


Incineration 101

Municipal solid waste (trash) incineration is the most expensive and polluting way to manage waste or to make energy. Only 11.7% of U.S. trash in the U.S. is incinerated. The rest is recycled, composted or landfilled.

Incineration is a dirty word, and industry knows it, so they use other terms to make it sound good, like resource recovery, trash-to-steam, waste-to-energy and energy from waste. All of these terms are untruthful and misleading. The most aggressive in arguing that they are not incinerators are specific



types of incinerators using technologies known as gasification, pyrolysis and plasma arc. In the U.S. and in the European Union, these technologies are legally defined and regulated as incinerators. They share the same fundamental problems with conventional incinerators, but they operate in two stages, first turning the waste into a gas, then burning it, letting the companies pretend that they aren't actually incinerating (burning) the waste itself.

In reality, incinerators are waste-OF-energy facilities. Incinerators destroy resources that are better reused. If the same materials burned in trash incinerators were recycled or composted, they would save 3–5 times more energy than incinerators can make from burning them, since raw materials don't need to be extracted and produced all over again. Most of the energy in materials, like paper, was spent making them, but is not physically present in the paper itself.

Not Renewable

Incineration is not renewable energy. While many state renewable energy laws count it as renewable energy, municipal waste is non-renewable, consisting of discarded materials such as paper, plastic and glass that are derived from finite natural resources such as forests that are being depleted at unsustainable rates. Burning these materials creates a demand for "waste" and discourages much-needed efforts to conserve resources, reduce packaging and waste and encourage recycling and composting.

Environmental Racism

Incinerators are an environmental racism issue. Incinerators for trash, hazardous waste, sewage sludge and other types of waste are typically located in communities of color and low-income communities. At least with hazardous waste facilities, race is more of a factor than class, so it's not just that people of color tend to live in low-income communities. Some are located in relatively affluent communities of color.

Dirtier Than Coal

To make the same amount of energy, burning trash pollutes the air far more than burning coal, even though incinerators are generally newer and have more air pollution controls than coal power plants. Trash incinerators release 28 times as much dioxin air pollution than coal, about six times more lead and mercury, 3.2 times more nitrogen oxides (NO_x), 2.5 times as much carbon dioxide (CO₂), twice as much carbon monoxide (CO) and 20% more sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

Sometimes called "trash-to-steam" plants, incinerators cannot turn trash into mere water vapor, as there are all sorts of elements in waste, not just hydrogen and oxygen to make H₂O (water). Trash contains toxic metals like arsenic, lead and mercury, halogens like chlorine that produce acid gases and ultratoxic dioxins and furans when burned, carbon, sulfur and nitrogen compounds that form some of the above-mentioned pollutants, and much more.

Incinerators are really "trash-to-toxic-

ash-and-toxic-air-pollution" facilities. Imagine that you throw an old pen "away" and it goes to a nearby landfill. There are metals in the pen, some of which may be toxic, as well as plastics and inks that may be chlorinated. Buried in a landfill, it will take a very long time before any of those chemicals can reach you in a form that you can breathe or drink. However, if that pen were sent to an incinerator, any toxic materials in the pen are instantly made available for breathing and drinking through a combination of air pollution and the toxic ash produced, which still goes to a landfill, but now can blow around and leach into groundwater more readily. In addition to making toxic elements more available, burning creates new pollutants that weren't there to begin with, including acid gases, NO_x, CO, CO₂, SO₂, dioxins and furans.

Incinerators, like nearly all facilities with smokestacks, do not monitor what they are putting into the air on a day-to-day basis. Permits only tend to require three pollutants — CO, NO_x and SO₂ (none of the toxic ones) — to be monitored on a continuous basis. Several other pollutants are tested once per year; many not at all. Annual testing is like having a speed limit where a speed trap is set just one day a year, there are signs warning "speed trap ahead" and the driver's brother runs the speed trap (the companies do their own testing). In reality, incinerators are "speeding" many other days of the year, with excessive emissions during startup, shutdown and malfunction times, when testing is not done.

Incinerators do not replace landfills, but require smaller, more toxic, landfills for their ash. Any pollutants captured in air pollution controls are added to the ash, so the cleaner the air, the more toxic the ash. Ash is more toxic than unburned trash because new toxins were formed by burning, and since existing toxins are more available. Think of coffee beans vs. coffee grounds. Pour water over beans and you won't get coffee, but grind them up and increase their surface area, pour water over them, and you get coffee. Ash is similar in that its higher surface area means more toxins can leach out, polluting groundwater.

Health Effects

Incinerators are bad for people's health. Studies have found, in communities around incinerators:

- Increases in pre-term babies and babies born with spina bifida or heart defects.
- Increased cancers, especially: larynx, lung, colorectal, liver and stomach cancers, leukemia (blood cancer), childhood cancers, soft-tissue sarcoma and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.
- Increased dioxins in the blood of incinerator workers.

Most Expensive — Bankruptcies and Bailouts

Studies done for U.S. Energy Information Administration in 2010 and 2013 show that trash incinerators are, by far, the most expensive way to make energy. Even though trash incinerators get paid to take their fuel, they're the most expensive to build and most expensive to operate and maintain – even worse than nuclear and biomass. They're nine times more expensive to build than a conventional natural gas power plant and 30 times more expensive to operate. They even cost about twice as much to build as solar and nearly four times as much as wind.

Incineration is also far more expensive than landfilling. It competes only by locating in high-priced waste markets and by locking local and county governments into long-term monopoly contracts, often with "put-or-pay" clauses. Such clauses require that a certain amount of waste be provided to the incinerator, or the governments pay the full amount, even if not providing enough waste. This discourages waste reduction, recycling and composting, because the community can't save money by doing these things. It also allows the incinerator company to fill that extra capacity with waste from other places, getting paid twice for the same capacity.


Expensive incinerators have driven some local governments into bankruptcy. The most spectacular examples have been Harrisburg, Pennsylvania (the largest city bankruptcy at the time, filed in 2011), and Claremont, New Hampshire, where 29 towns filed for bankruptcy due to "put-or-pay" contracts. In other cases, massive bailouts have been necessary, such as the \$1.5 billion in state bailouts for New Jersey's five incinerators, and the \$1.2 billion in debt payments at the Detroit incinerator, contributing to that city's

bankruptcy. In most other cases, the expense of incineration is covered other ways, such as through hidden fees on property tax assessments, by accepting more profitable industrial wastes, and/or by cranking up fees on the captive local community while offering discounted waste disposal to outlying areas to compete with landfills and attract waste to meet capacity.

Incinerators are terrible ways to produce jobs. For every 10,000 tons of waste processed per year, incinerators and landfills create one job, while recycling facilities create 10 jobs and reuse, remanufacturing and repairing materials creates far more (20-300 jobs depending on the material). With a national recycling rate of less than 33%, the U.S. recycling industries currently provide over 800,000 jobs. A national recycling rate of 75% would create 1.5 million jobs.

Competition with Recycling and Clean Energy

Incineration competes with waste reduction, recycling and composting, both through its contracts demanding a certain amount of waste generation, and by virtue of the fact that incinerators need recyclable materials, like paper, tires, wood and plastics, to be able to burn effectively. Within renewable energy policies, incinerators (and landfills that burn their gas for energy) often get subsidized as renewable energy, but recycling and composting do not. Burning trash, "biomass" and landfill gas crowds out wind power in renewable energy mandates.



The "Carbon-Neutral" Myth

While EPA data shows that trash incineration is 2.5 times as bad as coal for global warming (CO₂ pollution per amount of energy produced), the industry pretends

that they're carbon negative! They pull off this trick by comparing themselves to methane emissions from landfills, and by not counting the portion of emissions from burning paper and other organic material. Even if you don't count that "biogenic" fraction of what is in waste, the CO₂ emissions from the rest (plastics and such) is still 55% worse than coal. However, the "carbon neutral" myth has been repeatedly busted in recent years, since it takes trees centuries to suck all of the carbon back up, even if trees were replanted and left to grow for that long. It's true that landfills are worse than incinerators for global warming, but this can be avoided by keeping clean compostable organics out of landfills, and by digesting dirty organics before landfilling them, so that their methane can be contained and used for energy in a cleaner way.

It Doesn't Work in Europe

Incinerator pushers like to point across the ocean and claim that incineration works in Europe and Japan, where they rely heavily on incineration. Incinerators in these countries are also very polluting, still compete with recycling, and some European countries have found themselves having to import waste from neighboring countries just to keep their incinerators fed with enough waste to operate.

Real Solutions for Energy and Waste

We can meet all of our electricity needs with conservation, efficiency, wind, solar and energy storage. Sometimes incinerators are used for heating as well, but those needs are best met with conservation, efficiency, geothermal, air-source heat pumps and solar hot water.

The "zero waste" alternative aims to eliminate incinerators and cut use of landfills by at least 90%. Some communities, especially San Francisco, are well on their way. These solutions involve maximizing source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting. For whatever is left, it must be examined to see what failed to get diverted upstream, so products can be redesigned or phased out. Any remainder should go through mechanical and biological treatment before landfilling to get out more recyclables, and digest the remaining waste first, avoiding gassy landfills and their global warming impacts.