covered by SEM measurements.

To evaluate surface CH_4 concentrations, we analyzed the SEM data across all landfills. Figure 4(a) shows the surface CH_4 concentrations. In the figure, the red vertical line depicts the regulatory threshold of 500 ppmv. Figure 4(b) compares the areal coverage (C_{areal}) and rate coverage (C_{rate}) of SEM across measured landfills.



Figure 4 (a) Box plots showing CH_4 concentrations (ppmv) across landfills over multiple visits. The lines within the boxes represent the median values for each landfill's SEM measurements. The red vertical line indicates the regulatory proposed threshold for a single location, set at 500 ppmv, while n indicates the number of SEM measurements. (b) Bar chart showing the average total areal and rate coverage (C_{areal} and C_{rate}) across visits for each landfill, with error bars representing the standard deviation.

Generally, closed landfills showed higher averaged coverage. LF1 had C_{areal} of 36% and a C_{rate} of 47%, while LF6 showed even more coverage, with a C_{areal} of 66% and a C_{rate} of 88.43%. There was a noticeable variation in the SEM coverage of LF1 across two visits with the standard deviation of 36% which highlights the challenge of consistently capturing emissions, especially during colder seasons, even in closed landfills.

The overall spatial coverage for the open landfills remained low due to SEM's limited ability in covering active landfill components (i.e., active face, leachate, compost, and gas collection system). On average, the surveyed open landfills exhibited a C_{areal} of 21% and a C_{rate} of 17%. The highest recorded C_{rate} was 36% at LF4, and LF9 showed the maximum

C_{areal} at 36% (Figure 4(b)). Additionally, large error bars at some sites highlighted discrepancies in the monitoring of accessible landfill sections.

Table 2 lists the average contributions from each landfill feature across the open landfills, with and without landfill gas collection and control systems (GCCS). We see that the active face is, on average, the biggest source contributor: 69% and 42% for landfills with and without gas collection and control system, respectively. Since SEM does not cover the active face, the maximum effectiveness is bounded to 31% and 58% of emissions at these site types. SEM also does not typically cover other components like leachate systems or compost. These areas are large contributors to total emissions, so failing to capture these emission sources resulted in a reduced overall emission coverage as shown in Figure 4(b) where SEM captured maximally 36% of emissions at open sites.

Source	Open Landfill Status	Mean Emission Rate Per Component Area ($kghr^{-1}ha^{-1}$)	Average Contribution (%)	Standard Deviation of Contribution (%)
Active Face	Without GCCS	5.37	42.35	13.96
Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	Without GCCS	3.73	31.37	22.47
Compost Facility	Without GCCS	1.33	7.85	7.28
Others	Without GCCS	5.10	11.74	7.29
Leachate Management	Without GCCS	1.21	12.37	21.06
Closed Cell Final Cover	Without GCCS	0.02	0.41	-
Active Face	GCCS	14.17	69.12	22.65
Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	GCCS	2.34	16.76	13.50
Compost Facility	GCCS	2.89	7.28	7.73
Others	GCCS	0.85	3.89	4.31
Flare and Gas Collection System	GCCS	1.43	0.29	0.41
Leachate Management	GCCS	0.20	0.69	0.55
Closed Cell Final Cover	GCCS	1.82	13.86	22.37

Table 2. Summary of source contributions for open landfills, categorized by the presence or absence of landfill gas (LFG) collection systems. The table shows the mean emission rate per area (kg hr^{-1} ha^{-1}), the average contribution percentage of each source, and the standard deviation of these contributions.

Figure 4(b) shows that closed landfills had much better emission rate coverage from SEM coverage, and the open landfills had much lower coverage. It appears that comprehensive SEM coverage is possible at closed sites where intermediate or final cover dominates, in addition to GCCS infrastructure. There are however still gaps, and we note that although SEM at LF6 achieved >80% rate coverage, approximately 15% of that landfill's emissions came from its leachate (Table 1), which was a significant emissions source that SEM did not cover at this closed site.

4 Conclusion

This study assessed how well SEM surveys captured emissions from different sources at landfills. We evaluated how much different landfill components contributed to total emissions and compared the results with the areal coverage of SEM at ten Canadian landfills.

Our findings showed that SEM effectively captured emissions from closed sites, with an average rate coverage of 68%. At open landfill sites, the story is different. SEM misses most of the emissions and thus it is not recommended to be used alone in a regulatory framework trying to address total site emissions. If we use SEM as the default approach to measure and manage emissions, we are expending significant effort and cost to influence a small percentage of total site emissions. For open landfill sites we would suggest that regulators specify the use of measurement methodologies capable of assessing emissions from all landfill components to cover all under some form of measurement-informed management. Applicable methodologies are available to replace SEM (Hossian et al., 2024; Mønster et al. (2019)) and potentially at lower cost. These may include mobile surveys, eddy covariance, drone- or aircraft-based measurements (Hossian et al., 2024). Regulators need to send clear signals on what performance requirements are needed. For example, it would be reasonable to specify minimum detection thresholds at 90% probability of detection (Government of Canada, 2023; Environment Protection Agency, 2024). SEM could be used as a supplementary method to measure GCCS infrastructure but should not be the default or sole strategy. We also recommend that measurement and emissions management requirements for the active face be mandated in new regulations, given the importance of this source. Lastly, measurement requirements should be flexible and adaptable based on individual landfill operations since not all measurement approaches are available or useful everywhere. By combining SEM with other technologies, operators and regulators will build a more complete picture of landfill emissions and will be able to reduce methane emissions much further than is possible under the status quo.

5 Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Natural Resource Canada (NRCan) Energy Innovation Program, for which we are deeply grateful. We extend our thanks to landfill operators, and our dedicated FluxLab team who made this study possible.

6 Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT in order to improve readability. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication

REFERENCES

Abichou, T., Clark, J., and Chanton, J. 2011. Reporting central tendencies of chamber measured surface emission and oxidation, Waste Management, 31(5), 1002–1008. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2010.09.014

Abichou, T., Del'Angel, J. M., Koloushani, M., Stamatiou, K., Belhadj Ali, N., and Green, R. 2023. Estimation of total landfill surface methane emissions using geospatial approach combined with measured surface ambient air methane concentrations. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 73(12), 902–913. doi:10.1080/10962247.2023.2271431

Akerman, A., Budka, A., Hayward-Higham, S., Bour, O., and Rallu, D. 2007. Methane emissions measurements on different landfills. Proceedings of the Conference on Methane Emissions. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:131431015

Bel Hadj Ali, N., Abichou, T., and Green, R. 2020. Comparing estimates of fugitive landfill methane emissions using inverse plume modeling obtained with Surface Emission Monitoring (SEM), Drone Emission Monitoring (DEM), and Downwind Plume Emission Monitoring (DWPEM). Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 70(4),.410–424. doi:10.1080/10962247.2020.1728423

Bogner, J., Meadows, M., and Czepiel, P. 1997. Fluxes of methane between landfills and the atmosphere: natural and engineered controls, Soil Use and Management, 13(s4), 268–277. doi 10.1111/j.1475-2743.1997.tb00598.x

Bogner, J.E., Spokas, K.A., Chanton, J.P., 2011. Seasonal Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Methane, Carbon Dioxide, Nitrous Oxide) from Engineered Landfills: Daily, Intermediate, and Final California Cover Soils. J. Environ. Qual. 40, 1010–1020. https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2010.0407

Bourn, M., Robinson, R., Innocenti, F., & Scheutz, C. 2019. Regulating landfills using measured methane emissions: An English perspective. Waste Management, 87, 860–869. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.06.032

Cambaliza, M. O. L., Bogner, J. E., Green, R. B., Shepson, P. B., Harvey, T. A., Spokas, K. A., Stirm, B. H., & Corcoran, M. 2017. Field measurements and modeling to resolve m2 to km2 CH4 emissions for a complex urban source: An Indiana landfill study. Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene, 5, 36. https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.145

Environment Protection Agency. 2024, February 8. Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2022 [Reports and Assessments]. https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/draft-inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-sinks-1990-2022

Environment Protection Authority Victoria. 2018, February 2. 1684: Landfill gas fugitive emissions monitoring guideline. https://www.epa.vic.gov.au/about-epa/publications/1684

Gebhardt, A., Petzoldt, T., and Akima, H. 2022. Interpolation of Irregularly Spaced Data: The Akima Package for R (Version 0.6-2). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=akima

Goldsmith, C. Douglas, Jeffrey Chanton, Tarek Abichou, Nathan Swan, Roger Green, and Gary Hater. 2012. Methane Emissions from 20 Landfills across the United States Using Vertical Radial Plume Mapping. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association 62(2): 183–97. doi:10.1080/10473289.2011.639480.

Government of Canada 2024, June 24. Regulations Respecting the Reduction in the Release of Methane (Waste Sector), Canada Gazette Part 1, 158(26). https://canadagazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p1/2024/2024-06-29/html/reg5-eng.html

Government of Canada 2023, December 16. Canada Gazette, Part 1, Volume 157, Number 50: Regulations Amending the Regulations Respecting Reduction in the Release of Methane and Certain Volatile Organic Compounds (Upstream Oil and Gas Sector). Government of Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Integrated Services Branch, Canada Gazette. https://www.gazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p1/2023/2023-12-16/html/reg3-eng.html.

Hossian, R., Dudak, Y., Buntov, P., Canning, E., Martino, R., Fougère, C., Naseridoust, S., Bourlon, E., Lavoie, M., Khaleghi, A., Farjami, F., Ells, L., Berthiaume, M.-A., Hall, C., and Risk, D. 2024. A controlled release experiment for investigating methane measurement performance at landfills. Fluxlab. St. Francis Xavier University, Canada. https://erefdn.org/product/a-controlled-release-experiment-for-investigating-methane-measurement-performance-at-landfills/

Innocenti, F., Robinson, R., Gardiner, T., Finlayson, A., & Connor, A. 2017. Differential Absorption Lidar (DIAL) Measurements of Landfill Methane Emissions. Remote Sensing, 9(9), 953. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9090953

Kormi, T., Mhadhebi, S., Bel Hadj Ali, N., Abichou, T., and Green, R. 2018. Estimation of fugitive landfill methane emissions using surface emission monitoring and Genetic Algorithms optimization. Waste Management, 72, 313–328, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2016.11.024

Krause, M., Kenny, S., Stephenson, J., and Singleton, A. 2023. Quantifying methane emissions from landfilled food waste. United States Environmental Protection Agency, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-10/food-waste-landfill-methane-10-8-23-final_508-compliant.pdf

Kumar, P., Caldow, C., Broquet, G., Shah, A., Laurent, O., Yver-Kwok, C., Ars, S., Defratyka, S., Gichuki, S., Lienhardt, L., Lozano, M., Paris, J.-D., Vogel, F., Bouchet, C., Allegrini, E., Kelly, R., Juery, C., & Ciais, P. 2023. Detection and long-term quantification of methane emissions from an active landfill. https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2023-124

Mønster, J., Kjeldsen, P., and Scheutz, C. 2019. Methodologies for measuring fugitive methane emissions from landfills – a review. Waste Management, 87, 835–859. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2018.12.047

Olaguer, E., Jeltema, S., Gauthier, T., Jermalowicz, D., Ostaszewski, A., Batterman, S., Xia, T., Raneses, J., Kovalchick, M., Miller, S., Acevedo, J., Lamb, J., Benya, J., Wendling, A., Zhu, J., 2022. Landfill Emissions of Methane Inferred from Unmanned Aerial Vehicle and Mobile Ground Measurements. Atmosphere 13, 983. https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos13060983

Omidi, A., Bourlon, E., Khaleghi, A., Tarakki, N., Martino, R., Sakib, S., Farjami, F., Perrine, G., Foomaj, A., Buntov, P., and Risk, D. 2024. Methane emission dynamics: A comprehensive measurement study of Canadian landfills. Proceedings of the 7th Eurasia Waste Management Symposium 21-23 October 2024. Istanbul, Turkey. https://www.eurasiasymposium.com/EWMS_2024_ebook/pdfs.html

Ritchie, H., Rosado, P, and Roser, M. 2020. Breakdown of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emissions by sector. https://ourworldindata.org/emissions-by-sector (accessed 12 December 2024)

Scarpelli, T. R., Cusworth, D. H., Duren, R. M., Kim, J., Heckler, J., Asner, G. P., Thoma, E., Krause, M., J., Heins, D., and Thorneloe, S. 2024. Investigating major sources of methane emissions at US landfills. Environmental Science & Technology, 58(49). https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.4c07572

Scheutz, C., Kjeldsen, P., Bogner, J.E., De Visscher, A., Gebert, J., Hilger, H.A., Huber-Humer, M., Spokas, K., 2009. Microbial methane oxidation processes and technologies for mitigation of landfill gas emissions. Waste Manag Res 27, 409–455. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X09339325

Scheutz, C., Samuelsson, J., Fredenslund, A. M., and Kjeldsen, P. 2011. Quantification of multiple methane emission sources at landfills using a double tracer technique. Waste Management, 31(5), 1009–1017. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2011.01.015

Ute-Röwer, I., J. Streese-Kleeberg, J., Scharff, H., Pfeiffer, E.-M., and Gebert, J. 2016. Optimized landfill biocover for CH4 oxidation II: Implications of spatially heterogeneous fluxes for monitoring and emission prediction. CEE, 3(2), 94–106. doi:10.2174/2212717803666160804150348

Wang, X., Nagpure, A. S., DeCarolis, J. F., and Barlaz, M. A. 2015. Characterization of uncertainty in estimation of methane collection from select U. S. landfills. Environ. Sci. Technol., 49(3), 1545–1551. doi:10.1021/es505268x

Supplementary Materials



Figure S.1. SEM maps of surveyed landfills LF4, LF6 (closed), and LF9 from Visit 1, conducted between August and September 2023, and Visit 2, conducted between October and November 2023, and LF7, LF8, and LF10, which were surveyed once. The colors and borders are as in Figure 3.

LANDFILL ID	SOURCE	NUM OF SEM MEASUREMENTS	NUM SEM >500 ppmv	MEAN SEM (ppmv)	SEM VISIT ID	SOURCE TOTAL AREA (m^2)	AVERAGED MOBILE SURVEY RATE (kg hr^{-1})	SEM AREAL COVERAGE A_{SEM} (m^2)	SEM AREAL COVERAGE C_{areal} (%)	SEM RATE ESTIMATES (kg hr^{-1})	SEM RATE COVERAGE C_{rate} (%)	TOTAL SEM RATE COVERAGE $\sum C_{rate}$ (%)
LF1	Closed Cell Final Cover	180	2	18.39	1	242,629	113.75	162000	66.77	75.95	58.07	64.79
LF1	Closed Cell Final Cover	79	0	8.10	2	242,629	113.75	71100	29.30	33.33	25.48	28.97
LF1	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	139	0	3.90	1	211,413	14.87	125100	59.17	8.80	6.73	64.79
LF1	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	72	0	8.92	2	211,413	14.87	64800	30.65	4.56	3.48	28.97
LF2	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	158	2	204.02	1	167,407	32.60	142200	84.94	27.69	27.21	28.39
LF2	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	154	1	55.55	2	167,407	32.60	138600	82.79	26.99	26.52	27.59
LF2	Closed Cell Final Cover	63	0	67.30	1	57420	1.22	56700	98.75	1.20	1.18	28.39
LF2	Closed Cell Final Cover	57	0	27.46	2	57,420	1.22	51300	89.34	1.09	1.07	27.59
LF3	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	107	2	14.94	1	231,332	124.72	96300	41.63	51.92	20.92	20.92
LF3	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	59	1	25.55	2	231,332	124.72	53100	22.95	28.63	11.53	11.53
LF4	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	63	1	33.90	1	90,603	5.52	56700	62.58	3.45	6.23	36.35
LF4	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	64	0	17.77	2	90,603	5.52	57600	63.57	3.51	6.33	36.45
LF4	Leachate Management	86	1	10.60	1	112,591	24.29	77400	33.46	16.70	30.12	36.35
LF4	Leachate Management	86	0	9.85	2	112,591	24.29	77400	33.46	16.70	30.12	36.45
LF4	Others	10	0	9.96	1	-	10.40	9000	3.89	0	0	36.35
LF4	Others	15	0	5.41	2	-	10.40	13500	5.84	0	0	36.45
LF5	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	4	0	3.11	1	27,480	10.27	3600	13.10	1.35	2.42	19.81
LF5	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	4	0	39.36	2	27,480	10.27	3600	13.10	1.35	2.42	19.81
LF5	Others	22	0	3.67	1	19,316	9.43	19800	100	9.67	17.39	19.81
LF5	Others	22	0	4.69	2	19,316	9.43	19800	100	9.67	17.39	19.81
LF6	Closed Cell Final Cover	495	3	21.11	1	434,234	384.54	445500	100	394.52	89.06	89.06
LF6	Closed Cell Final Cover	488	15	99.33	2	434,234	384.54	439200	100	388.94	87.8	87.8
LF7	Closed Cell Final Cover	59	0	3.70	1	66,351	8.69	53100	80.03	6.95	14.13	14.13
LF8	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	60	0	32.88	1	89,592	88.47	54000	60.27	53.32	14.60	14.6
LF9	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	52	0	72.98	1	46,480	4.29	46800	100	4.32	5.45	6.20

LF9	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	43	0	38.14	2	46,480	4.29	38700	83.26	3.57	4.50	5.14
LF9	Closed Cell Final Cover	67	0	71.38	1	55,609	0.55	60300	100	0.60	0.75	6.20
LF9	Closed Cell Final Cover	57	0	26.75	2	55,609	0.55	51300	92.25	0.51	0.64	5.14
LF10	Closed Cell Intermediate Cover	113	0	42.96	1	146,387	10.97	101700	69.47	7.62	3.76	3.76

Table S.1. Details of the SEM and mobile measurements