Waste Management & Research: The Journal for a Sustainable Circular Economy

Impact Factor: **3.7**
5-Year Impact Factor:





# Abstract

Heavy fractions resu waste treatment plants are posing ve ns of inert and high-caloric compor stream cannot be landfilled and must n inert fraction generated from this waste stream with advanced separation technologies, two sensor-based [near-infrared spectroscopy (NIR), X-ray transmission (XRT)] and two mechanical systems (wet and dry) is able to be disposed of. The performance of the treatment options for separation was evaluated by characterizing the resulting product streams with respect to purity and yield. Complementing the technical evaluation of the processing options, an assessment of the economic and global warming effects of the change in waste stream routing was conducted. The separated inert fraction was evaluated with regard to landfilling. The remaining high-caloric product stream was evaluated with regard to thermal utilization. The results show that, in principal, the selected treatment technologies can be used to separate high-caloric from inert components. Limitations were identified with regard to the product qualities achieved, as well as to the economic expedience of the treatment options. One of the sensor-based sorting systems (X-ray) was able to produce the highest amount of disposeable heavy fraction (44.1%), while having the lowest content of organic (2.0% $C_{biogenic}$ per kg waste input) components. None of the high-caloric product streams complied with the requirements for solid recovered fuels as defined in the Austrian Ordinance on Waste Incineration. The economic evaluation illustrates the highest specific treatment costs for the XRT (€23.15 per t), followed by the NIR-based sorting system (€15.67 per t), and the lowest costs for the air separation system (€10.79 per t). Within the ecological evaluation it can be shown that the results depend strongly on the higher heating value of the high caloric light fraction and on the content of $C_{biogenic}$ of the heavy fraction. Therefore, the XRT system had the best results for the overall GWP [−14 kg carbon dioxide equivalents ($CO_2$eq) per t of input waste] and the NIR-based the worst (193 kg $CO_2$ eq per t of input waste). It is concluded that three of the treatment options would be suitable under the specific conditions considered here. Of these, sensor-based sorting is preferable owing to its flexibility.

# References

Austrian Federal Government (ed.) (2010) *Abfallverbrennungsverordnung* [Ordinance on Waste Incineration], BGBl. II Nr. 389/2002, Vienna (2008), in its latest revision through BGBl. II Nr. 476/2010, Vienna, Austria.

Google Scholar

Austrian Federal Government (ed.) (2011). *Deponieverordnung* [Landfill Ordinance], BGBl II Nr. 39/2008, Vienna (2008), in its latest revision through BGBl. II Nr. 455/2011, Vienna, Austria.

Google Scholar

BEWAG (ed.) (2011) 100% Ökostrom, BEWAG Energievertrieb GmbH & Co KG. Available at: http://www.bewag.at/index.php?id=1836 (accessed 26 April 2011).

Google Scholar

Bogner JE, Spokas KA, Chanton JP (2011) Seasonal greenhouse gas emissions (methane, carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide) from engineered landfills: daily, intermediate, and final california cover soils. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 40: 1010–1020.

Crossref

PubMed

Web of Science

Google Scholar

EN ISO 14040:2006 (2006) Umweltmanagement – Ökobilanz – Grundsätze und Rahmenbedingungen (ISO14040:2006), Deutsche und englische Fassung[Environmental management – Life cycle assessment – Principles and framework].

Google Scholar

EN ISO 14044:2006 (2006) Umweltmanagement – Ökobilanz – Anforderungen und Anleitungen (ISO14044:2006), Deutsche und englische Fassung [Environmental management – Life cycle assessment – Requirements and guidelines].

Google Scholar

Finnveden G, Johansson J, Lind P, Moberg A (2005) Life cycle assessment of energy from solid waste—part 1: general methodology and results. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 13: 213–229.

Crossref

Web of Science

Google Scholar

Giugliano M, Cernuschi S, Grosso M, Rigamonti L (2011) Material and energy recovery in integrated waste management systems. An evaluation based on life cycle assessment. *Waste Management* 31: 2092–2101.

Crossref

PubMed

Web of Science

Google Scholar

Haider R, Felber J, Curtis A (2011) *Informationen zur Modellbildung* [Modelling Information]. Graz: Umweltdienst Burgenland GmbH, Oberpullendorf, AT, BT-Wolfgang Binder G.m.b.H., Gleisdorf, AT and Saubermacher Dienstleistungs AG.

Google Scholar

Manfredi S, Tonini D, Christensen TH (2011) Environmental assessment of different management options for individual waste fractions by means of life-cycle assessment modelling. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 55: 995–1004.

Crossref

Web of Science

Google Scholar

Mauschitz G (2009) *Klimarelevanz der Abfallwirtschaft IV* [Climate Impacts of the Waste Industry IV]. Vienna: Federal Ministry of Forestry, Environment, and Water Management.

Google Scholar

Meirhofer M, Pieber S, Ragossnig A, Brooks L, Fercher E (2010). Behandlungsoptionen für eine MBA-Schwerfraktion – Am Beispiel der MBA Oberpullendorf. In: Lorber KE, Adam J, Aldrian A, Arnberger A, Bezama A, Kreindl G, et al. (eds) Proceedings of 10th DepoTech-Conference 2010, Leoben, Austria, 3–5 November 2010, pp. 271–276. Essen: VGE Verlag.

Google Scholar

Meirhofer M, Ragossnig A, Sommer M, Rixrath D (2012) Processing options of heavy fractions from MBT plants. In: Digital Proceedings of the ISWA World Solid Waste Congress 2012, Florence, Italy, 17–19 September 2012. Florence, Italy: ISWA.

Google Scholar
Nisters T (2006) Ersatzbrennstoffherstellung mittels NIR-Technologie. In: Pretz T (ed) Conference Proceedings Sensorgestützte Sortierung 2006, Aachen, Germany, 28-30 March 2006. Aachen, Germany: GDMB Gesellschaft für Bergbau, Metallurgie, Rohstoff- und Umwelttechnik e.V.

Google Scholar
PE International GmbH (2009) *AT Strom Mix, LBP-GaBi, University of Stuttgart*. Leinfelden-Echterdingen: GaBi Software System.

Google Scholar
Pretz T, Julius J (2008) State of the art and development in the field of non-contact waste sorting. *Osterreichische Wasser- und Abfallwirtschaft* 60: 105–112

Crossref

Google Scholar

Ragossnig A (2001) *Thermische behandlung heizwertreicher abfälle in wirbelschichtanlagen in Österreich* [Thermal treatment of high-caloric waste in fluidised bed combustion systems in Austria]. Dissertation, Montanuniversität Leoben, Austria.

Google Scholar
Rixrath D, Piringer G, Ragossnig A, Meirhofer M (2012) Carbon footprint of sorting for a middle-caloric fraction after mechanical-biological treatment. In: Proceedings of the ISWA World Solid Waste Congress 2012, Florence, Italy, 17–19 September 2012, Vol. 2, pp. 790-800. Florence: ISWA.

Google Scholar
Salhofer S, Wassermann G, Binner E (2007) Strategic environmental assessment as an approach to assess waste management systems. Experiences from an Austrian case study. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 22: 610–618.

Crossref

Web of Science

Google Scholar

Smith A, Brown K, Ogilvie S, Rushton K, Bates J (2001). *Waste management options and climate change*. Final Report ED21158R4.1 to the European Commission. Luxembourg: DG Environment. European Communities.

Google Scholar
Solomon S, Qin D, Manning M, Chen Z, Marquis M, Averyt KB, et al. (eds) (2007): *Climate change 2007: the physical science basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Google Scholar
Sommer M, Ragossnig A, Pieber S, Meirhofer M (2011) Economic evaluation of implementing NIR-sorting into a mechanical waste treatment plant. In: ISWA World Congress 2011, Daegu, South Korea, 17–20 October 2011. Florence, Italy: ISWA.

Google Scholar
Zeiger E (2006) Sortierung von Baumischabfall. Röntgenmaschine trennt wirtschaftlich organische und anorganische Bestandteile. *Abfalltechnik wlb* 5: 60–61.

Google Scholar

Entry

Carbon Sequestration

Show Details

View More



## Also from Sage