

Annexes to the Inventory of U.S. GHG Emissions and Sinks

The following eight annexes provide additional information related to the material presented in the main body of this report as directed in the *UNFCCC Guidelines on Reporting and Review* (UNFCCC 2014). Annex I contains an analysis of the key categories of emissions discussed in this report and a review of the methodology used to identify those key categories. Annex 2 describes the methodologies used to estimate CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion, the carbon content of fossil fuels, and the amount of carbon stored in products from non-energy uses of fossil fuels. Annex 3 discusses the methodologies used for a number of individual source categories in greater detail than was presented in the main body of the report and includes explicit activity data and emission factor tables. Annex 4 presents the IPCC reference approach for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion. Annex 5 addresses the criteria for the inclusion of an emission source or sink category and discusses some of the sources that are excluded from U.S. estimates. Annex 6 provides a range of additional information that is relevant to the contents of this report. Annex 7 provides data on the uncertainty of the emission estimates included in this report. Finally, Annex 8 provides information on the QA/QC methods and procedures used in the development of the Inventory.

ANNEX 1 Key Category Analysis	3
ANNEX 2 Methodology and Data for Estimating CO ₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion	35
2.1. Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CO ₂ from Fossil Fuel Combustion	35
2.2. Methodology for Estimating the Carbon Content of Fossil Fuels	72
2.3. Methodology for Estimating Carbon Emitted from Non-Energy Uses of Fossil Fuels	108
ANNEX 3 Methodological Descriptions for Additional Source or Sink Categories	135
3.1. Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CH ₄ , N ₂ O, and Indirect Greenhouse Gases from Stationary Combustion	135
3.2. Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CH ₄ , N ₂ O, and Indirect Greenhouse Gases from Mobile Combustion and Methodology for and Supplemental Information on Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	143
3.3. Methodology for Estimating Emissions from Commercial Aircraft Jet Fuel Consumption	187
3.4. Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Coal Mining	192
3.5. Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ and CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	200
3.6. Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ and CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	205
3.7. Methodology for Estimating CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O Emissions from the Incineration of Waste	212
3.8. Methodology for Estimating Emissions from International Bunker Fuels used by the U.S. Military	219
3.9. Methodology for Estimating HFC and PFC Emissions from Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	225
3.10. Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	249
3.11. Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ and N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	273
3.12. Methodology for Estimating N ₂ O Emissions, CH ₄ Emissions and Soil Organic C Stock Changes from Agricultural Lands (Cropland and Grassland) – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT	306
3.13. Methodology for Estimating Net Carbon Stock Changes in <i>Forest Land Remaining Forest Land</i> and <i>Land Converted to Forest Land</i>	371
3.14. Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	404
ANNEX 4 IPCC Reference Approach for Estimating CO ₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion	417
ANNEX 5 Assessment of the Sources and Sinks of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Not Included	427
ANNEX 6 Additional Information	436
6.1. Global Warming Potential Values	436
6.2. Ozone Depleting Substance Emissions	447
6.3. Sulfur Dioxide Emissions	449
6.4. Complete List of Source Categories	451
6.5. Constants, Units, and Conversions	453
6.6. Abbreviations	456
6.7. Chemical Formulas	463
ANNEX 7 Uncertainty	466
7.1. Overview	466
7.2. Methodology and Results	466
7.3. Reducing Uncertainty	472
7.4. Planned Improvements	473
7.5. Summary Information on Uncertainty Analyses by Source and Sink Category	474
ANNEX 8 QA/QC Procedures	490
8.1. Background	490

1	8.2.	Purpose.....	490
2	8.3.	Assessment Factors	491
3	8.4.	Responses During the Review Process – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT	493
4			

ANNEX 1 Key Category Analysis

The United States has identified national key categories based on the estimates presented in this report. The 2006 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006) describes a key category as a “[category] that is prioritized within the national inventory system because its estimate has a significant influence on a country’s total inventory of greenhouse gases in terms of the absolute level, the trend, or the uncertainty in emissions and removals.” By definition, key categories are sources or sinks that have the greatest contribution to the absolute overall level of national emissions in any of the years covered by the time series. In addition, when an entire time series of emission estimates is prepared, a determination of key categories must also account for the influence of the trends of individual categories. Therefore, a trend assessment is conducted to identify source and sink categories for which significant uncertainty in the estimate would have considerable effects on overall emission trends. Finally, a qualitative evaluation of key categories should be performed, in order to capture any key categories that were not identified in either of the quantitative analyses, but can be considered key because of the unique country-specific estimation methods.

The methodology for conducting a key category analysis, as defined by the 2006 *IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006), includes:

- Approach 1 (including both level and trend assessments);
- Approach 2 (including both level and trend assessments, and incorporating uncertainty analysis); and
- Qualitative approach.

This Annex presents an analysis of key categories, both for sources only and also for sources and sinks (i.e., including Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry [LULUCF]); discusses Approach 1, Approach 2, and qualitative approaches to identifying key categories; provides level and trend assessment equations; and provides a brief statistical evaluation of IPCC’s quantitative methodologies for defining key categories. Table A-1 presents the key categories for the United States (including and excluding LULUCF categories) using emissions and uncertainty data in this report, and ranked according to their sector and global warming potential (GWP)-weighted emissions in 2017. The table also indicates the criteria used in identifying these categories (i.e., level, trend, Approach 1, Approach 2, and/or qualitative assessments).

Table A-1: Key Source Categories for the United States (1990-2017)

IPCC Source/Sink Categories	Greenhouse Gas	Approach 1				Approach 2				Qual ^a	2017 Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
		Level Without LULUCF	Trend Without LULUCF	Level With LULUCF	Trend With LULUCF	Level Without LULUCF	Trend Without LULUCF	Level With LULUCF	Trend With LULUCF		
Energy											
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		1,493.6
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		1,210.0
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		505.1
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		486.0
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		276.4
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	•		•		•		•			242.1
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•					177.0
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•				173.6
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	•		•		•		•			124.6
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	•	•	•	•						83.2
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	•	•	•	•						59.3
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•				56.4
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		55.1
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	•	•	•	•						40.4
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	•	•	•	•						34.3
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	•		•							26.3
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂		•		•	•	•		•		23.3
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		18.5
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂						•				3.0

CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	•	•						2.0
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂					•	•		0.0
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	166.2
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	62.6
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	•		•		•	•		37.7
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄					•		•	6.9
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄					•	•	•	3.1
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄						•		1.9
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O					•			24.4
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	•	•	•	•		•	•	12.1
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O					•			2.6
International Bunker Fuels ^b	Several							•	2.0
Industrial Processes and Product Use									
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	41.8
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	•		•	•				39.4
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	•	•	•	•				28.2
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O		•		•				7.0
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	HiGWP	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	152.2
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HiGWP	•	•	•	•		•	•	5.2
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	HiGWP	•	•		•		•		4.3
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	HiGWP		•		•		•		1.1
Agriculture									
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂					•			3.2
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	•	•	•	•	•		•	175.4

CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	61.7
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄					•	•		11.3
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	227.7
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	•		•		•		•	38.8
Waste									
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	107.7
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O					•			5.0
Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry									
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Settlements	CO ₂			•	•		•	•	86.2
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Cropland	CO ₂			•	•		•	•	66.9
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Grassland	CO ₂						•		8.3
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Grassland Remaining Grassland ^c	CO ₂							•	(0.1)
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Cropland Remaining Cropland	CO ₂			•	•		•	•	(10.3)
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Forest Land	CO ₂			•					(120.6)
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Settlements Remaining Settlements	CO ₂			•	•		•	•	(134.5)
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	CO ₂			•	•		•	•	(620.3)
Subtotal Without LULUCF									6,317.8
Total Emissions Without LULUCF									6,472.3
Percent of Total Without LULUCF									98%
Subtotal With LULUCF									5,542.1
Total Emissions With LULUCF									5,758.9
Percent of Total With LULUCF									96%

^a Qualitative criteria.

^b Emissions from this source not included in totals.

^c This source category was excluded from the analysis and is identified as a key category using qualitative criteria. Emissions from this source are not included in the key categories Subtotal With LULUCF.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values (or sequestration).

Table A-2 provides a complete listing of source categories by IPCC sector, along with notations on the criteria used in identifying key categories, without LULUCF sources and sinks. Similarly, Table A-3 provides a complete listing of source and sink categories by IPCC sector, along with notations on the criteria used in identifying key categories, including LULUCF sources and sinks. The notations refer specifically to the year(s) in the Inventory time series (i.e., 1990 to 2017) in which each source or sink category reached the threshold for being a key category based on either a Tier 1 or Tier 2 level assessment.

In addition to conducting Approach 1 and 2 level and trend assessments, a qualitative assessment of the source categories, as described in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006), was conducted to capture any key categories that were not identified by either quantitative method. For this Inventory, no additional categories were identified using criteria recommend by IPCC, but EPA continues to update its qualitative assessment on an annual basis.

Table A-2: U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory Source Categories without LULUCF

IPCC Source Categories	Direct Greenhouse Gas	2017 Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Key Category?	ID Criteria ^a	Level in which year(s)? ^b
Energy					
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,493.6	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,210.0	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	505.1	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	486.0	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	276.4	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	242.1	•	L ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	177.0	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	173.6	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	124.6	•	L ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	83.2	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	59.3	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	56.4	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	55.1	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	40.4	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	34.3	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	26.3	•	L ₁	1990 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	23.3	•	T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	2017 ₂
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	18.5	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	10.8			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	4.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	3.0	•	T ₂	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	2.0	•	T ₁	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4			
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	0.0	•	T ₂	
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	166.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017

Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	62.6	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	37.7	•	L ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.9	•	L ₂	1990 ₂ , 2017 ₂
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	6.4			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	3.1	•	L ₂ T ₂	1990 ₂ , 2017 ₂
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	1.9	•	T ₂	
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.6			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.2			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	1.1			
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	1.0			
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.3			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	0.1			
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	24.4	•	L ₂	1990 ₂ , 2017 ₂
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	12.1	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.7			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	2.6	•	L ₂	1990 ₂
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.6			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	0.7			
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.5			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.3			
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.3			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1			
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+			
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+			
International Bunker Fuels ^c	Several	2.0	•		Q
Industrial Processes and Product Use					
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	41.8	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	39.4	•	L ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	28.2	•	L ₁ T ₁	2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.8			
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	13.2			
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	10.1			
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	4.5			
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	4.3			
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.8			
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.7			
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.3			
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	1.2			
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	1.0			

CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5			
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.2			
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.4			
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+			
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	10.1			
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	7.0	•	T ₁	
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2			
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.4			
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	0.2			
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	HiGWP	152.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	2017
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HiGWP	5.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	HiGWP	4.7			
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	HiGWP	4.3	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	HiGWP	1.1	•	T ₁ T ₂	
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HiGWP	1.1			
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HiGWP	0.1			
Agriculture					
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	5.1			
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	3.2	•	T ₂	
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	175.4	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	61.7	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	11.3	•	L ₂ T ₂	1990 ₂ , 2017 ₂
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.2			
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	227.7	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	38.8	•	L ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	18.7			
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	0.1			
Waste					
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	107.7	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	14.3			
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	2.2			
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	5.0	•	T ₂	
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	1.9			

1 + Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

2 ^a For the ID criteria, Q refers to "Qualitative", L refers to a key category identified through a level assessment; T refers to a key category identified through a trend
3 assessment and the subscripted number refers to either an Approach 1 or Approach 2 assessment (e.g., L₂ designates a source is a key category for an Approach
4 2 level assessment).

5 ^b If the source is a key category for both L₁ and L₂ (as designated in the ID criteria column), it is a key category for both assessments in the years provided unless
6 noted by a subscript, in which case it is a key category for that assessment in that year only (e.g., 1990₂ designates a source is a key category for the Approach 2
7 assessment only in 1990).

8 ^c Emissions from these sources not included in emission totals.

9 Note: LULUCF sources and sinks are not included in this analysis.

10

Table A-3: U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory Source Categories with LULUCF

IPCC Source/Sink Categories	Direct Greenhouse Gas	2017 Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Key Category?	ID Criteria ^a	Level in which year(s)? ^b
Energy					
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,493.6	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,210.0	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	505.1	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990 ₁ , 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	486.0	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	276.4	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	242.1	•	L ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	177.0	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	173.6	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	124.6	•	L ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	83.2	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	59.3	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	56.4	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	55.1	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	40.4	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	34.3	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	26.3	•	L ₁	1990 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	23.3	•	T ₁ T ₂	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	18.5	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	10.8			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	4.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	3.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	2.0	•	T ₁	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4			
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+			
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	0.0	•	T ₂	
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	166.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	62.6	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	37.7	•	L ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.9	•	L ₂	2017 ₂
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	6.4			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	3.1	•	T ₂	
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	1.9			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.6			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.2			

Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	1.1			
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	1.0			
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.3			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	0.1			
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	24.4			
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	12.1	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.7			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	2.6			
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.6			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	0.7			
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.5			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.3			
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.3			
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1			
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+			
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+			
International Bunker Fuels ^c	Several	2.0	•	Q	
Industrial Processes and Product Use					
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	41.8	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	39.4	•	L ₁ T ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	28.2	•	L ₁ T ₁	2017 ₁
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.8			
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	13.2			
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	10.1			
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	4.5			
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	4.3			
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.8			
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.7			
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.3			
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	1.2			
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	1.0			
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5			
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.2			
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.4			
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+			
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+			
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	10.1			

N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	7.0	•	T ₁	
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2			
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.4			
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	0.2			
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	HiGWP	152.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	2017
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HiGWP	5.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	HiGWP	4.7			
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	HiGWP	4.3	•	T ₁	
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	HiGWP	1.1	•	T ₁	
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HiGWP	1.1			
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HiGWP	0.1			
Agriculture					
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	5.1			
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	3.2			
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	175.4	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	61.7	•	L ₁ T ₁ T ₂	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	11.3			
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.2			
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	227.7	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	38.8	•	L ₁ L ₂	1990, 2017
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	18.7			
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	0.1			
Waste					
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	107.7	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	14.3			
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	2.2			
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	5.0			
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	1.9			
Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry					
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Settlements	CO ₂	86.2	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Cropland	CO ₂	66.9	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Grassland	CO ₂	8.3	•	L ₂	1990 ₂ , 2017 ₂
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Wetlands	CO ₂	(+)			
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Grassland Remaining Grassland	CO ₂	(+)	•	Q	
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CO ₂	(+)			
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Cropland Remaining Cropland	CO ₂	(+)	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017 ₂
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Forest Land	CO ₂	(+)	•	L ₁	1990 ₁ , 2017 ₁
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Settlements Remaining Settlements	CO ₂	(+)	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	CO ₂	(+)	•	L ₁ T ₁ L ₂ T ₂	1990, 2017
CH ₄ Emissions from Forest Fires	CH ₄	4.9			

CH ₄ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	3.6
CH ₄ Emissions from Grass Fires	CH ₄	0.3
CH ₄ Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	CH ₄	+
CH ₄ Emissions from Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	+
CH ₄ Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	CH ₄	+
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Fires	N ₂ O	3.2
N ₂ O Emissions from Settlement Soils	N ₂ O	2.5
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Soils	N ₂ O	0.5
N ₂ O Emissions from Grass Fires	N ₂ O	0.3
N ₂ O Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	N ₂ O	0.1
N ₂ O Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	N ₂ O	0.1
N ₂ O Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	N ₂ O	+

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

^a For the ID criteria, Q refers to "Qualitative," L refers to a key category identified through a level assessment; T refers to a key category identified through a trend assessment and the subscripted number refers to either an Approach 1 or Approach 2 assessment (e.g., L₂ designates a source is a key category for an Approach 2 level assessment).

^b If the source is a key category for both L₁ and L₂ (as designated in the ID criteria column), it is a key category for both assessments in the years provided unless noted by a subscript, in which case it is a key category only for that assessment in only that year (e.g., 1990₂ designates a source is a key category for the Approach 2 assessment only in 1990).

^c Emissions from these sources not included in emission totals.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values (or sequestration).

Evaluation of Key Categories

Level Assessment

When using an Approach 1 for the level assessment, a predetermined cumulative emissions threshold is used to identify key categories. When source and sink categories are sorted in order of decreasing absolute emissions, those that fall at the top of the list and cumulatively account for 95 percent of emissions are considered key categories. The 95 percent threshold in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006) was designed to establish a general level where the key category analysis covers approximately 75 to 92 percent of inventory uncertainty.

Including the Approach 2 provides additional insight into why certain source categories are considered key, and how to prioritize inventory improvements. In the Approach 2, the level assessment for each category from the Approach 1 is multiplied by its percent relative uncertainty. If the uncertainty reported is asymmetrical, the absolute value of the larger uncertainty is used. While CO₂ emissions from geothermal energy are included in the overall emissions estimate, they are not an official IPCC source category. As a result, there are no guidelines to associate uncertainty with the emissions estimate; therefore, an uncertainty analysis was not conducted. The uncertainty associated with CO₂ from mobile combustion is applied to each mode's emission estimate. No uncertainty was associated with CH₄ emissions from waste incineration because emissions are less than 0.05 kt CH₄ and an uncertainty analysis was not conducted. When source and sink categories are sorted in decreasing order of this calculation, those that fall at the top of the list and cumulatively account for 90 percent of emissions are considered key categories. The key categories identified by the Approach 2 level assessment may differ from those identified by the Approach 1 assessment. The final set of key categories includes all source and sink categories identified as key by either the Approach 1 or the Approach 2 assessment, keeping in mind that the two assessments are not mutually exclusive.

It is important to note that a key category analysis can be sensitive to the definitions of the source and sink categories. If a large source or sink category is split into many subcategories, then the subcategories may have contributions to the total inventory that are too small for those source categories to be considered key. Similarly, a collection of small, non-key source categories adding up to less than 5 percent of total emissions could become key source categories if those source categories were aggregated into a single source or sink category. The United States has attempted to define source and sink categories by the conventions that would allow comparison with other international key categories, while still maintaining the category definitions that constitute how the emissions estimates were calculated for this report. As such, some of the category names used in the key category analysis may differ from the names used in the main body of the report. Additionally, the United States accounts for some source categories, including fossil fuel feedstocks, international bunkers, and emissions from U.S. Territories, that are derived from unique data sources using country-specific methodologies.

Table A-4 through Table A-7 contain the 1990 and 2017 level assessments for both with and without LULUCF sources and sinks, and contain further detail on where each source falls within the analysis. Approach 1 key categories are shaded dark gray. Additional key categories identified by the Approach 2 assessment are shaded light gray.

Trend Assessment

Approach 1 for trend assessment is defined as the product of the source or sink category level assessment and the absolute difference between the source or sink category trend and the total trend. In turn, the source or sink category trend is defined as the change in emissions from the base year to the current year, as a percentage of current year emissions from that source or sink category. The total trend is the percentage change in total inventory emissions from the base year to the current year.

Thus, the source or sink category trend assessment will be large if the source or sink category represents a large percentage of emissions and/or has a trend that is quite different from the overall inventory trend. To determine key categories, the trend assessments are sorted in decreasing order, so that the source or sink categories with the highest trend assessments appear first. The trend assessments are summed until the threshold of 95 percent is reached; all categories that fall within that cumulative 95 percent are considered key categories.

For Approach 2, the trend assessment for each category from Approach 1 is multiplied by its percent relative uncertainty. If the uncertainty reported is asymmetrical, the larger uncertainty is used. When source and sink categories are sorted in decreasing order of this calculation, those that fall at the top of the list and cumulatively account for 90 percent of emissions are considered key categories. The key categories identified by the Approach 2 trend assessment may differ from those identified by the Approach 1 assessment. The final set of key categories includes all source and sink categories identified as key by either the Approach 1 or the Approach 2 assessment, keeping in mind that the two assessments are not mutually exclusive.

Table A-8 and Table A-9 contain the 1990 through 2017 trend assessment for both with and without LULUCF sources and sinks, and contain further detail on where each source falls within the analysis. Approach 1 key categories are shaded dark gray. Additional key categories identified by the Approach 2 assessment are shaded light gray.

Table A-4: 1990 Key Source Category Approach 1 and Approach 2 Analysis—Level Assessment, without LULUCF

IPCC Source Categories	Direct	Approach 1			Approach 2	
	Greenhouse Gas	1990 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Level Assessment	Cumulative Total	Uncertainty ^a	Level Assessment
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,547.6	0.24	0.24	10%	0.023
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,162.2	0.18	0.43	6%	0.012
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	408.5	0.06	0.49	7%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	293.7	0.05	0.54	20%	0.009
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	237.7	0.04	0.57	7%	0.003
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	212.7	0.03	0.61	18%	0.006
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	193.9	0.03	0.64	17%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	187.4	0.03	0.67	6%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	179.6	0.03	0.69	40%	0.011
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	175.3	0.03	0.72	5%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	164.2	0.03	0.75	18%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	155.3	0.02	0.77	16%	0.004
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	142.0	0.02	0.79	7%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	119.5	0.02	0.81	36%	0.007
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	101.6	0.02	0.83	17%	0.003
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	97.5	0.02	0.84	9%	0.001

CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	97.4	0.02	0.86	6%	0.001
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	96.5	0.02	0.87	14%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	73.2	0.01	0.89	6%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	72.6	0.01	0.90	6%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	46.3	0.01	0.90	6%	<0.001
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HFCs	46.1	0.01	0.91	10%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	42.1	0.01	0.92	34%	0.002
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	39.0	0.01	0.92	143%	0.009
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	37.6	0.01	0.93	14%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	37.1	0.01	0.94	20%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	33.5	0.01	0.94	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	30.0	<0.01	0.95	17%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	26.9	<0.01	0.95	11%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	SF ₆	23.1	<0.01	0.95	15%	0.001
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	PFCs	21.5	<0.01	0.96	9%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	21.3	<0.01	0.96	5%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	20.5	<0.01	0.96	42%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	16.0	<0.01	0.97	49%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	15.3	<0.01	0.97	28%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	15.2	<0.01	0.97	5%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	14.0	<0.01	0.97	24%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.0	<0.01	0.98	7%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	12.1	<0.01	0.98	5%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	12.0	<0.01	0.98	15%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	11.7	<0.01	0.98	2%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	8.9	<0.01	0.98	34%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	8.0	<0.01	0.98	16%	<0.001
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	7.2	<0.01	0.98	22%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	7.1	<0.01	0.99	52%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	6.8	<0.01	0.99	3%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.6	<0.01	0.99	215%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	6.3	<0.01	0.99	15%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	5.2	<0.01	0.99	218%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	5.2	<0.01	0.99	27%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	SF ₆	5.2	<0.01	0.99	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	4.7	<0.01	0.99	111%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2	<0.01	0.99	24%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	3.8	<0.01	0.99	12%	<0.001
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	Several	3.6	<0.01	0.99	6%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	3.4	<0.01	0.99	108%	0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	3.1	<0.01	1.00	199%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	3.0	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001

CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	2.4	<0.01	1.00	43%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.2	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.1	<0.01	1.00	60%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.8	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.7	<0.01	1.00	65%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.7	<0.01	1.00	31%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.5	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.5	<0.01	1.00	21%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	1.5	<0.01	1.00	5%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.4	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.2	<0.01	1.00	13%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.1	<0.01	1.00	144%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	1.0	<0.01	1.00	209%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.6	<0.01	1.00	19%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	0.6	<0.01	1.00	16%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.6	<0.01	1.00	44%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.6	<0.01	1.00	87%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5	<0.01	1.00	15%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.5	<0.01	1.00	324%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	0.4	<0.01	1.00	3%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4	<0.01	1.00	NA	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.4	<0.01	1.00	178%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	0.4	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.4	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.3	<0.01	1.00	57%	<0.001
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	Several	0.3	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	51%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	198%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	89%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	55%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	10%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	20%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001

N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	34%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	215%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	2%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HFCs	0.0	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.0	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001

1 + Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

2 NE (Not Estimated)

3 NA (Not Available)

4 ^a Percent relative uncertainty. If the corresponding uncertainty is asymmetrical, the uncertainty given here is the larger and always positive.

5 Note: LULUCF sources and sinks are not included in this analysis.

6

7

Table A-5: 1990 Key Source Category Approach 1 and Approach 2 Analysis—Level Assessment, with LULUCF

IPCC Source/Sink Categories	Direct Greenhouse Gas		1990 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Approach 1 Level Assessment		Cumulative Total	Uncertainty ^a	Approach 2 Level Assessment	
	Gas								
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂		1,547.6	0.21		0.21	10%	0.020	
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂		1,162.2	0.15		0.36	6%	0.010	
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	CO ₂		680.1	0.09		0.45	152%	0.138	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂		408.5	0.05		0.51	7%	0.004	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂		293.7	0.04		0.55	20%	0.008	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂		237.7	0.03		0.58	7%	0.002	
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O		212.7	0.03		0.61	18%	0.005	
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄		193.9	0.03		0.63	17%	0.004	
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂		187.4	0.02		0.66	6%	0.002	
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄		179.6	0.02		0.68	40%	0.010	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂		175.3	0.02		0.70	5%	0.001	
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄		164.2	0.02		0.73	18%	0.004	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂		155.3	0.02		0.75	16%	0.003	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂		142.0	0.02		0.77	7%	0.001	
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Settlements Remaining Settlements	CO ₂		122.1	0.02		0.78	86%	0.014	
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂		119.5	0.02		0.80	36%	0.006	
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Forest Land	CO ₂		119.1	0.02		0.81	9%	0.001	
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂		101.6	0.01		0.83	17%	0.002	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂		97.5	0.01		0.84	9%	0.001	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂		97.4	0.01		0.85	6%	0.001	
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄		96.5	0.01		0.87	14%	0.002	
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Cropland	CO ₂		75.6	0.01		0.88	60%	0.006	
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂		73.2	0.01		0.89	6%	0.001	

CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil – Commercial	CO ₂	72.6	0.01	0.90	6%	0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Settlements	CO ₂	62.9	0.01	0.90	29%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	46.3	0.01	0.91	6%	<0.001
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HFCs	46.1	0.01	0.92	10%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	42.1	0.01	0.92	34%	0.002
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Cropland Remaining Cropland	CO ₂	40.9	0.01	0.93	423%	0.023
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	39.0	0.01	0.93	143%	0.007
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	37.6	0.01	0.94	14%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	37.1	<0.01	0.94	20%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	33.5	<0.01	0.95	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	30.0	<0.01	0.95	17%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	26.9	<0.01	0.95	11%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	SF ₆	23.1	<0.01	0.96	15%	<0.001
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	PFCs	21.5	<0.01	0.96	9%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	21.3	<0.01	0.96	5%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	20.5	<0.01	0.97	42%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	16.0	<0.01	0.97	49%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	15.3	<0.01	0.97	28%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	15.2	<0.01	0.97	5%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	14.0	<0.01	0.97	24%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.0	<0.01	0.98	7%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	12.1	<0.01	0.98	5%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal – Commercial	CO ₂	12.0	<0.01	0.98	15%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	11.7	<0.01	0.98	2%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	8.9	<0.01	0.98	34%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Grassland	CO ₂	8.7	<0.01	0.98	214%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	8.0	<0.01	0.98	16%	<0.001
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	7.2	<0.01	0.99	22%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	7.1	<0.01	0.99	52%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	6.8	<0.01	0.99	3%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.6	<0.01	0.99	215%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	6.3	<0.01	0.99	15%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion – Residential	CH ₄	5.2	<0.01	0.99	218%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	5.2	<0.01	0.99	27%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	SF ₆	5.2	<0.01	0.99	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	4.7	<0.01	0.99	111%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2	<0.01	0.99	24%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CO ₂	4.0	<0.01	0.99	64%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	3.8	<0.01	0.99	12%	<0.001
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	Several	3.6	<0.01	0.99	6%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	3.4	<0.01	0.99	30%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	3.4	<0.01	0.99	108%	<0.001

Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	3.1	<0.01	1.00	199%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	3.0	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	2.4	<0.01	1.00	43%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.2	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.1	<0.01	1.00	60%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.8	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.7	<0.01	1.00	65%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.7	<0.01	1.00	31%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.5	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.5	<0.01	1.00	21%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	1.5	<0.01	1.00	5%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Forest Fires	CH ₄	1.5	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.4	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Settlement Soils	N ₂ O	1.4	<0.01	1.00	48%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.2	<0.01	1.00	13%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.1	<0.01	1.00	144%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	1.0	<0.01	1.00	209%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Fires	N ₂ O	1.0	<0.01	1.00	14%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.6	<0.01	1.00	19%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	0.6	<0.01	1.00	16%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.6	<0.01	1.00	44%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.6	<0.01	1.00	87%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5	<0.01	1.00	15%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.5	<0.01	1.00	324%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	0.4	<0.01	1.00	3%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4	<0.01	1.00	NA	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.4	<0.01	1.00	178%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	0.4	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.4	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.3	<0.01	1.00	57%	<0.001
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	Several	0.3	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	116%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	51%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	124%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Soils	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	318%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Grass Fires	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	140%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Grass Fires	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	139%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	198%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	89%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	55%	<0.001

N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Wetlands	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	30%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	10%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	20%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	76%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	30%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	215%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	78%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	2%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	34%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	54%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.0	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HFCs	0.0	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Percent relative uncertainty. If the corresponding uncertainty is asymmetrical, the uncertainty given here is the larger and always positive.

Table A-6: 2017 Key Source Category Approach 1 and Approach 2 Analysis—Level Assessment, without LULUCF

IPCC Source Categories	Direct	2017 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Approach 1		Approach 2	
	Greenhouse Gas		Level Assessment	Cumulative Total	Uncertainty ^a	Level Assessment
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,493.6	0.23	0.23	6%	0.015
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,210.0	0.19	0.42	10%	0.018
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	505.1	0.08	0.50	5%	0.004
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	486.0	0.08	0.57	7%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	276.4	0.04	0.61	20%	0.009
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	242.1	0.04	0.65	7%	0.003
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	227.7	0.04	0.69	18%	0.006
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	177.0	0.03	0.71	6%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	175.4	0.03	0.74	18%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	173.6	0.03	0.77	7%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	166.2	0.03	0.79	17%	0.004
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	Several	152.2	0.02	0.82	12%	0.003
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	124.6	0.02	0.84	36%	0.007
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	107.7	0.02	0.85	40%	0.007
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	83.2	0.01	0.87	6%	0.001

Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	62.6	0.01	0.88	14%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	61.7	0.01	0.88	20%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	59.3	0.01	0.89	6%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	56.4	0.01	0.90	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	55.1	0.01	0.91	16%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	41.8	0.01	0.92	17%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	40.4	0.01	0.92	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	39.4	0.01	0.93	6%	<0.001
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	38.8	0.01	0.94	143%	0.009
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	37.7	0.01	0.94	34%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	34.3	0.01	0.95	11%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	28.2	<0.01	0.95	5%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	26.3	<0.01	0.96	17%	0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	24.4	<0.01	0.96	42%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	23.3	<0.01	0.96	34%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	18.7	<0.01	0.97	24%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	18.5	<0.01	0.97	9%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	14.3	<0.01	0.97	28%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.8	<0.01	0.97	7%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	13.2	<0.01	0.97	2%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	12.1	<0.01	0.98	14%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	11.3	<0.01	0.98	49%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	10.8	<0.01	0.98	16%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	10.1	<0.01	0.98	15%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	10.1	<0.01	0.98	5%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	7.0	<0.01	0.98	5%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.9	<0.01	0.99	215%	0.002
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	6.4	<0.01	0.99	22%	<0.001
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HFCs	5.2	<0.01	0.99	10%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	5.1	<0.01	0.99	43%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	5.0	<0.01	0.99	108%	0.001
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	Several	4.7	<0.01	0.99	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	4.5	<0.01	0.99	5%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	4.3	<0.01	0.99	12%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	SF ₆	4.3	<0.01	0.99	15%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2	<0.01	0.99	24%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	4.0	<0.01	0.99	19%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	3.2	<0.01	0.99	111%	0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	3.1	<0.01	0.99	218%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	3.0	<0.01	0.99	17%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.7	<0.01	0.99	60%	<0.001

Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	2.6	<0.01	0.99	199%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	2.2	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	2.0	<0.01	1.00	15%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.0	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	1.9	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	1.9	<0.01	1.00	52%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.8	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.7	<0.01	1.00	13%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.6	<0.01	1.00	65%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.6	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.4	<0.01	1.00	31%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.3	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	1.2	<0.01	1.00	3%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.2	<0.01	1.00	144%	<0.001
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	PFCs	1.1	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	1.1	<0.01	1.00	3%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	SF ₆	1.1	<0.01	1.00	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.0	<0.01	1.00	21%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	1.0	<0.01	1.00	16%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	1.0	<0.01	1.00	27%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	0.7	<0.01	1.00	209%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.5	<0.01	1.00	44%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5	<0.01	1.00	15%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4	<0.01	1.00	NA	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.4	<0.01	1.00	57%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	178%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.3	<0.01	1.00	87%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	324%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	0.2	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.2	<0.01	1.00	51%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.2	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	198%	<0.001
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HFCs	0.1	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	55%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	89%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	34%	<0.001

CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	10%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	20%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	215%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	2%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	0.0	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Percent relative uncertainty. If the corresponding uncertainty is asymmetrical, the uncertainty given here is the larger and always positive.

Note: LULUCF sources and sinks are not included in this analysis.

Table A-7: 2017 Key Source Category Approach 1 and Approach 2 Analysis—Level Assessment with LULUCF

IPCC Source/Sink Categories	Direct Greenhouse Gas		Approach 1 Level		Approach 2 Level	
	Gas	2017 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Assessment	Cumulative Total	Uncertainty ^a	Assessment
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,493.6	0.20	0.20	6%	0.013
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,210.0	0.16	0.36	10%	0.016
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	CO ₂	620.3	0.08	0.44	152%	0.125
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	505.1	0.07	0.51	5%	0.003
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	486.0	0.06	0.57	7%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	276.4	0.04	0.61	20%	0.007
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	242.1	0.03	0.64	7%	0.002
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	227.7	0.03	0.67	18%	0.005
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	177.0	0.02	0.69	6%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	175.4	0.02	0.72	18%	0.004
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	173.6	0.02	0.74	7%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	166.2	0.02	0.76	17%	0.004
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	Several	152.2	0.02	0.78	12%	0.002
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Settlements Remaining Settlements	CO ₂	134.5	0.02	0.80	86%	0.015
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	124.6	0.02	0.82	36%	0.006
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Forest Land	CO ₂	120.6	0.02	0.83	9%	0.002
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	107.7	0.01	0.85	40%	0.006
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Settlements	CO ₂	86.2	0.01	0.86	29%	0.003
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	83.2	0.01	0.87	6%	0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Cropland	CO ₂	66.9	0.01	0.88	60%	0.005
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	62.6	0.01	0.89	14%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	61.7	0.01	0.90	20%	0.002

CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	59.3	0.01	0.90	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	56.4	0.01	0.91	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	55.1	0.01	0.92	16%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	41.8	0.01	0.92	17%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	40.4	0.01	0.93	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	39.4	0.01	0.93	6%	<0.001
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	38.8	0.01	0.94	143%	0.007
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	37.7	<0.01	0.94	34%	0.002
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	34.3	<0.01	0.95	11%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	28.2	<0.01	0.95	5%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	26.3	<0.01	0.96	17%	0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	24.4	<0.01	0.96	42%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	23.3	<0.01	0.96	34%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	18.7	<0.01	0.97	24%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	18.5	<0.01	0.97	9%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	14.3	<0.01	0.97	28%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.8	<0.01	0.97	7%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	13.2	<0.01	0.97	2%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	12.1	<0.01	0.97	14%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	11.3	<0.01	0.98	49%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	10.8	<0.01	0.98	16%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Cropland Remaining Cropland	CO ₂	10.3	<0.01	0.98	423%	0.006
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	10.1	<0.01	0.98	15%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	10.1	<0.01	0.98	5%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Grassland	CO ₂	8.3	<0.01	0.98	214%	0.002
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	7.0	<0.01	0.98	5%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.9	<0.01	0.98	215%	0.002
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	6.4	<0.01	0.99	22%	<0.001
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HFCs	5.2	<0.01	0.99	10%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	5.1	<0.01	0.99	43%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	5.0	<0.01	0.99	108%	0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Forest Fires	CH ₄	4.9	<0.01	0.99	17%	<0.001
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	Several	4.7	<0.01	0.99	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	4.5	<0.01	0.99	5%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CO ₂	4.4	<0.01	0.99	64%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	4.3	<0.01	0.99	12%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	SF ₆	4.3	<0.01	0.99	15%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2	<0.01	0.99	24%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	4.0	<0.01	0.99	19%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	3.6	<0.01	0.99	30%	<0.001

N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Fires	N ₂ O	3.2	<0.01	0.99	14%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	3.2	<0.01	0.99	111%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	3.1	<0.01	0.99	218%	0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	3.0	<0.01	0.99	17%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.7	<0.01	0.99	60%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	2.6	<0.01	1.00	199%	0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Settlement Soils	N ₂ O	2.5	<0.01	1.00	48%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	2.2	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	2.0	<0.01	1.00	15%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.0	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	1.9	<0.01	1.00	50%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	1.9	<0.01	1.00	52%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.8	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.7	<0.01	1.00	13%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.6	<0.01	1.00	65%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.6	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.4	<0.01	1.00	31%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.3	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	1.2	<0.01	1.00	3%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.2	<0.01	1.00	144%	<0.001
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	PFCs	1.1	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	1.1	<0.01	1.00	3%	<0.001
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	SF ₆	1.1	<0.01	1.00	6%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.0	<0.01	1.00	21%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	1.0	<0.01	1.00	16%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	1.0	<0.01	1.00	27%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	0.7	<0.01	1.00	209%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.5	<0.01	1.00	44%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Soils	N ₂ O	0.5	<0.01	1.00	318%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5	<0.01	1.00	15%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4	<0.01	1.00	NA	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.4	<0.01	1.00	57%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	178%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Grass Fires	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	140%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.3	<0.01	1.00	87%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.3	<0.01	1.00	324%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Grass Fires	CH ₄	0.3	<0.01	1.00	139%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	0.2	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.2	<0.01	1.00	51%	<0.001

CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.2	<0.01	1.00	9%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	116%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	198%	<0.001
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HFCs	0.1	<0.01	1.00	4%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	124%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	0.1	<0.01	1.00	47%	<0.001
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	0.1	<0.01	1.00	55%	<0.001
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Wetlands	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	30%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	89%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	17%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	76%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	30%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	12%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	10%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	20%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	215%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	34%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	78%	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+	<0.01	1.00	2%	<0.001
N ₂ O Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	N ₂ O	+	<0.01	1.00	54%	<0.001
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	0.0	<0.01	1.00	NE	<0.001

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Percent relative uncertainty. If the corresponding uncertainty is asymmetrical, the uncertainty given here is the larger and always positive.

Table A-8: 1990-2017 Key Source Category Approach 1 and 2 Analysis—Trend Assessment, without LULUCF

IPCC Source Categories	Direct Greenhouse Gas	1990 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	2017 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Approach 1 Trend Assessment	Approach 2 Trend Assessment	% Contribution to Trend	Cumulative Total
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,547.6	1,210.0	0.06	0.005	17.7	18
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	175.3	505.1	0.05	0.003	16.0	34
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,162.2	1,493.6	0.05	0.003	15.3	49
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	Several	0.3	152.2	0.02	0.003	7.4	56
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	155.3	55.1	0.02	0.003	5.0	62

CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	97.5	18.5	0.01	0.001	3.9	65
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	179.6	107.7	0.01	0.005	3.7	69
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	408.5	486.0	0.01	0.001	3.5	73
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	101.6	41.8	0.01	0.002	3.0	76
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	97.4	56.4	0.01	<0.001	2.1	78
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HFCs	46.1	5.2	0.01	0.001	2.0	80
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	96.5	62.6	0.01	0.001	1.7	81
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	193.9	166.2	<0.01	0.001	1.5	83
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	142.0	173.6	<0.01	<0.001	1.4	84
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	37.6	12.1	<0.01	0.001	1.3	86
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	37.1	61.7	<0.01	0.001	1.2	87
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	293.7	276.4	<0.01	0.001	1.1	88
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	PFCs	21.5	1.1	<0.01	<0.001	1.0	89
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	SF ₆	23.1	4.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.9	90
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	72.6	59.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.7	91
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	8.9	23.3	<0.01	0.001	0.7	91
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	187.4	177.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.6	92
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	212.7	227.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.6	93
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	12.0	2.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.5	93
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	73.2	83.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.4	93
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	164.2	175.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.4	94
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	15.2	7.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.4	94
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	26.9	34.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	95
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	46.3	40.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	95
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	21.3	28.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	95
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	6.8	1.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	96
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	33.5	39.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	96
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	7.1	1.9	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	96
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	42.1	37.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	96
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	16.0	11.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	14.0	18.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	5.2	1.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97

SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	SF ₆	5.2	1.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	30.0	26.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	6.3	10.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	20.5	24.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.6	4.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	119.5	124.6	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	3.0	0.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.0	3.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	1.5	4.5	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	8.0	10.8	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	2.4	5.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	5.2	3.1	<0.01	0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	12.1	10.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	0.4	2.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	0.3	1.9	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	4.7	3.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	3.4	5.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	11.7	13.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	15.3	14.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	Several	3.6	4.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	7.2	6.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	39.0	38.8	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	0.4	1.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	237.7	242.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.1	2.7	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.0	13.8	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.5	1.0	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	3.1	2.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	3.8	4.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.2	1.7	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	1.0	0.7	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	0.6	1.0	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.4	1.8	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100

N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.7	1.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.6	6.9	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.8	1.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.6	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.5	1.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	+	0.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.2	2.0	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.4	0.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.5	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.7	1.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.1	1.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HFCs	0.0	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.1	0.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2	4.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5	0.5	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.3	0.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.4	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	0.1	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	+	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.6	0.5	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	+	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4	0.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100

1 + Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

Note: LULUCF sources and sinks are not included in this analysis.

Table A-9: 1990-2017 Key Source Category Approach 1 and 2 Analysis—Trend Assessment, with LULUCF

IPCC Source Categories	Direct	1990 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	2017 Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	Approach 1	Approach 2	%	Cumulative Total
	Greenhouse Gas			Trend Assessment	Trend Assessment	Contribution to Trend	
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	1,547.6	1,210.0	0.05	0.004	15.8	16
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	175.3	505.1	0.04	0.002	15.1	31
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CO ₂	1,162.2	1,493.6	0.04	0.003	14.9	46
Emissions from Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances	Several	0.3	152.2	0.02	0.002	7.0	53
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Industrial	CO ₂	155.3	55.1	0.01	0.002	4.6	57
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Electricity Generation	CO ₂	97.5	18.5	0.01	0.001	3.6	61
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Industrial	CO ₂	408.5	486.0	0.01	0.001	3.4	64
CH ₄ Emissions from Landfills	CH ₄	179.6	107.7	0.01	0.004	3.3	68
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	CO ₂	680.1	620.3	0.01	0.013	2.9	71
CO ₂ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂	101.6	41.8	0.01	0.001	2.8	73
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Residential	CO ₂	97.4	56.4	0.01	<0.001	1.9	75
HFC-23 Emissions from HCFC-22 Production	HFCs	46.1	5.2	0.01	0.001	1.9	77
Fugitive Emissions from Coal Mining	CH ₄	96.5	62.6	<0.01	0.001	1.6	79
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Cropland Remaining Cropland	CO ₂	40.9	10.3	<0.01	0.017	1.4	80
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Commercial	CO ₂	142.0	173.6	<0.01	<0.001	1.4	82
CH ₄ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄	193.9	166.2	<0.01	0.001	1.3	83
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	N ₂ O	37.6	12.1	<0.01	<0.001	1.2	84
CH ₄ Emissions from Manure Management	CH ₄	37.1	61.7	<0.01	0.001	1.1	85
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Settlements	CO ₂	62.9	86.2	<0.01	0.001	1.1	86
PFC Emissions from Aluminum Production	PFCs	21.5	1.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.9	87
SF ₆ Emissions from Electrical Transmission and Distribution	SF ₆	23.1	4.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.9	88
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Industrial	CO ₂	293.7	276.4	<0.01	0.001	0.9	89
CO ₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CO ₂	8.9	23.3	<0.01	0.001	0.7	90
Direct N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O	212.7	227.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.6	90
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - Commercial	CO ₂	72.6	59.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.6	91
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Settlements Remaining Settlements	CO ₂	122.1	134.5	<0.01	0.001	0.5	91

CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CO ₂	187.4	177.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.5	92
CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄	164.2	175.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.5	92
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Commercial	CO ₂	12.0	2.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.5	93
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CO ₂	73.2	83.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.4	93
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Cropland	CO ₂	75.6	66.9	<0.01	0.001	0.4	94
N ₂ O Emissions from Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O	15.2	7.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.4	94
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Oil - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	26.9	34.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	94
CO ₂ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CO ₂	21.3	28.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	95
CO ₂ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CO ₂	46.3	40.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	95
CO ₂ Emissions from Cement Production	CO ₂	33.5	39.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	95
CO ₂ Emissions from Aluminum Production	CO ₂	6.8	1.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.3	96
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	CH ₄	7.1	1.9	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	96
CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation	CH ₄	16.0	11.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	96
CH ₄ Emissions from Petroleum Systems	CH ₄	42.1	37.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	96
N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management	N ₂ O	14.0	18.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	96
CO ₂ Emissions from Non-Energy Use of Fuels	CO ₂	119.5	124.6	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Road	CH ₄	5.2	1.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
SF ₆ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	SF ₆	5.2	1.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
CO ₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	CO ₂	30.0	26.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
CO ₂ Emissions from Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂	6.3	10.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	97
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	N ₂ O	20.5	24.4	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.6	4.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
CH ₄ Emissions from Forest Fires	CH ₄	1.5	4.9	<0.01	<0.001	0.2	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - Residential	CO ₂	237.7	242.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Gas - U.S. Territories	CO ₂	0.0	3.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Coal - Residential	CO ₂	3.0	0.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂	1.5	4.5	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	98
CO ₂ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CO ₂	8.0	10.8	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Fertilization	CO ₂	2.4	5.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Fires	N ₂ O	1.0	3.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	CH ₄	5.2	3.1	<0.01	0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O	12.1	10.1	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CH ₄ Emissions from Composting	CH ₄	0.4	2.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99

N ₂ O Emissions from Composting	N ₂ O	0.3	1.9	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	N ₂ O	3.4	5.0	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Liming	CO ₂	4.7	3.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CO ₂ Emissions from Lime Production	CO ₂	11.7	13.2	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
CH ₄ Emissions from Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄	15.3	14.3	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	Several	3.6	4.7	<0.01	<0.001	0.1	99
N ₂ O Emissions from Settlement Soils	N ₂ O	1.4	2.5	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	99
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Forest Land	CO ₂	119.1	120.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	99
Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄	7.2	6.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Ammonia Production	CO ₂	13.0	13.8	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Electricity Generation	CH ₄	0.4	1.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Other	N ₂ O	2.1	2.7	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Urea Consumption for Non-Ag Purposes	CO ₂	3.8	4.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂	1.5	1.0	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂	1.2	1.7	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	N ₂ O	3.1	2.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Indirect N ₂ O Emissions from Applied Nitrogen	N ₂ O	39.0	38.8	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Grassland	CO ₂	8.7	8.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Residential	N ₂ O	1.0	0.7	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Forest Soils	N ₂ O	0.1	0.5	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Zinc Production	CO ₂	0.6	1.0	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CH ₄	6.6	6.9	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CO ₂	4.0	4.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Soda Ash Production	CO ₂	1.4	1.8	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	N ₂ O	1.7	1.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Grass Fires	N ₂ O	0.1	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	CH ₄	0.6	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Industrial	CH ₄	1.8	1.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Grass Fires	CH ₄	0.1	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Glass Production	CO ₂	1.5	1.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O	+	0.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂	0.4	0.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂	2.2	2.0	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	3.4	3.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100

N ₂ O Emissions from Incineration of Waste	N ₂ O	0.5	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	CH ₄	1.1	1.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	N ₂ O	1.7	1.6	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
HFC-134a Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	HFCs	0.0	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄	0.1	0.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Petrochemical Production	CH ₄	0.3	0.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Lead Production	CO ₂	0.5	0.5	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Commercial	N ₂ O	0.4	0.3	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Product Uses	N ₂ O	4.2	4.2	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	N ₂ O	0.1	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Aviation	CH ₄	0.1	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	N ₂ O	+	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Mobile Combustion: Marine	N ₂ O	0.6	0.5	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Non-CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - U.S. Territories	CH ₄	+	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands	N ₂ O	0.1	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Stationary Combustion - Geothermal Energy	CO ₂	0.4	0.4	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Natural Gas Systems	N ₂ O	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Petroleum Systems	N ₂ O	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Ferroalloy Production	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CO ₂ Emissions from Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	N ₂ O	0.1	0.1	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
N ₂ O Emissions from Peatlands Remaining Peatlands	N ₂ O	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
Net CO ₂ Emissions from Land Converted to Wetlands	CO ₂	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Drained Organic Soils	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100
CH ₄ Emissions from Incineration of Waste	CH ₄	+	+	<0.01	<0.001	<0.1	100

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

1
2
3

References

IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Negara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayman, Kanagawa, Japan.

ANNEX 2 Methodology and Data for Estimating CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion

2.1. Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CO₂ from Fossil Fuel Combustion

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from fossil fuel combustion were estimated using a “bottom-up” methodology characterized by eight steps. These steps are described below.

Step 1: Determine Total Fuel Consumption by Fuel Type and Sector

The bottom-up methodology used by the United States for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion is conceptually similar to the approach recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) for countries that intend to develop detailed, sector-based emission estimates in line with a Tier 2 method in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006). Total consumption data and adjustments to consumption are presented in Columns 2 through 13 of Table A-10.

Adjusted consumption data are presented in Columns 2 through 8 of Table A-11 through Table A-38 with totals by fuel type in Column 8 and totals by end-use sector in the last rows. Fuel consumption data for the bottom-up approach were obtained directly from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) of the U.S. Department of Energy. These data were first gathered in physical units, and then converted to their energy equivalents (see Annex 6.5: Constants, Units, and Conversions). The EIA data were collected through a variety of consumption surveys at the point of delivery or use and qualified with survey data on fuel production, imports, exports, and stock changes. Individual data elements were supplied by a variety of sources within EIA. Most information was taken from published reports, although some data were drawn from unpublished energy studies and databases maintained by EIA.

Energy use data were aggregated by sector (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, electric power, and U.S. Territories), primary fuel type (e.g., coal, natural gas, and petroleum), and secondary fuel type (e.g., motor gasoline, distillate fuel). The 2017 total adjusted energy consumption across all sectors, including U.S. Territories, and energy types was 71,110.1 trillion British thermal units (TBtu), as indicated in the last entry of Column 13 in Table A-10. This total excludes fuel used for non-energy purposes and fuel consumed as international bunkers, both of which were deducted in earlier steps.

Electricity use information was allocated to each sector based on EIA’s distribution of electricity retail sales to ultimate customers (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, and other). Because the “other” fuel use includes sales to both the commercial and transportation sectors, EIA’s limited transportation electricity use data were subtracted from “other” electricity use and reported separately, and the remaining “other” electricity use was consequently combined with the commercial electricity data. Further information on these electricity end uses is described in EIA’s *Monthly Energy Review* (EIA 2018). Within the transportation sector, electricity use from electric vehicle charging in commercial and residential locations was re-allocated from the residential and commercial sectors to the transportation sector, for the years 2010 to present. The methodology for estimating electricity consumption by electric vehicles is outlined in Browning (2018).

There are also three basic differences between the consumption data presented in Table A-10 and Table A-11 through Table A-38 and those recommended in the IPCC (2006) emission inventory methodology.

First, consumption data in the U.S. Inventory are presented using higher heating values (HHV)¹ rather than the lower heating values (LHV)² reflected in the IPCC (2006) emission inventory methodology. This convention is followed because data obtained from EIA are based on HHV. Of note, however, is that EIA renewable energy statistics are often published using LHV. The difference between the two conventions relates to the treatment of the heat energy that is consumed in the process of evaporating the water contained in the fuel. The simplified convention used by the International Energy Agency for converting from HHV to LHV is to multiply the energy content by 0.95 for petroleum and coal and by 0.9 for natural gas.

¹ Also referred to as Gross Calorific Values (GCV).

² Also referred to as Net Calorific Values (NCV).

Second, while EIA's energy use data for the United States includes only the 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia, the data reported to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) are to include energy use within U.S. Territories. Therefore, estimates for U.S. Territories³ were added to domestic consumption of fossil fuels. Energy use data from U.S. Territories are presented in Column 7 of Table A-11 through Table A-38. It is reported separately from domestic sectoral consumption, because it is collected separately by EIA with no sectoral disaggregation.

Third, there were a number of modifications made in this report that may cause consumption information herein to differ from figures given in the cited literature. These are (1) the reallocation of select amounts of coking coal, petroleum coke, natural gas, residual fuel oil, and other oil (>401 degrees Fahrenheit) for processes accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter, (2) corrections for synthetic natural gas production, (3) subtraction of other fuels used for non-energy purposes, and (4) subtraction of international bunker fuels. These adjustments are described in the following steps.

Step 2: Subtract uses accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter.

Portions of the fuel consumption data for seven fuel categories—coking coal, distillate fuel, industrial other coal, petroleum coke, natural gas, residual fuel oil, and other oil (>401 degrees Fahrenheit)—were reallocated to the Industrial Processes and Product Use (IPPU) chapter, as these portions were consumed as raw materials during non-energy related industrial processes. Emissions from these fuels used as raw materials are presented in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter, and are removed from the energy and non-energy use estimates within the Energy chapter.

- Coking coal is used as a raw material (specifically as a reducing agent) in the blast furnace process to produce iron and steel, lead, and zinc and therefore is not used as a fuel for this process.
- Similarly, petroleum coke is used in multiple processes as a raw material, and is thus not used as a fuel in those applications. The processes in which petroleum coke is used include (1) ferroalloy production, (2) aluminum production (for the production of C anodes and cathodes), (3) titanium dioxide production (in the chloride process), (4) ammonia production, and (5) silicon carbide.
- Natural gas consumption is used for the production of ammonia, and blast furnace and coke oven gas used in iron and steel production.
- Residual fuel oil and other oil (>401 degrees Fahrenheit) are both used in the production of C black.
- Natural gas, distillate fuel, coal, and metallurgical coke are used to produce pig iron through the reduction of iron ore in the production of iron and steel.

Examples of iron and steel production adjustments in allocating emissions in Energy and IPPU sectors:

The consumption of coking coal, natural gas, distillate fuel, and coal used in iron and steel production are adjusted within the Energy chapter to avoid double counting of emissions from consumption of these fuels during non-energy related activities in IPPU sectors. These fuels are adjusted based on activity data utilized in calculating emissions estimates within the Iron and Steel Production section. Iron and steel production is an industrial process in which coal coke is used as a raw material rather than as a fuel;⁴ as such, the total non-energy use of industrial coking coal, as reported by EIA, is adjusted downward to account for this consumption within the iron and steel category. In this case, the reported amount of coking coal used in these processes is greater than the amount of coking coal reported as use by the EIA. The excess amount of coking coal used in these processes that is greater than the amount reported from consumption, is subtracted from the industrial other coal fuel type.

In 2017, 17,538 thousand tons of coking coal were consumed,⁵ resulting in an Energy sector adjustment of 377 TBtu. Natural gas, fuel oil, and coal are fossil fuels used in the production of iron and steel; therefore, the consumption of these fuels in industrial processes is subtracted from the industrial fossil fuel combustion sector to account for the amount of fuel used in the iron and steel calculation. In 2017, the iron and steel industry consumed 48,350 million ft³ of natural gas, 4,352 thousand gallons of distillate fuel, and 2,125 tons of coal (bituminous) as fuel. This resulted in Energy chapter adjustments of roughly 50 TBtu for natural gas, 51 TBtu for coal, and 1 TBtu for distillate fuel. In addition, an additional

³ Fuel consumption by U.S. Territories (i.e., American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wake Island, and other U.S. Pacific Islands) is included in this report.

⁴ In addition to iron and steel, lead and zinc production are also industrial processes in which coal coke is used as a raw material. Iron and steel, lead and zinc production accounts for the major portion of consumption of coal coke in the U.S.

⁵ Coking coal includes non-imported coke consumption from the iron and steel, lead, and zinc industries.

124.6 TBtu is adjusted to account for coking coal consumed for industrial processes other than iron and steel, lead, and zinc production in 2017.

Step 3: Adjust for Conversion of Fossil Fuels and Exports

First, a portion of industrial “other” coal that is accounted for in EIA coal combustion statistics is actually used to make “synthetic natural gas” via coal gasification at the Dakota Gasification Plant, a synthetic natural gas plant. The plant produces synthetic natural gas and byproduct CO₂. The synthetic natural gas enters the natural gas distribution system. Since October 2000, a portion of the CO₂ produced by the coal gasification plant has been exported to Canada by pipeline. The remainder of the CO₂ byproduct from the plant is released to the atmosphere. The energy in this synthetic natural gas enters the natural gas distribution stream, and is accounted for in EIA natural gas combustion statistics. Because this energy of the synthetic natural gas is already accounted for under natural gas combustion, this amount of energy is deducted from the industrial coal consumption statistics to avoid double counting. The exported CO₂ is not emitted to the atmosphere in the United States, and therefore the energy associated with the amount of CO₂ exported is subtracted from industrial other coal.

Step 4: Adjust Sectoral Allocation of Distillate Fuel Oil and Motor Gasoline

EPA conducted a separate bottom-up analysis of transportation fuel consumption based on data from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The FHWA data indicated that the amount of distillate and motor gasoline consumption allocated to the transportation sector in the EIA statistics should be adjusted. Therefore, for the estimates presented in the U.S. Inventory, the transportation sector’s distillate fuel and motor gasoline consumption was adjusted to match the value obtained from the bottom-up analysis. As the total distillate and motor gasoline consumption estimate from EIA are considered to be accurate at the national level, the distillate and motor gasoline consumption totals for the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors were adjusted proportionately.

Step 5: Subtract Consumption for Non-Energy Use

U.S. aggregate energy statistics include consumption of fossil fuels for non-energy purposes. Depending on the end-use, non-energy uses of fossil fuels can result in long term storage of some or all of the C contained in the fuel. For example, asphalt made from petroleum can sequester up to 100 percent of the C contained in the petroleum feedstock for extended periods of time. Other non-energy fossil fuel products, such as lubricants or plastics also store C, but can lose or emit some of this C when they are used and/or burned as waste. As the emission pathways of C used for non-energy purposes are vastly different than fuel combustion, these emissions are estimated separately in the Carbon Emitted in Products from Non-Energy Uses of Fossil Fuels section in this chapter. Therefore, the amount of fuels used for non-energy purposes, shown in Table A-39, was subtracted from total fuel consumption.

Step 6: Subtract Consumption of International Bunker Fuels

Emissions from international transport activities, or international bunker fuel consumption, are not included in national totals and instead reported separately, as required by the IPCC (2006) and UNFCCC (2014) inventory reporting guidelines. EIA energy statistics, however, include these bunker fuels—jet fuel for aircraft, and distillate fuel oil and residual fuel oil for marine shipping—as part of fuel consumption by the transportation end-use sector. Therefore, the amount of consumption for international bunker fuels was estimated and subtracted from total fuel consumption (see Table A-40). Emissions from international bunker fuels have been estimated separately and not included in national totals.⁶

Step 7: Determine the C Content of All Fuels

The C content of combusted fossil fuels was estimated by multiplying adjusted energy consumption (Columns 2 through 8 of Table A-11 through Table A-38) by fuel-specific C content coefficients (see Table A-41 and Table A-42) that reflect the amount of C per unit of energy in each fuel. The C content coefficients used in the Inventory were derived by EIA from detailed fuel information and are similar to the C content coefficients contained in the IPCC’s default methodology (IPCC 2006), with modifications reflecting fuel qualities specific to the United States.

Step 8: Estimate CO₂ Emissions

Actual CO₂ emissions in the United States were summarized by major fuel (i.e., coal, petroleum, natural gas, geothermal) and consuming sector (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, electric power, and U.S.

⁶ Refer to the International Bunker Fuels section of the Energy chapter and Annex 3.3 for a description of the methodology for distinguishing between international and domestic fuel consumption.

Territories). Emission estimates are expressed in million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MMT CO₂ Eq.). To convert from C content to CO₂ emissions, the fraction of C that is oxidized was applied. This fraction was 100 percent based on guidance in IPCC (2006).

To determine total emissions by final end-use sector, emissions from electric power were distributed to each end-use sector according to its share of aggregate electricity use (see Table A-43). This pro-rated approach to allocating emissions from electric power may overestimate or underestimate emissions for particular sectors due to differences in the average C content of fuel mixes burned to generate electricity.

To provide a more detailed accounting of emissions from transportation, fuel consumption data by vehicle type and transportation mode were used to allocate emissions by fuel type calculated for the transportation end-use sector. Additional information on the allocation is available in Annex 3.2.

Box 1. Uses of Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program Data in Reporting Emissions from Industrial Sector Fossil Fuel Combustion

As described in the calculation methodology, total fossil fuel consumption for each year is based on aggregated end-use sector consumption published by the EIA. The availability of facility-level combustion emissions through EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) has provided an opportunity to better characterize the industrial sector's energy consumption and emissions in the United States, through a disaggregation of EIA's industrial sector fuel consumption data from select industries.

For EPA's GHGRP 2010 through 2017 reporting years, facility-level fossil fuel combustion emissions reported through EPA's GHGRP were categorized and distributed to specific industry types by utilizing facility-reported NAICS codes (as published by the U.S. Census Bureau). As noted previously in this report, the definitions and provisions for reporting fuel types in EPA's GHGRP include some differences from the Inventory's use of EIA national fuel statistics to meet the UNFCCC reporting guidelines. The IPCC has provided guidance on aligning facility-level reported fuels and fuel types published in national energy statistics, which guided this exercise.⁷

As with previous Inventory reports, this year's effort represents an attempt to align, reconcile, and coordinate the facility-level reporting of fossil fuel combustion emissions under EPA's GHGRP with the national-level approach presented in this report. Consistent with recommendations for reporting the Inventory to the UNFCCC, progress was made on certain fuel types for specific industries and has been included in the Common Reporting Format (CRF) tables that are submitted to the UNFCCC along with this report.⁸ The efforts in reconciling fuels focus on standard, common fuel types (e.g., natural gas, distillate fuel oil) where the fuels in EIA's national statistics aligned well with facility-level GHGRP data. For these reasons, the current information presented in the CRF tables should be viewed as an initial attempt at this exercise. Additional efforts will be made for future Inventory reports to improve the mapping of fuel types, and examine ways to reconcile and coordinate any differences between facility-level data and national statistics.

This year's analysis includes the full time series presented in the CRF tables. Analyses were conducted linking GHGRP facility-level reporting with the information published by EIA in its MECS data in order to disaggregate the full 1990 through 2017 time series in the CRF tables. It is believed that the current analysis has led to improvements in the presentation of data in the Inventory, but further work will be conducted, and future improvements will be realized in subsequent Inventory reports. This includes incorporating the latest MECS data as it becomes available.

⁷ See Section 4 "Use of Facility-Level Data in Good Practice National Greenhouse Gas Inventories" of the IPCC meeting report, and specifically the section on using facility-level data in conjunction with energy data, available at: <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/tb/TFI_Technical_Bulletin_1.pdf>.

⁸ See <<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/usinventoryreport.html>>.

Table A-10: 2017 Energy Consumption Data by Fuel Type (TBtu) and Adjusted Energy Consumption Data

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Fuel Type	Total Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Adjustments (TBtu) ^b				Total Adjusted Consumption	
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Bunker Fuel	Unadjusted NEU Consumption				
									Ind.	Trans.	Terr.		
Total Coal	NE	20.7	712.3	NE	12,640.2	43.8	13,417.0		136.0				13,280.9
Residential Coal	NE						NE						NE
Commercial Coal		20.7					20.7						20.7
Industrial Other Coal			586.6				586.6	10.3					576.3
Transportation Coal				NE			NE						NE
Electric Power Coal					12,640.2		12,640.2						12,640.2
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						43.8	43.8						43.8
Natural Gas	4,567.8	3,275.6	9,501.5	799.4	9,530.0	57.0	27,731.4		331.5				27,399.9
Total Petroleum	835.2	840.2	8,355.9	26,046.0	214.2	549.0	36,840.4	1,616.9	4,629.2	142.3	77.3		30,374.8
Asphalt & Road Oil			849.2				849.2		849.2				
Aviation Gasoline				20.9			20.9						20.9
Distillate Fuel Oil	386.6	290.1	1,028.4	6,393.6	54.9	108.3	8,262.0	121.3	5.8				8,134.9
Jet Fuel				3,481.3	NA	45.6	3,527.0	1,050.2					2,476.7
Kerosene	8.1	1.2	1.3			2.3	13.0						13.0
LPG	440.4	153.7	2,625.9	9.9		15.4	3,245.3		2,333.6				911.7
Lubricants			124.6	142.3		1.0	267.9		124.6	142.3	1.0		
Motor Gasoline		389.8	272.5	15,339.9		173.2	16,175.4						16,175.4
Residual Fuel		4.9		657.9	65.7	127.0	855.5	445.3					410.2
Other Petroleum													
AvGas Blend Components			(0.2)				(0.2)						(0.2)
Crude Oil													
MoGas Blend Components													
Misc. Products			198.8			76.2	275.0		198.8			76.2	
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)			436.2				436.2		436.2				
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)			262.9				262.9		262.9				
Pentanes Plus			172.7				172.7		86.4				86.4
Petroleum Coke		0.5	613.7		93.6		707.8		57.4				650.4
Still Gas			1,582.8				1,582.8		163.8				1,419.0
Special Naphtha			100.3				100.3		100.3				
Unfinished Oils			76.4				76.4						76.4
Waxes			10.2				10.2		10.2				
Geothermal					54.5		54.5						54.5
Total (All Fuels)	5,403.0	4,136.4	18,569.7	26,845.5	22,438.9	649.8	78,043.3	1,616.9	5,096.8	142.3	77.3		71,110.1

NE (Not Estimated); NA (Not Available); Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

1 **Table A-11: 2017 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	20.7	576.3	NE	12,640.2	43.8	13,280.9	NE	2.0	55.1	NE	1,210.0	4.0	1,271.1	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		20.7					20.7		2.0					2.0	
Industrial Other Coal			576.3				576.3			55.1				55.1	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					12,640.2		12,640.2					1,210.0		1,210.0	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						43.8	43.8						4.0	4.0	
Natural Gas	4,567.8	3,275.6	9,170.0	799.4	9,530.0	57.0	27,399.9	242.1	173.6	486.0	42.4	505.1	3.0	1,452.3	
Total Petroleum	835.2	840.2	3,726.7	24,286.9	214.2	471.7	30,374.8	56.4	59.3	276.4	1,751.8	18.5	34.3	2,196.7	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				20.9			20.9				1.4			1.4	
Distillate Fuel Oil	386.6	290.1	1,022.6	6,272.3	54.9	108.3	8,134.9	28.6	21.5	75.6	463.9	4.1	8.0	601.6	
Jet Fuel				2,431.1	NA	45.6	2,476.7				175.6		3.3	178.9	
Kerosene	8.1	1.2	1.3			2.3	13.0	0.6	0.1	0.1			0.2	1.0	
LPG	440.4	153.7	292.3	9.9		15.4	911.7	27.2	9.5	18.0	0.6		0.9	56.3	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		389.8	272.5	15,339.9		173.2	16,175.4		27.8	19.4	1,094.3		12.4	1,153.9	
Residual Fuel		4.9		212.6	65.7	127.0	410.2		0.4		16.0	4.9	9.5	30.8	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.2)				(0.2)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			86.4				86.4			6.0				6.0	
Petroleum Coke		0.5	556.3		93.6		650.4	0.1	56.8			9.6		66.4	
Still Gas			1,419.0				1,419.0			94.7				94.7	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			76.4				76.4			5.7				5.7	
Waxes															
Geothermal					54.5		54.5					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,403.0	4,136.4	13,472.9	25,086.3	22,438.9	572.5	71,110.1	298.5	234.8	817.6	1,794.2	1,734.0	41.4	4,920.5	

2 NE (Not Estimated)

3 NA (Not Available)

4 ^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

6 ^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

7 Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-12: 2016 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	23.7	620.2	NE	12,996.4	43.8	13,684.1	NE	2.3	59.3	NE	1,243.3	4.0	1,308.9	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		23.7					23.7		2.3					2.3	
Industrial Other Coal			620.2				620.2			59.3				59.3	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					12,996.4		12,996.4					1,243.3		1,243.3	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						43.8	43.8						4.0	4.0	
Natural Gas	4,505.8	3,223.5	8,974.7	757.2	10,301.3	57.0	27,819.6	238.8	170.9	475.7	40.1	546.0	3.0	1,474.5	
Total Petroleum	808.1	841.4	3,683.1	24,111.3	243.9	471.7	30,159.5	54.5	59.3	273.6	1,739.0	21.4	34.3	2,182.1	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				20.5			20.5				1.4			1.4	
Distillate Fuel Oil	365.1	273.9	965.1	6,257.1	54.9	108.3	8,024.4	27.0	20.3	71.4	462.8	4.1	8.0	593.5	
Jet Fuel				2,298.8	NA	45.6	2,344.4				166.0		3.3	169.3	
Kerosene	13.7	2.1	2.3			2.3	20.3	1.0	0.2	0.2			0.2	1.5	
LPG	429.3	149.8	333.9	9.7		15.4	938.1	26.5	9.2	20.6	0.6		0.9	57.9	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		410.8	287.2	15,352.9		173.2	16,224.1		29.3	20.5	1,095.3		12.4	1,157.4	
Residual Fuel		4.4		172.4	70.7	127.0	374.5		0.3		12.9	5.3	9.5	28.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.3)				(0.3)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			56.1				56.1			3.9				3.9	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	591.6		118.3		710.2	0.0	60.4			12.1		72.5	
Still Gas			1,438.6				1,438.6			96.0				96.0	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			8.6				8.6			0.6				0.6	
Waxes															
Geothermal					54.0		54.0					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,314.0	4,088.6	13,278.0	24,868.5	23,595.6	572.5	71,717.2	293.3	232.4	808.5	1,779.1	1,811.2	41.4	4,966.0	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-13: 2015 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBTu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	31.1	695.6	NE	14,138.3	43.8	14,908.8	NE	3.0	66.4	NE	1,352.8	4.0	1,426.2	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		31.1					31.1		3.0					3.0	
Industrial Other Coal			695.6				695.6			66.4				66.4	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					14,138.3		14,138.3					1,352.8		1,352.8	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						43.8	43.8						4.0	4.0	
Natural Gas	4,776.9	3,315.6	8,778.7	744.8	9,926.5	57.0	27,599.6	253.2	175.7	465.3	39.5	526.1	3.0	1,462.8	
Total Petroleum	954.0	947.9	3,722.9	23,496.9	276.0	471.8	29,869.5	65.1	67.1	277.1	1,694.6	23.7	34.3	2,161.8	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				21.1			21.1				1.5			1.5	
Distillate Fuel Oil	498.7	325.7	1,051.1	6,229.4	70.4	108.3	8,283.5	36.9	24.1	77.7	460.7	5.2	8.0	612.6	
Jet Fuel				2,181.9	NA	45.6	2,227.5				157.6		3.3	160.9	
Kerosene	10.1	1.4	1.7			2.3	15.5	0.7	0.1	0.1			0.2	1.1	
LPG	445.1	147.8	353.0	9.4		15.4	970.7	27.5	9.1	21.8	0.6		0.9	59.9	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		468.6	321.4	14,998.5		173.3	15,961.7		33.4	22.9	1,070.0		12.4	1,138.7	
Residual Fuel		4.0		56.6	93.9	127.0	281.4		0.3		4.2	7.0	9.5	21.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.3)				(0.3)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			80.2				80.2			5.6				5.6	
Petroleum Coke		0.5	600.8		111.7		713.0	0.1	61.3			11.4		72.8	
Still Gas			1,332.9				1,332.9			88.9				88.9	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(17.8)				(17.8)			(1.3)				(1.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					54.3		54.3					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,730.9	4,294.6	13,197.3	24,241.7	24,395.0	572.6	72,432.1	318.3	245.8	808.8	1,734.0	1,903.0	41.4	5,051.2	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-14: 2014 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBTu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	40.2	799.0	NE	16,427.4	43.8	17,310.4	NE	3.8	76.1	NE	1,570.2	4.0	1,654.1	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		40.2					40.2		3.8					3.8	
Industrial Other Coal			799.0				799.0			76.1				76.1	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					16,427.4		16,427.4					1,570.2		1,570.2	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						43.8	43.8						4.0	4.0	
Natural Gas	5,242.5	3,571.9	8,818.1	759.7	8,361.7	56.8	26,810.6	277.9	189.3	467.4	40.3	443.2	3.0	1,421.0	
Total Petroleum	1,016.3	567.1	3,701.6	23,318.6	295.5	471.9	29,370.9	69.2	39.9	276.5	1,681.3	25.3	34.3	2,126.5	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				21.7			21.7				1.5			1.5	
Distillate Fuel Oil	513.6	343.6	1,308.3	6,053.1	82.2	108.3	8,409.1	38.0	25.4	96.8	447.7	6.1	8.0	621.9	
Jet Fuel				2,054.3	NA	45.6	2,099.9				148.4		3.3	151.7	
Kerosene	13.7	2.0	2.8			2.3	20.9	1.0	0.1	0.2			0.2	1.5	
LPG	488.9	160.3	276.8	9.2		15.4	950.5	30.2	9.9	17.1	0.6		0.9	58.7	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		52.7	205.6	15,103.0		173.3	15,534.7		3.8	14.7	1,077.4		12.4	1,108.2	
Residual Fuel		7.9		77.4	95.1	127.0	307.4		0.6		5.8	7.1	9.5	23.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.1)				(0.1)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			44.2				44.2			3.1				3.1	
Petroleum Coke		0.5	592.1		118.2		710.8		0.1	60.5		12.1		72.6	
Still Gas			1,352.4				1,352.4			90.2				90.2	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(80.6)				(80.6)			(6.0)				(6.0)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					54.2		54.2					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,258.8	4,179.2	13,318.6	24,078.3	25,138.7	572.4	73,546.0	347.0	233.0	819.9	1,721.6	2,039.1	41.4	5,202.0	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-15: 2013 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	41.4	800.0	NE	16,450.6	30.8	17,322.8	NE	3.9	76.1	NE	1,572.8	2.8	1,655.7	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		41.4					41.4		3.9					3.9	
Industrial Other Coal			800.0				800.0			76.1				76.1	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					16,450.6		16,450.6					1,572.8		1,572.8	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						30.8	30.8						2.8	2.8	
Natural Gas	5,022.9	3,379.8	8,525.6	887.3	8,376.3	56.6	26,248.5	266.2	179.1	451.9	47.0	444.0	3.0	1,391.2	
Total Petroleum	928.3	588.8	4,212.8	22,678.4	255.2	503.6	29,167.0	63.0	41.5	311.9	1,635.6	22.4	36.6	2,111.0	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				22.4			22.4				1.5			1.5	
Distillate Fuel Oil	457.2	319.6	1,169.8	5,866.3	55.4	115.5	7,983.8	33.8	23.6	86.5	433.9	4.1	8.5	590.5	
Jet Fuel				2,036.9	NA	48.7	2,085.6				147.1		3.5	150.6	
Kerosene	8.3	1.0	1.5			2.5	13.2	0.6	0.1	0.1			0.2	1.0	
LPG	462.9	151.4	400.6	9.4		16.4	1,040.6	28.6	9.3	24.7	0.6		1.0	64.2	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		92.1	606.2	14,542.0		185.0	15,425.3		6.6	43.2	1,037.4		13.2	1,100.4	
Residual Fuel		24.4		201.4	77.2	135.5	438.5		1.8		15.1	5.8	10.2	32.9	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.4)				(0.4)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			47.1				47.1			3.3				3.3	
Petroleum Coke		0.4	600.9		122.5		723.7		0.0	61.4		12.5		73.9	
Still Gas			1,370.6				1,370.6			91.4				91.4	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			16.7				16.7			1.2				1.2	
Waxes															
Geothermal					53.8		53.8					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,951.2	4,010.0	13,538.4	23,565.6	25,135.8	590.9	72,792.1	329.2	224.6	839.9	1,682.7	2,039.6	42.5	5,158.4	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values

Table A-16: 2012 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	43.6	782.3	NE	15,821.2	36.9	16,684.0	NE	4.1	74.5	NE	1,513.0	3.4	1,594.9	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		43.6					43.6		4.1					4.1	
Industrial Other Coal			782.3				782.3			74.5				74.5	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					15,821.2		15,821.2					1,513.0		1,513.0	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	4,242.1	2,959.5	8,204.2	779.8	9,286.8	49.2	25,521.5	224.8	156.9	434.8	41.3	492.2	2.6	1,352.7	
Total Petroleum	840.2	556.5	4,026.9	22,535.3	214.2	517.0	28,690.2	57.3	39.4	300.7	1,625.2	18.3	37.5	2,078.3	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				25.1			25.1				1.7			1.7	
Distillate Fuel Oil	437.5	322.1	1,144.7	5,780.1	52.4	99.1	7,836.0	32.4	23.8	84.7	427.5	3.9	7.3	579.5	
Jet Fuel				1,985.2	NA	57.4	2,042.5				143.4		4.1	147.5	
Kerosene	7.7	1.2	2.0			2.3	13.3	0.6	0.1	0.1			0.2	1.0	
LPG	395.0	135.3	376.5	10.4		18.5	935.8	24.4	8.4	23.2	0.6		1.1	57.7	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		66.1	432.2	14,523.3		207.4	15,229.1		4.7	30.8	1,036.1		14.8	1,086.4	
Residual Fuel		31.4		211.1	76.7	132.3	451.5		2.4		15.8	5.8	9.9	33.9	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.0)				(0.0)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			42.2				42.2			3.0				3.0	
Petroleum Coke		0.4	649.1		85.1		734.6		0.0	66.3		8.7		75.0	
Still Gas			1,320.2				1,320.2			88.1				88.1	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			60.1				60.1			4.5				4.5	
Waxes															
Geothermal					53.1		53.1					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,082.3	3,559.6	13,013.4	23,315.0	25,375.3	603.1	70,948.8	282.1	200.4	809.9	1,666.5	2,023.9	43.5	5,026.4	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-17: 2011 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBTu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	61.7	866.1	NE	18,035.2	36.9	18,999.9	NE	5.8	82.2	NE	1,723.5	3.4	1,815.0	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		61.7					61.7		5.8					5.8	
Industrial Other Coal			866.1				866.1			82.2				82.2	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					18,035.2		18,035.2					1,723.5		1,723.5	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	4,804.6	3,216.1	7,875.5	733.5	7,712.2	27.1	24,369.0	254.7	170.5	417.4	38.9	408.8	1.4	1,291.6	
Total Petroleum	1,045.3	678.9	4,026.2	22,714.7	295.0	496.7	29,256.8	71.3	48.3	300.7	1,638.3	25.8	36.0	2,120.4	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				27.1			27.1				1.9			1.9	
Distillate Fuel Oil	534.8	400.5	1,255.8	5,814.5	63.7	97.2	8,166.4	39.6	29.6	92.9	430.0	4.7	7.2	604.0	
Jet Fuel				2,029.9	NA	51.4	2,081.3				146.6		3.7	150.3	
Kerosene	18.5	3.2	3.6			1.2	26.5	1.4	0.2	0.3			0.1	1.9	
LPG	492.0	142.3	256.8	9.7		18.8	919.6	30.4	8.8	15.8	0.6		1.2	56.7	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		79.0	455.9	14,575.5		203.2	15,313.6		5.6	32.5	1,039.8		14.5	1,092.5	
Residual Fuel		53.7	46.9	258.0	93.1	124.9	576.6		4.0	3.5	19.4	7.0	9.4	43.3	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			0.0				0.0			0.0				0.0	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			27.3				27.3			1.9				1.9	
Petroleum Coke		0.2	600.3		138.3		738.8		0.0	61.3		14.1		75.4	
Still Gas			1,323.4				1,323.4			88.3				88.3	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			56.1				56.1			4.2				4.2	
Waxes															
Geothermal					52.3		52.3					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,849.9	3,956.7	12,767.8	23,448.2	26,094.7	560.7	72,677.9	325.9	224.6	800.4	1,677.2	2,158.5	40.9	5,227.4	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Table A-18: 2010 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	69.7	951.6	NE	19,133.5	36.9	20,191.6	NE	6.6	90.3	NE	1,828.2	3.4	1,928.4	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		69.7					69.7		6.6					6.6	
Industrial Other Coal			951.6				951.6			90.3				90.3	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					19,133.5		19,133.5					1,828.2		1,828.2	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	4,878.1	3,164.7	7,685.0	719.0	7,527.6	27.8	24,002.2	258.6	167.7	407.3	38.1	399.0	1.5	1,272.2	
Total Petroleum	1,115.2	706.5	4,037.5	23,010.7	370.3	515.5	29,755.6	76.0	50.3	302.2	1,659.2	31.4	37.5	2,156.6	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				27.0			27.0				1.9			1.9	
Distillate Fuel Oil	557.0	388.0	1,134.4	5,706.1	79.7	87.7	7,952.8	41.2	28.7	83.9	422.0	5.9	6.5	588.2	
Jet Fuel				2,097.5	NA	60.3	2,157.7				151.5		4.4	155.8	
Kerosene	29.1	4.8	7.3			7.4	48.7	2.1	0.4	0.5			0.5	3.6	
LPG	529.1	139.8	241.3	9.1		16.0	935.4	32.7	8.6	14.9	0.6		1.0	57.7	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		111.8	559.7	14,898.8		176.0	15,746.3		8.0	39.9	1,062.9		12.6	1,123.3	
Residual Fuel		61.7	32.2	272.2	154.1	168.1	688.2		4.6	2.4	20.4	11.6	12.6	51.7	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.2)				(0.2)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			77.7				77.7			5.4				5.4	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	633.0		136.6		770.0		0.0	64.6		13.9		78.6	
Still Gas			1,324.0				1,324.0			88.3				88.3	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			28.0				28.0			2.1				2.1	
Waxes															
Geothermal					51.9		51.9					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,993.3	3,940.8	12,674.1	23,729.6	27,083.3	580.1	74,001.3	334.5	224.6	799.7	1,697.3	2,259.0	42.4	5,357.6	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-19: 2009 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	73.4	877.3	NE	18,225.3	36.9	19,212.8	NE	6.9	83.2	NE	1,741.1	3.4	1,834.6	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		73.4					73.4		6.9					6.9	
Industrial Other Coal			877.3				877.3			83.2				83.2	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					18,225.3		18,225.3					1,741.1		1,741.1	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	4,883.1	3,186.6	7,126.0	714.9	7,022.4	27.4	22,960.3	258.8	168.9	377.7	37.9	372.2	1.5	1,217.0	
Total Petroleum	1,138.2	735.6	3,857.1	22,890.1	382.4	525.2	29,528.6	77.5	52.4	288.9	1,649.6	32.2	38.2	2,138.8	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				26.6			26.6				1.8			1.8	
Distillate Fuel Oil	563.4	382.4	1,018.1	5,488.2	69.6	80.6	7,602.3	41.7	28.3	75.3	405.9	5.1	6.0	562.2	
Jet Fuel				2,134.2	NA	61.1	2,195.3				154.1		4.4	158.5	
Kerosene	27.7	4.2	4.4			7.9	44.2	2.0	0.3	0.3			0.6	3.2	
LPG	547.1	138.9	201.7	28.0		14.9	930.6	33.8	8.6	12.4	1.7		0.9	57.4	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		138.6	635.4	15,027.3		196.3	15,997.5		9.9	45.3	1,072.0		14.0	1,141.2	
Residual Fuel		71.3	67.3	185.7	181.0	164.4	669.7		5.4	5.1	13.9	13.6	12.3	50.3	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.8)				(0.8)			(0.1)				(0.1)	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			63.8				63.8			4.5				4.5	
Petroleum Coke		0.2	624.0		131.8		756.1		0.0	63.7		13.5		77.2	
Still Gas			1,321.1				1,321.1			88.1				88.1	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(77.8)				(77.8)			(5.8)				(5.8)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					51.2		51.2					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,021.3	3,995.6	11,860.4	23,604.9	25,681.3	589.5	71,752.9	336.3	228.2	749.8	1,687.5	2,145.8	43.1	5,190.7	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-20: 2008 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	NE	80.8	1,081.5	NE	20,513.0	36.9	21,712.0	NE	7.6	102.4	NE	1,959.4	3.4	2,072.8	
Residential Coal	NE						NE	NE						NE	
Commercial Coal		80.8					80.8		7.6					7.6	
Industrial Other Coal			1,081.5				1,081.5			102.4				102.4	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,513.0		20,513.0					1,959.4		1,959.4	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	5,010.1	3,228.4	7,571.8	692.1	6,828.9	29.3	23,360.6	265.5	171.1	401.3	36.7	361.9	1.6	1,238.2	
Total Petroleum	1,201.5	693.3	4,312.6	23,899.8	459.3	487.5	31,054.0	82.1	49.1	321.9	1,723.5	38.4	35.7	2,250.6	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				28.3			28.3				2.0			2.0	
Distillate Fuel Oil	627.5	321.3	1,103.1	6,058.8	72.5	107.9	8,291.1	46.4	23.8	81.6	448.1	5.4	8.0	613.2	
Jet Fuel				2,396.1	NA	34.4	2,430.4				173.0		2.5	175.5	
Kerosene	21.3	4.4	3.8			5.8	35.3	1.6	0.3	0.3			0.4	2.6	
LPG	552.7	158.0	226.7	40.1		15.7	993.3	34.1	9.7	14.0	2.5		1.0	61.3	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		138.3	755.9	15,105.3		133.2	16,132.6		9.9	53.9	1,077.6		9.5	1,150.9	
Residual Fuel		71.0	131.5	271.3	240.4	190.6	904.8		5.3	9.9	20.4	18.1	14.3	67.9	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			0.1				0.1			0.0				0.0	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			76.5				76.5			5.4				5.4	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	645.7		146.4		792.3		0.0	65.9		14.9		80.9	
Still Gas			1,423.0				1,423.0			94.9				94.9	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(53.7)				(53.7)			(4.0)				(4.0)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					50.6		50.6					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,211.6	4,002.5	12,965.8	24,592.0	27,851.8	553.6	76,177.3	347.6	227.8	825.6	1,760.2	2,360.1	40.6	5,561.9	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-21: 2007 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (Tbtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	7.8	70.0	1,130.8	NE	20,807.7	36.9	22,053.2	0.7	6.7	107.0	NE	1,987.3	3.4	2,105.1	
Residential Coal	7.8						7.8	0.7						0.7	
Commercial Coal		70.0					70.0		6.7					6.7	
Industrial Other Coal			1,130.8				1,130.8			107.0				107.0	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,807.7		20,807.7					1,987.3		1,987.3	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	4,835.4	3,085.1	7,521.8	663.5	7,005.2	26.7	23,137.6	256.3	163.5	398.7	35.2	371.3	1.4	1,226.3	
Total Petroleum	1,219.9	744.8	4,910.3	25,142.0	647.8	576.5	33,241.5	84.3	53.3	365.6	1,819.7	52.9	42.2	2,418.0	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				31.6			31.6				2.2			2.2	
Distillate Fuel Oil	692.4	366.1	1,177.0	6,393.6	88.7	144.5	8,862.2	51.2	27.1	87.0	472.9	6.6	10.7	655.4	
Jet Fuel				2,485.0	NA	73.9	2,558.9				179.5		5.3	184.8	
Kerosene	43.9	9.2	13.4			5.6	72.1	3.2	0.7	1.0			0.4	5.3	
LPG	483.7	121.4	379.1	21.9		11.7	1,017.8	29.8	7.5	23.4	1.4		0.7	62.8	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		172.4	862.8	15,823.8		155.3	17,014.3		12.4	61.9	1,134.8		11.1	1,220.2	
Residual Fuel		75.4	130.4	386.1	396.6	185.5	1,174.0		5.7	9.8	29.0	29.8	13.9	88.2	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			1.8				1.8			0.1				0.1	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			89.7				89.7			6.3				6.3	
Petroleum Coke		0.4	708.4		162.6		871.3		0.0	72.3		16.6		89.0	
Still Gas			1,482.6				1,482.6			98.9				98.9	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			65.2				65.2			4.8				4.8	
Waxes															
Geothermal					49.9		49.9					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,063.2	3,899.9	13,562.9	25,805.5	28,510.7	640.1	78,482.3	341.3	223.5	871.3	1,854.9	2,411.9	47.0	5,749.9	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Table A-22: 2006 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	6.4	64.8	1,188.8	NE	20,461.9	36.9	21,758.7	0.6	6.2	112.6	NE	1,953.7	3.4	2,076.6	
Residential Coal	6.4						6.4	0.6						0.6	
Commercial Coal		64.8					64.8		6.2					6.2	
Industrial Other Coal			1,188.8				1,188.8			112.6				112.6	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,461.9		20,461.9					1,953.7		1,953.7	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						36.9	36.9						3.4	3.4	
Natural Gas	4,475.9	2,901.7	7,323.2	625.0	6,375.1	26.14	21,727.0	237.3	153.8	388.2	33.1	338.0	1.4	1,151.8	
Total Petroleum	1,202.3	723.2	5,062.1	25,232.6	637.0	615.4	33,472.6	83.4	51.7	376.9	1,819.6	53.2	45.1	2,430.0	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				33.4			33.4				2.3			2.3	
Distillate Fuel Oil	690.4	389.0	1,194.7	6,334.2	73.4	87.4	8,769.1	51.1	28.8	88.4	468.5	5.4	6.5	648.5	
Jet Fuel				2,523.8	NA	75.8	2,599.6				182.3		5.5	187.8	
Kerosene	66.4	15.2	29.6			4.3	115.4	4.9	1.1	2.2			0.3	8.5	
LPG	445.5	123.2	369.7	27.5		6.6	972.5	27.5	7.6	22.8	1.7		0.4	60.0	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		120.3	930.3	16,007.4		186.7	17,244.8		8.6	66.4	1,141.9		13.3	1,230.1	
Residual Fuel		75.3	176.4	306.3	360.5	254.4	1,172.9		5.7	13.2	23.0	27.1	19.1	88.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			0.6				0.6			0.0				0.0	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			70.1				70.1			4.9				4.9	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	724.3		203.0		927.6		0.0	74.0		20.7		94.7	
Still Gas			1,496.1				1,496.1			99.8				99.8	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			70.3				70.3			5.2				5.2	
Waxes															
Geothermal					49.7		49.7					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,684.6	3,689.7	13,574.0	25,857.6	27,523.7	678.4	77,008.0	321.3	211.8	877.8	1,852.7	2,345.3	49.9	5,658.8	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Table A-23: 2005 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	8.4	97.0	1,219.1	NE	20,737.2	32.7	22,094.5	0.8	9.3	115.3	NE	1,983.8	3.0	2,112.3	
Residential Coal	8.4						8.4	0.8						0.8	
Commercial Coal		97.0					97.0		9.3					9.3	
Industrial Other Coal			1,219.1				1,219.1			115.3				115.3	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,737.2		20,737.2					1,983.8		1,983.8	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						32.7	32.7						3.0	3.0	
Natural Gas	4,946.4	3,073.2	7,329.7	623.9	6,014.5	24.3	22,012.0	262.2	162.9	388.5	33.1	318.8	1.3	1,166.7	
Total Petroleum	1,368.3	761.5	4,684.9	25,376.1	1,222.1	619.7	34,032.5	94.9	54.6	349.5	1,823.9	97.9	45.4	2,466.2	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				35.4			35.4				2.4			2.4	
Distillate Fuel Oil	771.6	404.2	1,127.5	6,186.2	114.5	115.3	8,719.4	57.1	29.9	83.4	457.5	8.5	8.5	644.9	
Jet Fuel				2,621.7	NA	68.5	2,690.2				189.3		5.0	194.3	
Kerosene	83.8	21.6	39.1			5.6	150.1	6.1	1.6	2.9			0.4	11.0	
LPG	512.9	131.4	349.6	28.2		0.7	1,022.8	31.7	8.1	21.6	1.7		0.0	63.1	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		88.1	686.1	16,248.2		190.9	17,213.3		6.3	48.7	1,153.6		13.6	1,222.1	
Residual Fuel		115.8	237.4	256.4	876.5	238.6	1,724.7		8.7	17.8	19.3	65.8	17.9	129.5	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			8.3				8.3			0.6				0.6	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			98.1				98.1			6.9				6.9	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	706.6		231.1		938.0		0.0	72.1		23.6		95.8	
Still Gas			1,429.4				1,429.4			95.4				95.4	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			2.8				2.8			0.2				0.2	
Waxes															
Geothermal					50.1		50.1					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,323.1	3,931.7	13,233.7	26,000.0	28,024.0	676.7	78,189.2	357.8	226.7	853.4	1,857.0	2,400.9	49.7	5,745.5	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Table A-24: 2004 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	11.4	102.9	1,262.0	NE	20,305.0	32.0	21,713.4	1.1	9.8	118.3	NE	1,943.1	2.9	2,075.1	
Residential Coal	11.4						11.4	1.1						1.1	
Commercial Coal		102.9					102.9		9.8					9.8	
Industrial Other Coal			1,262.0				1,262.0			118.3				118.3	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,305.0		20,305.0					1,943.1		1,943.1	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						32.0	32.0						2.9	2.9	
Natural Gas	4,980.8	3,201.0	7,913.5	602.0	5,594.9	24.6	22,316.9	264.1	169.7	419.6	31.9	296.7	1.3	1,183.4	
Total Petroleum	1,467.8	807.8	4,559.2	25,111.5	1,201.0	651.5	33,798.8	102.2	57.8	340.2	1,805.2	95.8	47.8	2,449.0	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				31.2			31.2				2.2			2.2	
Distillate Fuel Oil	871.3	443.6	1,130.6	5,910.4	111.2	131.7	8,598.8	64.4	32.8	83.6	437.1	8.2	9.7	635.9	
Jet Fuel				2,584.8	NA	68.5	2,653.4				186.7		5.0	191.6	
Kerosene	84.8	20.5	28.2			6.0	139.5	6.2	1.5	2.1			0.4	10.2	
LPG	511.7	152.0	372.7	19.1		0.7	1,056.3	31.6	9.4	23.0	1.2		0.0	65.2	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		69.0	574.3	16,379.5		198.1	17,220.9		4.9	40.8	1,164.1		14.1	1,223.9	
Residual Fuel		122.5	204.7	186.4	879.0	246.4	1,639.0		9.2	15.4	14.0	66.0	18.5	123.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			10.6				10.6			0.7				0.7	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			111.2				111.2			7.8				7.8	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	719.1		210.8		930.1		0.0	73.4		21.5		95.0	
Still Gas			1,483.3				1,483.3			99.0				99.0	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(75.6)				(75.6)			(5.6)				(5.6)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					50.5		50.5					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,460.1	4,111.7	13,734.8	25,713.4	27,151.5	708.1	77,879.5	367.4	237.3	878.0	1,837.1	2,335.9	52.0	5,707.9	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-25: 2003 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	12.2	82.0	1,248.8	NE	20,184.7	33.9	21,561.7	1.2	7.8	117.0	NE	1,931.0	3.1	2,060.1	
Residential Coal	12.2						12.2	1.2						1.2	
Commercial Coal		82.0					82.0		7.8					7.8	
Industrial Other Coal			1,248.8				1,248.8			117.0				117.0	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,184.7		20,184.7					1,931.0		1,931.0	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						33.9	33.9						3.1	3.1	
Natural Gas	5,209.4	3,260.9	7,845.1	627.4	5,246.2	26.9	22,216.0	275.9	172.7	415.4	33.2	277.8	1.4	1,176.4	
Total Petroleum	1,468.3	827.0	4,296.5	24,499.7	1,204.8	617.7	32,914.0	101.9	59.1	321.2	1,759.3	95.0	45.0	2,381.5	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				30.2			30.2				2.1			2.1	
Distillate Fuel Oil	853.5	454.2	1,058.2	5,704.9	160.8	118.1	8,349.6	63.1	33.6	78.3	421.9	11.9	8.7	617.5	
Jet Fuel				2,482.5	NA	76.0	2,558.5				179.3		5.5	184.8	
Kerosene	70.3	18.6	24.1			10.7	123.7	5.1	1.4	1.8			0.8	9.1	
LPG	544.5	156.9	326.8	17.9		10.5	1,056.6	33.7	9.7	20.2	1.1		0.7	65.3	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		85.9	464.3	16,165.1		207.7	16,923.0		6.1	33.0	1,147.4		14.7	1,201.2	
Residual Fuel		111.1	176.4	99.1	869.4	194.7	1,450.8		8.3	13.2	7.4	65.3	14.6	108.9	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			7.5				7.5			0.5				0.5	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			110.4				110.4			7.7				7.7	
Petroleum Coke		0.3	701.9		174.7		876.8		0.0	71.7		17.8		89.5	
Still Gas			1,477.3				1,477.3			98.6				98.6	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(50.4)				(50.4)			(3.7)				(3.7)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					49.2		49.2					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,689.9	4,169.9	13,390.4	25,127.1	26,685.0	678.5	76,740.8	378.9	239.6	853.6	1,792.5	2,304.2	49.6	5,618.3	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-26: 2002 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	12.2	89.8	1,243.7	NE	19,782.8	10.8	21,139.3	1.2	8.6	116.6	NE	1,889.9	1.0	2,017.2	
Residential Coal	12.2						12.2	1.2						1.2	
Commercial Coal		89.8					89.8		8.6					8.6	
Industrial Other Coal			1,243.7				1,243.7			116.6				116.6	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					19,782.8		19,782.8					1,889.9		1,889.9	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.8	10.8						1.0	1.0	
Natural Gas	4,995.0	3,212.5	8,086.3	698.9	5,766.8	22.8	22,782.3	264.7	170.3	428.6	37.0	305.7	1.2	1,207.5	
Total Petroleum	1,360.9	697.8	4,139.4	24,528.1	961.2	551.6	32,238.9	94.1	49.8	309.1	1,762.8	76.8	40.2	2,332.7	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				33.7			33.7				2.3			2.3	
Distillate Fuel Oil	763.8	394.5	1,051.2	5,590.0	127.3	91.3	8,018.1	56.5	29.2	77.7	413.4	9.4	6.8	593.0	
Jet Fuel				2,565.5	NA	61.7	2,627.2				185.3		4.5	189.7	
Kerosene	59.9	15.9	13.8			8.0	97.7	4.4	1.2	1.0			0.6	7.2	
LPG	537.1	140.8	393.3	14.3		11.1	1,096.6	33.2	8.7	24.3	0.9		0.7	67.8	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		66.5	455.5	16,096.7		187.2	16,806.0		4.7	32.4	1,143.7		13.3	1,194.1	
Residual Fuel		79.8	146.1	227.9	658.7	192.2	1,304.7		6.0	11.0	17.1	49.5	14.4	98.0	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			7.5				7.5			0.5				0.5	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			111.9				111.9			7.8				7.8	
Petroleum Coke		0.2	696.3		175.2		871.7		0.0	71.1		17.9		89.0	
Still Gas			1,399.4				1,399.4			93.4				93.4	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(135.7)				(135.7)			(10.1)				(10.1)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					49.4		49.4					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,368.1	4,000.1	13,469.4	25,227.0	26,560.2	585.2	76,210.0	360.0	228.6	854.3	1,799.8	2,272.7	42.4	5,557.8	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-27: 2001 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	12.0	96.9	1,358.4	NE	19,613.7	3.8	21,084.8	1.1	9.2	127.8	NE	1,869.8	0.4	2,008.4	
Residential Coal	12.0						12.0	1.1						1.1	
Commercial Coal		96.9					96.9		9.2					9.2	
Industrial Other Coal			1,358.4				1,358.4			127.8				127.8	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					19,613.7		19,613.7					1,869.8		1,869.8	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						3.8	3.8						0.4	0.4	
Natural Gas	4,889.0	3,097.3	7,949.0	658.0	5,458.1	22.9	22,074.3	259.1	164.2	421.3	34.9	289.3	1.2	1,170.0	
Total Petroleum	1,464.9	765.0	4,271.3	24,016.5	1,276.4	628.2	32,422.4	101.9	54.8	318.8	1,723.5	98.4	45.9	2,343.3	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				34.9			34.9				2.4			2.4	
Distillate Fuel Oil	844.1	472.4	1,184.5	5,411.3	170.3	106.8	8,189.5	62.4	34.9	87.6	400.2	12.6	7.9	605.7	
Jet Fuel				2,626.3	NA	98.2	2,724.5				189.7		7.1	196.8	
Kerosene	95.1	31.4	23.2			0.8	150.5	7.0	2.3	1.7			0.1	11.0	
LPG	525.7	142.7	372.1	13.7		7.0	1,061.2	32.5	8.8	23.0	0.8		0.4	65.6	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		48.5	382.0	15,770.8		186.0	16,387.2		3.4	27.1	1,118.4		13.2	1,162.1	
Residual Fuel		69.9	146.7	159.5	1,002.8	229.4	1,608.2		5.2	11.0	12.0	75.3	17.2	120.8	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			6.1				6.1			0.4				0.4	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			131.6				131.6			9.2				9.2	
Petroleum Coke		0.2	683.3		103.2		786.7		0.0	69.8		10.5		80.3	
Still Gas			1,417.3				1,417.3			94.6				94.6	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(75.4)				(75.4)			(5.6)				(5.6)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					46.9		46.9					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,365.9	3,959.2	13,578.8	24,674.6	26,395.0	654.9	75,628.3	362.2	228.2	867.9	1,758.4	2,257.9	47.5	5,522.0	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-28: 2000 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	11.4	91.9	1,348.8	NE	20,220.2	10.3	21,682.4	1.1	8.8	127.3	NE	1,927.4	0.9	2,065.5	
Residential Coal	11.4						11.4	1.1						1.1	
Commercial Coal		91.9					91.9		8.8					8.8	
Industrial Other Coal			1,348.8				1,348.8			127.3				127.3	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					20,220.2		20,220.2					1,927.4		1,927.4	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.3	10.3						0.9	0.9	
Natural Gas	5,104.6	3,251.5	8,656.0	672.0	5,293.4	12.7	22,990.2	270.7	172.5	459.1	35.6	280.8	0.7	1,219.4	
Total Petroleum	1,429.5	770.0	3,830.6	24,291.6	1,144.1	467.2	31,932.9	99.0	55.0	285.6	1,743.7	88.4	33.9	2,305.6	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				36.3			36.3				2.5			2.5	
Distillate Fuel Oil	780.0	423.3	1,006.4	5,436.7	174.7	68.5	7,889.5	57.7	31.3	74.4	402.1	12.9	5.1	583.5	
Jet Fuel				2,700.3	NA	73.9	2,774.2				195.0		5.3	200.4	
Kerosene	94.6	29.7	15.6			2.3	142.1	6.9	2.2	1.1			0.2	10.4	
LPG	554.9	150.4	468.7	11.9		8.0	1,193.9	34.4	9.3	29.0	0.7		0.5	74.0	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		74.9	252.7	15,663.0		183.1	16,173.7		5.3	17.9	1,110.1		13.0	1,146.3	
Residual Fuel		91.6	184.1	443.5	870.8	131.3	1,721.3		6.9	13.8	33.3	65.4	9.9	129.3	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			3.8				3.8			0.3				0.3	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			171.6				171.6			12.0				12.0	
Petroleum Coke		0.2	697.6		98.6		796.4		0.0	71.2		10.1		81.3	
Still Gas			1,431.2				1,431.2			95.5				95.5	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(401.2)				(401.2)			(29.7)				(29.7)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					48.1		48.1					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,545.4	4,113.4	13,835.3	24,963.6	26,705.8	490.1	76,653.6	370.8	236.2	872.0	1,779.4	2,296.9	35.5	5,590.8	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-29: 1999 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	14.0	102.5	1,372.8	NE	19,279.5	10.2	20,778.9	1.3	9.8	129.9	NE	1,836.4	0.9	1,978.3	
Residential Coal	14.0						14.0	1.3						1.3	
Commercial Coal		102.5					102.5		9.8					9.8	
Industrial Other Coal			1,372.8				1,372.8			129.9				129.9	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					19,279.5		19,279.5					1,836.4		1,836.4	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.2	10.2						0.9	0.9	
Natural Gas	4,834.9	3,115.0	8,424.6	675.3	4,902.1		21,952.0	256.3	165.1	446.6	35.8	259.9		1,163.8	
Total Petroleum	1,344.0	643.1	3,730.9	23,850.0	1,211.2	454.5	31,233.7	92.9	45.8	280.1	1,710.2	93.8	33.0	2,256.0	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				39.2			39.2				2.7			2.7	
Distillate Fuel Oil	706.9	374.4	986.1	5,245.8	140.0	93.2	7,546.3	52.3	27.7	72.9	388.0	10.4	6.9	558.1	
Jet Fuel				2,664.8	NA	62.8	2,727.6				192.5		4.5	197.0	
Kerosene	111.2	26.9	12.8			3.5	154.5	8.1	2.0	0.9			0.3	11.3	
LPG	526.0	140.2	395.9	14.3		9.2	1,085.5	32.5	8.7	24.5	0.9		0.6	67.1	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		28.2	150.3	15,710.2		161.7	16,050.4		2.0	10.7	1,113.0		11.5	1,137.1	
Residual Fuel		73.3	150.9	175.7	958.7	124.2	1,482.9		5.5	11.3	13.2	72.0	9.3	111.4	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			6.4				6.4			0.4				0.4	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			182.5				182.5			12.8				12.8	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	719.8		112.5		832.4		0.0	73.5		11.5		85.0	
Still Gas			1,414.1				1,414.1			94.3				94.3	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(287.9)				(287.9)			(21.3)				(21.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					50.6		50.6					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,192.9	3,860.6	13,528.3	24,525.3	25,443.4	464.7	74,015.3	350.6	220.7	856.6	1,746.0	2,190.5	34.0	5,398.4	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-30: 1998 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	11.5	93.4	1,470.8	NE	19,215.7	10.5	20,802.0	1.1	8.9	139.1	NE	1,828.2	1.0	1,978.3	
Residential Coal	11.5						11.5	1.1						1.1	
Commercial Coal		93.4					93.4		8.9					8.9	
Industrial Other Coal			1,470.8				1,470.8			139.1				139.1	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					19,215.7		19,215.7					1,828.2		1,828.2	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.5	10.5						1.0	1.0	
Natural Gas	4,646.1	3,083.0	8,826.0	666.1	4,674.9		21,896.1	246.0	163.3	467.4	35.3	247.6		1,159.5	
Total Petroleum	1,209.0	668.7	3,773.4	22,890.6	1,306.1	442.4	30,290.3	84.1	47.9	283.9	1,643.3	101.3	32.2	2,192.8	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				35.5			35.5				2.5			2.5	
Distillate Fuel Oil	676.8	376.0	1,030.5	4,949.9	135.6	70.6	7,239.5	50.1	27.8	76.2	366.1	10.0	5.2	535.4	
Jet Fuel				2,608.0	NA	58.8	2,666.8				188.4		4.2	192.6	
Kerosene	108.3	31.2	22.1			6.0	167.5	7.9	2.3	1.6			0.4	12.3	
LPG	423.9	117.6	271.6	17.6		5.9	836.7	26.1	7.2	16.7	1.1		0.4	51.6	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		58.6	300.1	15,200.7		161.0	15,720.4		4.2	21.3	1,079.4		11.4	1,116.3	
Residual Fuel		85.2	173.3	78.9	1,047.0	140.1	1,524.4		6.4	13.0	5.9	78.6	10.5	114.5	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			4.0				4.0			0.3				0.3	
Crude Oil															
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			147.0				147.0			10.3				10.3	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	707.7		123.6		831.4		0.0	72.3		12.6		84.9	
Still Gas			1,431.0				1,431.0			95.5				95.5	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(313.9)				(313.9)			(23.3)				(23.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					50.4		50.4					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	5,866.6	3,845.1	14,070.2	23,556.7	25,247.1	453.0	73,038.8	331.2	220.1	890.4	1,678.6	2,177.4	33.2	5,330.9	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-31: 1997 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	16.0	129.4	1,457.6	NE	18,904.5	10.4	20,518.0	1.5	12.3	137.6	NE	1,797.0	1.0	1,949.5	
Residential Coal	16.0						16.0	1.5						1.5	
Commercial Coal		129.4					129.4		12.3					12.3	
Industrial Other Coal			1,457.6				1,457.6			137.6				137.6	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					18,904.5		18,904.5					1,797.0		1,797.0	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.4	10.4						1.0	1.0	
Natural Gas	5,092.9	3,285.3	9,032.5	780.3	4,125.5		22,316.6	270.1	174.2	479.0	41.4	218.8		1,183.4	
Total Petroleum	1,335.0	714.5	4,188.9	22,319.8	926.7	439.9	29,924.7	93.1	51.3	310.8	1,601.9	72.2	32.0	2,161.4	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				39.7			39.7				2.7			2.7	
Distillate Fuel Oil	787.3	399.6	1,059.3	4,797.9	110.5	79.1	7,233.8	58.2	29.6	78.3	354.8	8.2	5.9	535.0	
Jet Fuel				2,553.8	NA	61.3	2,615.1				184.4		4.4	188.9	
Kerosene	92.9	24.6	18.8			3.9	140.3	6.8	1.8	1.4			0.3	10.3	
LPG	454.8	120.2	429.9	14.2		6.5	1,025.7	28.1	7.4	26.5	0.9		0.4	63.3	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		58.6	290.6	14,777.7		158.7	15,285.6		4.2	20.6	1,048.8		11.3	1,084.8	
Residual Fuel		111.2	240.1	136.5	714.6	130.2	1,332.7		8.4	18.0	10.3	53.7	9.8	100.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			9.1				9.1			0.6				0.6	
Crude Oil			4.6				4.6			0.3				0.3	
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			164.5				164.5			11.5				11.5	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	639.9		101.6		741.6		0.0	65.3		10.4		75.7	
Still Gas			1,435.0				1,435.0			95.7				95.7	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(102.9)				(102.9)			(7.6)				(7.6)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					50.2		50.2					0.4		0.4	
Total (All Fuels)	6,443.9	4,129.2	14,679.0	23,100.1	24,007.0	450.3	72,809.5	364.7	237.8	927.5	1,643.3	2,088.4	33.0	5,294.6	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-32: 1996 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	16.6	121.6	1,454.9	NE	18,429.0	10.3	20,032.4	1.6	11.6	137.4	NE	1,752.4	1.0	1,903.9	
Residential Coal	16.6						16.6	1.6						1.6	
Commercial Coal		121.6					121.6		11.6					11.6	
Industrial Other Coal			1,454.9				1,454.9			137.4				137.4	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					18,429.0		18,429.0					1,752.4		1,752.4	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.3	10.3						1.0	1.0	
Natural Gas	5,354.4	3,226.3	9,020.3	736.9	3,862.4		22,200.4	283.9	171.1	478.3	39.1	204.8		1,177.2	
Total Petroleum	1,398.0	761.5	4,234.4	22,123.6	817.3	428.1	29,762.9	97.6	54.8	314.4	1,588.1	63.4	31.1	2,149.4	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				37.4			37.4				2.6			2.6	
Distillate Fuel Oil	840.5	438.3	1,050.9	4,594.9	109.3	73.4	7,107.4	62.2	32.4	77.7	339.8	8.1	5.4	525.6	
Jet Fuel				2,556.0	NA	77.2	2,633.2				184.6		5.6	190.2	
Kerosene	88.8	21.0	18.3			2.9	131.0	6.5	1.5	1.3			0.2	9.6	
LPG	468.7	122.4	401.7	15.6		7.5	1,015.9	28.9	7.5	24.8	1.0		0.5	62.6	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		42.5	320.0	14,604.8		150.0	15,117.2		3.0	22.7	1,036.5		10.6	1,072.8	
Residual Fuel		137.2	284.7	314.9	628.4	117.1	1,482.3		10.3	21.4	23.6	47.2	8.8	111.3	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			7.0				7.0			0.5				0.5	
Crude Oil			13.7				13.7			1.0				1.0	
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			177.5				177.5			12.4				12.4	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	638.6		79.6		718.3		0.0	65.2		8.1		73.3	
Still Gas			1,434.9				1,434.9			95.7				95.7	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(112.8)				(112.8)			(8.4)				(8.4)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					48.9		48.9					0.4		0.4	
Total Coal	6,769.0	4,109.5	14,709.6	22,860.5	23,157.6	438.4	72,044.6	383.1	237.5	930.1	1,627.1	2,021.0	32.1	5,230.9	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

1

Table A-33: 1995 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	17.5	116.8	1,526.9	NE	17,466.3	10.2	19,137.7	1.7	11.2	144.4	NE	1,660.7	0.9	1,819.0	
Residential Coal	17.5						17.5	1.7						1.7	
Commercial Coal		116.8					116.8		11.2					11.2	
Industrial Other Coal			1,526.9				1,526.9			144.4				144.4	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					17,466.3		17,466.3					1,660.7		1,660.7	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.2	10.2						0.9	0.9	
Natural Gas	4,954.2	3,096.0	8,722.5	724.0	4,302.0		21,798.6	262.7	164.2	462.5	38.4	228.1		1,155.9	
Total Petroleum	1,262.3	726.0	3,885.9	21,525.9	754.5	458.8	28,613.4	88.5	52.4	287.9	1,542.1	58.7	33.3	2,062.9	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				39.6			39.6				2.7			2.7	
Distillate Fuel Oil	793.2	419.8	969.7	4,379.4	108.0	86.8	6,756.8	58.7	31.0	71.7	323.9	8.0	6.4	499.7	
Jet Fuel				2,428.8	NA	76.0	2,504.8				172.2		5.4	177.6	
Kerosene	74.3	22.1	15.4			3.5	115.4	5.4	1.6	1.1			0.3	8.4	
LPG	394.8	108.7	403.4	17.7		5.6	930.3	24.4	6.7	24.9	1.1		0.3	57.4	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		33.8	373.2	14,273.1		146.9	14,827.0		2.4	26.5	1,013.1		10.4	1,052.4	
Residual Fuel		141.5	286.2	387.3	566.0	139.8	1,520.8		10.6	21.5	29.1	42.5	10.5	114.2	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			5.3				5.3			0.4				0.4	
Crude Oil			14.5				14.5			1.1				1.1	
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			169.0				169.0			11.8				11.8	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	600.7		80.6		681.4		0.0	61.3		8.2		69.6	
Still Gas			1,369.5				1,369.5			91.4				91.4	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(320.9)				(320.9)			(23.8)				(23.8)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					45.6		45.6					0.3		0.3	
Total Coal	6,233.9	3,938.8	14,135.4	22,249.8	22,568.4	469.0	69,595.3	352.8	227.8	894.9	1,580.5	1,947.9	34.3	5,038.1	

2 NE (Not Estimated)

3 NA (Not Available)

4 ^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).5 ^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

6 Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

7

8

Table A-34: 1994 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (Tbtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	20.8	118.1	1,594.9	NE	17,260.9	10.0	19,004.7	2.0	11.3	150.7	NE	1,638.8	0.9	1,803.7	
Residential Coal	20.8						20.8	2.0						2.0	
Commercial Coal		118.1					118.1		11.3					11.3	
Industrial Other Coal			1,594.9				1,594.9			150.7				150.7	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					17,260.9		17,260.9					1,638.8		1,638.8	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						10.0	10.0						0.9	0.9	
Natural Gas	4,959.8	2,962.0	8,290.3	708.5	3,977.3		20,897.9	262.9	157.0	439.4	37.6	210.8		1,107.6	
Total Petroleum	1,306.7	779.1	3,947.1	21,167.0	1,058.7	504.9	28,763.6	91.9	56.4	292.3	1,516.2	81.2	36.8	2,074.9	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				38.1			38.1				2.6			2.6	
Distillate Fuel Oil	858.1	447.9	977.4	4,183.3	120.0	117.0	6,703.6	63.5	33.1	72.3	309.4	8.9	8.7	495.8	
Jet Fuel				2,473.8	NA	65.9	2,539.6				175.5		4.7	180.2	
Kerosene	64.9	19.5	16.9			2.9	104.2	4.8	1.4	1.2			0.2	7.6	
LPG	383.7	107.3	423.1	34.0		7.2	955.2	23.7	6.6	26.1	2.1		0.4	59.0	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline			32.4	14,079.8		146.6	14,506.4		2.3	17.6	999.7		10.4	1,030.0	
Residual Fuel		171.9	368.4	358.1	869.0	165.3	1,932.8		12.9	27.7	26.9	65.3	12.4	145.1	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			6.1				6.1			0.4				0.4	
Crude Oil			18.7				18.7			1.4				1.4	
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			169.4				169.4			11.9				11.9	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	594.9		69.7		664.7		0.0	60.7		7.1		67.9	
Still Gas			1,404.0				1,404.0			93.7				93.7	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(279.2)				(279.2)			(20.7)				(20.7)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					53.0		53.0					0.4		0.4	
Total Coal	6,287.4	3,859.2	13,832.3	21,875.6	22,349.9	514.9	68,719.2	356.8	224.7	882.4	1,553.7	1,931.2	37.7	4,986.6	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-35: 1993 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBtu) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	25.7	117.3	1,585.0	NE	17,195.9	9.6	18,933.5	2.5	11.3	149.8	NE	1,632.5	0.9	1,796.9	
Residential Coal	25.7						25.7	2.5						2.5	
Commercial Coal		117.3					117.3		11.3					11.3	
Industrial Other Coal			1,585.0				1,585.0			149.8				149.8	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					17,195.9		17,195.9					1,632.5		1,632.5	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						9.6	9.6						0.9	0.9	
Natural Gas	5,058.4	2,920.4	8,263.7	644.1	3,537.5		20,424.1	268.2	154.8	438.1	34.1	187.5		1,082.8	
Total Petroleum	1,348.5	784.6	3,838.6	20,534.2	1,123.8	456.1	28,085.6	94.9	56.8	285.2	1,474.6	86.4	33.3	2,031.2	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				38.4			38.4				2.7			2.7	
Distillate Fuel Oil	883.3	447.2	989.9	3,889.4	86.5	103.0	6,399.2	65.3	33.1	73.2	287.6	6.4	7.6	473.3	
Jet Fuel				2,368.4	NA	61.3	2,429.7				168.2		4.4	172.6	
Kerosene	75.6	14.0	13.1			3.7	106.4	5.5	1.0	1.0			0.3	7.8	
LPG	389.6	109.2	412.2	20.2		4.9	936.2	24.0	6.7	25.4	1.2		0.3	57.8	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		41.2	249.9	13,850.2		126.9	14,268.3		2.9	17.8	987.2		9.0	1,017.0	
Residual Fuel		172.7	382.9	367.5	958.6	156.2	2,038.0		13.0	28.8	27.6	72.0	11.7	153.0	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			0.1				0.1			0.0				0.0	
Crude Oil			21.2				21.2			1.6				1.6	
MoGas Blend Components															
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			166.1				166.1			11.6				11.6	
Petroleum Coke		0.2	614.6		78.6		693.4		0.0	62.8		8.0		70.8	
Still Gas			1,384.6				1,384.6			92.4				92.4	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(396.0)				(396.0)			(29.3)				(29.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					57.3		57.3					0.4		0.4	
Total Coal	6,432.6	3,822.3	13,687.3	21,178.3	21,914.5	465.6	67,500.5	365.5	222.8	873.0	1,508.7	1,906.9	34.2	4,911.2	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-36: 1992 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	25.6	116.6	1,554.6	NE	16,465.6	8.8	18,171.1	2.5	11.3	147.4	NE	1,569.6	0.8	1,731.6	
Residential Coal	25.6						25.6	2.5						2.5	
Commercial Coal		116.6					116.6		11.3					11.3	
Industrial Other Coal			1,554.6				1,554.6			147.4				147.4	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					16,465.6		16,465.6					1,569.6		1,569.6	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						8.8	8.8						0.8	0.8	
Natural Gas	4,804.6	2,871.2	8,125.3	608.1	3,511.5		19,920.7	254.5	152.1	430.5	32.2	186.0		1,055.4	
Total Petroleum	1,365.8	866.6	3,948.8	20,094.1	990.7	443.0	27,708.9	96.5	62.8	293.1	1,445.5	75.5	32.3	2,005.7	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				41.1			41.1				2.8			2.8	
Distillate Fuel Oil	931.4	481.7	1,028.5	3,665.7	73.5	89.6	6,270.4	68.9	35.6	76.1	271.1	5.4	6.6	463.7	
Jet Fuel				2,343.8	NA	60.7	2,404.5				166.6		4.3	170.9	
Kerosene	65.0	11.1	9.8			3.1	89.1	4.8	0.8	0.7			0.2	6.5	
LPG	369.4	106.9	441.8	19.4		11.8	949.4	22.8	6.6	27.3	1.2		0.7	58.7	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		77.7	189.6	13,624.0		121.5	14,012.6		5.6	13.5	973.7		8.7	1,001.5	
Residual Fuel		189.1	323.9	400.1	872.2	156.4	1,941.7		14.2	24.3	30.0	65.5	11.7	145.8	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			0.2				0.2			0.0				0.0	
Crude Oil			27.4				27.4			2.0				2.0	
MoGas Blend Components			75.7				75.7			5.4				5.4	
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			161.3				161.3			11.3				11.3	
Petroleum Coke		0.1	627.2		45.0		672.2		0.0	64.0		4.6		68.6	
Still Gas			1,418.4				1,418.4			94.6				94.6	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(354.8)				(354.8)			(26.3)				(26.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					55.1		55.1					0.4		0.4	
Total Coal	6,196.0	3,854.3	13,628.6	20,702.2	21,022.9	451.9	65,855.8	353.5	226.2	871.0	1,477.8	1,831.5	33.1	4,793.1	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-37: 1991 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Fuel Type	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	25.4	115.5	1,602.7	NE	16,249.7	7.7	18,001.0	2.4	11.1	152.1	NE	1,548.2	0.7	1,714.6	
Residential Coal	25.4						25.4	2.4						2.4	
Commercial Coal		115.5					115.5		11.1					11.1	
Industrial Other Coal			1,602.7				1,602.7			152.1				152.1	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					16,249.7		16,249.7					1,548.2		1,548.2	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						7.7	7.7						0.7	0.7	
Natural Gas	4,667.2	2,795.4	7,827.8	620.3	3,377.4		19,288.1	247.3	148.1	414.7	32.9	178.9		1,021.8	
Total Petroleum	1,381.5	989.5	3,675.8	19,363.1	1,198.3	422.4	27,030.5	97.5	71.7	273.1	1,389.6	90.7	30.7	1,953.3	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				41.7			41.7				2.9			2.9	
Distillate Fuel Oil	931.0	517.7	1,050.8	3,449.7	83.6	69.6	6,102.4	68.9	38.3	77.7	255.1	6.2	5.1	451.3	
Jet Fuel				2,373.6	NA	76.8	2,450.4				168.8		5.5	174.3	
Kerosene	72.3	12.1	11.4			2.7	98.5	5.3	0.9	0.8			0.2	7.2	
LPG	378.1	108.2	342.2	21.1		13.8	863.5	23.3	6.7	21.1	1.3		0.8	53.3	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		139.6	317.2	13,252.6		123.6	13,833.0		9.9	22.6	944.6		8.8	986.0	
Residual Fuel		211.9	270.9	224.4	1,085.3	135.9	1,928.5		15.9	20.3	16.9	81.5	10.2	144.8	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			(0.1)				(0.1)			(0.0)				(0.0)	
Crude Oil			38.9				38.9			2.9				2.9	
MoGas Blend Components			(25.9)				(25.9)			(1.8)				(1.8)	
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			147.0				147.0			10.3				10.3	
Petroleum Coke			587.6		29.3		616.9			60.0		3.0		63.0	
Still Gas			1,385.9				1,385.9			92.5				92.5	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(450.2)				(450.2)			(33.3)				(33.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					54.5		54.5					0.4		0.4	
Total Coal	6,074.0	3,900.4	13,106.3	19,983.4	20,879.8	430.1	64,374.1	347.2	230.9	839.9	1,422.5	1,818.2	31.4	4,690.1	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-38: 1990 Energy Consumption Data and CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Fuel Type

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Adjusted Consumption (TBTU) ^a							Emissions ^b (MMT CO ₂ Eq.) from Energy Use							
Fuel Type	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	Res.	Comm.	Ind.	Trans.	Elec.	Terr.	Total	
Total Coal	31.1	124.5	1,640.4	NE	16,261.0	7.0	18,064.0	3.0	12.0	155.3	NE	1,547.6	0.6	1,718.4	
Residential Coal	31.1						31.1	3.0						3.0	
Commercial Coal		124.5					124.5		12.0					12.0	
Industrial Other Coal			1,640.4				1,640.4			155.3				155.3	
Transportation Coal				NE			NE				NE			NE	
Electric Power Coal					16,261.0		16,261.0					1,547.6		1,547.6	
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)						7.0	7.0						0.6	0.6	
Natural Gas	4,486.6	2,679.6	7,708.2	679.2	3,308.5		18,862.1	237.7	142.0	408.5	36.0	175.3		999.5	
Total Petroleum	1,375.2	999.2	3,960.0	19,977.1	1,289.4	370.3	27,971.3	97.4	72.6	293.7	1,433.1	97.5	26.9	2,021.2	
Asphalt & Road Oil															
Aviation Gasoline				45.0			45.0				3.1			3.1	
Distillate Fuel Oil	959.2	525.4	1,098.5	3,554.8	96.5	70.8	6,305.2	70.9	38.9	81.2	262.9	7.1	5.2	466.3	
Jet Fuel				2,590.1	NA	59.6	2,649.7				184.2		4.2	188.5	
Kerosene	63.9	11.8	12.3			2.5	90.5	4.7	0.9	0.9			0.2	6.6	
LPG	352.1	102.3	380.2	22.9		14.5	872.0	21.8	6.3	23.5	1.4		0.9	53.9	
Lubricants															
Motor Gasoline		129.8	216.2	13,464.1		100.7	13,910.8		9.2	15.4	958.9		7.2	990.7	
Residual Fuel		229.8	364.1	300.3	1,162.6	122.2	2,179.0		17.3	27.3	22.6	87.3	9.2	163.6	
Other Petroleum															
AvGas Blend Components			0.2				0.2			0.0				0.0	
Crude Oil			50.9				50.9			3.8				3.8	
MoGas Blend Components			53.7				53.7			3.8				3.8	
Misc. Products															
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)															
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)															
Pentanes Plus			125.2				125.2			8.8				8.8	
Petroleum Coke			591.2		30.4		621.5			60.4		3.1		63.5	
Still Gas			1,436.5				1,436.5			95.8				95.8	
Special Naphtha															
Unfinished Oils			(369.0)				(369.0)			(27.3)				(27.3)	
Waxes															
Geothermal					52.7		52.7					0.4		0.4	
Total Coal	5,892.9	3,803.2	13,308.6	20,656.4	20,911.6	377.4	64,950.0	338.1	226.5	857.4	1,469.1	1,820.8	27.6	4,739.5	

NE (Not Estimated)

NA (Not Available)

^a Expressed as gross calorific values (i.e., higher heating values). Adjustments include biofuels, conversion of fossil fuels, non-energy use (see Table A-39), and international bunker fuel consumption (see Table A-40).

^b Consumption and/or emissions of select fuels are shown as negative due to differences in EIA energy balancing accounting. These are designated with parentheses.

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-39: Unadjusted Non-Energy Fuel Consumption (TBTu)

Sector/Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Industry	4,544.0	5,089.7	5,263.7	5,425.7	5,342.9	5,847.2	5,483.3	5,470.0	5,224.8	4,769.2	4,509.3	4,737.6	4,648.5	4,597.9	4,810.1	4,731.1	4,921.6	4,903.9	5,097.7
Industrial Coking Coal	0.0	37.8	24.8	40.3	51.9	167.8	80.4	62.9	2.3	29.2	6.4	64.8	60.8	132.5	119.3	48.8	121.8	89.2	125.7
Industrial Other Coal	8.2	11.3	11.3	12.0	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3
Natural Gas to Chemical Plants, Other Uses	305.9	371.0	391.8	380.7	345.3	306.6	270.4	233.4	233.1	233.1	232.7	310.0	309.7	310.6	311.5	330.6	332.2	332.5	331.5
Asphalt & Road Oil	1,170.2	1,178.2	1,256.9	1,240.0	1,219.5	1,303.8	1,323.2	1,261.2	1,197.0	1,012.0	873.1	877.8	859.5	826.7	783.3	792.6	831.7	853.4	849.2
LPG	1,201.4	1,586.9	1,642.3	1,766.3	1,701.6	1,768.5	1,659.5	1,734.6	1,726.7	1,596.6	1,748.0	1,901.6	1,943.4	1,990.5	2,149.0	2,148.7	2,215.1	2,254.0	2,333.6
Lubricants	186.3	177.8	174.0	171.9	159.0	161.0	160.2	156.1	161.2	149.6	134.5	135.9	127.4	118.3	125.1	130.7	142.1	135.1	124.6
Pentanes Plus	125.2	169.0	131.6	111.9	110.4	111.2	98.1	70.1	89.7	76.5	63.8	77.7	27.3	42.2	47.1	44.2	80.2	56.1	86.4
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)	347.8	373.0	493.7	582.6	613.0	749.4	698.7	628.9	562.5	477.2	471.9	490.6	487.3	453.9	517.8	442.6	428.1	420.0	436.2
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)	753.9	801.0	662.5	632.1	699.4	779.5	708.0	790.6	744.1	647.8	424.8	452.5	388.5	287.2	223.9	247.2	229.0	222.5	262.9
Still Gas	36.7	47.9	49.3	61.7	59.0	62.9	67.7	57.2	44.2	47.3	133.9	147.8	163.6	160.6	166.7	164.5	162.2	166.1	163.8
Petroleum Coke	123.1	120.6	174.3	145.8	122.8	217.7	186.9	213.6	201.2	224.5	180.7	61.0	62.4	67.6	62.4	61.4	62.5	61.1	57.4
Special Naphtha	107.1	70.8	78.5	102.4	80.5	51.0	62.5	70.1	78.0	84.9	46.2	26.1	22.6	14.7	100.0	106.1	99.3	93.6	100.3
Other (Wax/Misc.)																			
Distillate Fuel Oil	7.0	6.8	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	17.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8
Waxes	33.3	40.6	36.3	32.2	31.0	30.8	31.4	26.1	21.9	19.1	12.2	17.1	15.1	15.3	16.5	14.8	12.4	12.8	10.2
Miscellaneous Products	137.8	97.1	124.9	134.2	126.0	113.4	112.8	136.0	133.5	142.0	151.8	158.7	164.7	161.6	171.2	182.7	188.9	191.3	198.8
Transportation	176.0	167.9	164.3	162.4	150.1	152.1	151.3	147.4	152.2	141.3	127.1	154.8	148.4	135.4	143.4	149.4	162.8	154.4	142.3
Lubricants	176.0	167.9	164.3	162.4	150.1	152.1	151.3	147.4	152.2	141.3	127.1	154.8	148.4	135.4	143.4	149.4	162.8	154.4	142.3
U.S. Territories	85.6	90.8	83.2	140.8	123.5	111.0	123.2	133.5	71.8	132.3	60.4	60.1	75.6	72.0	82.4	77.3	77.3	77.3	77.3
Lubricants	0.7	2.0	2.5	3.0	4.9	5.1	4.6	6.2	5.9	2.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other Petroleum (Misc. Prod.)	84.9	88.8	80.7	137.8	118.6	105.9	118.6	127.3	65.9	129.6	59.3	59.0	74.6	71.0	81.4	76.2	76.2	76.2	76.2
Total	4,805.6	5,348.4	5,511.3	5,728.9	5,616.5	6,110.3	5,757.9	5,750.9	5,448.8	5,042.8	4,696.7	4,952.4	4,872.5	4,805.4	5,035.8	4,957.7	5,161.7	5,135.5	5,316.3

Note: These values are unadjusted non-energy fuel use provided by EIA. They have not yet been adjusted to remove petroleum feedstock exports and processes accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter.

Table A-40: International Bunker Fuel Consumption (TBTu)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Marine Residual Fuel Oil	715.7	523.2	426.0	448.9	471.8	553.1	581.0	599.4	607.5	654.6	604.8	619.8	518.4	459.5	379.8	369.2	406.8	450.7	445.3
Marine Distillate Fuel Oil & Other	158.0	125.7	72.4	82.6	103.9	143.6	126.9	119.3	111.3	122.2	111.0	128.2	107.4	91.7	75.4	82.0	113.5	117.5	121.3
Aviation Jet Fuel	539.4	703.4	799.7	774.8	783.0	797.7	853.1	855.6	872.7	796.8	749.1	865.4	919.9	916.3	931.6	987.8	1,022.3	1,051.1	1,050.2
Total	1,413.1	1,352.3	1,298.1	1,306.3	1,358.7	1,494.4	1,561.0	1,574.2	1,591.5	1,573.6	1,464.9	1,613.4	1,545.7	1,467.4	1,386.9	1,439.0	1,542.6	1,619.3	1,616.9

Note: Further information on the calculation of international bunker fuel consumption of aviation jet fuel is provided in Annex 3.3 Methodology for Estimating Emissions from Commercial Aircraft Jet Fuel Consumption.

1 **Table A-41: Key Assumptions for Estimating CO₂ Emissions**

Fuel Type	C Content Coefficient (MMT C/QBtu)
Coal	
Residential Coal	(See footnote b)
Commercial Coal	(See footnote b)
Industrial Coking Coal	31.00
Industrial Other Coal	(See footnote b)
Electric Power Coal	(See footnote b)
U.S. Territory Coal (bit)	25.14
Natural Gas	
Pipeline Natural Gas	(See footnote b)
Petroleum	
Asphalt & Road Oil	20.55
Aviation Gasoline	18.86
Distillate Fuel Oil No. 1	19.98
Distillate Fuel Oil No. 2 ^a	20.17
Distillate Fuel Oil No. 4	20.47
Jet Fuel	(See footnote b)
Kerosene	19.96
LPG (energy use)	(See footnote b)
LPG (non-energy use)	(See footnote b)
Lubricants	20.20
Motor Gasoline	(See footnote b)
Residual Fuel Oil No. 5	19.89
Residual Fuel Oil No. 6 ^a	20.48
Other Petroleum	
AvGas Blend Components	18.87
Crude Oil	(See footnote b)
MoGas Blend Components	(See footnote b)
Misc. Products	(See footnote b)
Misc. Products (Territories)	20.00
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)	18.55
Other Oil (>401 deg. F)	20.17
Pentanes Plus	19.10
Petroleum Coke	27.85
Still Gas	18.20
Special Naphtha	19.74
Unfinished Oils	(See footnote b)
Waxes	19.80
Geothermal	2.05

^a Distillate fuel oil No. 2 and residual fuel oil No. 6 are used in the CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion calculations, and other oil types are presented for informational purposes only. An additional discussion on the derivation of these carbon content coefficients is presented in Annex 2.2.

^b These coefficients vary annually due to fluctuations in fuel quality (see Table A-42).

Sources: C coefficients from EIA (2009) and EPA (2010).

Table A-42: Annually Variable C Content Coefficients by Year (MMT C/QBtu)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Residential Coal	26.20	26.13	26.00	25.98	26.04	25.91	26.09	26.29	25.94	25.71 ^a	25.74 ^a	25.76 ^a	25.83 ^a	25.91 ^a	25.94 ^a	25.91 ^a	26.01 ^a	26.04 ^a	26.12 ^a
Commercial Coal	26.20	26.13	26.00	25.98	26.04	25.91	26.09	26.29	25.94	25.71	25.74	25.76	25.83	25.91	25.94	25.91	26.01	26.04	26.12
Industrial Other Coal	25.82	25.80	25.66	25.57	25.55	25.56	25.80	25.84	25.82	25.82	25.87	25.87	25.90	25.96	25.95	25.97	26.02	26.06	26.09
Electric Power Coal	25.96	25.93	26.00	26.05	26.09	26.10	26.09	26.04	26.05	26.05	26.05	26.06	26.06	26.08	26.08	26.07	26.10	26.09	26.11
Pipeline Natural Gas	14.45	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.44	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46
LPG (energy use)	16.86	16.82	16.87	16.85	16.86	16.84	16.84	16.83	16.82	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83
LPG (non-energy use)	17.06	17.09	17.10	17.09	17.09	17.07	17.06	17.06	17.05	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06
Motor Gasoline	19.42	19.36	19.34	19.38	19.36	19.38	19.36	19.45	19.56	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46
Jet Fuel	19.40	19.34	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70
MoGas Blend Components	19.42	19.36	19.34	19.38	19.36	19.38	19.36	19.45	19.56	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46
Misc. Products	20.15	20.21	20.27	20.28	20.25	20.31	20.31	20.28	20.28	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31
Unfinished Oils	20.15	20.21	20.27	20.28	20.25	20.31	20.31	20.28	20.28	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31
Crude Oil	20.15	20.21	20.27	20.28	20.25	20.31	20.31	20.28	20.28	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31

^a EIA discontinued collection of residential sector coal consumption data in 2008, because consumption of coal in the residential sector is extremely limited. Therefore, the number cited here is developed from commercial/institutional consumption.
Source: EPA (2010a).

Table A-43: Electricity Consumption by End-Use Sector (Billion Kilowatt-Hours)

End-Use Sector	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Residential	924	1,043	1,202	1,265	1,276	1,292	1,359	1,352	1,392	1,381	1,365	1,446	1,423	1,374	1,394	1,407	1,403	1,410	1,377
Commercial	838	953	1,191	1,205	1,199	1,230	1,275	1,300	1,336	1,336	1,307	1,330	1,328	1,327	1,337	1,352	1,361	1,367	1,349
Industrial	1,070	1,163	1,159	1,156	1,181	1,186	1,169	1,158	1,154	1,142	1,044	1,103	1,124	1,123	1,129	1,136	1,128	1,117	1,084
Transportation ^a	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	7	8
Total	2,837	3,164	3,557	3,632	3,662	3,716	3,811	3,817	3,890	3,866	3,724	3,887	3,883	3,832	3,868	3,902	3,899	3,901	3,818

^a Includes electricity used for electric vehicle charging in the residential and commercial sectors.
Note: Does not include the U.S. Territories.
Source: EIA (2018).

Table A-44: Electric Power Generation by Fuel Type (Percent)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Coal	54.5%	53.2%	52.9%	52.0%	52.8%	51.7%	51.4%	50.8%	50.3%	49.9%	46.1%	46.4%	43.9%	38.9%	40.5%	40.2%	34.6%	31.7%	31.4%
Natural Gas	10.7%	13.2%	15.6%	16.5%	15.4%	16.6%	17.6%	18.9%	20.5%	20.3%	22.3%	22.9%	23.6%	29.4%	26.6%	26.5%	31.9%	33.0%	30.8%
Nuclear	20.0%	21.2%	21.6%	21.2%	20.7%	20.8%	20.2%	20.3%	20.3%	20.4%	21.1%	20.5%	20.2%	19.9%	20.4%	20.4%	20.5%	20.8%	21.1%
Renewables	10.7%	10.2%	6.6%	7.8%	8.1%	7.8%	7.7%	8.5%	7.4%	8.2%	9.6%	9.4%	11.6%	11.3%	11.8%	12.1%	12.3%	14.0%	16.2%
Petroleum	4.1%	2.2%	3.3%	2.4%	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%
<i>Total Electricity Generation (Billion kWh)</i>	<i>2,886</i>	<i>3,169</i>	<i>3,561</i>	<i>3,674</i>	<i>3,695</i>	<i>3,782</i>	<i>3,874</i>	<i>3,879</i>	<i>3,976</i>	<i>3,944</i>	<i>3,778</i>	<i>3,940</i>	<i>3,917</i>	<i>3,857</i>	<i>3,867</i>	<i>3,900</i>	<i>3,881</i>	<i>3,882</i>	<i>3,821</i>

Source: EIA (2018).

References

- Browning, L. (2018). Updated Methodology for Estimating Electricity Use from Highway Plug-In Electric Vehicles. Technical Memo, October 2018.
- EIA (2018) *Monthly Energy Review*. October 2018, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0035(2018/10)
- EIA (2009) Manufacturing Consumption of Energy 2006. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, DC. Released July, 2009.
- EPA (2010) Carbon Content Coefficients Developed for EPA's Mandatory Reporting Rule. Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Atmospheric Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- UNFCCC (2014) Report of the Conference of the Parties on its nineteenth session, held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013. (FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.3). January 31, 2014. Available online at: <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf#page=2>>.

2.2. Methodology for Estimating the Carbon Content of Fossil Fuels

This sub-annex presents the background and methodology for estimating the carbon (C) content of fossil fuels combusted in the United States. The C content of a particular fossil fuel represents the maximum potential emissions to the atmosphere if all C in the fuel is oxidized during combustion. The C content coefficients used in this report were developed using methods first outlined in the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) *Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States: 1987-1992* (1994) and were developed primarily by EIA. EPA has updated many of the C content coefficients based on carbon dioxide (CO₂) emission factors developed for the Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule, signed in September 2009 (EPA 2009b; 2010). This sub-annex presents a time-series analysis of changes in U.S. C content coefficients for coal, petroleum products, and natural gas. A summary of C content coefficients used in this report appears in Table A-45.

Though the methods for estimating C contents for coal, natural gas, and petroleum products differ in their details, they each follow the same basic approach. First, because C coefficients are presented in terms of mass per unit energy (i.e., million metric tons C per quadrillion Btu or MMT C/QBtu), those fuels that are typically described in volumetric units (i.e., petroleum products and natural gas) are converted to units of mass using an estimated density. Second, C contents are derived from fuel sample data, using descriptive statistics to estimate the C share of the fuel by weight. The heat content of the fuel is then estimated based on the sample data, or where sample data are unavailable or unrepresentative, by default values that reflect the characteristics of the fuel as defined by market requirements. A discussion of each fuel appears below.

The C content of coal is described first because approximately one-quarter of all U.S. C emissions from fossil fuel combustion are associated with coal consumption. The methods and sources for estimating the C content of natural gas are provided next. Approximately one-third of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel combustion are attributable to natural gas consumption. Finally, this sub-annex examines C contents of petroleum products. U.S. energy use statistics account for more than 20 different petroleum products.

Table A-45: Carbon Content Coefficients Used in this Report (MMT Carbon/QBtu)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Coal																			
Residential Coal ^a	26.20	26.13	26.00	25.98	26.04	25.91	26.09	26.29	25.94	25.71 ^b	25.74 ^b	25.76 ^b	25.83 ^b	25.91 ^b	25.94 ^b	25.91 ^b	26.01 ^b	26.04 ^b	26.12 ^b
Commercial Coal ^a	26.20	26.13	26.00	25.98	26.04	25.91	26.09	26.29	25.94	25.71	25.74	25.76	25.83	25.91	25.94	25.91	26.01	26.04	26.12
Industrial Coking Coal ^a	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00
Industrial Other Coal ^a	25.82	25.80	25.66	25.57	25.55	25.56	25.80	25.84	25.82	25.82	25.87	25.87	25.90	25.96	25.95	25.97	26.02	26.06	26.09
Utility Coal ^{a,c}	25.96	25.93	26.00	26.05	26.09	26.10	26.09	26.04	26.05	26.05	26.05	26.06	26.06	26.08	26.08	26.07	26.10	26.09	26.11
Pipeline Natural Gas^d	14.45	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.44	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46
Petroleum																			
Asphalt and Road Oil	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55	20.55
Aviation Gasoline	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86	18.86
Distillate Fuel Oil No. 1	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98	19.98
Distillate Fuel Oil No. 2	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17
Distillate Fuel Oil No. 4	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47	20.47
Jet Fuel ^a	19.40	19.34	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70
Kerosene	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96	19.96
LPG (energy use) ^d	16.86	16.82	16.87	16.85	16.86	16.84	16.84	16.83	16.82	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83
LPG (non-energy use) ^d	17.06	17.09	17.10	17.09	17.09	17.07	17.06	17.06	17.05	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06
Lubricants	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20	20.20
Motor Gasoline ^d	19.42	19.36	19.34	19.38	19.36	19.38	19.36	19.45	19.56	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46
Residual Fuel No. 5	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89	19.89
Residual Fuel No. 6	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48	20.48
Other Petroleum																			
Av. Gas Blend Comp.	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87
Mo. Gas Blend Comp. ^c	19.42	19.36	19.34	19.38	19.36	19.38	19.36	19.45	19.56	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46	19.46
Crude Oil ^d	20.15	20.21	20.27	20.28	20.25	20.31	20.31	20.28	20.28	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31
Misc. Products ^d	20.15	20.21	20.27	20.28	20.25	20.31	20.31	20.28	20.28	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31
Misc. Products (Terr.)	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55	18.55

Other oil (>401 deg. F)	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17	20.17
Pentanes Plus	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10	19.10
Petroleum Coke	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85
Still Gas	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.20
Special Naphtha	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74	19.74
Unfinished Oils ^d	20.15	20.21	20.27	20.28	20.25	20.31	20.31	20.28	20.28	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31	20.31
Waxes	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80
Other Wax and Misc.	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80	19.80
Geothermal	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.05

^aC contents vary annually based on changes in annual mix of production and end-use consumption of coal from each producing state.

^b EIA discontinued collection of residential sector coal consumption data in 2008, because consumption of coal in the residential sector is extremely limited. Therefore, the number cited here is developed from commercial/institutional consumption.

^cC content for utility coal used in the electric power calculations. All coefficients based on higher heating value. Higher heating value (gross heating value) is the total amount of heat released when a fuel is burned. Coal, crude oil, and natural gas all include chemical compounds of carbon and hydrogen. When those fuels are burned, the carbon and hydrogen combine with oxygen in the air to produce CO₂ and water. Some of the energy released in burning goes into transforming the water into steam and is usually lost. The amount of heat spent in transforming the water into steam is counted as part of gross heat content. Lower heating value (net heating value), in contrast, does not include the heat spent in transforming the water into steam. Using a simplified methodology based on International Energy Agency defaults, higher heating value can be converted to lower heating value for coal and petroleum products by multiplying by 0.95 and for natural gas by multiplying by 0.90. Carbon content coefficients are presented in higher heating value because U.S. energy statistics are reported by higher heating value.

^dC contents vary annually based on changes in fuel composition.

Coal

Although the IPCC (2006) guidelines provide C contents for coal according to rank, it was necessary to develop C content coefficients by consuming sector to match the format in which coal consumption is reported by EIA. Because the C content of coal varies by the state in which it was mined and by coal rank, and because the sources of coal for each consuming sector vary by year, the weighted average C content for coal combusted in each consuming sector also varies over time. A time series of C contents by coal rank and consuming sector appears in Table A-46.⁹

Methodology

The methodology for developing C contents for coal by consuming sector consists of four steps. An additional step has been taken to calculate C contents by coal rank to facilitate comparison with IPCC default values.

Step 1: Determine Carbon Contents by Rank and by State of Origin

Carbon contents by rank and state of origin are estimated on the basis of 7,092 coal samples, 6,588 of which were collected by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS 1998) and 504 samples that come from the Pennsylvania State University database (PSU 2010). These coal samples are classified according to rank and state of origin. For each rank in each state, the average heat content and C content of the coal samples are calculated based on the proximate (heat) and ultimate (percent carbon) analyses of the samples. Dividing the C content (reported in pounds CO₂) by the heat content (reported in million Btu or MMBtu) yields an average C content coefficient. This coefficient is then converted into units of MMT C/QBtu.

Step 2: Determine Weighted Average Carbon Content by State

Carbon contents by rank and origin calculated in Step 1 are then weighted by the annual share of state production that was each rank. State production by rank is obtained from the EIA. This step yields a single carbon content per state that varies annually based on production by coal type. However, most coal-producing states produce only one rank of coal. For these states the weighted factor equals the carbon content calculated in Step 1 and is constant across the time series.

Step 3: Allocate Sectoral Consumption by State of Origin

U.S. energy statistics¹⁰ through 2017 provide data on the origin of coal used in four areas: 1) the electric power industry, 2) industrial coking, 3) all other industrial uses, and 4) the residential and commercial end-use sectors.¹¹ Because U.S. energy statistics do not provide the distribution of coal rank consumed by each consuming sector, it is assumed that each sector consumes a representative mixture of coal ranks from a particular state that matches the mixture of all coal produced in that state during the year. Thus, the weighted state-level factor developed in Step 2 is applied.

Step 4: Weight Sectoral Carbon Contents to Reflect the Rank and State of Origin of Coal Consumed

Sectoral C contents are calculated by multiplying the share of coal purchased from each state by the state's weighted C content estimated in Step 2. The resulting partial C contents are then totaled across all states to generate a national sectoral C content.

$$C_{\text{sector}} = S_{\text{state1}} \times C_{\text{state1}} + S_{\text{state2}} \times C_{\text{state2}} + \dots + S_{\text{state50}} \times C_{\text{state50}}$$

where,

C_{sector}	=	The C content by consuming sector;
S_{state}	=	The portion of consuming sector coal consumption attributed to production from a given state;
C_{state}	=	The estimated weighted C content of all ranks produced in a given state.

⁹ For a comparison to earlier estimated carbon contents see *Chronology and Explanation of Changes in Individual Carbon Content Coefficients of Fossil Fuels* near the end of this Annex.

¹⁰ U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). *Annual Coal Distribution Report* (2001-2017b); *Coal Industry Annual* (1990-2001).

¹¹ Beginning in 2008, the EIA collects and reports data on commercial and institutional coal consumption, rather than residential and commercial consumption. Thus, the residential/commercial coal coefficient reported in Table A-45 for 2009 to the present represents the mix of coal consumed by commercial and institutional users. Currently, only an extremely small amount of coal is consumed in the U.S. residential sector.

Table A-46: Carbon Content Coefficients for Coal by Consuming Sector and Coal Rank (MMT C/QBtu) (1990-2017)

Consuming Sector	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Electric Power	25.96	25.93	26.00	26.05	26.09	26.10	26.09	26.04	26.05	26.05	26.05	25.83	26.06	26.08	26.08	26.07	26.10	26.09	26.11
Industrial Coking	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00	31.00
Other Industrial	25.82	25.80	25.66	25.57	25.55	25.56	25.80	25.84	25.82	25.82	25.87	24.22	25.90	25.96	25.95	25.97	26.02	26.06	26.09
Residential/ Commercial ^a	26.20	26.13	26.00	25.98	26.04	25.91	26.09	26.29	25.94	25.71	25.74	24.29	25.83	25.91	25.94	25.91	26.01	26.04	26.12
Coal Rank^b																			
Anthracite	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28	28.28
Bituminous	25.38	25.42	25.46	25.46	25.45	25.45	25.45	25.45	25.45	25.44	25.43	25.42	25.45	25.44	25.46	25.45	25.44	25.45	25.45
Sub-bituminous	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.52	26.51	26.51	26.52	26.51	26.51	26.22
Lignite	26.58	26.59	26.62	26.63	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.64	26.65	26.67	26.63	26.61	26.61	26.62	26.63	26.66	26.64	26.68

^a In 2008, the EIA began collecting consumption data for commercial and institutional consumption rather than commercial and residential consumption.

^b Emission factors for coal rank are weighted based on production in each state.

Sources: C content coefficients calculated from USGS (1998), PSU (2010), and EIA (2018); data presented in EPA (2010).

Step 5: Develop National-Level Carbon Contents by Rank for Comparison to IPCC Defaults

Although not used to calculate emissions, national-level C contents by rank are more easily compared to C contents of other countries than are sectoral C contents. This step requires weighting the state-level C contents by rank developed under Step 1 by overall coal production by state and rank. Each state-level C content by rank is multiplied by the share of national production of that rank that each state represents. The resulting partial C contents are then summed across all states to generate an overall C content for each rank.

$$N_{\text{rank}} = P_{\text{rank1}} \times C_{\text{rank1}} + P_{\text{rank2}} \times C_{\text{rank2}} + \dots + P_{\text{rankn}} \times C_{\text{rankn}}$$

where,

N_{rank}	=	The national C content by rank;
P_{rank}	=	The portion of U.S. coal production of a given rank attributed to each state; and
C_{rank}	=	The estimated C content of a given rank in each state.

Data Sources

The ultimate analysis of coal samples was based on the 7,092 coal samples, 6,588 of which are from USGS (1998) and 504 that come from the Pennsylvania State University Coal Database (PSU 2010). Data contained in the USGS's CoalQual Database are derived primarily from samples taken between 1973 and 1989, and were largely reported in State Geological Surveys. Data in the PSU Coal Database are mainly from samples collected by PSU since 1967 and are housed at the PSU Sample Bank. Only the subset of PSU samples that are whole-seam channel samples are included in the development of carbon factors in order to increase data accuracy.

Data on coal consumption by sector and state of origin, as well as coal production by state and rank, were obtained from EIA. The EIA's *Annual Coal Report* (EIA 2001 through 2017a) is the source for state coal production by rank from 2001 through 2017. In prior years, the EIA reported this data in its *Coal Industry Annual* (EIA 1990 through 2001). Data for coal consumption by state of origin and consuming sector for 2001 through 2017 was obtained from the EIA's *Annual Coal Distribution Report* (EIA 2001 through 2017b). For 1990 through 2000, end-use data was obtained from the *Coal Industry Annual* (EIA 1990 through 2001).

Uncertainty

Carbon contents vary considerably by state. Bituminous coal production and sub-bituminous coal production represented 45.6 percent and 45.4 percent of total U.S. supply in 2017, respectively. State average C content coefficients for bituminous coal vary from a low of 85.59 kg CO₂ per MMBtu in Texas to a high of 105.21 kg CO₂ per MMBtu in Montana. However, Texas bituminous coal is considered anomalous,¹² has not been produced since 2004 and production since 1990 peaked at just 446,000 short tons in 1996. The next lowest average emission factor for bituminous coal is found in Western Kentucky (91.36 kg CO₂ per MMBtu). In 2000, Montana produced no bituminous coal and Western Kentucky production accounted for just 4.5 percent of overall bituminous production. In 2017, more than 50 percent of bituminous coal was produced in three states: West Virginia, Kentucky (predominantly from the Eastern production region), and Pennsylvania, and this share has remained fairly constant since 1990. These three states show a variation in C content for bituminous coals of ±0.7 percent, based on more than 2,000 samples (see Table A-47).

Similarly, the C content coefficients for sub-bituminous coal range from 91.29 kg CO₂ per MMBtu in Utah to 98.10 kg CO₂ per MMBtu in Alaska. However, Utah has no recorded production of sub-bituminous coal since 1990. Production of sub-bituminous coal in Alaska has made up less than 0.7 percent of total sub-bituminous production since 1990, with even this small share declining over time. Wyoming has represented between 75 percent and 87 percent of total sub-bituminous coal production in the United States in each year since 1990. Thus, the C content coefficient for Wyoming (97.22 kg CO₂ per MMBtu), based on 455 samples, dominates the national average.

The interquartile range of C content coefficients among samples of sub-bituminous coal in Wyoming was ±1.5 percent from the mean. Similarly, this range among samples of bituminous coal from West Virginia, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania was ±1.2 percent or less for each state. The large number of samples and the low variability within the sample set of the states that represent the predominant source of supply of U.S. coal suggest that the uncertainty in this factor is very low, on the order of ±1.0 percent.

¹² See, for example: San Filippo, 1999. USGS. (U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 99-301), Ch. 4.

For comparison, J. Quick (2010) completed an analysis similar in methodology to that used here, in order to generate national average C emission factors as well as county-level factors. This study's rank-based national average factors have a maximum deviation from the factors developed in this Inventory report of -0.55 percent, which is for lignite (range: -0.55 to +0.1 percent). This corroboration further supports the assertion of minimal uncertainty in the application of the rank-based factors derived for the purposes of this Inventory.

Table A-47: Variability in Carbon Content Coefficients by Rank Across States (Kilograms CO₂ Per MMBtu)

State	Number of Samples	Bituminous	Sub-bituminous	Anthracite	Lignite
Alabama	951	92.84	-	-	99.10
Alaska	91	98.33	98.09	-	98.65
Arizona	15	93.94	97.34	-	-
Arkansas	77	96.36	-	-	94.97
Colorado	317	94.37	96.52	-	101.10
Georgia	35	95.01	-	-	-
Idaho	1	-	94.90	-	-
Illinois	57	92.33	-	-	-
Indiana	146	92.65	-	-	-
Iowa	100	91.87	-	-	-
Kansas	29	90.91	-	-	-
Kentucky	897	92.61	-	-	-
Louisiana	1	-	-	-	96.01
Maryland	47	94.29	-	-	-
Massachusetts	3	-	-	114.82	-
Michigan	3	92.88	-	-	-
Mississippi	8	-	-	-	98.19
Missouri	111	91.71	-	-	-
Montana	309	105.21	97.73	-	99.40
Nebraska	6	103.60	-	-	-
Nevada	2	94.41	-	-	99.86
New Mexico	185	94.29	94.88	103.92	-
North Dakota	202	-	93.97	-	99.48
Ohio	674	91.84	-	-	-
Oklahoma	63	92.33	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	849	93.33	-	103.68	-
Tennessee	61	92.82	-	-	-
Texas	64	85.59	94.19	-	94.47
Utah	169	95.75	91.29	-	-
Virginia	465	93.51	-	98.54	-
Washington	18	94.53	97.36	102.53	106.55
West Virginia	612	93.84	-	-	-
Wyoming	503	94.80	97.22	-	-
U.S. Average	7,071	93.13	96.94	104.29	98.63

Note: "-" Indicates no sample data available. Average is weighted by number of samples.

Sources: Calculated from USGS (1998) and PSU (2010); data presented in EPA (2010).

Natural Gas

Natural gas is predominantly composed of methane (CH₄), which is 75 percent C by weight and contains 14.2 MMT C/QBtu (higher heating value), but it may also contain many other compounds that can lower or raise its overall C content. These other compounds may be divided into two classes: (1) natural gas liquids (NGLs) and (2) non-hydrocarbon gases. The most common NGLs are ethane (C₂H₆), propane (C₃H₈), butane (C₄H₁₀), and, to a lesser extent, pentane (C₅H₁₂) and hexane (C₆H₁₄). Because the NGLs have more C atoms than CH₄ (which has only one), their presence increases the overall C content of natural gas. NGLs have a commercial value greater than that of CH₄, and therefore are usually separated from raw natural gas at gas processing plants and sold as separate products. Ethane is typically used as a petrochemical

feedstock, propane and butane have diverse uses, and natural gasoline¹³ contributes to the gasoline/naphtha "octane pool," used primarily to make motor gasoline.

Raw natural gas can also contain varying amounts of non-hydrocarbon gases, such as CO₂, nitrogen, helium and other noble gases, and hydrogen sulfide. The share of non-hydrocarbon gases is usually less than 5 percent of the total, but there are individual natural gas reservoirs where the share can be much larger. The treatment of non-hydrocarbon gases in raw gas varies. Hydrogen sulfide is always removed. Inert gases are removed if their presence is substantial enough to reduce the energy content of the gas below pipeline specifications (see Step 1, below). Otherwise, inert gases will usually be left in the natural gas. Because the raw gas that is usually flared (see Step 2, below) contains NGLs and CO₂, it will typically have a higher overall C content than gas that has been processed and moved to end-use customers via transmission and distribution pipelines.

Methodology

The methodology for estimating the C contents of pipeline and flared natural gas can be described in five steps.

Step 1: Define pipeline-quality natural gas

In the United States, pipeline-quality natural gas is required to have an energy content greater than 970 Btu per cubic foot, but less than 1,100 Btu per cubic foot. Hydrogen sulfide content must be negligible. Typical pipeline-quality natural gas is about 95 percent CH₄, 3 percent NGLs, and 2 percent non-hydrocarbon gases, of which approximately half is CO₂.

However, there remains a range of gas compositions that are consistent with pipeline specifications. The minimum C content coefficient for natural gas would match that for pure CH₄, which equates to an energy content of 1,005 Btu per standard cubic foot. Gas compositions with higher or lower Btu content tend to have higher C emission factors, because the "low" Btu gas has a higher content of inert gases (including CO₂ offset with more NGLs), while "high" Btu gas tends to have more NGLs.

Step 2: Define flared gas

Every year, a certain amount of natural gas is flared in the United States. There are several reasons that gas is flared:

- There may be no market for some batches of natural gas, the amount may be too small or too variable, or the quality might be too poor to justify treating the gas and transporting it to market (such is the case when gas contains large shares of CO₂). Most natural gas that is flared for these reasons is "rich" associated gas, with relatively high energy content, high NGL content, and a high C content.
- Gas treatment plants may flare substantial volumes of natural gas because of "process upsets," because the gas is "off spec," or possibly as part of an emissions control system. Gas flared at processing plants may be of variable quality.

Data on the energy content of flare gas, as reported by states to EIA, indicate an average energy content of 1,130 Btu per standard cubic foot (EIA 1994). Flare gas may have an even higher energy content than reported by EIA since rich associated gas can have energy contents as high as 1,300 to 1,400 Btu per cubic foot.

Step 3: Determine a relationship between carbon content and heat content

A relationship between C content and heat content may be used to develop a C content coefficient for natural gas consumed in the United States. In 1994, EIA examined the composition (including C contents) of 6,743 samples of pipeline-quality natural gas from utilities and/or pipeline companies in 26 cities located in 19 states. To demonstrate that these samples were representative of actual natural gas "as consumed" in the United States, their heat content was compared to that of the national average. For the most recent year, the average heat content of natural gas consumed in the United States was 1,037 Btu per cubic foot, and has varied by less than 2 percent (1,022 to 1,037 Btu per cubic foot) over the past 5 years. Meanwhile, the average heat content of the 6,743 samples was 1,027 Btu per cubic foot, and the median heat content was 1,031 Btu per cubic foot. Thus, the average heat content of the sample set falls well within the typical range of natural gas consumed in

¹³ A term used in the gas processing industry to refer to a mixture of liquid hydrocarbons (mostly pentanes and heavier hydrocarbons) extracted from natural gas.

the United States, suggesting that these samples continue to be representative of natural gas “as consumed” in the United States. The average and median composition of these samples appear in Table A-48.

Table A-48: Composition of Natural Gas (Percent)

Compound	Average	Median
Methane	93.07	95.00
Ethane	3.21	2.79
Propane	0.59	0.48
Higher Hydrocarbons	0.32	0.30
Non-hydrocarbons	2.81	1.43
Higher Heating Value (Btu per cubic foot)	1,027	1,031

Source: Gas Technology Institute (1992).

Carbon contents were calculated for a series of sub-samples based on their CO₂ content and heat content. Carbon contents were calculated for the groups of samples with less than 1.0 percent (n=5,181) and less than 1.5 percent CO₂ only (n=6,522) and those with less than 1.0 or 1.5 percent CO₂ and less than 1,050 Btu/cf (n=4,888 and 6,166, respectively). These stratifications were chosen to exclude samples with CO₂ content and heat contents outside the range of pipeline-quality natural gas. In addition, hexane was removed from the samples since it is usually stripped out of raw natural gas before delivery because it is a valuable natural gas liquid used as a feedstock for gasoline. The average carbon contents for the four separate sub-samples are shown below in Table A-49.

Table A-49: Carbon Content of Pipeline-Quality Natural Gas by CO₂ and Heat Content (MMT C/QBtu)

Sample	Average Carbon Content
Full Sample	14.48
< 1.0% CO ₂	14.43
< 1.5% CO ₂	14.47
< 1.0 % CO ₂ and <1,050 Btu/cf	14.42
< 1.5 % CO ₂ and <1,050 Btu/cf	14.47

Source: EPA (2010).

Step 4. Apply carbon content coefficients developed in Step 3 to pipeline natural gas

A regression analysis was performed on the sub-samples in to further examine the relationship between carbon (C) content and heat content. The regression used carbon content as the dependent variable and heat content as the independent variable. The resulting R-squared values¹⁴ for each of the sub-samples ranged from 0.79 for samples with less than 1.5 percent CO₂ and under 1,050 Btu/cf to 0.91 for samples containing less than 1.0 percent CO₂ only. However, the sub-sample with less than 1.5 percent CO₂ and 1,050 Btu/cf was chosen as the representative sample for two reasons. First, it most accurately reflects the range of CO₂ content and heat content of pipeline quality natural gas. Secondly, the R-squared value, although it is the lowest of the sub-groups tested, remains relatively high. This high R-squared indicates a low percentage of variation in C content as related to heat content. The regression for this sub-sample resulted in the following equation:

$$C \text{ Content} = (0.011 \times \text{Heat Content}) + 3.5341$$

This equation was used to estimate the annual predicted carbon content of natural gas from 1990 to 2010 based on the EIA’s national average pipeline-quality gas heat content for each year. The table of average C contents for each year is shown below in Table A-50.


Table A-50: Carbon Content Coefficients for Natural Gas (MMT Carbon/QBtu)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Natural Gas	14.45	14.46	14.47	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46	14.46

Source: EPA (2010).

¹⁴ R-squared represents the percentage of variation in the dependent variable (in this case carbon content) explained by variation in the independent variables.

Figure A-1: Carbon Content for Samples of Pipeline-Quality Natural Gas Included in the Gas Technology Institute Database



Source: EIA (1994) Energy Information Administration, Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 1987-1992, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC, November, 1994, DOE/EIA 0573, Appendix A.

Natural gas suppliers may achieve the same overall energy content from a wide variety of methane, higher hydrocarbon, and non-hydrocarbon gas combinations. Thus, the plot reveals large variations in C content for a single Btu value. In fact, the variation in C content for a single Btu value may be nearly as great as the variation for the whole sample. As a result, while energy content has some predictive value, the specific energy content does not substantially improve the accuracy of an estimated C content coefficient beyond the ± 5.0 percent offered with the knowledge that it is of pipeline-quality.

The plot of C content also reveals other interesting anomalies. Samples with the lowest emissions coefficients tend to have energy contents of about 1,000 Btu per cubic foot. They are composed of almost pure CH_4 . Samples with a greater proportion of NGLs (e.g., ethane, propane, and butane) tend to have energy contents greater than 1,000 Btu per cubic foot, along with higher emissions coefficients. Samples with a greater proportion of inert gases tend to have lower energy content, but they usually contain CO_2 as one of the inert gases and, consequently, also tend to have higher emission coefficients (see left side of Figure A-1).

For the full sample ($n=6,743$), the average C content of a cubic foot of gas was 14.48 MMT C/QBtu. Additionally, a regression analysis using the full sample produced a predicted C content of 14.49 MMT C/QBtu based on a heat content of 1,029 Btu/cf (the average heat content in the United States for the most recent year). However, these two values include an upward influence on the resulting carbon content that is caused by inclusion in the sample set of the samples that contain large amounts of inert carbon dioxide and those samples with more than 1,050 Btu per cubic foot that contain an unusually large amount of NGLs. Because typical gas consumed in the United States does not contain such a large amount of carbon dioxide or natural gas liquids, a C content of 14.46 MMT C/QBtu (see Table A-50), based on samples with less than 1.5 percent carbon dioxide and less than 1,050 Btu per cubic foot, better represents the pipeline-quality fuels typically consumed.

Petroleum

There are four critical determinants of the C content coefficient for a petroleum-based fuel:

- The density of the fuel (e.g., the weight in kilograms of one barrel of fuel);

- The fraction by mass of the product that consists of hydrocarbons, and the fraction of non-hydrocarbon impurities;
- The specific types of “families” of hydrocarbons that make up the hydrocarbon portion of the fuel; and
- The heat content of the fuel.

$$\text{where,} \quad C_{\text{fuel}} = (D_{\text{fuel}} \times S_{\text{fuel}}) / E_{\text{fuel}}$$

C_{fuel}	=	The C content coefficient of the fuel
D_{fuel}	=	The density of the fuel
S_{fuel}	=	The share of the fuel that is C
E_{fuel}	=	The heat content of the fuel

Most of the density, carbon share, or heat contents applied to calculate the carbon coefficients for petroleum products that are described in this sub-Annex and applied to this emissions Inventory were updated in 2010 for the 1990-2008 Inventory report. These changes have been made where necessary to increase the accuracy of the underlying data or to align the petroleum properties data used in this report with that developed for use in EPA’s *Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule* (EPA 2009b).

Petroleum products vary between 5.6 degrees API gravity¹⁵ (dense products such as asphalt and road oil) and 247 degrees (ethane). This is a range in density of 60 to 150 kilograms per barrel, or ± 50 percent. The variation in C content, however, is much smaller (± 5 to 7 percent) for products produced by standard distillation refining: ethane is 80 percent C by weight, while petroleum coke is 90 to 92 percent C. This tightly bound range of C contents can be explained by basic petroleum chemistry (see below). Additional refining can increase carbon contents. Calcined coke, for example, is formed by heat treating petroleum coke to about 1600 degrees Kelvin (calcining), to expel volatile materials and increase the percentage of elemental C. This product can contain as much as 97 to 99 percent carbon. Calcined coke is mainly used in the aluminum and steel industry to produce C anodes.


Petroleum Chemistry

Crude oil and petroleum products are typically mixtures of several hundred distinct compounds, predominantly hydrocarbons. All hydrocarbons contain hydrogen and C in various proportions. When crude oil is distilled into petroleum products, it is sorted into fractions by the boiling temperature of these hundreds of organic compounds. Boiling temperature is strongly correlated with the number of C atoms in each molecule. Petroleum products consisting of relatively simple molecules and few C atoms have low boiling temperatures, while larger molecules with more C atoms have higher boiling temperatures.

Products that boil off at higher temperatures are usually denser, which implies greater C content as well. Petroleum products with higher C contents, in general, have lower energy content per unit mass and higher energy content per unit volume than products with lower C contents. Empirical research led to the establishment of a set of quantitative relationships between density, energy content per unit weight and volume, and C and hydrogen content. Figure A-2 compares C content coefficients calculated on the basis of the derived formula with actual C content coefficients for a range of crude oils, fuel oils, petroleum products, and pure hydrocarbons. The actual fuel samples were drawn from the sources described below in the discussions of individual petroleum products.

¹⁵ API gravity is an arbitrary scale expressing the gravity or density of liquid petroleum products, as established by the American Petroleum Institute (API). The measuring scale is calibrated in terms of degrees API. The higher the API gravity, the lighter the compound. Light crude oils generally exceed 38 degrees API and heavy crude oils are all crude oils with an API gravity of 22 degrees or below. Intermediate crude oils fall in the range of 22 degrees to 38 degrees API gravity. API gravity can be calculated with the following formula: $\text{API Gravity} = (141.5 / \text{Specific Gravity}) - 131.5$. Specific gravity is the density of a material relative to that of water. At standard temperature and pressure, there are 62.36 pounds of water per cubic foot, or 8.337 pounds water per gallon.

Figure A-2: Estimated and Actual Relationships Between Petroleum Carbon Content Coefficients and Hydrocarbon Density



Source: Carbon content factors for paraffins are calculated based on the properties of hydrocarbons in V. Guthrie (ed.), *Petroleum Products Handbook* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960) p. 33. Carbon content factors from other petroleum products are drawn from sources described below. Relationship between density and emission factors based on the relationship between density and energy content in U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, *Thermal Properties of Petroleum Products*, Miscellaneous Publication, No. 97 (Washington, D.C., 1929), pp.16-21, and relationship between energy content and fuel composition in S. Ringen, J. Lanum, and F.P. Miknis, "Calculating Heating Values from the Elemental Composition of Fossil Fuels," *Fuel*, Vol. 58 (January 1979), p.69.

The derived empirical relationship between C content per unit heat and density is based on the types of hydrocarbons most frequently encountered. Petroleum fuels can vary from this relationship due to non-hydrocarbon impurities and variations in molecular structure among classes of hydrocarbons. In the absence of more exact information, this empirical relationship offers a good indication of C content.

Non-hydrocarbon Impurities

Most fuels contain a certain share of non-hydrocarbon material. This is also primarily true of crude oils and fuel oils. The most common impurity is sulfur, which typically accounts for between 0.5 and 4 percent of the mass of most crude oils, and can form an even higher percentage of heavy fuel oils. Some crude oils and fuel oils also contain appreciable quantities of oxygen and nitrogen, typically in the form of asphaltenes or various acids. The nitrogen and oxygen content of crude oils can range from near zero to a few percent by weight. Lighter petroleum products have much lower levels of impurities, because the refining process tends to concentrate all of the non-hydrocarbons in the residual oil fraction. Light products usually contain less than 0.5 percent non-hydrocarbons by mass. Thus, the C content of heavy fuel oils can often be several percent lower than that of lighter fuels, due entirely to the presence of non-hydrocarbons.

Variations in Hydrocarbon Classes

Hydrocarbons can be divided into five general categories, each with a distinctive relationship between density and C content and physical properties. Refiners tend to control the mix of hydrocarbon types in particular products in order to give petroleum products distinct properties. The main classes of hydrocarbons are described below.

1 *Paraffins.* Paraffins are the most common constituent of crude oil, usually comprising 60 percent by mass. Paraffins
2 are straight-chain hydrocarbons with the general formula C_nH_{2n+2} . Paraffins include ethane (C_2H_6), propane (C_3H_8), butane
3 (C_4H_{10}), and octane (C_8H_{18}). As the chemical formula suggests, the C content of the paraffins increases with their C number:
4 ethane is 79.89 percent C by weight, octane 84.12 percent. As the size of paraffin molecules increases, the C content
5 approaches the limiting value of 85.7 percent asymptotical (see Figure A-3).

6 *Cycloparaffins.* Cycloparaffins are similar to paraffins, except that the C molecules form ring structures rather than
7 straight chains, and consequently require two fewer hydrogen molecules than paraffins. Cycloparaffins always have the
8 general formula C_nH_{2n} and are 85.63 percent C by mass, regardless of molecular size.


9 *Olefins.* Olefins are a very reactive and unstable form of paraffin: a straight chain with two carbon atoms double
10 bonded together (thus are unsaturated) compared to the carbon atoms in a paraffin (which are saturated with hydrogen).
11 They are never found in crude oil but are created in moderate quantities by the refining process. Gasoline, for example, may
12 contain between 2 and 20 percent olefins. They also have the general formula C_nH_{2n} , and hence are also always 85.63 percent
13 C by weight. Propylene (C_3H_6), a common intermediate petrochemical product, is an olefin.

14 *Aromatics.* Aromatics are very reactive hydrocarbons that are relatively uncommon in crude oil (10 percent or
15 less). Light aromatics increase the octane level in gasoline, and consequently are deliberately created by catalytic reforming
16 of heavy naphtha. Aromatics also take the form of ring structures with some double bonds between C atoms. The most
17 common aromatics are benzene (C_6H_6), toluene (C_7H_8), and xylene (C_8H_{10}). The general formula for aromatics is C_nH_{2n-6} .
18 Benzene is 92.26 percent C by mass, while xylene is 90.51 percent C by mass and toluene is 91.25 percent C by mass. Unlike
19 the other hydrocarbon families, the C content of aromatics declines asymptotically toward 85.7 percent with increasing C
20 number and density (see Figure A-3).

21 *Polynuclear Aromatics.* Polynuclear aromatics are large molecules with a multiple ring structure and few hydrogen
22 atoms, such as naphthalene ($C_{10}H_8$ and 93.71 percent C by mass) and anthracene ($C_{14}H_{10}$ and 97.7 percent C). They are
23 relatively rare but do appear in heavier petroleum products.

24 Figure A-3 illustrates the share of C by weight for each class of hydrocarbon. Hydrocarbon molecules containing
25 2 to 4 C atoms are all natural gas liquids; hydrocarbons with 5 to 10 C atoms are predominantly found in naphtha and
26 gasoline; and hydrocarbon compounds with 12 to 20 C atoms comprise "middle distillates," which are used to make diesel
27 fuel, kerosene and jet fuel. Larger molecules which can be vacuum distilled may be used as lubricants, waxes, and residual
28 fuel oil or cracked and blended into the gasoline or distillate pools.

Figure A-3: Carbon Content of Pure Hydrocarbons as a Function of Carbon Number



Source: J.M. Hunt, *Petroleum Geochemistry and Geology* (San Francisco, CA, W.H. Freeman and Company, 1979), pp. 31-37.

If nothing is known about the composition of a particular petroleum product, assuming that it is 85.7 percent C by mass is not an unreasonable first approximation. Since denser products have higher C numbers, this guess would be most likely to be correct for crude oils and fuel oils. The C content of lighter products is more affected by the shares of paraffins and aromatics in the blend.

Energy Content of Petroleum Products

The exact energy content (gross heat of combustion) of petroleum products is not generally known. EIA estimates energy consumption in Btu on the basis of a set of industry-standard conversion factors. These conversion factors are generally accurate to within 3 to 5 percent.

Individual Petroleum Products

The United States maintains data on the consumption of more than twenty separate petroleum products and product categories. The C contents, heat contents, and density for each product are provided below in Table A-51. A description of the methods and data sources for estimating the key parameters for each individual petroleum product appears below.

Table A-51: Carbon Content Coefficients and Underlying Data for Petroleum Products

Fuel	Carbon Content (MMT C/QBtu)	Gross Heat of Combustion (MMBtu/Barrel)	Density (API Gravity)	Percent Carbon
Motor Gasoline	19.46	(See a)	(See a)	(See a)
LPG(total)	16.97	(See b)	(See b)	(See b)
LPG (energy use)	16.83	(See b)	(See b)	(See b)
LPG (non-energy use)	17.06	(See b)	(See b)	(See b)
Jet Fuel	19.70	5.670	42.0	86.30
Distillate Fuel No. 1	19.98	5.822	35.3	86.40
Distillate Fuel No. 2	20.17	5.809	35.8	87.30
Distillate Fuel No. 4	20.47	6.135	23.2	86.47
Residual Fuel No. 5	19.89	5.879	33.0	85.67
Residual Fuel No. 6	20.48	6.317	15.5	84.67
Asphalt and Road Oil	20.55	6.636	5.6	83.47
Lubricants	20.20	6.065	25.7	85.80
Naphtha (< 400 deg. F) ^c	18.55	5.248	62.4	84.11
Other Oils (>400 deg. F) ^c	20.17	5.825	35.8	87.30
Aviation Gas	18.86	5.048	69.0	85.00
Kerosene	19.96	5.825	35.3	86.40
Petroleum Coke	27.85	6.024	-	92.28
Special Naphtha	19.74	5.248	52.0	84.75
Petroleum Waxes	19.80	5.537	43.3	85.30
Still Gas	18.20	6.000	-	77.70
Crude Oil	20.31	5.800	31.2	85.49
Unfinished Oils	20.31	5.825	31.2	85.49
Miscellaneous Products	20.31	5.796	31.2	85.49
Pentanes Plus	19.10	4.620	81.3	83.63

^a Calculation of the carbon content coefficient for motor gasoline in 2008 uses separate higher heating values for conventional and reformulated gasoline of 5.253 and 5.150, respectively (EIA 2008a). Densities and carbon shares (percent carbon) are annually variable and separated by both fuel formulation and grade, see Motor Gasoline and Blending Components, below, for details.

^b LPG is a blend of multiple paraffinic hydrocarbons: ethane, propane, isobutane, and normal butane, each with their own heat content, density and C content, see Table A-54.

^c Petrochemical feedstocks have been split into naphthas and other oils for this Inventory report. Parameters presented are for naphthas with a boiling temperature less than 400 degrees Fahrenheit. Other oils are petrochemical feedstocks with higher boiling points. They are assumed to have the same characteristics as distillate fuel oil no. 2.

Note: "-" Indicates no sample data available.

Sources: EIA (1994); EIA (2009); EPA (2009b); and EPA (2010).

Motor Gasoline and Motor Gasoline Blending Components

Motor gasoline is a complex mixture of relatively volatile hydrocarbons with or without small quantities of additives, blended to form a fuel suitable for use in spark-ignition engines.¹⁶ "Motor Gasoline" includes conventional gasoline; all types of oxygenated gasoline, including gasohol; and reformulated gasoline; but excludes aviation gasoline.

Gasoline is the most widely used petroleum product in the United States, and its combustion accounts for nearly 20 percent of all U.S. CO₂ emissions. EIA collects consumption data (i.e., "petroleum products supplied" to end-users) for several types of finished gasoline over the 1990 through 2017 time period: regular, mid-grade and premium conventional gasoline (all years) and regular, mid-grade and premium reformulated gasoline (November 1994 to 2017). Leaded and oxygenated gasoline are not separately included in the data used for this report.¹⁷

The American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standards permit a broad range of densities for gasoline, ranging from 50 to 70 degrees API gravity, or 111.52 to 112.65 kilograms per barrel (EIA 1994), which implies a range of

¹⁶ Motor gasoline, as defined in ASTM Specification D 4814 or Federal Specification VV-G-1690C, is characterized as having a boiling range of 122 degrees to 158 degrees Fahrenheit at the 10-percent recovery point to 365 degrees to 374 degrees Fahrenheit at the 90-percent recovery point.

¹⁷ Oxygenated gasoline volumes are included in the conventional gasoline data provided by EIA from 2007 onwards. Leaded gasoline was included in total gasoline by EIA until October 1993.

possible C and energy contents per barrel. Table A-52 reflects changes in the density of gasoline over time and across grades and formulations of gasoline through 2017.

Table A-52: Motor Gasoline Density, 1990 – 2017 (Degrees API)

Fuel Grade	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Conventional - Winter Grade																			
Low Octane	62.0	59.8	61.7	61.6	61.8	62.4	62.6	62.7	63.1	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0	63.0
High Octane	59.0	58.0	59.1	59.0	59.9	60.7	60.9	60.0	60.3	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9	60.9
Conventional - Summer Grade																			
Low Octane	58.2	56.1	57.2	56.5	56.8	57.4	57.9	57.8	57.5	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6	58.6
High Octane	55.5	55.1	55.5	55.7	56.0	57.0	57.0	57.4	56.9	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0
Reformulated - Winter Grade																			
Low Octane	NA	61.9	62.6	61.9	62.1	62.7	62.8	62.3	62.1	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4	62.4
High Octane	NA	59.9	61.0	61.8	61.9	61.8	61.8	61.7	62.1	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5	62.5
Reformulated - Summer Grade																			
Low Octane	NA	58.5	58.8	58.2	59.1	58.1	58.4	58.7	58.5	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1
High Octane	NA	56.7	58.2	58.0	58.7	58.9	58.1	59.0	59.3	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8	59.8

Notes: NA (Not Applicable), fuel type was not analyzed.

Source: National Institute of Petroleum and Energy Research (1990 through 2009).

The density of motor gasoline increased across all grades through 1994, partly as a result of the leaded gasoline phase-out. In order to maintain the “anti-knock” quality and octane ratings of gasoline in the absence of lead, the portion of aromatic hydrocarbons blended into gasoline through the refining process was increased. As discussed above, aromatic hydrocarbons have a lower ratio of hydrogen to C than other hydrocarbons typically found in gasoline, and therefore increase fuel density.

The trend in gasoline density was reversed beginning in 1996 with the development of fuel additives that raised oxygen content. In 1995, a requirement for reformulated gasoline in non-attainment areas implemented under the Clean Air Act Amendments further changed the composition of gasoline consumed in the United States. Through 2005, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), ethanol, ethyl tertiary butyl ether (ETBE), and tertiary amyl methyl ether (TAME) were added to reformulated and sometimes to conventional gasoline to boost its oxygen content, reduce its toxics impacts and increase its octane. The increased oxygen reduced the emissions of carbon monoxide and unburned hydrocarbons. These oxygen-rich blending components are also much lower in C than standard gasoline. The average gallon of reformulated gasoline consumed in 2005 contained over 10 percent MTBE and 0.6 percent TAME (by volume). The characteristics of reformulated fuel additives appear in Table A-53.

Table A-53: Characteristics of Major Reformulated Fuel Additives

Additive	Density (Degrees API)	Carbon Share (Percent)
MTBE	58.6	68.13
ETBE	58.5	70.53
TAME	51.2	70.53
DIPE	62.7	70.53
Ethanol (100%)	45.8	52.14

Source: EPA (2009b).

Since 2005, due to concerns about the potential environmental consequences of the use of MTBE in fuels, there has been a shift away from the addition of MTBE, TAME, ETBE, and DIPE and towards the use of ethanol as a fuel oxygenate.¹⁸ Ethanol, also called ethyl alcohol, is an anhydrous alcohol with molecular formula C₂H₅OH. Ethanol has a lower C share than other oxygenates, approximately 52 percent compared to about 70 percent for MTBE and TAME. The density of ethanol was calculated by fitting density data at 10 degree intervals to a polynomial of order two and then using the fit to interpolate the value of the density at 15 degrees Celsius. A common fuel mixture of 10 percent denatured ethanol (denatured by 2 percent hydrocarbons) and 90 percent gasoline, known as E10, is widely used in the United States and does not require any modification to vehicle engines or fuel systems. The federal Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) program

¹⁸ The annual motor gasoline carbon contents that are applied for this Inventory do not include the carbon contributed by the ethanol contained in reformulated fuels. Ethanol is a biofuel, and net carbon fluxes from changes in biogenic carbon reservoirs in croplands are accounted for in the estimates for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry.

requires a certain volume of renewable fuel, including ethanol, be blended into the national fuel supply.¹⁹ Ethanol blends up to E85 (85 percent ethanol, 15 percent gasoline) are in use in the United States but can only be used in specially designed vehicles called flexible fuel vehicles (FFVs). Most ethanol fuel in the United States is produced using corn as feedstock,²⁰ although production pathways utilizing agricultural waste, woody biomass and other resources are in development.

Methodology

Step 1. Disaggregate U.S. gasoline consumption by grade and type

Separate monthly data for U.S. sales to end users of finished gasoline by product grade and season for both standard gasoline and reformulated gasoline were obtained from the EIA.

Step 2. Develop carbon content coefficients for each grade and type

Annual C content coefficients for each gasoline grade, type, and season are derived from four parameters for each constituent of the finished gasoline blend: the volumetric share of each constituent,²¹ the density of the constituent, share of the constituent²² that is C; and the energy content of a gallon of the relevant formulation of gasoline. The percent by mass of each constituent of each gasoline type was calculated using percent by volume data from the National Institute for Petroleum and Energy Research (NIPER) and the density of each constituent. The ether additives listed in Table A-53 are accounted for in both reformulated fuels and conventional fuels, to the extent that they were present in the fuel. From 2006 onward, reformulated fuel mass percentages are calculated from their constituents, net of the share provided by ethanol. C content coefficients were then derived from the calculated percent by mass values by weighting the C share of each constituent by its contribution to the total mass of the finished motor gasoline product.

Step 3. Weight overall gasoline carbon content coefficient for consumption of each grade and type

The C content for each grade, type, and season of fuel is multiplied by the share of annual consumption represented by the grade and fuel type during the relevant time period. Individual coefficients are then summed and totaled to yield an overall C content coefficient for each year.

Data Sources

Data for the density of motor gasoline were derived from NIPER (1990 through 2009). Data on the characteristics of reformulated gasoline, including C share, were also taken from NIPER (1990 through 2009).

Standard heat contents for motor gasoline of 5.222 MMBtu per barrel conventional gasoline and 5.150 MMBtu per barrel reformulated gasoline²³ were adopted from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

The uncertainty underlying the C content coefficients for motor gasoline has three underlying sources: (1) the uncertainty in the averages published by NIPER, (2) uncertainty in the C shares assumed in the EPA's analysis to be representative of the constituent hydrocarbon classes within gasoline (aromatics, olefins and saturates), and (3) uncertainty in the heat contents applied.

A variable number of samples are used each year to determine the average percent by volume share of each hydrocarbon within each grade, season and formulation of gasoline that are obtained from NIPER. The total number of samples analyzed for each seasonal NIPER report varies from approximately 730 to over 1,800 samples over the period from 1990 through 2009. The number of samples analyzed that underlie the calculation of the average make-up of each seasonal formulation and grade varies from approximately 50 to over 400, with the greatest number of samples each season being of conventional, regular or premium gasoline. Further, not all sample data submitted to NIPER contains data for each of the properties, such that the number of samples underlying each constituent average value for each season, grade and formulation may be variable within the single gasoline type (e.g., of the 1,073 samples for which some data was obtained for gasoline sold in Winter 1995 through 1996, benzene content was provided for all samples, while olefin, aromatic and saturate content was provided for just 736 of those samples).

¹⁹ <https://www.epa.gov/renewable-fuel-standard-program>

²⁰ <https://www.epa.gov/fuels-registration-reporting-and-compliance-help/public-data-renewable-fuel-standard>

²¹ Calculations account for the properties of the individual constituents of gasoline, including, as applicable to the fuel grade and type: aromatics (excluding benzene), olefins, benzene, saturates, MTBE, TAME, ETBE, DIPE and ethanol.

²² Saturates are assumed to be octane and aromatics are assumed to be toluene.

²³ The reformulated gasoline heat content is applied to both reformulated blends containing ethers and those containing ethanol.

The distribution of sample origin collected for the NIPER report and the calculation of national averages are not reflective of sales volumes. The publication of simple, rather than sales-weighted averages to represent national average values increases the uncertainty in their application to the calculation of carbon content factors for the purposes of this Inventory. Further, data for each sample is submitted voluntarily, which may also affect their representativeness.

Additionally, because the simple average constituent shares are calculated based upon data that have been renormalized to account for the share of ethers and alcohols, total average volume shares may not equal 100 percent.

The simple average for each hydrocarbon constituent is contained within a range of values that are as wide as -63.0/+74.5 percent of the mean across the Winter 2007 through 2008 and -51.3/+49.6 percent across the Summer 2008 samples of conventional, regular grade gasoline. However, these wide ranges exist for benzene, which generally accounts for only 1 percent, by volume, of each gallon. In contrast, saturates, the class of hydrocarbon that contribute the largest share, by volume, ranges only -6.5/+6.4 percent for the same set of winter samples and -8.8/+15.7 percent for the summer samples.

Secondly, EPA's calculation of C content factors for each gasoline type includes the following assumptions: for the purposes of assigning a carbon share to each compound in the blend, aromatic content (other than benzene) is assumed to be toluene and saturated hydrocarbons are assumed to be octane. All olefins have the same carbon share because they all have a molecular formula in the form C_nH_{2n} , so the C share applied to the olefin portion of the total gasoline blend does not increase the level of uncertainty in the calculation. These assumptions are based upon the use of octane and octane isomers as the primary saturates and toluene as the primary non-benzene aromatic in U.S. motor gasoline blends. The octane rating of a particular blend is based upon the equivalent iso-octane to heptane ratio, which is achieved through significant octane content relative to the other saturates. Aside from benzene, U.S. gasolines will include toluene as a major aromatic component, so toluene may be assumed a reasonable representative of total non-benzene aromatic content (EPA 2009a).

For each hydrocarbon category, the assumed C content lies within a range of possible values for all such hydrocarbons. Among saturated hydrocarbons, the C share of octane (84.12 percent) is at the high end of the range while ethane is represents the low end of the range (79.89 percent C). Total saturates constitute from 40 to 95 percent by volume of a given gasoline blend. For aromatics, toluene (91.25 percent C) lies in the middle of the possible range. This range is bounded by cumene (89.94 percent C) and naphthalene (93.71 percent C). Total aromatics may make up between 3 and 50 percent by volume of any given gasoline blend. The range of these potential values contributes to the uncertainty surrounding the final calculated C factors.

However, as demonstrated above in Figure A-3, the amount of variation in C content of gasoline is restricted by the compounds in the fuel to ± 4 percent. Further, despite variation in sampling survey response, sample size and annually variable fuel formulation requirements, the observed variation in the annual weighted motor gasoline coefficients estimated for this Inventory is ± 0.8 percent over 1990 through 2017.

The third primary contributor to uncertainty is the assumed heat content. The heat contents are industry standards established many years ago. The heat contents are standard conversion factors used by EIA to convert volumetric energy data to energy units. Because the heat contents of fuels change over time, without necessarily and directly altering their volume, the conversion of known volumetric data to energy units may introduce bias. Thus, a more precise approach to estimating emissions factors would be to calculate C content per unit of volume, rather than per unit of energy. Adopting this approach, however, makes it difficult to compare U.S. C content coefficients with those of other nations.

The changes in density of motor gasoline over the last decade suggest that the heat content of the fuels is also changing. However, that change within any season grade has been less than 1 percent over the decade. Of greater concern is the use of a standardized heat content across grades that show a variation in density of ± 1.5 percent from the mean for conventional gasoline and ± 1.0 percent for reformulated fuels.

Jet Fuel

Jet fuel is a refined petroleum product used in jet aircraft engines. There are two classes of jet fuel used in the United States: "naphtha-based" jet fuels and "kerosene-based" jet fuels. In 1989, 13 percent of U.S. consumption was naphtha-based fuel, with the remainder kerosene-based jet fuel. In 1993, the U.S. Department of Defense began a conversion from naphtha-based JP-4 jet fuel to kerosene-based jet fuel, because of the possibility of increased demand for reformulated motor gasoline limiting refinery production of naphtha-based jet fuel. By 1996, naphtha-based jet fuel represented less than one-half of one percent of all jet fuel consumption. The C content coefficient for jet fuel used in this report prior to 1996 represents a consumption-weighted combination of the naphtha-based and kerosene-based coefficients. From 1996 to 2017, only the kerosene-based portion of total consumption is considered significant.

Methodology

Step 1. Estimate the carbon content for naphtha-based jet fuels

Because naphtha-based jet fuels are used on a limited basis in the United States, sample data on its characteristics are limited. The density of naphtha-based jet fuel (49 degrees) was estimated as the central point of the acceptable API gravity range published by ASTM. The heat content of the fuel was assumed to be 5.355 MMBtu per barrel based on EIA industry standards. The C fraction was derived from an estimated hydrogen content of 14.1 percent (Martel and Angello 1977), and an estimated content of sulfur and other non-hydrocarbons of 0.1 percent.

Step 2. Estimate the carbon content for kerosene-based jet fuels

The density of kerosene-based jet fuels was estimated at 42 degrees API and the carbon share at 86.3 percent. The density estimate was based on 38 fuel samples examined by NIPER. Carbon share was estimated on the basis of a hydrogen content of 13.6 percent found in fuel samples taken in 1959 and reported by Martel and Angello, and on an assumed sulfur content of 0.1 percent. The EIA's standard heat content of 5.670 MMBtu per barrel was adopted for kerosene-based jet fuel.

Step 3. Weight the overall jet fuel carbon content coefficient for consumption of each type of fuel (1990-1995 only)

For years 1990 through 1995, the C content for each jet fuel type (naphtha-based, kerosene-based) is multiplied by the share of overall consumption of that fuel type, as reported by EIA (2009). Individual coefficients are then summed and totaled to yield an overall C content coefficient. Only the kerosene-based C coefficient is reflected in the overall jet fuel coefficient for 1996 through 2017.

Data Sources

Data on the C content of naphtha-based jet fuel was taken from C.R. Martel and L.C. Angello (1977). Data on the density of naphtha-based jet fuel was taken from ASTM (1985). Standard heat contents for kerosene and naphtha-based jet fuels were adopted from EIA (2009). Data on the C content of kerosene-based jet fuel is based on C.R. Martel and L.C. Angello (1977) and the density is derived from NIPER (1993).

Uncertainty

Variability in jet fuel is relatively small with the average C share of kerosene-based jet fuel varying by less than ± 1 percent and the density varying by ± 1 percent. This is because the ratio of fuel mass to useful energy must be tightly bounded to maximize safety and range. There is more uncertainty associated with the density and C share of naphtha-based jet fuel because sample data were unavailable and default values were used. This uncertainty has only a small impact on the overall uncertainty of the C content coefficient for jet fuels, however, because naphtha-based jet fuel represents a small and declining share of total jet fuel consumption in the United States and is treated as negligible when calculating C content factors for 1996 onward.

Distillate Fuel

Distillate fuel is a general classification for diesel fuels and fuel oils. Products known as No. 1, No. 2, and No. 4 diesel fuel are used in on-highway diesel engines, such as those in trucks and automobiles, as well as off-highway engines, such as those in railroad locomotives and agricultural machinery. No. 1, No. 2, and No. 4 fuel oils are also used for space heating and electric power generation.

Methodology

For this Inventory, separate C coefficients have been estimated for each of the three distillates, although the level of aggregation of U.S. energy statistics requires that a single coefficient is used to represent all three grades in inventory calculations. In past Inventories, the emission coefficient was only determined for distillate No. 2. Distillate No. 2 remains the representative grade applied to the distillate class for calculation purposes. Coefficients developed for No. 1 and No. 4 distillate are provided for informational purposes. The C share each distillate is drawn from *Perry's Chemical Engineers' Handbook, 8th Ed.* (Green & Perry 2008). Each C share was combined with individual heat contents of 5.822, 5.809 and 6.135 MMBtu per barrel, respectively for distillates No. 1, No. 2, and No. 4, and densities of 35.3, 35.8, and 23.2 degrees API to calculate C coefficients for each distillate type.

Data Sources

Densities for distillate No. 1 and No. 2 were derived from Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Diesel Survey – Winter 2008 (AAM 2009). Densities are based on four, and 144 samples, respectively. The density of distillate fuel oil No. 4 is taken from *Perry's Chemical Engineer's Handbook, 8th Ed.* (Green & Perry, ed. 2008), Table 24-6.

Heat contents are adopted from EPA (2009b). And carbon shares for each distillate are from *Perry's Chemical Engineers' Handbook* (Green & Perry, ed. 2008), Table 24-6.

Uncertainty

The primary source of uncertainty for the estimated C content of distillate fuel is the selection of No. 2 distillate as the typical distillate fuel oil or diesel fuel. No. 2 fuel oil is generally consumed for home heating. No. 1 distillate is generally less dense and if it is consumed in large portions for mobile sources, the application of the C content estimated for No. 2 for this report is likely to be too high when applied to both No. 1 and No. 2 distillates. The opposite is true of the application of a coefficient based upon the properties of No. 2 to the consumption of No. 4 distillate, which is of a significantly higher density and thus, has a higher C coefficient despite its lower C share. The overall effect on uncertainty from applying a single factor will depend on the relative annual consumption of each distillate.

The densities applied to the calculation of each carbon factor are an underlying a source of uncertainty. While the density of No. 1 distillate is based upon just four samples, the factor applied to all distillates in the Inventory estimates (that for No. 2 oil) is based on a much larger sample size (144). Given the range of densities for these three distillate fuel classes (0.1342 to 0.1452 MT/bbl at 60 degrees F), the uncertainty associated with the assumed density of distillate fuels is predominately a result of the use of No. 2 to represent all distillate consumption. There is also a small amount of uncertainty in the No. 2 distillate density itself. This is due to the possible variation across seasonal diesel formulations and fuel grades and between stationary and transport applications within the No. 2 distillate classification. The range of the density of the samples of No. 2 diesel (regular grade, 15 ppm sulfur) is ± 2.5 percent from the mean, while the range in density across the small sample set of No. 1 diesel is -2.1 to +1.6 percent of the mean. Samples from AAM (2009) of Premium No. 2 diesel (n=5) and higher sulfur (500 ppm S) regular diesel (n=2), which are also consumed in the United States, each have nominally higher average densities (+1.3 percent and +0.6 percent, respectively) than do the low-sulfur regular diesel samples that underlie the density applied in this Inventory.

The use of the 144 AAM samples to define the density of No. 2 distillate (and those four samples used to define that of No. 1 distillate) may introduce additional uncertainty because the samples were collected from just one season of on-road fuel production (Winter 2008). Despite the limited sample frame, the average No. 2 density calculated from the samples is applied to the calculation of a uniform C coefficient applicable for all years of the Inventory and for all types of distillate consumption. The ASTM standards for each grade of diesel fuel oil do not include a required range in which the density must lie, and the density (as well as heat content and carbon share) may vary according to the additives in each seasonal blend and the sulfur content of each sub-grade.

However, previous studies also show relatively low variation in density across samples of No. 2 and across all distillates, supporting the application of a single No. 2 density to all U.S. distillate consumption. The average density calculated from samples analyzed by the EIA in 1994 (n=7) differs only very slightly from the value applied for the purposes of this Inventory (-0.12 percent for No. 2 distillate). Further, the difference between the mean density applied to this Inventory (No. 2 only) and that calculated from EIA samples of all distillates, regardless of grade, is also near zero (-0.06 percent, based on n=14, of distillates No. 1, No. 2 and No. 4 combined).

A C share of 87.30 percent is applied to No. 2 distillate, while No. 1 and No. 4 have C shares estimated at 86.40 and 86.47 percent, respectively. Again, the application of parameters specific to No. 2 to the consumption of all three distillates contributes to an increased level of uncertainty in the overall coefficient and emissions estimate and its broad application. For comparison, four No. 1 fuel oil samples obtained by EIA (1994) contained an average of 86.19 percent C, while seven samples No. 2 fuel oil from the same EIA analysis showed an average of 86.60 percent C. Additionally, three samples of No. 4 distillate indicate an average C share of 85.81 percent. The range of C share observed across the seven No. 2 samples is 86.1 to 87.5 percent, and across all samples (all three grades, n=14) the range is 85.3 to 87.5 percent C. There also exists an uncertainty of ± 1 percent in the share of C in No. 2 based on the limited sample size.

Residual Fuel

Residual fuel is a general classification for the heavier oils, known as No. 5 and No. 6 fuel oils, that remain after the distillate fuel oils and lighter hydrocarbons are distilled away in refinery operations. Residual fuel conforms to ASTM Specifications D 396 and D 975 and Federal Specification VV-F-815C. No. 5, a residual fuel oil of medium viscosity, is also known as Navy Special and is defined in Military Specification MIL-F-859E, including Amendment 2 (NATO Symbol F-770). It is used in steam-powered vessels in government service and inshore power plants. No. 6 fuel oil includes Bunker C fuel oil and is used for the production of electric power, space heating, vessel bunkering, and various industrial purposes.

In the United States, electric utilities purchase about one-third of the residual oil consumed. A somewhat larger share is used for vessel bunkering, and the balance is used in the commercial and industrial sectors. The residual oil (defined

as No. 6 fuel oil) consumed by electric utilities has an energy content of 6.287 MMBtu per barrel (EIA 2008a) and an average sulfur content of 1 percent (EIA 2001). This implies a density of about 17 degrees API.

Methodology

Because U.S. energy consumption statistics are available only as an aggregate of No. 5 and No. 6 residual oil, a single coefficient must be used to represent the full residual fuel category. As in earlier editions of this report, residual fuel oil has been defined as No. 6 fuel oil, due to the majority of residual consumed in the United States being No. 6. However, for this report, a separate coefficient for fuel oil No. 5 has also been developed for informational purposes. Densities of 33.0 and 15.5 degrees API were adopted when developing the C content coefficients for Nos. 5 and 6, respectively (Wauquier, J.-P., ed. 1995; Green & Perry, ed. 2008).

The estimated C share of fuel oil No. 5 is 85.67 percent, based on an average of 12 ultimate analyses of samples of fuel oil (EIA 1994). An average share of C in No. 6 residual oil of 84.67 percent by mass was used, based on Perry's, 8th Ed. (Green & Perry, ed. 2008).

Data Sources

Data on the C share and density of residual fuel oil No. 6 were obtained from Green & Perry, ed. (2008). Data on the C share of fuel oil No. 5 was adopted from EIA (1994), and the density of No. 5 was obtained from Wauquier, J.-P., ed. (1995). Heat contents for both No. 5 and No. 6 fuel oil are adopted from EPA (2009b).

Uncertainty

Beyond the application of a C factor based upon No. 6 oil to all residual oil consumption, the largest source of uncertainty in estimating the C content of residual fuel centers on the estimates of density. Fuel oils are likely to differ depending on the application of the fuel (i.e., power generation or as a marine vessel fuel). Slight differences between the density of residual fuel used by utilities and that used in mobile applications are likely attributable to non-sulfur impurities, which reduce the energy content of the fuel, but do not greatly affect the density of the product. Impurities of several percent are commonly observed in residual oil. The extent of the presence of impurities has a greater effect on the uncertainty of C share estimation than it does on density. This is because these impurities do provide some Btu content to the fuel, but they are absent of carbon. Fuel oils with significant sulfur, nitrogen and heavy metals contents would have a different total carbon share than a fuel oil that is closer to pure hydrocarbon. This contributes to the uncertainty of the estimation of an average C share and C coefficient for these varied fuels.

The 12 samples of residual oil (EIA 1994) cover a density range from 4.3 percent below to 8.2 percent above the mean density. The observed range of C share in these samples is -2.5 to +1.8 percent of the mean. Overall, the uncertainty associated with the C content of residual fuel is probably ± 1 percent.

Liquefied Petroleum Gases (LPG)

EIA identifies four categories of paraffinic hydrocarbons as LPG: ethane, propane, isobutane, and n-butane. Because each of these compounds is a pure paraffinic hydrocarbon, their C shares are easily derived by taking into account the atomic weight of C (12.01) and the atomic weight of hydrogen (1.01). Thus, for example, the C share of propane, C₃H₈, is 81.71 percent. The densities and heat contents of the compounds are also well known, allowing C content coefficients to be calculated directly. Table A-54 summarizes the physical characteristic of LPG.

Table A-54: Physical Characteristics of Liquefied Petroleum Gases

Compound	Chemical Formula	Density (Barrels Per Metric Ton)	Carbon Content (Percent)	Energy Content (MMBtu/Barrel)	Carbon Content Coefficient (MMT C/QBtu)
Ethane	C ₂ H ₆	11.55	79.89	3.082	17.16
Propane	C ₃ H ₈	12.76	81.71	3.836	16.76
Isobutane	C ₄ H ₁₀	11.42	82.66	3.974	17.77
n-butane	C ₄ H ₁₀	10.98	82.66	4.326	17.75

Source: Densities – CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics (2008/09); Carbon Contents – derived from the atomic weights of the elements; Energy Contents – EPA (2009b). All values are for the compound in liquid form. The density and energy content of ethane are for refrigerated ethane (-89 degrees C). Values for n-butane are for pressurized butane (-25 degrees C).

Methodology

Step 1. Assign carbon content coefficients to each pure paraffinic compound

Based on their known physical characteristics, a C content coefficient is assigned to each compound contained in the U.S. energy statistics category, Liquefied Petroleum Gases.

Step 2. Weight individual LPG coefficients for share of fuel use consumption

A C content coefficient for LPG used as fuel is developed based on the consumption mix of the individual compounds reported in U.S. energy statistics.

Step 3. Weight individual LPG coefficients for share of non-fuel use consumption

The mix of LPG consumed for non-fuel use differs significantly from the mix of LPG that is combusted. While the majority of LPG consumed for fuel use is propane, ethane is the largest component of LPG used for non-fuel applications. A C content coefficient for LPG used for non-fuel applications is developed based on the consumption mix of the individual compounds reported in U.S. energy statistics.

Step 4. Weight the carbon content coefficients for fuel use and non-fuel use by their respective shares of consumption

The changing shares of LPG fuel use and non-fuel use consumption appear below in Table A-55.

Data Sources

Data on C share was derived via calculations based on atomic weights of each element of the four individual compounds densities are from the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 89th Edition. The energy content of each LPG is from the EPA (2009b). LPG consumption was based on data obtained from API (1990 through 2008) and EIA (2018). Non-fuel use of LPG was obtained from API (1990 through 2008).

Uncertainty

Because LPG consists of pure paraffinic compounds whose density, heat content and C share are physical constants, there is limited uncertainty associated with the C content coefficient for this petroleum product. Any uncertainty is associated with the collection of data tabulating fuel- and non-fuel consumption in U.S. energy statistics. This uncertainty is likely less than ± 3 percent.

Table A-55: Consumption and Carbon Content Coefficients of Liquefied Petroleum Gases, 1990-2017

	1990	2000	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Energy Consumption (QBTU)														
Fuel Use	0.88	1.31	1.19	1.20	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16
Ethane	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Propane	0.77	1.07	1.07	1.09	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02
Butane	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Isobutane	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Non-Fuel Use	1.35	1.90	1.74	1.78	1.67	1.80	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Ethane	0.71	1.04	0.98	1.03	0.95	1.12	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
Propane	0.51	0.65	0.63	0.64	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60
Butane	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Isobutane	0.02	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Carbon Content (MMT C/QBTU)														
Fuel Use	16.86	16.89	16.83	16.82	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83	16.83
Non-Fuel Use	17.06	17.09	17.06	17.05	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06	17.06

Sources: Fuel use of LPG based on data from EIA (2018) and API (1990 through 2008). Non-fuel use of LPG from API (1990 through 2008). Volumes converted using the energy contents provided in Table A-54. C contents from EPA (2010).

Aviation Gasoline

Aviation gasoline is used in piston-powered airplane engines. It is a complex mixture of relatively volatile hydrocarbons with or without small quantities of additives, blended to form a fuel suitable for use in aviation reciprocating engines. Fuel specifications are provided in ASTM Specification D910 and Military Specification MIL-G-5572. Aviation gas is a relatively minor contributor to greenhouse gas emissions compared to other petroleum products, representing approximately 0.1 percent of all consumption.

The ASTM standards for boiling and freezing points in aviation gasoline effectively limit the aromatics content to a maximum of 25 percent (ASTM D910). Because weight is critical in the operation of an airplane, aviation gas must have as many Btu per pound (implying a lower density) as possible, given other requirements of piston engines such as high anti-knock quality.

Methodology

A C content coefficient for aviation gasoline was calculated on the basis of the EIA standard heat content of 5.048 MMBtu per barrel. This implies a density of approximately 69 degrees API gravity or 5.884 pounds per gallon, based on the relationship between heat content and density of petroleum liquids, as described in *Thermal Properties of Petroleum Products* (DOC 1929). To estimate the share of C in the fuel, it was assumed that aviation gasoline is 87.5 percent iso-octane, 9.0 percent toluene, and 3.5 percent xylene. The maximum allowable sulfur content in aviation gasoline is 0.05 percent, and the maximum allowable lead content is 0.1 percent. These amounts were judged negligible and excluded for the purposes of this analysis. This yielded a C share of 85.00 percent and a C content coefficient of 18.86 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

Data sources include ASTM (1985). A standard heat content for aviation gas was adopted from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

The relationship used to calculate density from heat content has an accuracy of five percent at 1 atm. The uncertainty associated with the C content coefficient for aviation gasoline is larger than that for other liquid petroleum products examined because no ultimate analyses of samples are available. Given the requirements for safe operation of piston-powered aircraft the composition of aviation gas is well bounded and the uncertainty of the C content coefficient is likely to be ± 5 percent.

Still Gas

Still gas, or refinery gas, is composed of light hydrocarbon gases that are released as petroleum is processed in a refinery. The composition of still gas is highly variable, depending primarily on the nature of the refining process and secondarily on the composition of the product being processed. Petroleum refineries produce still gas from many different processes. Still gas can be used as a fuel or feedstock within the refinery, sold as a petrochemical feedstock, or purified and sold as pipeline-quality natural gas. For the purposes of this Inventory, the coefficient derived here is only applied to still gas that is consumed as a fuel. In general, still gas tends to include large amounts of free hydrogen and methane, as well as smaller amounts of heavier hydrocarbons. Because different refinery operations result in different gaseous by-products, it is difficult to determine what represents typical still gas.

Methodology

The properties of still gas used to calculate the carbon content are taken from the literature. The carbon share of still gas was calculated from its net calorific value and carbon content from IPCC (2006). This calculation yields a carbon share of 77.7 percent. The density of still gas was estimated to be 0.1405 metric tons per barrel based on its heat content (EIA 2008a) and the relationship between heat content and density that is described by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Standards (DOC 1929).

Data Sources

The carbon share of still gas is calculated from data provided by IPCC (2006). Density is estimated at 0.1405 metric tons per barrel, approximately 28.3 degrees API, based on the heat content of 6.00 MMBtu/barrel of still gas from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

The EIA obtained data on four samples of still gas. Table A-56 below shows the composition of those samples.

Table A-56: Composition, Energy Content, and Carbon Content Coefficient for Four Samples of Still Gas

Sample	Hydrogen (%)	Methane (%)	Ethane (%)	Propane (%)	Btu Per Cubic Foot	Carbon Content (MMT C/QBtu)
One	12.7	28.1	17.1	11.9	1,388	17.51
Two	34.7	20.5	20.5	6.7	1,143	14.33
Three	72.0	12.8	10.3	3.8	672	10.23
Four	17.0	31.0	16.2	2.4	1,100	15.99

Sources: EIA (2008b).

Because the composition of still gas is highly heterogeneous, the C content coefficient for this product is highly uncertain. Gas streams with a large, free-hydrogen content are likely to be used as refinery or chemical feedstocks. Therefore, the sample cited above with the very high H content of 72 percent (and the lowest calculated C content) is less likely to be representative of the still gas streams to which the calculated coefficient is applied. The C content coefficient used for this report is probably at the high end of the plausible range given that it is higher than the greatest sample-based C content in Table A-56.

Asphalt

Asphalt is used to pave roads. Because most of its C is retained in those roads, it is a small source of carbon dioxide emissions. It is derived from a class of hydrocarbons called "asphaltenes," which are abundant in some crude oils but not in others. Asphaltenes have oxygen and nitrogen atoms bound into their molecular structure, so that they tend to have lower C contents than do other hydrocarbons.

Methodology

Ultimate analyses of twelve samples of asphalts showed an average C content of 83.47 percent. The EIA standard Btu content for asphalt of 6.636 MMBtu per barrel was assumed. The ASTM petroleum measurement tables show a density of 5.6 degrees API or 8.605 pounds per gallon for asphalt. Together, these variables generate C content coefficient of 20.55 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

A standard heat content for asphalt was adopted from EIA (2009). The density of asphalt was determined by the ASTM (1985). C share is adopted from analyses in EIA (2008b).

Uncertainty

The share of C in asphalt ranges from 79 to 88 percent by weight. Also present in the mixture are hydrogen and sulfur, with shares by weight ranging from seven to 13 percent for hydrogen, and from trace levels to eight percent for sulfur. Because C share and total heat content in asphalts do vary systematically, the overall C content coefficient is likely to be accurate to ± 5 percent.

Lubricants

Lubricants are substances used to reduce friction between bearing surfaces, or incorporated into processing materials used in the manufacture of other products, or used as carriers of other materials. Petroleum lubricants may be produced either from distillates or residues. Lubricants include all grades of lubricating oils, from spindle oil to cylinder oil to those used in greases. Lubricant consumption is dominated by motor oil for automobiles, but there is a large range of product compositions and end uses within this category.

Methodology

The ASTM Petroleum Measurement tables give the density of lubricants at 25.6 degrees API, or 0.1428 metric tons per barrel. Ultimate analysis of a single sample of motor oil yielded a C content of 85.80 percent. A standard heat content of 6.065 MMBtu per barrel was adopted from EIA. These factors produce a C content coefficient of 20.20 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

A standard heat content was adopted from the EIA (2009). The carbon content of lubricants is adopted from ultimate analysis of one sample of motor oil (EPA 2009a). The density of lubricating oils was determined by ASTM (1985).

Uncertainty

Uncertainty in the estimated C content coefficient for lubricants is driven by the large range of product compositions and end uses in this category combined with an inability to establish the shares of the various products captured under this category in U.S. energy statistics. Because lubricants may be produced from either the distillate or residual fractions during refineries, the possible C content coefficients range from 19.89 MMT C/QBtu to 21.48 MMT C/QBtu or an uncertainty band from -1.5 percent to $+1.4$ percent of the estimated value.

Petrochemical Feedstocks

U.S. energy statistics distinguish between two different kinds of petrochemical feedstocks: those with a boiling temperature below 400 degrees Fahrenheit, generally called “naphtha,” and those with a boiling temperature 401 degrees Fahrenheit and above, referred to as “other oils” for the purposes of this Inventory.

Methodology

The C content of these petrochemical feedstocks are estimated independently according to the following steps.

Step 1. Estimate the carbon content coefficient for naphtha

Because reformed naphtha is used to make motor gasoline (hydrogen is released to raise aromatics content and octane rating), “straight-run” naphtha is assumed to be used as a petrochemical feedstock. Ultimate analyses of five samples of naphtha were examined and showed an average C share of 84.11 percent. A density of 62.4 degrees API gravity was taken from the *Handbook of Petroleum Refining Processes*, 3rd ed. (Meyers 2004). The standard EIA heat content of 5.248 MMBtu per barrel is used to estimate a C content coefficient of 18.55 MMT C/QBtu.

Step 2. Estimate the carbon content coefficient for petrochemical feedstocks with a boiling temperature 400 degrees Fahrenheit and above (“other oils”)

The boiling temperature of this product places it into the “middle distillate” fraction in the refining process, and EIA estimates that these petrochemical feedstocks have the same heat content as distillate fuel No. 2. Thus, the C content coefficient of 20.17 MMT C/QBtu used for distillate fuel No. 2 is also adopted for this portion of the petrochemical feedstocks category.

Data Sources

Naphthas: Data on the C content was taken from Unzelman (1992). Density is from Meyers (2004). A standard heat content for naphthas was adopted from EIA (2009). Other oils: See Distillate Fuel, Distillate No.2.

Uncertainty

Petrochemical feedstocks are not so much distinguished on the basis of chemical composition as on the identity of the purchaser, who are presumed to be a chemical company or a petrochemical unit co-located on the refinery grounds. Naphthas are defined, for the purposes of U.S. energy statistics, as those naphtha products destined for use as a petrochemical feedstock. Because naphthas are also commonly used to produce motor gasoline, there exists a considerable degree of uncertainty about the exact composition of petrochemical feedstocks.

Different naphthas are distinguished by their density and by the share of paraffins, isoparaffins, olefins, naphthenes and aromatics contained in the oil. Naphtha from the same crude oil fraction may have vastly different properties depending on the source of the crude. Two different samples of Egyptian crude, for example, produced two straight run naphthas having naphthene and paraffin contents (percent volume) that differ by 18.1 and 17.5 percent, respectively (Matar and Hatch 2000).

Naphthas are typically used either as a petrochemical feedstock or a gasoline feedstock, with lighter paraffinic naphthas going to petrochemical production. Naphthas that are rich in aromatics and naphthenes tend to be reformed or blended into gasoline. Thus, the product category encompasses a range of possible fuel compositions, creating a range of possible C shares and densities. The uncertainty associated with the calculated C content of naphthas is primarily a function of the uncertainty that underlies the average carbon share calculation, which is based on a limited number of samples. Two additional samples cited by the EIA (1994) have a range of 83.80 to 84.42 percent C.

The uncertainty of the C content for other oils is based upon the assumption of distillate oil No. 2 as a product representative of the ill-defined classification of “other oils,” and from the calculation of the C content of No. 2 itself (see “Distillate Fuels,” above). While No. 2 distillate is used as a proxy for “other oils” for the purposes of this Inventory’s carbon coefficient, important differences exist between these two petroleum products, contributing some uncertainty to the cross-application. Other oils are defined herein as those “oils with a boiling range equal to or greater than 401 degrees F that are generally intended for use as a petrochemical feedstock and are not defined elsewhere.” For comparison, various material safety data sheets (MSDSs) published by producers of distillate No. 2 indicate a boiling range for this product of 320 to 700 degrees Fahrenheit. The relatively open definition of the classification “other oils” leaves room for potentially significant variation in the heating value, density and carbon share properties of each feedstock oil having a boiling point above 400 degrees Fahrenheit, creating a large band of uncertainty beyond that associated with the C factor for distillate No. 2.

Kerosene

A light petroleum distillate that is used in space heaters, cook stoves, and water heaters and is suitable for use as a light source when burned in wick-fed lamps, kerosene is drawn from the same petroleum fraction as jet fuel. Kerosene is generally comparable to No. 1 distillate oil.

Methodology

The average density and C share of kerosene are assumed to be the same as those for distillate No. 1 since the physical characteristics of the products are very similar. Thus, a density of 35.3 degrees API and average C share of 86.40 percent were applied to a standard heat content for distillate No. 1 of 5.825 MMBtu per barrel to yield a C content coefficient of 19.96 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

A standard heat content for distillate No. 1 was adopted from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

Uncertainty in the estimated C content for kerosene is driven by the selection of distillate No. 1 as a proxy for kerosene. If kerosene is more like kerosene-based jet fuel, the true C content coefficient is likely to be some 1.3 percent lower. If kerosene is more aptly compared to No. 2 distillate oil, then the true C content coefficient is likely to be about 1.1 percent higher. While kerosene is a light petroleum distillate, like distillate No. 1, the two oil classes do have some variation in their properties. For example, the boiling range of kerosene is 250 to 550 degrees Fahrenheit, whereas No. 1 oils typically boil over a range from 350 to 615 degrees Fahrenheit. The properties of individual kerosenes will vary with their use and particular crude origin, as well. Both kerosene and fuel oil No. 1 are primarily composed of hydrocarbons having 9 to 16 carbon atoms per molecule. However, kerosene is a straight-run No. 1 fuel oil, additional cracking processes and additives contribute to the range of possible fuels that make up the broader distillate No. 1 oil category.

Petroleum Coke

Petroleum coke is the solid residue by-product of the extensive processing of crude oil. It is a coal-like solid, usually has a C content greater than 90 percent, and is used as a boiler fuel and industrial raw material.

Methodology

Ultimate analyses of two samples of petroleum coke showed an average C share of 92.28 percent. The ASTM standard density of 9.543 pounds per gallon was adopted and the EIA standard energy content of 6.024 MMBtu per barrel assumed. Together, these factors produced an estimated C content coefficient of 27.85 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

C content was derived from two samples from Martin, S.W. (1960). The density of petroleum coke was taken from the ASTM (1985). A standard heat content for petroleum coke was adopted from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

The uncertainty associated with the estimated C content coefficient of petroleum coke can be traced to two factors: the use of only two samples to establish C contents and a standard heat content which may be too low. Together, these uncertainties are likely to bias the C content coefficient upwards by as much as 6 percent.

Special Naphtha

Special naphtha is defined as a light petroleum product to be used for solvent applications, including commercial hexane and four classes of solvent: (1) Stoddard solvent, used in dry cleaning; (2) high flash point solvent, used as an industrial paint because of its slow evaporative characteristics; (3) odorless solvent, most often used for residential paints; and (4) high solvency mineral spirits, used for architectural finishes. These products differ in both density and C percentage, requiring the development of multiple coefficients.

Methodology

The method for estimating the C content coefficient of special naphtha includes three steps.

Step 1. Estimate the carbon content coefficient for hexane

Hexane is a pure paraffin containing 6 C atoms and 14 hydrogen atoms; thus, it is 83.63 percent C. Its density is 83.7 degrees API or 5.477 pounds per gallon and its derived C content coefficient is 21.40 MMT C/QBtu.

Step 2. Estimate the carbon contents of non-hexane special naphthas

The hydrocarbon compounds in special naphthas are assumed to be either paraffinic or aromatic (see discussion above). The portion of aromatics in odorless solvents is estimated at less than 1 percent, Stoddard and high flash point solvents contain 15 percent aromatics and high solvency mineral spirits contain 30 percent aromatics (Boldt and Hall 1977). These assumptions, when combined with the relevant densities, yield the C content factors contained in Table A-57, below.

Table A-57: Characteristics of Non-hexane Special Naphthas

Special Naphtha	Aromatic Content (Percent)	Density (Degrees API)	Carbon Share (Percent Mass)	Carbon Content (MMT C/QBtu)
Odorless Solvent	1	55.0	84.51	19.41
Stoddard Solvent	15	47.9	84.44	20.11
High Flash Point	15	47.6	84.70	20.17
Mineral Spirits	30	43.6	85.83	20.99

Sources: EIA (2008b) and Boldt and Hall (1977).

Step 3. Develop weighted carbon content coefficient based on consumption of each special naphtha

EIA reports only a single consumption figure for special naphtha. The C contents of the five special naphthas are weighted according to the following formula: approximately 10 percent of all special naphtha consumed is hexane; the remaining 90 percent is assumed to be distributed evenly among the four other solvents. The resulting emissions coefficient for special naphthas is 19.74 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

A standard heat content for special naphtha was adopted from EIA (2009). Density and aromatic contents were adopted from Boldt and Hall (1977).

Uncertainty

The principal uncertainty associated with the estimated C content coefficient for special naphtha is the allocation of overall consumption across individual solvents. The overall uncertainty is bounded on the low end by the C content of odorless solvent and on the upper end by the C content of hexane. This implies an uncertainty band of -1.7 percent to +8.4 percent.

Petroleum Waxes

The ASTM standards define petroleum wax as a product separated from petroleum that is solid or semi-solid at 77 degrees Fahrenheit (25 degrees Celsius). The two classes of petroleum wax are paraffin waxes and microcrystalline waxes. They differ in the number of C atoms and the type of hydrocarbon compounds. Microcrystalline waxes have longer C chains and more variation in their chemical bonds than paraffin waxes.

Methodology

The method for estimating the C content coefficient for petroleum waxes includes three steps.

Step 1. Estimate the carbon content of paraffin waxes

For the purposes of this analysis, paraffin waxes are assumed to be composed of 100 percent paraffinic compounds with a chain of 25 C atoms. The resulting C share for paraffinic wax is 85.23 percent and the density is estimated at 45 degrees API or 6.684 pounds per gallon.

Step 2. Estimate the carbon content of microcrystalline waxes

Microcrystalline waxes are assumed to consist of 50 percent paraffinic and 50 percent cycloparaffinic compounds with a chain of 40 C atoms, yielding a C share of 85.56 percent. The density of microcrystalline waxes is estimated at 36.7 degrees API, based on a sample of 10 microcrystalline waxes found in the *Petroleum Products Handbook* (Martin, S.W. 1960).

Step 3. Develop a carbon content coefficient for petroleum waxes by weighting the density and carbon content of paraffinic and microcrystalline waxes

A weighted average density and C content was calculated for petroleum waxes, assuming that wax consumption is 80 percent paraffin wax and 20 percent microcrystalline wax. The weighted average C content is 85.30 percent, and the weighted average density is 6.75 pounds per gallon. EIA's standard heat content for waxes is 5.537 MMBtu per barrel. These inputs yield a C content coefficient for petroleum waxes of 19.80 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

Density of paraffin wax was taken from ASTM (1985). Density of microcrystalline waxes was derived from 10 samples found in Guthrie (1960). A standard heat content for petroleum waxes was adopted from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

Although there is considerable qualitative uncertainty associated with the allocation of petroleum waxes and microcrystalline waxes, the quantitative variation in the C contents for all waxes is limited to ± 1 percent because of the nearly uniform relationship between C and other elements in petroleum waxes broadly defined.

Crude Oil, Unfinished Oils, and Miscellaneous Products

U.S. energy statistics include several categories of petroleum products designed to ensure that reported refinery accounts “balance” and cover any “loopholes” in the taxonomy of petroleum products. These categories include crude oil, unfinished oils, and miscellaneous products. Crude oil is rarely consumed directly, miscellaneous products account for less than one percent of oil consumption, and unfinished oils are a balancing item that may show negative consumption. For C accounting purposes, it was assumed that all these products have the same C content as crude oil.

Methodology

EIA reports on the average density and sulfur content of U.S. crude oil purchased by refineries. To develop a method of estimating C content based on this information, results of ultimate analyses of 182 crude oil samples were collected. Within the sample set, C content ranged from 82 to 88 percent C, but almost all samples fell between 84 percent and 86 percent C. The density and sulfur content of the crude oil data were regressed on the C content, producing the following equation:

$$\text{Percent C} = 76.99 + (10.19 \times \text{Specific Gravity}) + (-0.76 \times \text{Sulfur Content})$$

Absent the term representing sulfur content, the equation had an R-squared of only 0.35.²⁴ When C content was adjusted to exclude sulfur, the R-squared value rose to 0.65. While sulfur is the most important non-hydrocarbon impurity, nitrogen and oxygen can also be significant, but they do not seem to be correlated with either density or sulfur content. Restating these results, density accounts for about 35 percent of the variation in C content, impurities account for about 30 percent of the variation, and the remaining 35 percent is accounted for by other factors, including (presumably) the degree to which aromatics and polynuclear aromatics are present in the crude oil. Applying this equation to the 2017 crude oil quality data (30.21 degrees API and 1.47 percent sulfur) produces an estimated C content of 84.79 percent. Applying the density and C content to the EIA standard energy content for crude oil of 5.800 MMBtu per barrel produced an emissions coefficient of 20.31 MMT C/QBtu.

Data Sources

Carbon content was derived from 182 crude oil samples, including 150 samples from U.S. National Research Council (1927). A standard heat content for crude oil was adopted from EIA (2009).

Uncertainty

The uncertainty of the estimated C content for crude oil centers on the 35 percent of variation that cannot be explained by density and sulfur content. This variation is likely to alter the C content coefficient by ± 3 percent. Since unfinished oils and miscellaneous products are impossible to define, the uncertainty of applying a crude oil C content is likely to be bounded by the range of petroleum products described in this chapter at ± 10 percent.

Chronology and Explanation of Changes in Individual Carbon Content Coefficients of Fossil Fuels

Coal

Original 1994 Analysis

A set of 5,426 coal samples from the EIA coal analysis file were used to develop C content estimates. The results from that sample set appear below in Table A-58. The EIA Coal Analysis File was originally developed by the U.S. Bureau of Mines and contained over 60,000 coal samples obtained through numerous coal seams throughout the United States.

²⁴ R-squared represents the percentage of variation in the dependent variable (in this case carbon content) explained by variation in the independent variables.

Many of the samples were collected starting in the 1940s and 1950s through the 1980s and analyzed in U.S. government laboratories.

Table A-58: Carbon Content Coefficients for Coal by Consuming Sector and Coal Rank, 1990 – 2000 (MMT C/QBtu)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Consuming Sector											
Electric Power	25.68	25.69	25.69	26.71	25.72	25.74	25.74	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76
Industrial Coking	25.51	25.51	25.51	25.51	25.52	25.53	25.55	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56
Other Industrial	25.58	25.59	25.62	25.61	25.63	25.63	25.61	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63
Residential / Commercial	25.92	26.00	26.13	25.97	25.95	26.00	25.92	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00
Coal Rank											
Anthracite	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13	28.13
Bituminous	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37	25.37
Sub-bituminous	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24	26.24
Lignite	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62	26.62

Sources: Emission factors by consuming sector from B.D. Hong and E.R. Slatnick, "Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors for Coal," U.S. EIA, *Quarterly Coal Report*, January-March 1994 (Washington, DC, 1994); and emission factors by rank from Science Applications International Corporation, *Analysis of the Relationship Between Heat and Carbon Content of U.S. Fuels: Final Task Report*, Prepared for the U.S. EIA, Office of Coal, Nuclear, Electric and Alternative Fuels (Washington, DC 1992).

2002 Update

The methodology employed for these estimates was unchanged from previous years; however, the underlying coal data sample set was updated. A new database, CoalQual 2.0 (1998), compiled by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) was adopted for the updated analysis. The updated sample set included 6,588 coal samples collected by the USGS and its state affiliates between 1973 and 1989. The decision to switch to the sample data contained in the USGS CoalQual database from the EIA database was made because the samples contained in the USGS database were collected and analyzed more recently than those obtained by EIA from the Bureau of Mines. The new coefficients developed in the 2002 revision were in use through the 1990 through 2007 Inventory and are provided in Table A-59.

Table A-59: Carbon Content Coefficients for Coal by Consuming Sector and Coal Rank, 1990 – 2000 (MMT C/QBtu)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Consuming Sector											
Electric Power	25.68	25.69	25.69	25.71	25.72	25.74	25.74	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76
Industrial Coking	25.51	25.51	25.51	25.51	25.52	25.53	25.55	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56
Other Industrial	25.58	25.60	25.62	25.61	25.63	25.63	25.61	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63
Residential/ Commercial	25.92	26.00	26.13	25.97	25.95	26.00	25.92	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00
Coal Rank											
Anthracite	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26
Bituminous	25.43	25.45	25.44	25.45	25.46	25.47	25.47	25.48	25.47	25.48	25.49
Sub-bituminous	26.50	26.49	26.49	26.48	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.48
Lignite	26.19	26.21	26.22	26.21	26.24	26.22	26.17	26.20	26.23	26.26	26.30

Sources: Data from USGS, U.S. Coal Quality Database Version 2.0 (1998) and analysis prepared by SAIC (2007).

2007 Update

The analysis of the USGS CoalQual data was updated in 2007 to make a technical correction that affected the value for lignite and those sectors which consume lignite. Table A-60 contains the annual coefficients that resulted from the 2007 analysis.

1 **Table A-60: Carbon Content Coefficients for Coal by Consuming Sector and Coal Rank, 1990-2007 (MMT C/QBtu)**

	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Consuming Sector														
Electric Power	25.68	25.74	25.74	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76	25.76
Industrial Coking	25.51	25.53	25.55	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56	25.56
Other Industrial	25.58	25.63	25.61	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63
Residential/Commercial	25.92	26.00	25.92	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00
Coal Rank														
Anthracite	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26	28.26
Bituminous	25.43	25.47	25.47	25.48	25.47	25.48	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49
Sub-bituminous	26.50	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.49	26.48	26.48	26.48	26.48	26.48	26.48	26.48	26.48
Lignite	26.19	26.22	26.17	26.20	26.23	26.26	26.30	26.30	26.30	26.30	26.30	26.30	26.30	26.57

2 Sources: Data from USGS, U.S. Coal Quality Database Version 2.0 (1998) and analysis prepared by (SAIC 2007).
3

2010 Update

The estimated annual C content coefficients for coal by rank and sector of consumption were updated again in 2010. Sample data from the Energy Institute at Pennsylvania State University (504 samples) were added to the 6,588 USGS samples to create a new database of 7,092 samples. The same analytical method used in the 2002 update was applied from 2010 on using these additional samples to calculate revised state-level carbon contents for each coal rank and then for national average consumption by end-use sector and by rank.

Natural Gas

2010 Update

A revised analytical methodology introduced in 2010 underlies the natural gas coefficients used in this report. Prior to 2010, descriptive statistics were used to stratify 6,743 samples of pipeline quality natural gas by heat content and then to determine the average C content of natural gas at the national average heat content (EIA 1994). The same coefficient was applied to all pipeline natural gas consumption for all years, because U.S. energy statistics showed a range of national average heat contents of pipeline gas of only 1,025 to 1,031 Btu per cubic foot (1 percent) from 1990 through 1994. A separate factor was developed in the same manner for all flared gas. Previously, a weighted national average C content was calculated using the average C contents for each sub-sample of gas that conformed with an individual state's typical cubic foot of natural gas since there is regional variation in energy content. The result was a weighted national average of 14.47 MMT C/QBtu.

Beginning in 2010, the Inventory was revised to make use of the same set of samples, but utilized a regression equation, as described above, of sample-based heat content and carbon content data in order to calculate annually-variable national average C content coefficients based on annual national average heat contents for pipeline natural gas and for flare gas. In addition, the revised analysis calculated an average C content from all samples with less than 1.5 percent CO₂ and less than 1,050 Btu/cf (samples most closely approximating the makeup of pipeline quality natural gas). The result was identical to the previous weighted national average of 14.47 MMT C/QBtu. The average C contents from the 1994 calculations are presented in Table A-61 below for comparison.

Table A-61: Carbon Content of Pipeline-Quality Natural Gas by Energy Content (MMT C/QBtu)

Sample	Average Carbon Content
GRI Full Sample	14.51
Greater than 1,000 Btu	14.47
1,025 to 1,035 Btu	14.45
975 to 1,000 Btu	14.73
1,000 to 1,025 Btu	14.43
1,025 to 1,050 Btu	14.47
1,050 to 1,075 Btu	14.58
1,075 to 1,100 Btu	14.65
Greater than 1,100 Btu	14.92
Weighted National Average	14.47

Source: EIA (1994).

Petroleum Products

All of the petroleum product C coefficients except that for Aviation Gasoline Blending Components were updated in 2010 for the 1990-2008 Inventory and held constant through the current Inventory. EPA updated these factors to better align the fuel properties data that underlie the Inventory factors with those published in EPA's *Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule* (EPA 2009b), Suppliers of Petroleum Products (MM) and Stationary Combustion (C) subparts. The coefficients that were applied in previous reports are provided in Table A-62 below. Specifically, each of the coefficients used in this report have been calculated from updated density and C share data, largely adopted from analyses undertaken for the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule (EPA 2009b). In some cases, the heat content applied to the conversion to a carbon-per-unit-energy basis was also updated. Additionally, the category Misc. Products (U.S. Territories), which is based upon the coefficients calculated for crude oil, was allowed to vary annually with the crude oil coefficient. The petrochemical feedstock category was eliminated because the constituent products—naphthas and other oils—are estimated independently. Further, although the level of aggregation of U.S. energy statistics currently limits the application of coefficients for residual and distillate fuels to these two generic classifications, individual coefficients for the five major types of fuel oil (Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6) were estimated and are presented in Table A-51 above. Each of the C coefficients applied in previous Inventories are provided below for comparison (Table A-62).

Table A-62: Carbon Content Coefficients and Underlying Data for Petroleum Products

Fuel	Carbon Content (MMT C/QBtu)	Gross Heat of Combustion (MMBtu/Barrel)	Density (API Gravity)	Percent Carbon
Motor Gasoline	19.33	5.219	59.1	86.60
LPG (total) ^a	16.99	(See b)	(See b)	(See b)
LPG (energy use)	17.18	(See b)	(See b)	(See b)
LPG (non-energy use)	16.76	(See b)	(See b)	(See b)
Jet Fuel	19.33	5.670	42.0	86.30
Distillate Fuel	19.95	5.825	35.5	86.34
Residual Fuel	21.49	6.287	11.0	85.68
Asphalt and Road Oil	20.62	6.636	5.6	83.47
Lubricants	20.24	6.065	25.6	85.80
Petrochemical Feedstocks	19.37	5.248 ^c	67.1 ^c	84.11 ^c
Aviation Gas	18.87	5.048	69.0	85.00
Kerosene	19.72	5.670	41.4	86.01
Petroleum Coke	27.85	6.024	-	92.28
Special Naphtha	19.86	5.248	51.2	84.76
Petroleum Waxes	19.81	5.537	43.3	85.29
Still Gas	17.51	6.000	-	-
Crude Oil	20.33	5.800	30.5	85.49
Unfinished Oils	20.33	5.825	30.5	85.49
Miscellaneous Products	20.33	5.796	30.5	85.49
Pentanes Plus	18.24	4.620	81.7	83.70
Natural Gasoline	18.24	4.620	81.7	83.70

^a LPG is a blend of multiple paraffinic hydrocarbons: ethane, propane, isobutane, and normal butane, each with their own heat content, density and C content, see Table A-54.

^b Heat, density, and percent carbon values are provided separately for ethane, propane and isobutene.

^c Parameters presented are for naphthas with a boiling temperature less than 400 degrees Fahrenheit. Petrochemical feedstocks with higher boiling points are assumed to have the same characteristics as distillate fuel.

Note: "-" Indicates no sample data available.

Sources: EIA (1994); EIA (2008a); SAIC (2007).

Additional revisions to the Inventory's C coefficients since 1990 are detailed below.

Jet Fuel

1995 Update

Between 1994 and 1995, the C content coefficient for kerosene-based jet fuel was revised downward from 19.71 MMT C/QBtu to 19.33 MMT C/QBtu. This downward revision was the result of a shift in the sample set used from one collected between 1959 and 1972 and reported on by Martel and Angello in 1977 to one collected by Boeing in 1989 and published by Hadaller and Momeny in 1990. The downward revision was a result of a decrease in density, as well as slightly lower C shares than in the earlier samples. However, the assumed heat content is unchanged because it is based on an EIA standard and probably yields a downward bias in the revised C content coefficient.

1990 through 2008 Inventory Update

The coefficient was revised again for the 1990 through 2008 Inventory, returning to Martel and Angello and NIPER as the source of the carbon share and density data, respectively, for kerosene-based fuels. This change was made in order to align the coefficients used for this report with the values used in EPA's *Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule* (EPA 2009b). The return to the use of the Martel and Angello and NIPER coefficients was deemed more appropriate for the Rule as it was considered a more conservative coefficient given the uncertainty and variability in coefficients across the types of jet fuel in use in the United States.

Liquefied Petroleum Gases (LPG)

The C content coefficient of LPG is updated annually to reflect changes in the consumption mix of the underlying compounds: ethane; propane; isobutane; and normal butane. In 1994, EIA included pentanes plus—assumed to have the

characteristics of hexane—in the mix of compounds broadly described as LPG. In 1995, EIA removed pentanes plus from this fuel category. Because pentanes plus is relatively rich in C per unit of energy, its removal from the consumption mix lowered the C content coefficient for LPG from 17.26 MMT C/QBtu to 16.99 MMT C/QBtu. In 1998, EIA began separating LPG consumption into two categories: energy use and non-fuel use and providing individual coefficients for each. Because LPG for fuel use typically contains higher proportions of propane than LPG for non-fuel use, the C content coefficient for fuel use was 1.8 to 2.5 percent higher than the coefficient for non-fuel use in previous inventories (see Table A-62).

However, for the current update of the LPG coefficients, the assumptions that underlie the selection of density and heat content data for each pure LPG compound have been updated, leading to a significant revision of the assumed properties of ethane. In 2010, the physical characteristics of ethane, which constitutes over 90 percent of LPG consumption for non-fuel uses, were been updated to reflect ethane that is in (refrigerated) liquid form. Previously, the share of ethane was included using the density and energy content of gaseous ethane. Table A-63, below, compares the values applied for each of the compounds under the two sets of coefficient calculations. The C share of each pure compound was also updated by using more precise values for each compound's molecular weight.

Due in large part to the revised assumptions for ethane, the weighted C content for non-fuel use is now higher than that of the weighted coefficient for fuel use, which is dominated by the consumption of more dense propane. Under the revised assumptions, each annual weighted coefficient for non-fuel LPG consumption is 1.2 to 1.7 percent higher each year than is that for LPGs consumed for fuel (energy) uses.

Table A-63: Physical Characteristics of Liquefied Petroleum Gases

Compound	Chemical Formula	1990-2007		Updated		1990-2007	
		Density (bbl / MT)	Density (bbl / MT)	Energy Content (MMBtu/bbl)	Energy Content (MMBtu/bbl)	C Content Coefficient (MMT C/QBtu)	C Content Coefficient (MMT C/QBtu)
Ethane	C ₂ H ₆	16.88	11.55	2.916	3.082	16.25	17.16
Propane	C ₃ H ₈	12.44	12.76	3.824	3.836	17.20	16.76
Isobutane	C ₄ H ₁₀	11.20	11.42	4.162	3.974	17.75	17.77
n-butane	C ₄ H ₁₀	10.79	10.98	4.328	4.326	17.72	17.75

Sources: Updated: Densities – CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 89th Ed. (2008/09); Energy Contents – EPA (2009b). All values are for the compound in liquid form. The density and energy content of ethane are for refrigerated ethane (-89 degrees C). Values for n-butane are for pressurized butane (-25 degrees C). Values in previous editions of this Inventory: Gurthrie (1960).

Motor Gasoline

The C content coefficient for motor gasoline varies annually based on the density of and proportion of additives in a representative sample of motor gasoline examined each year. However, in 1997 EIA began incorporating the effects of the introduction of reformulated gasoline into its estimate of C content coefficients for motor gasoline. This change resulted in a downward step function in C content coefficients for gasoline of approximately 0.3 percent beginning in 1995. In 2005 through 2006 reformulated fuels containing ethers began to be phased out nationally. Ethanol was added to gasoline blends as a replacement oxygenate, leading to another shift in gasoline density (see Table A-52), in the list and proportion of constituents that form the blend and in the blended C share based on those constituents.

1

Table A-64: Carbon Content Coefficients for Petroleum Products, 1990-2007 (MMT C/QBtu)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Petroleum														
Asphalt and Road Oil	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62	20.62
Aviation Gasoline	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87
Distillate Fuel Oil	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95
Jet Fuel ^a	19.40	19.34	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33
Kerosene	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72
LPG (energy use) ^a	17.21	17.20	17.20	17.18	17.23	17.25	17.20	17.21	17.20	17.21	17.20	17.19	17.19	17.18
LPG (non-energy use) ^a	16.83	16.87	16.86	16.88	16.88	16.84	16.81	16.83	16.82	16.84	16.81	16.81	16.78	16.76
Lubricants	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24	20.24
Motor Gasoline ^a	19.41	19.38	19.36	19.35	19.33	19.33	19.34	19.34	19.35	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33
Residual Fuel	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49	21.49
Other Petroleum														
Av Gas Blend Comp.	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87	18.87
Mo Gas Blend Comp ^a	19.41	19.38	19.36	19.35	19.33	19.33	19.34	19.34	19.35	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33	19.33
Crude Oil ^a	20.16	20.23	20.25	20.24	20.24	20.19	20.23	20.29	20.30	20.28	20.33	20.33	20.33	20.33
Misc. Products ^a	20.16	20.23	20.25	20.24	20.24	20.19	20.23	20.29	20.30	20.28	20.33	20.33	20.33	20.33
Misc. Products (Terr.)	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Naphtha (<401 deg. F)	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14	18.14
Other oil (>401 deg. F)	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95	19.95
Pentanes Plus	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24	18.24
Petrochemical Feed.	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37	19.37
Petroleum Coke	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85	27.85
Still Gas	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51	17.51
Special Naphtha	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86	19.86
Unfinished Oils ^a	20.16	20.23	20.25	20.24	20.24	20.19	20.23	20.29	20.30	20.28	20.33	20.33	20.33	20.33
Waxes	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81
Other Wax and Misc.	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81	19.81

2

^aC contents vary annually based on changes in fuel composition.

References

- AAM (2009) *Diesel Survey*. Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Winter 2008.
- API (1990 through 2008) *Sales of Natural Gas Liquids and Liquefied Refinery Gases*, American Petroleum Institute.
- ASTM (1985) *ASTM and Other Specifications for Petroleum Products and Lubricants*, American Society for Testing and Materials. Philadelphia, PA.
- Boldt, K. and B.R. Hall (1977) *Significance of Tests for Petroleum Products*, Philadelphia, PA, American Society for Testing and Materials, p. 30.
- Chemical Rubber Company (CRC) (2008/2009), *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 89th Ed., editor D. Lide, Cleveland, OH: CRC Press.
- DOC (1929) *Thermal Properties of Petroleum Products*, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards. Washington, DC. pp.16-21.
- EIA (2018) *Petroleum Supply Annual*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/petroleum_supply_annual/psa_volume1/psa_volume1.html>.
- EIA (2001 through 2017a) *Annual Coal Report*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. Washington, DC. DOE/EIA 0584.
- EIA (2001 through 2017b) *Annual Coal Distribution Report*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. Washington, DC. DOE/EIA.
- EIA (2008a) *Monthly Energy Review, September 2006* and Published Supplemental Tables on Petroleum Product detail. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0035(2007/9).
- EIA (2008b) *Documentation for Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 2006*. DOE/EIA-0638(2006). October 2008.
- EIA (2009) *Annual Energy Review*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0384(2008).
- EIA (2001) *Cost and Quality of Fuels for Electric Utility Plants 2000*, Energy Information Administration. Washington, DC. August 2001. Available online at <http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/electricity/cq/cq_sum.html>.
- EIA (1990 through 2001) *Coal Industry Annual*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. Washington, DC. DOE/EIA 0584.
- EIA (1994) *Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 1987-1992*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, DC. November, 1994. DOE/EIA 0573.
- EIA (1993) *Btu Tax on Finished Petroleum Products*, Energy Information Administration, Petroleum Supply Division (unpublished manuscript, April 1993).
- EPA (2010) *Carbon Content Coefficients Developed for EPA's Inventory of Greenhouse Gases and Sinks*. Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Atmospheric Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- EPA (2009a) "Industry Overview and Current Reporting Requirements for Petroleum Refining and Petroleum Imports," Petroleum Product Suppliers Technical Support Document for the Proposed Mandatory Reporting Rule. Office of Air and Radiation. 30 January, 2009.
- EPA (2009b) *Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule*. Federal Register Docket ID EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0508-2278, 30 September, 2009.
- Gas Technology Institute (1992) Database as documented in W.E. Liss, W.H. Thrasher, G.F. Steinmetz, P. Chowdiah, and A. Atari, *Variability of Natural Gas Composition in Select Major Metropolitan Areas of the United States*. GRI-92/0123. March 1992.
- Green & Perry, ed. (2008). *Perry's Chemical Engineers' Handbook*, 8th Ed. New York, NY, McGraw-Hill.
- Guthrie, V.B., ed. (1960) *Characteristics of Compounds*, Petroleum Products Handbook, p.3-3. New York, NY, McGraw-Hill.

- 1 Hadaller, O.J. and A.M. Momeny (1990) *The Characteristics of Future Fuels*, Part 1, "Conventional Heat Fuels". Seattle,
2 WA, Boeing Corp. September 1990. pp. 46-50 (2006).
- 3 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*.
4 Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme (Japan, 2006).
- 5 Matar, S. and L. Hatch (2000) *Chemistry of Petrochemical Processes*, 2nd Ed. Gulf Publishing Company: Houston.
- 6 Martel, C.R., and L.C. Angello (1977) "Hydrogen Content as a Measure of the Combustion Performance of Hydrocarbon
7 Fuels," in *Current Research in Petroleum Fuels*, Volume I. New York, NY, MSS Information Company, p. 116.
- 8 Martin, S.W. (1960) "Petroleum Coke," in Virgil Guthrie (ed.), *Petroleum Processing Handbook*, New York, NY, McGraw-
9 Hill, pp. 14-15.
- 10 Meyers (2004) *Handbook of Petroleum Refining Processes*, 3rd ed., NY, NY: McGraw Hill.
- 11 National Institute for Petroleum and Energy Research (1990 through 2009) *Motor Gasolines, Summer and Motor Gasolines*,
12 *Winter*.
- 13 NIPER (1993) C. Dickson, *Aviation Turbine Fuels, 1992*, NIPER-179 PPS93/2 (Bartlesville, OK: National Institute for
14 Petroleum and Energy Research, March 1993).
- 15 Pennsylvania State University (PSU) (2010) Coal Sample Bank and Database. Data received by SAIC 18 February 2010
16 from Gareth Mitchell, The Energy Institute, Pennsylvania State University.
- 17 Quick, Jeffrey (2010) "Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors for U.S. Coal by Origin and Destination," *Environmental Science*
18 *& Technology*, Forthcoming.
- 19 SAIC (2007) Analysis prepared by Science Applications International Corporation for EPA, Office of Air and Radiation,
20 Market Policies Branch.
- 21 U.S. National Research Council (1927) *International Critical Tables of Numerical Data, Physics, Chemistry, and*
22 *Technology*, New York, NY, McGraw-Hill.
- 23 Unzelman, G.H. (1992) "A Sticky Point for Refiners: FCC Gasoline and the Complex Model," *Fuel Reformulation*,
24 July/August 1992, p. 29.
- 25 USGS (1998) *CoalQual Database Version 2.0*, U.S. Geological Survey.
- 26 Wauquier, J., ed. (1995) *Petroleum Refining, Crude Oil, Petroleum Products and Process Flowsheets* (Editions Technip -
27 Paris, 1995) pg.225, Table 5.16.

2.3. Methodology for Estimating Carbon Emitted from Non-Energy Uses of Fossil Fuels

Carbon (C) storage associated with the non-energy use of fossil fuels was calculated by multiplying each fuel's potential emissions (i.e., each fuel's total C content) by a fuel-specific storage factor, as listed in Table A-65. The remaining C—i.e., that which is not stored—is emitted. This sub-annex explains the methods and data sources employed in developing the storage factors for (1) petrochemical feedstocks (industrial other coal, natural gas for non-fertilizer uses, liquefied petroleum gases (LPG), pentanes plus, naphthas, other oils, still gas, special naphtha), (2) asphalt and road oil, (3) lubricants, (4) waxes, and (5) miscellaneous products. The storage factors²⁵ for the remaining other (industrial coking coal, petroleum coke, distillate fuel oil, and other petroleum) non-energy fuel uses are either based on values recommended for use by IPCC (2006), or when these were not available, assumptions based on the potential fate of C in the respective non-energy use (NEU) products.

Table A-65: Fuel Types and Percent of C Stored for Non-Energy Uses

Sector/Fuel Type	Storage Factor (%)
Industry	
Industrial Coking Coal ^a	10%
Industrial Other Coal ^b	67%
Natural Gas to Chemical Plants ^b	67%
Asphalt & Road Oil	100%
LPG ^b	67%
Lubricants	9%
Pentanes Plus ^b	67%
Naphtha (<401 deg. F) ^b	67%
Other Oil (>401 deg. F) ^b	67%
Still Gas ^b	67%
Petroleum Coke ^c	30%
Special Naphtha ^b	67%
Distillate Fuel Oil	50%
Waxes	58%
Miscellaneous Products	0%
Transportation	
Lubricants	9%
U.S. Territories	
Lubricants	9%
Other Petroleum (Misc. Prod.)	10%

^a Includes processes for which specific coking coal consumption and emission factor data are not available. Consumption of coking coal for production of iron and steel is covered in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter.

^b The storage factor listed is the value for 2017. As described in this annex, the factor varies over time.

^c Assumes petroleum coke consumption is for pigments. Consumption of petroleum coke for production of primary aluminum anodes, electric arc furnace anodes, titanium dioxide, ammonia, urea, and ferroalloys is covered in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter.

The following sections describe the non-energy uses in greater detail, outlining the methods employed and data used in estimating each storage factor. Several of the fuel types tracked by EIA are used in organic chemical synthesis and in other manufacturing processes, and are referred to collectively as “petrochemical feedstocks.” Because the methods and data used to analyze them overlap, they are handled as a group and are discussed first. Discussions of the storage factors for asphalt and road oil, lubricants, waxes, miscellaneous, and other products follow.

²⁵ Throughout this section, references to “storage factors” represent the proportion of carbon stored.

Petrochemical Feedstocks

Petrochemical feedstocks—industrial other coal, natural gas for non-fertilizer uses, LPG, pentanes plus, naphthas, other oils, still gas, special naphtha—are used in the manufacture of a wide variety of man-made chemicals and products. Plastics, rubber, synthetic fibers, solvents, paints, fertilizers, pharmaceuticals, and food additives are just a few of the derivatives of these fuel types. Chemically speaking, these fuels are diverse, ranging from simple natural gas (i.e., predominantly CH₄) to heavier, more complex naphthas and other oils.²⁶

After adjustments for (1) use in industrial processes and (2) net exports, these eight fuel categories constituted approximately 223.0 MMT CO₂ Eq., or 65 percent, of the 342.7 MMT CO₂ Eq. of non-energy fuel consumption in 2017. For 2017, the storage factor for the eight fuel categories was 67 percent. In other words, of the net consumption, 67 percent was destined for long-term storage in products—including products subsequently combusted for waste disposal—while the remaining 33 percent was emitted to the atmosphere directly as CO₂ (e.g., through combustion of industrial by-products) or indirectly as CO₂ precursors (e.g., through evaporative product use). The indirect emissions include a variety of organic gases such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and carbon monoxide (CO), which eventually oxidize into CO₂ in the atmosphere. The derivation of the storage factor is described in the following sections.

Methodology and Data Sources

The petrochemical feedstocks storage factor is equal to the ratio of C stored in the final products to total C content for the non-energy fossil fuel feedstocks used in industrial processes, after adjusting for net exports of feedstocks. One aggregate storage factor was calculated to represent all eight fuel feedstock types. The feedstocks were grouped because of the overlap of their derivative products. Due to the many reaction pathways involved in producing petrochemical products (or wastes), it becomes extraordinarily complex to link individual products (or wastes) to their parent fuel feedstocks.

Import and export data for feedstocks were obtained from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) for the major categories of petrochemical feedstocks. EIA's *Petroleum Supply Annual* publication tracks imports and exports of petrochemical feedstocks, including butanes, butylenes, ethane, ethylene, propane, propylene, LPG, and naphthas (i.e., most of the large volume primary chemicals produced by petroleum refineries). These imports and exports are already factored into the U.S. fuel consumption statistics. However, EIA does not track imports and exports of chemical intermediates and products produced by the chemical industry (e.g., xylenes, vinyl chloride), which are derived from the primary chemicals produced by the refineries. These products represent very large flows of C derived from fossil fuels (i.e., fossil C), so estimates of net flows not already considered in EIA's dataset were developed for the entire time series from 1990 to 2017.

The approach to estimate imports and exports involves three steps, listed here and then described in more detail below:

Step 1. Identify commodities derived from petrochemical feedstocks, and calculate net import/export for each.

Step 2. Estimate the C content for each commodity.

Step 3. Sum the net C imports/exports across all commodities.

Step 1 relies heavily on information provided by the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association (NPRA) and U.S. Bureau of the Census (BoC) trade statistics published by the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC). NPRA provided a spreadsheet of the ten-digit BoC Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) Commodity Codes used to compile import-export data for periodic reports issued to NPRA's membership on trade issues. Additional feedstock commodities were identified by HTS code in the BoC data system and included in the net import/export analysis.

One of the difficulties in analyzing trade data is that a large portion of the outputs from the refining industry are fuels and fuel components, and it was difficult to segregate these from the outputs used for non-energy uses. The NPRA-supplied codes identify fuels and fuel components, thus providing a sound basis for isolating net imports/exports of petrochemical feedstocks. Although MTBE and related ether imports are included in the published NPRA data, these commodities are not included in the total net imports/exports calculated here, because it is assumed that they are fuel additives and do not contribute to domestic petrochemical feedstocks. Net exports of MTBE and related ethers are also not included in the totals, as these commodities are considered to be refinery products that are already accounted for in the EIA data. Imports and exports of commodities for which production and consumption data are provided by EIA (e.g., butane, ethylene, and liquefied petroleum gases) are also not included in the totals, to avoid double-counting.

²⁶ Naphthas are compounds distilled from petroleum containing 4 to 12 carbon atoms per molecule and having a boiling point less than 401 degrees Fahrenheit. "Other oils" are distillates containing 12 to 25 carbon atoms per molecule and having a boiling point greater than 401 degrees Fahrenheit.

Another difficulty is that one must be careful to assure that there is not double-counting of imports and exports in the data set. Other parts of the mass balance (described later) provide information on C flows, in some cases based on production data and in other cases based on consumption data. Production data relates only to production within the country; consumption data incorporates information on imports and exports as well as production. Because many commodities are emissive in their use, but not necessarily their production, consumption data is appropriately used in calculations for emissive fates. For purposes of developing an overall mass balance on U.S. non-energy uses of C, for those materials that are non-emissive (e.g., plastics), production data is most applicable. And for purposes of adjusting the mass balance to incorporate C flows associated with imports and exports, it was necessary to carefully review whether or not the mass balance already incorporated cross-boundary flows (through the use of consumption data), and to adjust the import/export balance accordingly.

The BoC trade statistics are publicly available²⁷ and cover a complete time series from 1990 to 2017. These statistics include information on imports and exports of thousands of commodities. After collecting information on annual flows of the more than 100 commodities identified by NPRA, Step 2 involves calculating the C content for each commodity from its chemical formula. In cases where the imports and exports were expressed in units of volume, rather than mass, they were converted to mass based on the commodities' densities.

Step 3 involves summing the net C imports/exports across all commodities. The results of this step are shown in Table A-66. As shown in the table, the United States has been a net exporter of chemical intermediates and products throughout the 1990 to 2017 period.

Table A-66: Net Exports of Petrochemical Feedstocks, 1990 – 2017 (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	2005	2010	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Net Exports	12.0	6.5	7.3	8.4	3.8	5.5	12.7	14.0

After adjusting for imports and exports, the C budget is adjusted for the quantity of C that is used in the Industrial Processes and Product Use sector of the Inventory. Fossil fuels used for non-energy purposes in industrial processes—and for which C emissions and storage have been characterized through mass balance calculations and/or emission factors that directly link the non-energy use fossil fuel raw material and the industrial process product—are not included in the non-energy use sector. These industrial processes (and their non-energy use fossil fuel raw materials) include iron and steel (coal coke), primary aluminum (petroleum coke), titanium oxide (petroleum coke), ferroalloys (petroleum coke), and ammonia and urea (petroleum coke and natural gas).

For each year of the Inventory, the total C content of non-energy uses was calculated by starting with the EIA estimate of non-energy use, and reducing it by the adjustment factor for net exports (see Table A-66) to yield net domestic fuel consumption for non-energy. The balance was apportioned to either stored C or emissive C, based on a storage factor.

The overall storage factor for the feedstocks was determined by developing a mass balance on the C in feedstocks, and characterizing products, uses, and environmental releases as resulting in either storage or emissions. The total C in the system was estimated by multiplying net domestic consumption for non-energy by the C content of each of the feedstocks (i.e., industrial other coal, natural gas for non-fertilizer uses, LPG, pentanes plus, naphthas, other oils, still gas, special naphtha). Carbon content values for the fuel feedstocks are discussed in the Estimating Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion and Estimating the Carbon Content from Fossil Fuel Combustion Annexes.

Next, C pools and releases in a variety of industrial releases, energy recovery processes, and products were characterized. The C fate categories are plastics, energy recovery, synthetic rubber, synthetic fibers, organic solvents, C black, detergents and personal cleansers, industrial non-methane volatile organic compound (NMVOC) emissions, hazardous waste incineration, industrial toxic chemical (i.e., TRI) releases, pesticides, food additives, antifreeze and deicers (glycols), and silicones.²⁸

The C in each product or waste produced was categorized as either stored or emitted. The aggregate storage factor is the C-weighted average of storage across fuel types. As discussed later in the section on uncertainty, the sum of stored C and emitted C (i.e., the outputs of the system) exceeded total C consumption (i.e., the inputs to the system) for some years in the time series. To address this mass imbalance, the storage factor was calculated as C storage divided by total C outputs (rather than C storage divided by C inputs).

²⁷ See the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) Trade Dataweb at <<http://dataweb.usitc.gov/>>.

²⁸ For the most part, the releases covered by the U.S. Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) represent air emissions or water discharges associated with production facilities. Similarly, VOC emissions are generally associated with production facilities. These emissions could have been accounted for as part of the Waste chapter, but because they are not necessarily associated with waste management, they were included here. Toxic releases are not a “product” category, but they are referred to as such for ease of discussion.

Note that the system boundaries for the storage factor do not encompass the entire life-cycle of fossil-based C consumed in the United States insofar as emissions of CO₂ from waste combustion are accounted for separately in the Inventory and are discussed in the Incineration of Waste section of the Energy chapter.

The following sections provide details on the calculation steps, assumptions, and data sources employed in estimating and classifying the C in each product and waste shown in Table A-67. Summing the C stored and dividing it by total C outputs yields the overall storage factor, as shown in the following equation for 2017:

$$\text{Overall Storage Factor} = \text{C Stored} / (\text{C Stored} + \text{C Emitted} + \text{C Unaccounted for}) =$$

$$149.9 \text{ MMT CO}_2 \text{ Eq.} / (149.9 + 65.1 + 7.9) \text{ MMT CO}_2 \text{ Eq.} = 67\%$$

Table A-67: C Stored and Emitted by Products from Feedstocks in 2017 (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Product/Waste Type	C Stored (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	C Emitted (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Industrial Releases	0.1	6.4
TRI Releases	0.1	1.0
Industrial VOCs	NA	4.0
Non-combustion CO	NA	0.6
Hazardous Waste Incin.	NA	0.8
Energy Recovery	NA	45.6
Products	149.8	13.0
Plastics	127.1	NA
Synthetic Rubber	14.3	NA
Antifreeze and deicers	NA	1.0
Abraded tire rubber	NA	0.2
Food additives	NA	1.1
Silicones	0.5	NA
Synthetic Fiber	7.7	NA
Pesticides	0.2	0.3
Soaps, shampoos, detergents	NA	4.7
Solvent VOCs	NA	5.7
Total	149.9	65.1

NA (Not Applicable)

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

The C unaccounted for is the difference between the C accounted for (discussed below) and the total C in the Total U.S. Petrochemical consumption, which are the potential carbon emissions from all energy consumption in Non-Energy Use.

The three categories of C accounted for in the table are industrial releases, energy recovery, and products. Each is discussed below.

Industrial Releases

Industrial releases include toxic chemicals reported through the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI), industrial emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), CO emissions (other than those related to fuel combustion), and emissions from hazardous waste incineration.

TRI Releases

Fossil-derived C is found in many toxic substances released by industrial facilities. The TRI, maintained by EPA, tracks these releases by chemical and environmental release medium (i.e., land, air, or water) on a biennial basis (EPA 2000b). By examining the C contents and receiving media for the top 35 toxic chemicals released, which account for 90 percent of the total mass of chemicals, the quantity of C stored and emitted in the form of toxic releases can be estimated.

The TRI specifies releases by chemical, so C contents were assigned to each chemical based on molecular formula. The TRI also classifies releases by disposal location as either off-site or on-site. The on-site releases are further subdivided into air emissions, surface water discharges, underground injection, and releases to land; the latter is further broken down to

disposal in a RCRA Subtitle C (i.e., hazardous waste) landfill or to “Other On-Site Land Disposal.”²⁹ The C released in each disposal location is provided in Table A-68.

Each on-site classification was assigned a storage factor. A 100 percent storage factor was applied to disposition of C to underground injection and to disposal to RCRA-permitted landfills, while the other disposition categories were assumed to result in an ultimate fate of emission as CO₂ (i.e., a storage factor of zero was applied to these categories). The release allocation is not reported for off-site releases; therefore, the approach was to develop a C-weighted average storage factor for the on-site C and apply it to the off-site releases.

For the remaining 10 percent of the TRI releases, the weights of all chemicals were added and an average C content value, based upon the top 35 chemicals’ C contents, was applied. The storage and emission allocation for the remaining 10 percent of the TRI releases was carried out in the same fashion as for the 35 major chemicals.

Data on TRI releases for the full 1990 through 2017 time series were not readily available. Since this category is small (less than 1 MMT C emitted and stored), the 1998 value was applied for the entire time series.

Table A-68: 1998 TRI Releases by Disposal Location (kt CO₂ Eq.)

Disposal Location	Carbon Stored (kt CO ₂ Eq.)	Carbon Emitted (kt CO ₂ Eq.)
Air Emissions	NA	924
Surface Water Discharges	NA	6.7
Underground Injection	89.4	NA
RCRA Subtitle C Landfill Disposal	1.4	NA
Other On-Site Land Releases	NA	15.9
Off-site Releases	6.4	36
Total	97.2	982.6

NA (Not Applicable)

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Industrial Processes and Solvent Evaporation Emissions

Data on annual non-methane volatile organic compound (NMVOC) emissions were obtained (EPA 2018) and disaggregated based on EPA (2003), which has been published on the National Emission Inventory (NEI) Air Pollutant Emission Trends web site. The 1990 through 2017 Trends data include information on NMVOC emissions by end-use category; some of these fall into the heading of “industrial releases” in Table A-67 above, and others are related to “product use;” for ease of discussion, both are covered here. The end-use categories that represent “Industrial NMVOC Emissions” include some chemical and allied products, certain petroleum related industries, and other industrial processes. NMVOC emissions from solvent utilization (product use) were considered to be a result of non-energy use of petrochemical feedstocks. These categories were used to distinguish non-energy uses from energy uses; other categories where VOCs could be emitted due to combustion of fossil fuels were excluded to avoid double counting.

Because solvent evaporation and industrial NMVOC emission data are provided in tons of total NMVOCs, assumptions were made concerning the average C content of the NMVOCs for each category of emissions. The assumptions for calculating the C fraction of industrial and solvent utilization emissions were made separately and differ significantly. For industrial NMVOC emissions, a C content of 85 percent was assumed. This value was chosen to reflect the C content of an average volatile organic compound based on the list of the most abundant NMVOCs provided in the Trends Report. The list contains only pure hydrocarbons, including saturated alkanes (C contents ranging from 80 to 85 percent based upon C number), alkenes (C contents approximately 85 percent), and some aromatics (C contents approximately 90 percent, depending upon substitution).

An EPA solvent evaporation emissions dataset (Tooly 2001) was used to estimate the C content of solvent emissions. The dataset identifies solvent emissions by compound or compound category for six different solvent end-use categories: degreasing, graphic arts, dry cleaning, surface coating, other industrial processes, and non-industrial processes. The percent C of each compound identified in the dataset was calculated based on the molecular formula of the individual compound (e.g., the C content of methylene chloride is 14 percent; the C content of toluene is 91 percent). For solvent emissions that are identified in the EPA dataset only by chemical category (e.g., butanediol derivatives) a single individual

²⁹ Only the top nine chemicals had their land releases separated into RCRA Landfills and Other Land Disposal. For the remaining chemicals, it was assumed that the ratio of disposal in these two categories was equal to the carbon-weighted average of the land disposal fate of the top nine chemicals (i.e., 8 percent attributed to RCRA Landfills and 92 percent in the “Other” category).

compound was selected to represent each category, and the C content of the category was estimated based on the C content of the representative compound. The overall C content of the solvent evaporation emissions for 1998, estimated to be 56 percent, is assumed to be constant across the entire time series.

The results of the industrial and solvent NMVOC emissions analysis are provided in Table A-69 for 1990 through 2017. Industrial NMVOC emissions in 2017 were 4.0 MMT CO₂ Eq. and solvent evaporation emissions in 2017 were 5.7 MMT CO₂ Eq.

Table A-69: Industrial and Solvent NMVOC Emissions

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Industrial NMVOCs^a									
NMVOCs ('000 Short Tons)	1,279	1,358	802	825	1,377	1,421	1,421	1,421	1,421
Carbon Content (%)	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
Carbon Emitted (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	3.6	3.8	2.3	2.3	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Solvent Evaporation^b									
Solvents ('000 Short Tons)	5,750	6,183	4,832	4,245	2,972	3,052	3,052	3,052	3,052
Carbon Content (%)	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%	56%
Carbon Emitted (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	10.8	11.6	9.0	7.9	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7

^a Includes emissions from chemical and allied products, petroleum and related industries, and other industrial processes categories.

^b Includes solvent usage and solvent evaporation emissions from degreasing, graphic arts, dry cleaning, surface coating, other industrial processes, and non-industrial processes.

Non-Combustion Carbon Monoxide Emissions

Carbon monoxide (CO) emissions data were also obtained from the NEI data (EPA 2018), and disaggregated based on EPA (2003). There are three categories of CO emissions in the report that are classified as process-related emissions not related to fuel combustion. These include chemical and allied products manufacturing, metals processing, and other industrial processes. Some of these CO emissions are accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use section of this report, and are therefore not accounted for in this section. These include total C emissions from the primary aluminum, titanium dioxide, iron and steel, and ferroalloys production processes. The total C (CO and CO₂) emissions from oil and gas production, petroleum refining, and asphalt manufacturing are also accounted for elsewhere in this Inventory. Biogenic emissions (e.g., pulp and paper process emissions) are accounted for in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry chapter and excluded from calculation of CO emissions in this section. Those CO emissions that are not accounted for elsewhere are considered to be by-products of non-fuel use of feedstocks, and are thus included in the calculation of the petrochemical feedstocks storage factor. Table A-70 lists the CO emissions that remain after taking into account the exclusions listed above.

Table A-70: Non-Combustion Carbon Monoxide Emissions

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO Emissions ('000 Short Tons)	489	481	623	461	396	420	420	420	420
Carbon Emitted (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6

Note: Includes emissions from chemical and allied products, petroleum and related industries, metals processing, and other industrial processes categories.

Hazardous Waste Incineration

Hazardous wastes are defined by the EPA under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).³⁰ Industrial wastes, such as rejected products, spent reagents, reaction by-products, and sludges from wastewater or air pollution control, are federally regulated as hazardous wastes if they are found to be ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic according to standardized tests or studies conducted by the EPA.

Hazardous wastes must be treated prior to disposal according to the federal regulations established under the authority of RCRA. Combustion is one of the most common techniques for hazardous waste treatment, particularly for those wastes that are primarily organic in composition or contain primarily organic contaminants. Generally speaking, combustion devices fall into two categories: incinerators that burn waste solely for the purpose of waste management, and boilers and industrial furnaces (BIFs) that burn waste in part to recover energy from the waste. More than half of the hazardous waste combusted in the United States is burned in BIFs; because these processes are included in the energy recovery calculations described below, they are not included as part of hazardous waste incineration.

³⁰ [42 U.S.C. §6924, SDWA §3004]

EPA's Office of Solid Waste requires biennial reporting of hazardous waste management activities, and these reports provide estimates of the amount of hazardous waste burned for incineration or energy recovery. EPA stores this information in its Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Information system (EPA 2013a), formerly reported in its Biennial Reporting System (BRS) database (EPA 2000a; 2009; 2015a; 2016a). Combusted hazardous wastes are identified based on EPA-defined management system types M041 through M049 (incineration). Combusted quantities are grouped into four representative waste form categories based on the form codes reported in the BRS: aqueous liquids, organic liquids and sludges, organic solids, and inorganic solids. To relate hazardous waste quantities to C emissions, "fuel equivalent" factors were derived for hazardous waste by assuming that the hazardous wastes are simple mixtures of a common fuel, water, and noncombustible ash. For liquids and sludges, crude oil is used as the fuel equivalent and coal is used to represent solids.

Fuel equivalent factors were multiplied by the tons of waste incinerated to obtain the tons of fuel equivalent. Multiplying the tons of fuel equivalent by the C content factors (discussed in the Estimating the Carbon Content from Fossil Fuel Combustion Annex) yields tons of C emitted. Implied C content is calculated by dividing the tons of C emitted by the associated tons of waste incinerated.

Waste quantity data for hazardous wastes were obtained from EPA's RCRA Information/BRS database for reporting years 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015 (EPA 2000a; 2009; 2013a; 2015a; 2016a). Combusted waste quantities were obtained from Form GM (Generation and Management) for wastes burned on site and Form WR (Wastes Received) for waste received from off-site for combustion. The quantity of combusted hazardous waste in 2016 and 2017 was proxied to the 2015 value. For each of the waste types, assumptions were developed on average waste composition (see Table A-71). Regulations require incinerators to achieve at least 99.99 percent destruction of organics; this formed the basis for assuming the fraction of C oxidized. Emissions from hazardous waste incineration in 2017 were 0.8 MMT CO₂ Eq. Table A-72 lists the CO₂ emissions from hazardous waste incineration.

Table A-71: Assumed Composition of Combusted Hazardous Waste by Weight (Percent)

Waste Type	Water (%)	Noncombustibles (%)	Fuel Equivalent (%)
Aqueous Waste	90	5	5
Organic Liquids and Sludges	40	20	40
Organic Solids	20	40	40
Inorganic Solids	20	70	10

Table A-72: CO₂ Emitted from Hazardous Waste Incineration (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO ₂ Emissions	1.1	1.7	1.4	1.5	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8

Energy Recovery

The amount of feedstocks combusted for energy recovery was estimated from data included in EIA's Manufacturers Energy Consumption Survey (MECS) for 1991, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2010, and 2014 (EIA 1994; 1997; 2001; 2005; 2010; 2013b; 2017). Some fraction of the fossil C exiting refineries and designated for use for feedstock purposes actually ends up being combusted for energy recovery (despite the designation of feedstocks as a "non-energy" use) because the chemical reactions in which fuel feedstocks are used are not 100 percent efficient. These chemical reactions may generate unreacted raw material feedstocks or generate by-products that have a high energy content. The chemical industry and many downstream industries are energy-intensive and often have boilers or other energy recovery units on-site, and thus these unreacted feedstocks or by-products are often combusted for energy recovery. Also, as noted above in the section on hazardous waste incineration, regulations provide a strong incentive—and in some cases require—burning of organic wastes generated from chemical production processes.

Information available from the MECS include data on the consumption for energy recovery of "other" fuels in the petroleum and coal products, chemicals, primary metals, nonmetallic minerals, and other manufacturing sectors. These "other" fuels include refinery still gas; waste gas; waste oils, tars, and related materials; petroleum coke, coke oven and blast furnace gases; scrap tires; liquor or black liquor; woodchips and bark; and other uncharacterized fuels. Fuel use of petroleum coke is included separately in the fuel use data provided annually by EIA, and energy recovery of coke oven gas and blast furnace gas (i.e., by-products of the iron and steel production process) is addressed in the Iron and Steel production section in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter. Consumption of refinery still gas in the refinery sector is also included separately in the fuel use data from EIA. The combustion of scrap tires in cement kilns, lime kilns, and electric arc furnaces is accounted for in the Waste Incineration chapter; data from the Rubber Manufacturers Association (RMA 2009a) were used to subtract out energy recovery from scrap tires in these industries. Consumption of net steam, assumed to be generated from fossil fuel combustion, is also included separately in the fuel use data from EIA. Therefore, these categories of "other"

fuels are addressed elsewhere in the Inventory and not considered as part of the petrochemical feedstocks energy recovery analysis. Liquor or black liquor and woodchips and bark are assumed to be biogenic fuels, in accordance with IPCC (2006), and therefore are not included in the Inventory. The remaining categories of fuels, including waste gas; waste oils, tars, and related materials; and other uncharacterized fuels are assumed to be petrochemical feedstocks burned for energy recovery (see Table A-73). The conversion factors listed in Annex 2.1 were used to convert the Btu values for each fuel feedstock to MMT CO₂. Petrochemical feedstocks combusted for energy recovery corresponded to 42.5 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 1991, 35.1 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 1994, 58.0 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 1998, 70.6 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2002, 74.7 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2006, 41.3 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2010, and 45.6 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2014. Values for petrochemical feedstocks burned for energy recovery for years between 1991 and 1994, between 1994 and 1998, between 1998 and 2002, between 2002 and 2006, between 2007 and 2010, and between 2011 and 2013 have been estimated by linear interpolation. The value for 1990 is assumed to be the same as the value for 1991, and the values for 2015, 2016, and 2017 are assumed to be the same as the value for 2014 (Table A-74).

Table A-73: Summary of 2014 MECS Data for Other Fuels Used in Manufacturing/Energy Recovery (Trillion Btu)

Subsector and Industry	NAICS CODE	Waste Gas ^a	Waste Oils/Tars ^b	Refinery Still Gas ^c	Net Steam ^d	Other Fuels ^e
Printing and Related Support	323	0	0	0	0	0
Petroleum and Coal Products	324	0	4	1,329	191	106
Chemicals	325	364	6	0	310	128
Plastics and Rubber Products	326	0	0	0	0	0
Nonmetallic Mineral Products	327	0	7	0	0	16
Primary Metals	331	4	0	0	10	15
Fabricated Metal Products	332	0	0	0	0	1
Machinery	333	0	0	0	0	2
Computer and Electronic Products	334	0	0	0	0	0
Electrical Equip., Appliances, Components	335	0	0	0	0	2
Transportation Equipment	336	4	0	0	1	4
Furniture and Related Products	337	0	0	0	0	2
Miscellaneous	339	0	0	0	0	0
Total (Trillion Btu)		372	17	1,329	511	276
Average C Content (MMT/QBtu)		18.14	20.62	17.51	0	19.37
Fraction Oxidized		1	1	1	0	1
Total C (MMT)		6.75	0.35	23.27	0.00	5.35
Total C (MMT) (ex. still gas from refining)		6.75	0.35	0.00	0.00	5.35

NA (Not Applicable)

^a C content: Waste Gas is assumed to be same as naphtha <401 deg. F.

^b C content: Waste Oils/Tars is assumed to be same as asphalt/road oil.

^c Refinery "still gas" fuel consumption is reported elsewhere in the Inventory and is excluded from the total C content estimate.

^d Net steam fuel consumption is reported elsewhere in the Inventory and is excluded from the total C content estimate.

^e C content: "Other" is assumed to be the same as petrochemical feedstocks.

Table A-74: Carbon Emitted from Fuels Burned for Energy Recovery (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C Emissions	42.5	40.8	64.3	73.7	44.6	45.6	45.6	45.6	45.6

Products

More C is found in products than in industrial releases or energy recovery. The principal types of products are plastics; synthetic rubber; synthetic fiber; C black; pesticides; soaps, detergents, and cleansers; food additives; antifreeze and deicers (glycols); silicones; and solvents. Solvent evaporation was discussed previously along with industrial releases of NMVOCs; the other product types are discussed below.

Plastics

Data on annual production of plastics through 2005 were taken from the American Plastics Council (APC), as published in *Chemical & Engineering News* and on the APC and Society of Plastics Industry (SPI) websites, and through direct communication with the APC (APC 2000, 2001, 2003 through 2006; SPI 2000; Eldredge-Roebuck 2000). Data for

2006 through 2017 were taken directly or derived from the American Chemistry Council (ACC 2007 through 2017b supplemented by Vallianos 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018). In 2009, the American Chemistry Council consolidated the resin categories for which it reports plastics production. Production numbers in the original categories were provided via personal correspondence for 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 (Vallianos 2011; 2012; 2013; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018). Production figures for the consolidated resin categories in 2010 were linearly interpolated from 2009 and 2011 data. Production was organized by resin type (see Table A-75) and by year.

Several of the resin categories included production from Canada and/or Mexico, in addition to the U.S. values for part of the time series. The production data for the affected resins and years were corrected using an economic adjustment factor, based on the percent of North American production value in this industry sector accounted for by the United States. A C content was then assigned for each resin. These C contents were based on molecular formulae and are listed in Table A-76 and Table A-77. In cases where the resin type is generic, referring to a group of chemicals and not a single polymer (e.g., phenolic resins, other styrenic resins), a representative compound was chosen. For other resins, a weighted C content of 69 percent was assumed (i.e., it was assumed that these resins had the same content as those for which a representative compound could be assigned).

There were no emissive uses of plastics identified, so 100 percent of the C was considered stored in products. As noted in the chapter, an estimate of emissions related to the combustion of these plastics in the municipal solid waste stream can be found in the Incineration of Waste section of the Energy chapter; those emissions are not incorporated in the mass balance for feedstocks (described in this annex) to avoid double-counting.

Table A-75: 2017 Plastic Resin Production (MMT dry weight) and C Stored (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Resin Type	2017 Production ^a (MMT dry weight)	Carbon Stored (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Epoxy	0.2	0.7
Urea	1.1	1.4
Melamine	0.1	0.1
Phenolic	1.6	4.4
Low-Density Polyethylene (LDPE)	2.9	9.1
Linear Low-Density Polyethylene (LLDPE)	6.4	20.1
High Density Polyethylene (HDPE)	7.9	25.0
Polypropylene (PP)	6.8	21.5
Acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene (ABS)	0.5	1.5
Other Styrenics ^b	0.5	1.7
Polystyrene (PS)	1.8	6.1
Nylon	0.6	1.3
Polyvinyl chloride (PVC) ^c	6.7	9.4
Thermoplastic Polyester	3.4	7.8
All Other (including Polyester (unsaturated))	6.2	15.6
Total	46.6	125.6

^a Production estimates provided by the American Chemistry Council include Canadian production for Urea, Melamine, Phenolic, LDPE, LLDPE, HDPE, PP, ABS, SAN, Other Styrenics, PS, Nylon, PVC, and Thermoplastic Polyester, and Mexican production for PP, ABS, SAN, Other Styrenics, Nylon, and Thermoplastic Polyester. Values have been adjusted to account just for U.S. production.

^b Includes Styrene-acrylonitrile (SAN).

^c Includes copolymers.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-76: Assigned C Contents of Plastic Resins (% by weight)

Resin Type	C Content	Source of C Content Assumption
Epoxy	76%	Typical epoxy resin made from epichlorohydrin and bisphenol A
Polyester (Unsaturated)	63%	Poly (ethylene terephthalate) (PET)
Urea	34%	50% carbamal, 50% N-(hydroxymethyl) urea ^a
Melamine	29%	Trimethylol melamine ^a
Phenolic	77%	Phenol
Low-Density Polyethylene (LDPE)	86%	Polyethylene
Linear Low-Density Polyethylene (LLDPE)	86%	Polyethylene
High Density Polyethylene (HDPE)	86%	Polyethylene
Polypropylene (PP)	86%	Polypropylene
Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS)	85%	50% styrene, 25% acrylonitrile, 25% butadiene
Styrene-Acrylonitrile (SAN)	80%	50% styrene, 50% acrylonitrile
Other Styrenics	92%	Polystyrene
Polystyrene (PS)	92%	Polystyrene
Nylon	65%	Average of nylon resins (see Table A-77)
Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC)	38%	Polyvinyl chloride
Thermoplastic Polyester	63%	Polyethylene terephthalate
All Other	69%	Weighted average of other resin production

^a Does not include alcoholic hydrogens.

Table A-77: Major Nylon Resins and their C Contents (% by weight)

Resin	C Content
Nylon 6	64%
Nylon 6,6	64%
Nylon 4	52%
Nylon 6,10	68%
Nylon 6,11	69%
Nylon 6,12	70%
Nylon 11	72%

Synthetic Rubber

Data on synthetic rubber in tires were derived from data on the scrap tire market and the composition of scrap tires from the Rubber Manufacturers' Association (RMA). The market information is presented in the report *2017 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary* (RMA 2018), while the tire composition information is from the "Scrap Tires, Facts and Figures" section of the organization's website (RMA 2009). Data on synthetic rubber in other products (durable goods, nondurable goods, and containers and packaging) were obtained from EPA's *Municipal Solid Waste in the United States* reports (1996 through 2003a, 2005, 2007b, 2008, 2009a, 2011a, 2013b, 2014, 2016c) and detailed unpublished backup data for some years not shown in the *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States* reports (Schneider 2007). The abraded rubber from scrap passenger tires was assumed to be 2.5 pounds per scrap tire, while the abraded rubber from scrap commercial tires was assumed to be 10 pounds per scrap tire. Data on abraded rubber weight were obtained by calculating the average weight difference between new and scrap tires (RMA 2018). Import and export data were obtained from the published by the U.S. International Trade Commission (U.S. International Trade Commission 1990 through 2017).

A C content for synthetic rubber (90 percent for tire synthetic rubber and 85 percent for non-tire synthetic rubber) was assigned based on the weighted average of C contents (based on molecular formula) by elastomer type consumed in 1998, 2001, and 2002 (see Table A-78). The 1998 consumption data were obtained from the International Institute of Synthetic Rubber Producers (IISRP) press release *Synthetic Rubber Use Growth to Continue Through 2004, Says IISRP and RMA* (IISRP 2000). The 2001 and 2002 consumption data were obtained from the IISRP press release, *IISRP Forecasts Moderate Growth in North America to 2007* (IISRP 2003).

The rubber in tires that is abraded during use (the difference between new tire and scrap tire rubber weight) was considered to be 100 percent emitted. Other than abraded rubber, there were no emissive uses of scrap tire and non-tire rubber identified, so 100 percent of the non-abraded amount was assumed stored. Emissions related to the combustion of rubber in scrap tires and consumer goods can be found in the Incineration of Waste section of the Energy chapter.

Table A-78: 2002 Rubber Consumption (kt) and C Content (%)

Elastomer Type	2002 Consumption (kt) ^a	C Content
SBR Solid	768	91%
Polybutadiene	583	89%
Ethylene Propylene	301	86%
Polychloroprene	54	59%
NBR Solid	84	77%
Polyisoprene	58	88%
Others	367	88%
Weighted Average	NA	90%
Total	2,215	NA

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Includes consumption in Canada.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Synthetic Fibers

Annual synthetic fiber production data were obtained from the Fiber Economics Bureau, as published in *Chemical & Engineering News* (FEB 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013). The most recent data available were for 2012, so it was assumed that the 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 consumption was equal to that of 2012. An update from *Chemical & Engineering News* (C&EN 2017) was used to update the polyester value for 2016. These data are organized by year and fiber type. For each fiber, a C content was assigned based on molecular formula (see Table A-79). For polyester, the C content for poly (ethylene terephthalate) (PET) was used as a representative compound. For nylon, the average C content of nylon 6 and nylon 6.6 was used, since these are the most widely produced nylon fibers. Cellulosic fibers, such as acetate and rayon, have been omitted from the synthetic fibers' C accounting displayed here because much of their C is of biogenic origin and carbon fluxes from biogenic compounds are accounted for in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry chapter. These fibers account for only 4 percent of overall fiber production by weight.

There were no emissive uses of fibers identified, so 100 percent of the C was considered stored. Note that emissions related to the combustion of textiles in municipal solid waste are accounted for under the Incineration of Waste section of the Energy chapter.

Table A-79: 2017 Fiber Production (MMT), C Content (%), and C Stored (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Fiber Type	Production (MMT)	C Content	C Stored (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Polyester	1.4	63%	3.1
Nylon	0.6	64%	1.3
Olefin	1.0	86%	3.2
Acrylic	+	68%	0.1
Total	3.0	NA	7.7

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT.

NA (Not Applicable)

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Pesticides

Pesticide consumption data were obtained from the *1994/1995, 1996/1997, 1998/1999, 2000/2001, 2006/2007, and 2008-2012 Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage Market Estimates* (EPA 1998, 1999, 2002, 2004, 2011b, 2017) reports. The most recent data available were for 2012, so it was assumed that the 2013 through 2017 consumption was equal to that of 2012. Active ingredient compound names and consumption weights were available for the top 25 agriculturally-used pesticides and top 10 pesticides used in the home and garden and the industry/commercial/government categories. The report provides a range of consumption for each active ingredient; the midpoint was used to represent actual consumption. Each of these compounds was assigned a C content value based on molecular formula. If the compound contained aromatic rings substituted with chlorine or other halogens, then the compound was considered persistent and the C in the compound was assumed to be stored. All other pesticides were assumed to release their C to the atmosphere. Over one-third of 2012 total pesticide active ingredient consumption was not specified by chemical type in the *Sales and Usage* report (EPA 2017). This unspecified portion of the active ingredient consumption was treated as a single chemical and assigned a C content and a storage factor based on the weighted average of the known chemicals' values.

Table A-80: Active Ingredient Consumption in Pesticides (Million lbs.) and C Emitted and Stored (MMT CO₂ Eq.) in 2012

Pesticide Use ^a	Active Ingredient (Million lbs.)	C Emitted (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	C Stored (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Agricultural Uses	606.0	0.2	0.1
Non-Agricultural Uses	58.0	+	+
Home & Garden	37.8	+	+
Industry/Gov't/Commercial	28.0	+	+
Other	342.0	0.1	0.1
Total	1,006.0	0.3	0.2

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

^a 2012 estimates (EPA 2017).

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Soaps, Shampoos, and Detergents

Cleansers—soaps, shampoos, and detergents—are among the major consumer products that may contain fossil C. All of the C in cleansers was assumed to be fossil-derived, and, as cleansers eventually biodegrade, all of the C was assumed to be emitted. The first step in estimating C flows was to characterize the “ingredients” in a sample of cleansers. For this analysis, cleansers were limited to the following personal household cleaning products: bar soap, shampoo, laundry detergent (liquid and granular), dishwasher detergent, and dishwashing liquid. Data on the annual consumption of household personal cleansers were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2012 Economic Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1994, 1999, 2004, 2009, 2014). Production values for 1990 and 1991 were assumed to be the same as the 1992 value; consumption was interpolated between 1992 and 1997, 1997 and 2002, 2002 and 2007, and 2007 and 2012; production for 2013 through 2017 was assumed to equal the 2012 value. Cleanser production values were adjusted by import and export data to develop U.S. consumption estimates.

Chemical formulae were used to determine C contents (as percentages) of the ingredients in the cleansers. Each product’s overall C content was then derived from the composition and contents of its ingredients. From these values the mean C content for cleansers was calculated to be 21.9 percent.

The Census Bureau presents consumption data in terms of quantity (in units of million gallons or million pounds) and/or terms of value (thousands of dollars) for eight specific categories, such as “household liquid laundry detergents, heavy duty” and “household dry alkaline automatic dishwashing detergents.” Additionally, the report provides dollar values for the total consumption of “soaps, detergents, etc.—dry” and “soaps, detergents, etc.—liquid.” The categories for which both quantity and value data are available is a subset of total production. Those categories that presented both quantity and value data were used to derive pounds per dollar and gallons per dollar conversion rates, and they were extrapolated (based on the Census Bureau estimate of total value) to estimate the total quantity of dry and liquid³¹ cleanser categories, respectively.

Next, the total tonnage of cleansers was calculated (wet and dry combined) for 1997. Multiplying the mean C content (21.9 percent) by this value yielded an estimate of 4.6 MMT CO₂ Eq. in cleansers for 1997. For all subsequent years, it was assumed that the ratio of value of shipments to total carbon content remained constant. For 1998 through 2017, value of shipments was adjusted to 1997 dollars using the producer price index for soap and other detergent manufacturing (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2017). The ratio of value of shipments to carbon content was then applied to arrive at total carbon content of cleansers. Estimates are shown in Table A-81.

Table A-81: C Emitted from Utilization of Soaps, Shampoos, and Detergents (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C Emissions	3.6	4.2	4.5	6.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7

Antifreeze and Deicers

Glycol compounds, including ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, diethylene glycol, and triethylene glycol, are used as antifreeze in motor vehicles, deicing fluids for commercial aircraft, and other similar uses. These glycol compounds are assumed to ultimately enter wastewater treatment plants where they are degraded by the wastewater treatment process to CO₂ or to otherwise biodegrade to CO₂. Glycols are water soluble and degrade rapidly in the environment (Howard 1993).

³¹ A density of 1.05 g/mL—slightly denser than water—was assumed for liquid cleansers.

Annual production data for each glycol compound used as antifreeze and deicers were obtained from the *Guide to the Business of Chemistry* (ACC 2018a) and the EPA Chemical Data Access Tool (CDAT) (EPA 2014). Import and export data were used to adjust annual production data to annual consumption data. The percentage of the annual consumption of each glycol compound used for antifreeze and deicing applications was estimated from Chemical Profiles data published on The Innovation Group website³² and from similar data published in the Chemical Market Reporter, which became ICIS Chemical Business in 2005.³³ Production data for propylene glycol, diethylene glycol, and triethylene glycol are no longer reported in the *Guide to the Business of Chemistry*, so data from ICIS Chemical Business on total demand was used with import and export data to estimate production of these chemicals. ICIS last reported total demand for propylene glycol and diethylene glycol in 2006, and triethylene glycol demand in 2007. EPA reported total U.S. production of propylene glycol, diethylene glycol, and triethylene glycol in 2012 in the CDAT (EPA 2014). Total demand for these compounds for 2012 was calculated from the 2012 production data using import and export data. Demand for propylene glycol and diethylene glycol was interpolated for years between 2006 and 2012, and demand for triethylene glycol was interpolated for years between 2007 and 2012, using the calculated 2012 total demand values for each compound and the most recently reported total demand data from ICIS. Values for 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 for these compounds were assumed to be the same as the 2012 values.

The glycol compounds consumed in antifreeze and deicing applications is assumed to be 100 percent emitted as CO₂. Emissions of CO₂ from utilization of antifreeze and deicers are summarized in Table A-82.

Table A-82: C Emitted from Utilization of Antifreeze and Deicers (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C Emissions	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.2	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0

Food Additives

Petrochemical feedstocks are used to manufacture synthetic food additives, including preservatives, flavoring agents, and processing agents. These compounds include glycerin, propylene glycol, benzoic acid, and other compounds. These compounds are incorporated into food products, and are assumed to ultimately enter wastewater treatment plants where they are degraded by the wastewater treatment processes to CO₂ or to otherwise biodegrade to CO₂. Certain food additives, e.g., glycerin, are manufactured both from petrochemical feedstocks and from biogenic feedstocks. Food additives that are derived from biogenic feedstocks are accounted for in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry chapter.

Annual production data for food additive compounds were obtained from the *Guide to the Business of Chemistry* (ACC 2018a). Historical values for adipic acid were adjusted according to the most recent data in the 2018 *Guide to the Business of Chemistry*. Import and export data were used to adjust annual production data to annual consumption data. The percentage of the annual consumption of food additive compounds was estimated from Chemical Profiles data published on The Innovation Group website³⁴ and from similar data published in the Chemical Market Reporter, which became ICIS Chemical Business in 2005.³⁵ Production data for several food additive compounds are no longer reported in the *Guide to the Business of Chemistry*, so data from ICIS Chemical Business on total demand was used with import and export data to estimate production of these chemicals.

ICIS last reported total demand for glycerin and benzoic acid in 2007, and demand for propionic acid in 2008. Total demand for acetic acid and maleic anhydride were last reported by ICIS in 2005, and dipropylene glycol demand in 2004. ICIS last reported cresylic acid demand in 1999. EPA reported total U.S. production of these compounds in 2012 in the CDAT (EPA 2014). Total demand for these compounds for 2012 was calculated from the 2012 production data using import and export data. Demand for each of these compounds was interpolated for years between the most recently reported total demand data from ICIS and 2012, using the calculated 2012 total demand values for each compound. Values for 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 for these compounds were assumed to be the same as the 2012 values.

The consumption of synthetic food additives is assumed to be 100 percent emitted as CO₂. Emissions of CO₂ from utilization of synthetic food additives are summarized in Table A-83.

³² See <<http://www.the-innovation-group.com/ChemProfiles>>.

³³ See <<http://www.icis.com/home/default.aspx>>.

³⁴ See <<http://www.the-innovation-group.com/ChemProfiles>>.

³⁵ See <<http://www.icis.com/home/default.aspx>>.

Table A-83: C Emitted from Utilization of Food Additives (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C Emissions	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1

Silicones

Silicone compounds (e.g., polymethyl siloxane) are used as sealants and in manufactured products. Silicone compounds are manufactured from petrochemical feedstocks including methyl chloride. It is assumed that petrochemical feedstocks used to manufacture silicones are incorporated into the silicone products and not emitted as CO₂ in the manufacturing process. It is also assumed that the C contained in the silicone products is stored, and not emitted as CO₂.

Import and export data were used to adjust annual production data to annual consumption data. The percentage of the annual consumption of each silicone manufacturing compound was estimated from Chemical Profiles data published on The Innovation Group website and from similar data published in the Chemical Market Reporter, which became ICIS Chemical Business in 2005.³⁶ ICIS last reported production of methyl chloride in 2007. EPA reported total U.S. production of methyl chloride in 2012 in the CDAT (EPA 2014). Total consumption of methyl chloride for 2012 was calculated from the 2012 production data using import and export data. Production of methyl chloride was interpolated for years between 2007 and 2012, using the calculated 2012 total production value for methyl chloride and the most recently reported total production data from ICIS. The production values for 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017 were assumed to be the same as the 2012 value.

The consumption of silicone manufacturing compounds is assumed to be 100 percent stored, and not emitted as CO₂. Storage of silicone manufacturing compounds is summarized in Table A-84.

Table A-84: C Stored in Silicone Products (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C Storage	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5

Uncertainty

A Tier 2 Monte Carlo analysis was performed using @RISK software to determine the level of uncertainty surrounding the estimates of the feedstocks C storage factor and the quantity of C emitted from feedstocks in 2017. The Tier 2 analysis was performed to allow the specification of probability density functions for key variables, within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the Inventory estimate. Statistical analyses or expert judgments of uncertainty were not available directly from the information sources for the activity variables; thus, uncertainty estimates were determined using assumptions based on source category knowledge. Uncertainty estimates for production data (the majority of the variables) were assumed to exhibit a normal distribution with a relative error of ±20 percent in the underlying EIA estimates, plus an additional ±15 percent to account for uncertainty in the assignment of imports and exports. An additional 10 percent (for a total of ±45 percent) was applied to the production of other oils (>401 degrees Fahrenheit) to reflect the additional uncertainty in the assignment of part of the production quantity to industrial processes. A relatively narrow uniform distribution ±1 percent to ±15 percent, depending on the fuel type) was applied to each C coefficient.

The Monte Carlo analysis produced a storage factor distribution with a mean of 66 percent, a standard deviation of 5 percent, and the 95 percent confidence interval of 55 percent and 72 percent. This compares to the calculated Inventory estimate of 67 percent. The analysis produced a C emission distribution with a mean of 75.9 MMT CO₂ Eq., standard deviation of 19.5 MMT CO₂ Eq., and 95 percent confidence limits of 51.1 and 122.1 MMT CO₂ Eq. This compares with a calculated Inventory estimate of 73.1 MMT CO₂ Eq.

The apparently tight confidence limits for the storage factor and C storage probably understate uncertainty, as a result of the way this initial analysis was structured. As discussed above, the storage factor for feedstocks is based on an analysis of six fates that result in long-term storage (e.g., plastics production), and eleven that result in emissions (e.g., volatile organic compound emissions). Rather than modeling the total uncertainty around all 17 of these fate processes, the current analysis addresses only the storage fates, and assumes that all C that is not stored is emitted. As the production statistics that drive the storage factors are relatively well-characterized, this approach yields a result that is probably biased toward understating uncertainty.

As far as specific sources of uncertainty, there are several cross-cutting factors that pervade the characterization of C flows for feedstocks. The aggregate storage factor for petrochemical feedstocks (industrial other coal, natural gas for non-fertilizer uses, LPG, pentanes plus, naphthas, other oils, still gas, special naphtha) is based on assuming that the ultimate

³⁶ Ibid.

fates of all of these fuel types—in terms of storage and emissions—are similar. In addition, there are uncertainties associated with the simplifying assumptions made for each end use category C estimate. Generally, the estimate for a product is subject to one or more of the following uncertainties:

- The value used for estimating the C content has been assumed or assigned based upon a representative compound.
- The split between C storage and emission has been assumed based on an examination of the environmental fate of the products in each end use category.
- Environmental fates leading to emissions are assumed to operate rapidly, i.e., emissions are assumed to occur within one year of when the fossil C enters the non-energy mass balance. Some of the pathways that lead to emissions as CO₂ may actually take place on a time-scale of several years or decades. By attributing the emissions to the year in which the C enters the mass balance (i.e., the year in which it leaves refineries as a non-energy fuel use and thus starts being tracked by EIA), this approach has the effect of “front-end loading” the emission profile.

Another cross-cutting source of uncertainty is that for several sources the amount of C stored or emitted was calculated based on data for only a single year. This specific year may not be representative of storage for the entire Inventory period. Sources of uncertainty associated with specific elements of the analysis are discussed below.

Import and export data for petrochemical feedstocks were obtained from EIA, the National Petroleum Refiners Association, and the BoC for the major categories of petrochemical feedstocks (EIA 2001; NPRA 2001; and U.S. Bureau of the Census 2017). The complexity of the organic chemical industry, with multiple feedstocks, intermediates, and subtle differences in nomenclature, makes it difficult to ensure that the adjustments to the EIA data for imports and exports is accurate and the approach used here may underestimate or overestimate net exports of C.

Oxidation factors have been applied to non-energy uses of petrochemical feedstocks in the same manner as for energy uses. However, for those fuels where IPCC storage factors are used, this “oxidation factor” may be inherent in the storage factor applied when calculating emissions from non-energy consumption, which would result in a double-counting of the unoxidized C. Oxidation factors are small corrections, on the order of 1 percent, and therefore application of oxidation factors to non-energy uses may result in a slight underestimation of C emissions from non-energy uses.

The major uncertainty in using the TRI data is the possibility of double counting emissions that are already accounted for in the NMVOC data (see above) and in the storage and emission assumptions used. The approach for predicting environmental fate simplifies some complex processes, and the balance between storage and emissions is very sensitive to the assumptions on fate. Extrapolating from known to unknown characteristics also introduces uncertainty. The two extrapolations with the greatest uncertainty are: (1) that the release media and fate of the off-site releases were assumed to be the same as for on-site releases, and (2) that the C content of the least frequent 10 percent of TRI releases was assumed to be the same as for the chemicals comprising 90 percent of the releases. However, the contribution of these chemicals to the overall estimate is small. The off-site releases only account for 3 percent of the total releases, by weight, and, by definition, the less frequent compounds only account for 10 percent of the total releases.

The principal sources of uncertainty in estimating CO₂ emissions from solvent evaporation and industrial NMVOC emissions are in the estimates of (a) total emissions and (b) their C content. Solvent evaporation and industrial NMVOC emissions reported by EPA are based on a number of data sources and emission factors, and may underestimate or overestimate emissions. The C content for solvent evaporation emissions is calculated directly from the specific solvent compounds identified by EPA as being emitted, and is thought to have relatively low uncertainty. The C content for industrial emissions has more uncertainty, however, as it is calculated from the average C content of an average volatile organic compound based on the list of the most abundant measured NMVOCs provided in EPA (2002a).

Uncertainty in the hazardous waste combustion analysis is introduced by the assumptions about the composition of combusted hazardous wastes, including the characterization that hazardous wastes are similar to mixtures of water, noncombustibles, and fuel equivalent materials. Another limitation is the assumption that all of the C that enters hazardous waste combustion is emitted—some small fraction is likely to be sequestered in combustion ash—but given that the destruction and removal efficiency for hazardous organics is required to meet or exceed 99.99 percent, this is a very minor source of uncertainty. C emission estimates from hazardous waste should be considered central value estimates that are likely to be accurate to within ±50 percent.

The amount of feedstocks combusted for energy recovery was estimated from data included in the *Manufacturers Energy Consumption Surveys* (MECS) for 1991, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2010, and 2014 (EIA 1994, 1997, 2001, 2005, 2010, 2013b, 2017). MECS is a comprehensive survey that is conducted every four years and intended to represent U.S. industry as a whole, but because EIA does not receive data from all manufacturers (i.e., it is a sample rather than a census), EIA must extrapolate from the sample. Also, the “other” fuels are identified in the MECS data in broad categories, including refinery still gas; waste gas; waste oils, tars, and related materials; petroleum coke, coke oven and blast furnace gases; and

other uncharacterized fuels. Moreover, the industries using these “other” fuels are also identified only in broad categories, including the petroleum and coal products, chemicals, primary metals, nonmetallic minerals, and other manufacturing sectors. The “other” fuel consumption data are reported in BTUs (energy units) and there is uncertainty concerning the selection of a specific conversion factor for each broad “other” fuel category to convert energy units to mass units. Taken as a whole, the estimate of energy recovery emissions probably introduces more uncertainty than any other element of the non-energy analysis.

Uncertainty in the C storage estimate for plastics arises primarily from four factors. First, production of some plastic resins is not tracked directly and must be estimated based on other market data. Second, the raw data on production for several resins include Canadian and/or Mexican production and may overestimate the amount of plastic produced from U.S. fuel feedstocks; this analysis includes adjustments to “back out” the Canadian and Mexican values, but these adjustments are approximate. Third, the assumed C content values are estimates for representative compounds, and thus do not account for the many formulations of resins available. This uncertainty is greater for resin categories that are generic (e.g., phenolics, other styrenics, nylon) than for resins with more specific formulations (e.g., polypropylene, polyethylene). Fourth, the assumption that all of the C contained in plastics is stored ignores certain end uses (e.g., adhesives and coatings) where the resin may be released to the atmosphere; however, these end-uses are likely to be small relative to use in plastics.

The quantity of C stored in synthetic rubber only accounts for the C stored in scrap tire synthetic rubber. The value does not take into account the rubber stored in other durable goods, clothing, footwear, and other non-durable goods, or containers and packaging. This adds uncertainty to the total mass balance of C stored. There are also uncertainties as to the assignment of C content values; however, they are much smaller than in the case of plastics. There are probably fewer variations in rubber formulations than in plastics, and the range of potential C content values is much narrower. Lastly, assuming that all of the C contained in rubber is stored ignores the possibility of volatilization or degradation during product lifetimes. However, the proportion of the total C that is released to the atmosphere during use is probably negligible.

A small degree of uncertainty arises from the assignment of C content values in textiles; however, the magnitude of this uncertainty is less than that for plastics or rubber. Although there is considerable variation in final textile products, the stock fiber formulations are standardized and proscribed explicitly by the Federal Trade Commission.

For pesticides, the largest source of uncertainty involves the assumption that an active ingredient’s C is either zero percent stored or 100 percent stored. This split is a generalization of chemical behavior, based upon active-ingredient molecular structure, and not on compound-specific environmental data. The mechanism by which a compound is bound or released from soils is very complicated and can be affected by many variables, including the type of crop, temperature, application method, and harvesting practice. Another smaller source of uncertainty arises from the C content values applied to the unaccounted for portion of active ingredient. C contents vary widely among pesticides, from 7 to 77 percent, and the remaining pesticides may have a chemical make-up that is very different from the 49 pesticides that have been examined. Additionally, pesticide consumption data were only available for 1987, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2007, 2009, and 2012; the majority of the time series data were interpolated or held constant at the latest (2012) value. Another source of uncertainty is that only the “active” ingredients of pesticides are considered in the calculations; the “inactive” ingredients may also be derived from petrochemical feedstocks.

It is important to note that development of this uncertainty analysis is a multi-year process. The current feedstocks analysis examines NEU fuels that end in storage fates. Thus, only C stored in pesticides, plastics, synthetic fibers, synthetic rubbers, silicones, and TRI releases to underground injection and Subtitle C landfills is accounted for in the uncertainty estimate above. In the future this analysis will be expanded to include the uncertainty surrounding emitted fates in addition to the storage fates. Estimates of variable uncertainty will also be refined where possible to include fewer assumptions. With these major changes in future Inventories, the uncertainty estimate is expected to change, and likely increase. An increase in the uncertainty estimate in the coming years will not indicate that the Inventory calculations have become less certain, but rather that the methods for estimating uncertainty have become more comprehensive; thus, potential future changes in the results of this analysis will reflect a change in the uncertainty analysis, not a change in the Inventory quality.

Asphalt and Road Oil

Asphalt is one of the principal non-energy uses of fossil fuels. The term “asphalt” generally refers to a mixture of asphalt cement and a rock material aggregate, a volatile petroleum distillate, or water. For the purposes of this analysis, “asphalt” is used interchangeably with asphalt cement, a residue of crude oil. Though minor amounts of C are emitted during production, asphalt has an overall C storage factor of almost 100 percent, as discussed below.

Paving is the primary application of asphalt cement, comprising 86 percent of production. The three types of asphalt paving produced in the United States are hot mix asphalt (HMA), cut-backs, and emulsified asphalt. HMA, which makes up 90 percent of total asphalt paving (EPA 2001), contains asphalt cement mixed with an aggregate of rock materials. Cut-back asphalt is composed of asphalt cement thinned with a volatile petroleum distillate (e.g., naphtha). Emulsified asphalt contains

only asphalt cement and water. Roofing products are the other significant end use of asphalt cement, accounting for approximately 14 percent of U.S. production (Kelly 2000). No data were available on the fate of C in asphalt roofing; it was assumed that it has the same fate as C in asphalt paving applications.

Methodology and Data Sources

A C storage factor was calculated for each type of asphalt paving. The fraction of C emitted by each asphalt type was multiplied by consumption data for asphalt paving (EPA 2001) to estimate a weighted average C storage factor for asphalt as a whole.

The fraction of C emitted by HMA was determined by first calculating the organic emissions (volatile organic compounds [VOCs], carbon monoxide [CO], polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons [PAHs], hazardous air pollutants [HAPs], and phenol) from HMA paving, using emission factors reported in EPA (2001) and total HMA production.³⁷ The next step was to estimate the C content of the organic emissions. This calculation was based on the C content of CO and phenol, and an assumption of 85 percent C content for PAHs and HAPs. The C content of asphalt paving is a function of (1) the proportion of asphalt cement in asphalt paving, assumed to be 8 percent asphalt cement content based on EPA (2001), and (2) the proportion of C in asphalt cement. For the latter factor, all paving types were characterized as having a mass fraction of 85 percent C in asphalt cement, based on the assumption that asphalt is primarily composed of saturated paraffinic hydrocarbons. By combining these estimates, the result is that over 99.6 percent of the C in asphalt cement was retained (i.e., stored), and less than 0.4 percent was emitted.

Cut-back asphalt is produced in three forms: rapid, medium, and slow cure. The production processes for all three forms emit C primarily from the volatile petroleum distillate used in the process as a diluent to thin the asphalt cement so that it can be applied more readily (EPA 2001).

A mass balance on C losses from asphalt was constructed by first estimating the amount of carbon emitted as VOCs. Values for medium cure asphalt are used to represent all cut-back asphalt. The average weight of distillates used in medium cure cut-back asphalt (35 percent) is multiplied by the loss rate (as emissions of VOCs) of 70 percent from the *Emissions Inventory Guidebook* to arrive at an estimate that 25 percent of the diluent is emitted (Environment Canada 2006). Next, the fraction of C in the asphalt/ diluent mix that is emitted was estimated, assuming 85 percent C content; this yields an overall storage factor of 93.5 percent for cut-back asphalt.

One caveat associated with this calculation is that it is possible that the carbon flows for asphalt and diluent (volatile petroleum distillate) are accounted for separately in the EIA statistics on fossil fuel flows, and thus the mass balance calculation may need to re-map the system boundaries to correctly account for carbon flows. EPA plans to re-evaluate this calculation in the future.

It was assumed that there was no loss of C from emulsified asphalt (i.e., the storage factor is 100 percent) based on personal communication with an expert from Akzo Nobel Coatings, Inc. (James 2000).

Data on asphalt and road oil consumption and C content factors were supplied by EIA. Hot mix asphalt production and emissions factors, and the asphalt cement content of HMA were obtained from *Hot Mix Asphalt Plants Emissions Assessment Report* from EPA's AP-42 (EPA 2001) publication. The consumption data for cut-back and emulsified asphalts were taken from a Moulthrop, et al. study used as guidance for estimating air pollutant emissions from paving processes (EIIP 2001). "Asphalt Paving Operation" AP-42 (EPA 2001) provided the emissions source information used in the calculation of the C storage factor for cut-back asphalt. The storage factor for emulsified asphalt was provided by Alan James of Akzo Nobel Coatings, Inc. (James 2000).

Uncertainty

A Tier 2 Monte Carlo analysis was performed using @RISK software to determine the level of uncertainty surrounding the estimates of the asphalt C storage factor and the quantity of C stored in asphalt in 2017. The Tier 2 analysis was performed to allow the specification of probability density functions for key variables, within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the Inventory estimate. Statistical analyses or expert judgments of uncertainty were not available directly from the information sources for the activity variables; thus, uncertainty estimates were determined using assumptions based on source category knowledge. Uncertainty estimates for asphalt production were assumed to be ± 20 percent, while the asphalt property variables were assumed to have narrower distributions. A narrow uniform distribution, with maximum 5 percent uncertainty (± 5 percent) around the mean, was applied to the C content coefficient.

³⁷ The emission factors are expressed as a function of asphalt paving tonnage (i.e., including the rock aggregate as well as the asphalt cement).

The Monte Carlo analysis produced a tight distribution of storage factor values, with the 95 percent confidence interval of 99 percent and 100 percent, with the mean value of 100 percent. This compares to the storage factor value used in the Inventory of 99.6 percent. The analysis produced a C emission distribution with a mean of 0.3 MMT CO₂ Eq., standard deviation of 0.1 and 95 percent confidence limits of 0.1 MMT CO₂ Eq. and 0.6 MMT CO₂ Eq. This compares to an Inventory calculated estimate of 0.3 MMT CO₂ Eq.

The principal source of uncertainty is that the available data are from short-term studies of emissions associated with the production and application of asphalt. As a practical matter, the cement in asphalt deteriorates over time, contributing to the need for periodic re-paving. Whether this deterioration is due to physical erosion of the cement and continued storage of C in a refractory form or physicochemical degradation and eventual release of CO₂ is uncertain. Long-term studies may reveal higher lifetime emissions rates associated with degradation.

Many of the values used in the analysis are also uncertain and are based on estimates and professional judgment. For example, the asphalt cement input for hot mix asphalt was based on expert advice indicating that the range is variable—from about 3 to 5 percent—with actual content based on climate and geographical factors (Connolly 2000). Over this range, the effect on the calculated C storage factor is minimal (on the order of 0.1 percent). Similarly, changes in the assumed C content of asphalt cement would have only a minor effect.

The consumption figures for cut-back and emulsified asphalts are based on information reported for 1994. More recent trends indicate a decrease in cut-back use due to high VOC emission levels and a related increase in emulsified asphalt use as a substitute. This change in trend would indicate an overestimate of emissions from asphalt.

Future improvements to this uncertainty analysis, and to the overall estimation of a storage factor for asphalt, include characterizing the long-term fate of asphalt.

Lubricants

Lubricants are used in industrial and transportation applications. They can be subdivided into oils and greases, which differ in terms of physical characteristics (e.g., viscosity), commercial applications, and environmental fate. According to EIA (2018), the C content from U.S. production of lubricants in 2017 was approximately 5.4 MMT C. Based on apportioning oils and greases to various environmental fates, and characterizing those fates as resulting in either long-term storage or emissions, the overall C storage factor was estimated to be 9.2 percent; thus, emissions in 2017 were about 4.9 MMT C, or 18.0 MMT CO₂ Eq.

Methodology and Data Sources

For each lubricant category, a storage factor was derived by identifying disposal fates and applying assumptions as to the disposition of the C for each practice. An overall lubricant C storage factor was calculated by taking a production-weighted average of the oil and grease storage factors.

Oils

Regulation of used oil in the United States has changed dramatically over the past 20 years.³⁸ The effect of these regulations and policies has been to restrict landfilling and dumping, and to encourage collection of used oil. The economics of the petroleum industry have generally not favored re-refining—instead, most of the used oil that has been collected has been combusted.

Table A-85 provides an estimated allocation of the fates of lubricant oils (Rinehart 2000), along with an estimate of the proportion of C stored in each fate. The ultimate fate of the majority of oils (about 84 percent) is combustion, either during initial use or after collection as used oil. Combustion results in 99 percent oxidation to CO₂ (EIIIP 1999), with correspondingly little long-term storage of C in the form of ash. Dumping onto the ground or into storm sewers, primarily by “do-it-yourselfers” who change their own oil, is another fate that results in conversion to CO₂ given that the releases are generally small and most of the oil is biodegraded (based on the observation that land farming—application to soil—is one of the most frequently used methods for degrading refinery wastes). In the landfill environment, which tends to be anaerobic within municipal landfills, it is assumed that 90 percent of the oil persists in an undegraded form, based on analogy with the persistence of petroleum in native petroleum-bearing strata, which is also anaerobic. Re-refining adds a recycling loop to the fate of oil. Re-refined oil was assumed to have a storage factor equal to the weighted average for the other fates (i.e., after re-refining, the oil would have the same probability of combustion, landfilling, or dumping as virgin oil), that is, it was

³⁸ For example, the U.S. EPA “RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) On-line” web site (<<http://www.epa.gov/rcraonline/>>) has over 50 entries on used oil regulation and policy for 1994 through 2000.

assumed that about 97 percent of the C in re-refined oil is ultimately oxidized. Because of the dominance of fates that result in eventual release as CO₂, only about 3 percent of the C in oil lubricants goes into long-term storage.

Table A-85: Commercial and Environmental Fate of Oil Lubricants (Percent)

Fate of Oil	Portion of Total Oil	C Stored
Combusted During Use	20%	0.2%
Not Combusted During Use	80%	2.7%
Combusted as Used Oil ^a	64%	0.6%
Dumped on the ground or in storm sewers	6%	NA
Landfilled	2%	1.8%
Re-refined into lube oil base stock and other products	8%	0.2%
Weighted Average	NA	2.9%

NA (Not Applicable)

^a For example, in boilers or space heaters.

Greases

Table A-86 provides analogous estimates for lubricant greases. Unlike oils, grease is generally not combusted during use, and combustion for energy recovery and re-refining is thought to be negligible. Although little is known about the fate of waste grease, it was assumed that 90 percent of the non-combusted portion is landfilled, and the remainder is dumped onto the ground or storm sewers. Because much of the waste grease will be in containers that render it relatively inaccessible to biodegradation, and because greases contain longer chain paraffins, which are more persistent than oils, it was assumed that 90 percent and 50 percent of the C in landfilled and dumped grease, respectively, would be stored. The overall storage factor is 82 percent for grease.

Table A-86: Commercial and Environmental Fate of Grease Lubricants (Percent)

Fate of Grease	Portion of Total Grease	C Stored
Combusted During Use	5%	0.1%
Not Combusted During Use	95%	81.7%
Landfilled	90%	77.0%
Dumped on the ground or in storm sewers	10%	4.8%
Weighted Average	NA	81.8%

NA (Not Applicable)

Having derived separate storage factors for oil and grease, the last step was to estimate the weighted average for lubricants as a whole. No data were found apportioning the mass of lubricants into these two categories, but the U.S. Census Bureau does maintain records of the value of production of lubricating oils and lubricating greases. These were retrieved from the relevant industry series summaries from the *1997 Economic Census* (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1999). Assuming that the mass of lubricants can be allocated according to the proportion of value of production (92 percent oil, 8 percent grease), applying these weights to the storage factors for oils and greases (3 percent and 82 percent) yields an overall storage factor of 9.2 percent.

Uncertainty

A Tier 2 Monte Carlo analysis was performed using @RISK software to determine the level of uncertainty surrounding the estimates of the lubricants weighted average C storage factor and the quantity of C emitted from lubricants in 2017. The Tier 2 analysis was performed to allow the specification of probability density functions for key variables, within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the Inventory estimate. Statistical analyses or expert judgments of uncertainty were not available directly from the information sources for the activity variables; thus, uncertainty estimates were determined using assumptions based on source category knowledge. Uncertainty estimates for oil and grease variables were assumed to have a moderate variance, in triangular or uniform distribution. Uncertainty estimates for lubricants production were assumed to be rather high (± 20 percent). A narrow uniform distribution, with 6 percent uncertainty (± 6 percent) around the mean, was applied to the lubricant C content coefficient.

The Monte Carlo analysis produced a storage factor distribution with the 95 percent confidence interval of 4 percent and 17 percent around a mean value of 10 percent. This compares to the calculated Inventory estimate of 9.2 percent. The analysis produced a C emission distribution approximating a normal curve with a mean of 17.8 MMT CO₂ Eq., standard

deviation of 1.5 and 95 percent confidence limits of 14.9 MMT CO₂ Eq. and 20.9 MMT CO₂ Eq. This compares to an inventory-calculated estimate of 18.0 MMT CO₂ Eq.

The principal sources of uncertainty for the disposition of lubricants are the estimates of the commercial use, post-use, and environmental fate of lubricants, which, as noted above, are largely based on assumptions and judgment. There is no comprehensive system to track used oil and greases, which makes it difficult to develop a verifiable estimate of the commercial fates of oil and grease. The environmental fate estimates for percent of C stored are less uncertain, but also introduce uncertainty in the estimate.

The assumption that the mass of oil and grease can be divided according to their value also introduces uncertainty. Given the large difference between the storage factors for oil and grease, changes in their share of total lubricant production have a large effect on the weighted storage factor.

Future improvements to the analysis of uncertainty surrounding the lubricants C storage factor and C stored include further refinement of the uncertainty estimates for the individual activity variables.

Waxes

Waxes are organic substances that are solid at ambient temperature, but whose viscosity decreases as temperature increases. Most commercial waxes are produced from petroleum refining, though “mineral” waxes derived from animals, plants, and lignite (coal) are also used. An analysis of wax end uses in the United States, and the fate of C in these uses, suggests that about 42 percent of C in waxes is emitted, and 58 percent is stored.

Methodology and Data Sources

The National Petroleum Refiners Association (NPRA) considers the exact amount of wax consumed each year by end use to be proprietary (Maguire 2004). In general, about thirty percent of the wax consumed each year is used in packaging materials, though this percentage has declined in recent years. The next highest wax end use, and fastest growing end use, is candles, followed by construction materials and firelogs. Table A-87 categorizes some of the wax end uses, which the NPRA generally classifies into cosmetics, plastics, tires and rubber, hot melt (adhesives), chemically modified wax substances, and other miscellaneous wax uses (NPRA 2002).

Table A-87: Emissive and Non-emissive (Storage) Fates of Waxes: Uses by Fate and Percent of Total Mass

Use	Emissive	Non-emissive
Packaging	6%	24%
Non-packaging	36%	34%
Candles	18%	2%
Construction Materials	4%	14%
Firelogs	7%	+
Cosmetics	1%	2%
Plastics	1%	2%
Tires/Rubber	1%	1%
Hot Melts	1%	1%
Chemically Modified	0%	1%
Other	2%	9%
Total	42%	58%

+ Does not exceed 0.5 percent.

A C storage factor for each wax end use was estimated and then summed across all end uses to provide an overall C storage factor for wax. Because no specific data on C contents of wax used in each end use were available, all wax products are assumed to have the same C content. Table A-88 categorizes wax end uses identified by the NPRA, and lists the estimated C storage factor of each end use.

Table A-88: Wax End-Uses by Fate, Percent of Total Mass, Percent C Stored, and Percent of Total C Mass Stored

Use	Percent of Total Wax Mass	Percent of C Stored	Percent of Total C Mass Stored
Packaging	30%	79%	24%
Non-Packaging			
Candles	20%	10%	2%
Construction Materials	18%	79%	14%
Firelogs	7%	1%	+
Cosmetics	3%	79%	2%
Plastics	3%	79%	2%
Tires/Rubber	3%	47%	1%
Hot Melts	3%	50%	1%
Chemically Modified	1%	79%	1%
Other	12%	79%	9%
Total	100%	NA	58%

+ Does not exceed 0.5 percent.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Estimates of percent stored are based on professional judgment, ICF International.

Source mass percentages: NPRA (2002).

Emissive wax end-uses include candles, firelogs (synthetic fireplace logs), hotmelts (adhesives), matches, and explosives. At about 20 percent, candles consume the greatest portion of wax among emissive end uses. As candles combust during use, they release emissions to the atmosphere. For the purposes of the Inventory, it is assumed that 90 percent of C contained in candles is emitted as CO₂. In firelogs, petroleum wax is used as a binder and as a fuel, and is combusted during product use, likely resulting in the emission of nearly all C contained in the product. Similarly, C contained in hotmelts is assumed to be emitted as CO₂ as heat is applied to these products during use. It is estimated that 50 percent of the C contained in hot melts is stored. Together, candles, firelogs, and hotmelts constitute approximately 30 percent of annual wax production (NPRA 2002).

All of the wax utilized in the production of packaging, cosmetics, plastics, tires and rubber, and other products is assumed to remain in the product (i.e., it is assumed that there are no emissions of CO₂ from wax during the production of the product). Wax is used in many different packaging materials including wrappers, cartons, papers, paperboard, and corrugated products (NPRA 2002). Davie (1993) and Davie et al. (1995) suggest that wax coatings in packaging products degrade rapidly in an aerobic environment, producing CO₂; however, because packaging products ultimately enter landfills typically having an anaerobic environment, most of the C from this end use is assumed to be stored in the landfill.

In construction materials, petroleum wax is used as a water repellent on wood-based composite boards, such as particle board (IGI 2002). Wax used for this end-use should follow the life-cycle of the harvested wood used in product, which is classified into one of 21 categories, evaluated by life-cycle, and ultimately assumed to either be disposed of in landfills or be combusted (EPA 2003).

The fate of wax used for packaging, in construction materials, and for most remaining end uses is ultimately to enter the municipal solid waste (MSW) stream, where it is either combusted or sent to landfill for disposal. Most of the C contained in these wax products will be stored. It is assumed that approximately 21 percent of the C contained in these products will be emitted through combustion or at landfill. With the exception of tires and rubber, these end-uses are assigned a C storage factor of 79 percent.

Waxes used in tires and rubber follow the life cycle of the tire and rubber products. Used tires are ultimately recycled, landfilled, or combusted. The life-cycle of tires is addressed elsewhere in this annex as part of the discussion of rubber products derived from petrochemical feedstocks. For the purposes of the estimation of the C storage factor for waxes, wax contained in tires and rubber products is assigned a C storage factor of 47 percent.

Uncertainty

A Tier 2 Monte Carlo analysis was performed using @RISK software to determine the level of uncertainty surrounding the estimates of the wax C storage factor and the quantity of C emitted from wax in 2017. A Tier 2 analysis was performed to allow the specification of probability density functions for key variables, within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the Inventory estimate. Statistical analyses or expert judgments of uncertainty were not available directly from the information sources for the activity variables; thus, uncertainty estimates were determined using assumptions based on source category knowledge. Uncertainty estimates for wax variables were assumed to have a moderate

variance, in normal, uniform, or triangular distribution; uniform distributions were applied to total consumption of waxes and the C content coefficients.

The Monte Carlo analysis produced a storage factor distribution, whose 95 percent confidence interval values fell within the range of 47 percent and 68 percent, around the mean value of 58 percent. This compares to the calculated Inventory estimate of 57.8 percent. The analysis produced an emission distribution, with the 95 percent confidence interval values of 0.2 MMT CO₂ Eq. and 0.6 MMT CO₂ Eq., with a mean value of 0.4 MMT CO₂ Eq. This compares with a calculated Inventory estimate of 0.3 MMT CO₂ Eq., which falls within the range of 95 percent confidence limits established by this quantitative uncertainty analysis. Uncertainty associated with the wax storage factor is considerable due to several assumptions pertaining to wax imports/exports, consumption, and fates.

Miscellaneous Products

Miscellaneous products are defined by the U.S. Energy Information Administration as: “all finished [petroleum] products not classified elsewhere, e.g., petrolatum; lube refining by-products (e.g., aromatic extracts and tars); absorption oils; ram-jet fuel; petroleum rocket fuel; synthetic natural gas feedstocks; and specialty oils.”

Methodology and Data Sources

Data are not available concerning the distribution of each of the above-listed subcategories within the “miscellaneous products” category. However, based on the anticipated disposition of the products in each subcategory, it is assumed that all of the C content of miscellaneous products is emitted rather than stored. Petrolatum and specialty oils (which include greases) are likely to end up in solid waste or wastewater streams rather than in durable products, and would be emitted through waste treatment. Absorption oil is used in natural gas processing and is not a feedstock for manufacture of durable products. Jet fuel and rocket fuel are assumed to be combusted in use, and synthetic natural gas feedstocks are assumed to be converted to synthetic natural gas that is also combusted in use. Lube refining by-products could potentially be used as feedstocks for manufacture of durable goods, but such by-products are more likely to be used in emissive uses. Lube refining by-products and absorption oils are liquids and are precluded from disposal in landfills. Because no sequestering end uses of any of the miscellaneous products subcategories have been identified, a zero percent storage factor is assigned to miscellaneous products. The C content for 2017 was proxied to the 2008 value, which, according to EIA (2009), was approximately 20.3 MMT C/QBtu. One hundred percent of the C content is assumed to be emitted to the atmosphere, where it is oxidized to CO₂.

Uncertainty

A separate uncertainty analysis was not conducted for miscellaneous products, though this category was included in the uncertainty analysis of other non-energy uses discussed in the following section.

Other Non-Energy Uses

The remaining fuel types use storage factors that are not based on U.S.-specific analysis. For industrial coking coal and distillate fuel oil, storage factors were taken from IPCC (2006), which in turn draws from Marland and Rotty (1984). These factors are 0.1 and 0.5, respectively.

IPCC does not provide guidance on storage factors for the remaining fuel types (petroleum coke, miscellaneous products, and other petroleum), and assumptions were made based on the potential fate of C in the respective NEUs. Specifically, the storage factor for petroleum coke is 0.3, based on information from Huurman (2006) indicating that petroleum coke is used in the Netherlands for production of pigments, with 30 percent being stored long-term. Carbon dioxide emissions from carbide production are implicitly accounted for in the storage factor calculation for the non-energy use of petroleum coke. The “other petroleum” category is reported by U.S. Territories and accounts mostly for the same products as miscellaneous products, but probably also includes some asphalt, known to be non-emissive. The exact amount of asphalt or any of the other miscellaneous products is confidential business information, but based on judgment the storage factor for this category was estimated at 0.1.

For all these fuel types, the overall methodology simply involves multiplying C content by a storage factor, yielding an estimate of the mass of C stored. To provide a complete analysis of uncertainty for the entire NEU subcategory, the uncertainty around the estimate of “other” NEUs was characterized, as discussed below.

Uncertainty

A Tier 2 Monte Carlo analysis was performed using @RISK software to determine the level of uncertainty surrounding the weighted average of the remaining fuels’ C storage factors and the total quantity of C emitted from these other fuels in 2017. A Tier 2 analysis was performed to allow the specification of probability density functions for key

variables, within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the Inventory estimate. Statistical analyses or expert judgments of uncertainty were not available directly from the information sources for some of the activity variables; thus, uncertainty estimates were determined using assumptions based on source category knowledge. A uniform distribution was applied to coking coal consumption, while the remaining consumption inputs were assumed to be normally distributed. The C content coefficients were assumed to have a uniform distribution; the greatest uncertainty range of 20 percent ($\pm$ 20 percent) around the Inventory value, was applied to coking coal and miscellaneous products. C coefficients for distillate fuel oil ranged from 19.2 to 35.9 MMT C/QBtu. The fuel-specific storage factors were assigned wide triangular distributions indicating greater uncertainty.

The Monte Carlo analysis produced a storage factor distribution with 95 percent confidence limits of 6 percent and 43 percent, with a mean of 21 percent. This compares to the Inventory calculation of weighted average (across the various fuels) storage factor of about 6.3 percent. The analysis produced an emission distribution, with the 95 percent confidence limit of 19.2 MMT CO₂ Eq. and 35.9 MMT CO₂ Eq., and a mean of 27.7 MMT CO₂ Eq. This compares with the Inventory estimate of 32.9 MMT CO₂ Eq., which falls closer to the upper boundary of the 95 percent confidence limit. The uncertainty analysis results are driven primarily by the very broad uncertainty inputs for the storage factors.

References

- ACC (2018a) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2018,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2018b) "U.S. Resin Production & Sales 2017 vs. 2016." Available online at: <<https://plastics.americanchemistry.com/Plastics-Statistics/ACC-PIPS-Year-End-2017-Resin-Stats-vs-2016.pdf>>.
- ACC (2017a) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2017,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2017b) "U.S. Resin Production & Sales 2016 vs. 2015." Available online at: <<https://plastics.americanchemistry.com/Sales-Data-by-Resin.pdf>>.
- ACC (2016a) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2016,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2016b) "U.S. Resin Production & Sales 2015 vs. 2014." Available online at: <<https://plastics.americanchemistry.com/Sales-Data-by-Resin.pdf>>.
- ACC (2015a) "U.S. Resin Production & Sales: 2014 vs. 2013," American Chemistry Council. Available online at: <<http://www.americanchemistry.com/Jobs/EconomicStatistics/Plastics-Statistics/Production-and-Sales-Data-by-Resin.pdf>>.
- ACC (2015b) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2015,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2014) "U.S. Resin Production & Sales: 2013 vs. 2012," American Chemistry Council. Available online at: <<http://www.americanchemistry.com/Jobs/EconomicStatistics/Plastics-Statistics/Production-and-Sales-Data-by-Resin.pdf>>.
- ACC (2012) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2012,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2011) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2011,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2010) *"Guide to the Business of Chemistry, 2010,"* American Chemistry Council.
- ACC (2007 through 2011) "PIPS Year-End Resin Statistics: Production, Sales and Captive Use." Available online at: <<http://www.americanchemistry.com/Jobs/EconomicStatistics/Plastics-Statistics/Production-and-Sales-Data-by-Resin.pdf>>.
- APC (2003 through 2006) "APC Year-End Statistics." Available online at: <http://www.americanplasticscouncil.org/s_apc/docs/1700/1678.pdf>.
- APC (2001) as cited in ACS (2001) "Production: slow gains in output of chemicals and products lagged behind U.S. economy as a whole" Chemical & Engineering News.
- APC (2000) Facts and Figures, Chemical & Engineering News, June 26, 2000.
- Bank of Canada (2017) Financial Markets Department Year Average of Exchange Rates. Available online at: <<https://www.icao.int/CAFICS/News%20Library/nraa-2016-en-2.pdf>>.
- Bank of Canada (2016) Financial Markets Department Year Average of Exchange Rates. Available online at: <<http://www.bankofcanada.ca/stats/assets/pdf/nraa-2015.pdf>>.

- 1 Bank of Canada (2013) Financial Markets Department Year Average of Exchange Rates. Available online at:
2 <<http://www.bankofcanada.ca/stats/assets/pdf/nraa-2012.pdf>>.
- 3 Bank of Canada (2012) Financial Markets Department Year Average of Exchange Rates. Available online at:
4 <<http://www.bankofcanada.ca/stats/assets/pdf/nraa-2011.pdf>>.
- 5 Bank of Canada (2009) Financial Markets Department Year Average of Exchange Rates. Available online at:
6 <<http://www.bankofcanada.ca/pdf/nraa09.pdf>>.
- 7 Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017) Producer Price Index Industry Data: Soap and Other Detergent Manufacturing.
8 Available online at: <<http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/dsrv?pc>>.
- 9 C&EN (2017) *U.S. textile makers look for a revival*, Chemical & Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 19
10 June. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 11 Davie, I.N., J.P. Winter, and R.P. Varoney (1995) "Decomposition of Coated Papers from a Quick Service Restaurant."
12 *Technical Association for Pulp and Paper Industry Journal*. Vol 78 (5): 127-130.
- 13 Davie, I.N. (1993) "Compostability of Petroleum Wax-based Coatings." *Technical Association for Pulp and Paper*
14 *Industry Journal*. Vol 76 (2): 167-170.
- 15 EIA (2018) Supplemental Tables on Petroleum Product detail. *Monthly Energy Review, October 2018*. Energy Information
16 Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. DOE/EIA-0035 (2018/10).
- 17 EIA (2017) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 2014*. U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information
18 Administration, Washington, D.C.
- 19 EIA (2013b) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 2010*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information
20 Administration, Washington, DC.
- 21 EIA (2009) *Petroleum Supply Annual*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.
22 Available online at <[http://www.eia.doe.gov/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/petroleum_supply_annual/](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/petroleum_supply_annual/psa_volume1/psa_volume1.html)
23 [psa_volume1/psa_volume1.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/petroleum_supply_annual/psa_volume1/psa_volume1.html)>.
- 24 EIA (2010) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 2006*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information
25 Administration, Washington, DC. EIA (2005) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 2002*, U.S.
26 Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, Washington, DC.
- 27 EIA (2001) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 1998*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information
28 Administration, Washington, DC.
- 29 EIA (1997) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 1994*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information
30 Administration, Washington, DC.
- 31 EIA (1994) *EIA Manufacturing Consumption of Energy (MECS) 1991*, U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information
32 Administration, Washington, DC.
- 33 Eldredge-Roebuck (2000) Personal communication between Joe Casola, ICF Consulting and Brandt Eldredge-Roebuck,
34 American Plastics Council, 11 July 2000.
- 35 EIIP (2001) "Area Sources" *Asphalt Paving*, Emissions Inventory Improvement Program: State and Territorial Air
36 Pollution Program Administrators/Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials and U.S. EPA, EIIP
37 Document Series Vol. III, Ch. 17. (STAPPA/ALAPCO/EPA), Washington DC, January 2001. Available online at
38 <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/eiip/techreport/volume03/index.html>>.
- 39 EIIP (1999) *Methods for Estimating Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Combustion of Fossil Fuels*. Emissions Inventory
40 Improvement Program: State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators/Association of Local Air Pollution
41 Control Officials and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EIIP Document Series Volume VIII, Chapter 1,
42 STAPPA/ALAPCO/EPA, Washington, DC. August 2000. Available online at
43 <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/eiip/viii01.pdf>>. 28 August 2000.
- 44 Environment Canada (2006) *Emissions Inventory Guidebook v1.3*. Criteria Air Contaminants Division: Quebec, Canada.
45 Available online at: <<http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/EMEPCORINAIR5/B4611vs1.3.pdf>>.
- 46 EPA (2017) EPA's Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage, 2008-2012 Market Estimates. Available online at:
47 < https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/pesticides-industry-sales-usage-2016_0.pdf>.

- 1 EPA (2013a, 2015a, 2016a) RCRAInfo, Biennial Report, Generation and Management (GM) Form (Section 2 - Onsite
2 Management) and Waste Received from Offsite (WR) Form.
- 3 EPA (2018) "1970 - 2017 Average annual emissions, all criteria pollutants in MS Excel." *National Emissions Inventory*
4 *(NEI) Air Pollutant Emissions Trends Data*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 2018. Available
5 online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/air-pollutant-emissions-trends-data>>.
- 6 EPA (2016c) Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2014 Facts and Figures Fact Sheet. Office of Solid Waste
7 and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. Available online at:
8 <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-11/documents/2014_smmfactsheet_508.pdf>.
- 9 EPA (2014) Chemical Data Access Tool (CDAT). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, June 2014. Available online at
10 <http://java.epa.gov/oppt_chemical_search/>. Accessed January 2015.
- 11 EPA (1996 through 2003a, 2005, 2007b, 2008, 2009a, 2011a, 2013b, 2014) *Municipal Solid Waste in the United States:*
12 *Facts and Figures*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
13 Washington, DC. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/non-hw/muncpl/msw99.htm>>.
- 14 EPA (2011b) EPA's Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage, 2006 and 2007 Market Estimates. Available online at
15 <<http://www.epa.gov/oppbead1/pestsales/>>. Accessed January 2012>.
- 16 EPA (2009) Biennial Reporting System (BRS) Database. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Envirofacts Warehouse.
17 Washington, DC. Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/enviro/html/brs/>>.
- 18 EPA (2006) *Air Emissions Trends - Continued Progress Through 2005*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
19 Washington DC. December 19, 2006. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/air/airtrends/index.html>>.
- 20 EPA (2004) EPA's Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage, 2000 and 2001 Market Estimates. Available online at
21 <<http://www.epa.gov/oppbead1/pestsales/>>. Accessed September 2006.
- 22 EPA (2003) E-mail correspondence containing preliminary ambient air pollutant data. Office of Air Pollution and the
23 Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. December 22, 2003.
- 24 EPA (2002) EPA's Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage, 1998 and 1999 Market Estimates, table 3.6. Available online at
25 <http://www.epa.gov/oppbead1/pestsales/99pestsales/market_estimates1999.pdf>. Accessed July 2003.
- 26 EPA (2001) AP 42, Volume I, Fifth Edition. Chapter 11: Mineral Products Industry. Available online at
27 <<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch11/index.html>>.
- 28 EPA (2000a) *Biennial Reporting System (BRS)*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Envirofacts Warehouse.
29 Washington, DC. Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/enviro/html/brs/>>.
- 30 EPA (2000b) *Toxics Release Inventory, 1998*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental
31 Information, Office of Information Analysis and Access, Washington, DC. Available online at
32 <<http://www.epa.gov/triexplorer/chemical.htm>>.
- 33 EPA (1999) EPA's Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage, 1996-1997 Market Estimates and Available online at:
34 <http://www.epa.gov/oppbead1/pestsales/97pestsales/market_estimates1997.pdf>.
- 35 EPA (1998) EPA's Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage, 1994-1995 Market Estimates. Available online at
36 <http://www.epa.gov/oppbead1/pestsales/95pestsales/market_estimates1995.pdf>.
- 37 FEB (2013) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2013) Lackluster Year for Chemical Output: Production stayed*
38 *flat or dipped in most world regions in 2012*. Chemical &Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 1 July.
39 Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 40 FEB (2012) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2012) Too Quiet After the Storm: After a rebound in 2010,*
41 *chemical production hardly grew in 2011*. Chemical &Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 2 July.
42 Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 43 FEB (2011) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2011) Output Ramps up in all Regions*. Chemical & Engineering
44 News, American Chemical Society, 4 July. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 45 FEB (2010) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2010) Output Declines in U.S., Europe*. Chemical &
46 Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 6 July. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 47 FEB (2009) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2009) Chemical Output Slipped In Most Regions*. Chemical &
48 Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 6 July. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.

- 1 FEB (2007) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2007) Gains in Chemical Output Continue*. Chemical &
2 Engineering News, American Chemical Society. July 2, 2007. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 3 FEB (2005) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2005) Production: Growth in Most Regions*. Chemical &
4 Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 11 July. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 5 FEB (2003) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2003) Production Inches Up in Most Countries*. Chemical &
6 Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 7 July. Available online at: <<http://www.cen-online.org>>.
- 7 FEB (2001) *Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in ACS (2001) Production: slow gains in output of chemicals and products*
8 *lagged behind U.S. economy as a whole* Chemical & Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 25 June.
9 Available online at: <<http://pubs.acs.org/cen>>.
- 10 Financial Planning Association (2006) *Canada/US Cross-Border Tools: US/Canada Exchange Rates*. Available online at:
11 <http://www.fpanet.org/global/planners/US_Canada_ex_rates.cfm>. Accessed August 16, 2006.
- 12 Gosselin, Smith, and Hodge (1984) *Clinical Toxicology of Commercial Products*. Fifth Edition, Williams & Wilkins,
13 Baltimore.
- 14 Huurman, J.W.F. (2006) *Recalculation of Dutch Stationary Greenhouse Gas Emissions Based on sectoral Energy*
15 *Statistics 1990-2002*. Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg, The Netherlands.
- 16 IGI (2002) *100 Industry Applications*. The International Group Inc. Available online at
17 <http://www.igiwax.com/100_apps.html Toronto, Ontario>.
- 18 IISRP (2003) "*IISRP Forecasts Moderate Growth in North America to 2007*" International Institute of Synthetic Rubber
19 Producers, Inc. New Release; available online at: <[http://www.iisrp.com/press-releases/2003-Press-Releases/IISRP-](http://www.iisrp.com/press-releases/2003-Press-Releases/IISRP-NA-Forecast-03-07.html)
20 [NA-Forecast-03-07.html](http://www.iisrp.com/press-releases/2003-Press-Releases/IISRP-NA-Forecast-03-07.html)>.
- 21 IISRP (2000) *Synthetic Rubber Use Growth to Continue Through 2004, Says IISRP and RMA*. International Institute of
22 Synthetic Rubber Producers press release.
- 23 INEGI (2006) *Producción bruta total de las unidades económicas manufactureras por Subsector, Rama, Subrama y Clase*
24 *de actividad*. Available online at:
25 <http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/proyectos/censos/ce2004/tb_manufacturas.asp>. Accessed August
26 15.
- 27 IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
28 Programme, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe, eds.; Institute for Global Environmental
29 Strategies (IGES). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- 30 James, A. (2000) Personal communication between Suzanne Bratis of ICF International and Alan James of Akzo Nobel
31 Coatings, Inc. July 2000. (Tel: 614-294-3361).
- 32 Kelly (2000) Personal communication between Tom Smith, ICF Consulting and Peter Kelly, Asphalt Roofing
33 Manufacturers Association, August 2000.
- 34 Maguire (2004) Personal communication with J. Maguire, National Petrochemicals and Refiners Association. August –
35 September 2004.
- 36 Marland, G., and R.M. Rotty (1984) *Carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels: A procedure for estimation and results for*
37 *1950-1982*, Tellus 36b:232-261.
- 38 NPRA (2002) *North American Wax - A Report Card*. Available online at:
39 <<http://www.npra.org/members/publications/papers/lubes/LW-02-126.pdf>>.
- 40 Rinehart, T. (2000) Personal communication between Thomas Rinehart of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office
41 of Solid Waste, and Randall Freed of ICF International. July 2000. (Tel: 703-308-4309).
- 42 RMA (2018) *2017 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary*. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Washington, DC. July
43 2018.
- 44 RMA (2016) *2015 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary*. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Washington, DC. August
45 2016.
- 46 RMA (2014) *2013 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary*. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Washington, DC.
47 November 2014.

1 RMA (2011) *U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary: 2005-2009*. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Washington, DC.
2 October 2011, updated September 2013.

3 RMA (2009) “Scrap Tire Markets: Facts and Figures – Scrap Tire Characteristics.” Available online at:
4 <http://www.rma.org/scrap_tires/scrap_tire_markets/scrap_tire_characteristics/>. Accessed 17 September 2009.

5 Schneider, S. (2007) E-mail between Shelly Schneider of Franklin Associates (a division of ERG) and Sarah Shapiro of
6 ICF International, January 10, 2007.

7 SPI (2000) The Society of the Plastics Industry Website, <http://www.plasticsindustry.org/industry/stat3.htm>, Accessed 28
8 June 2000.

9 U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994, 1999, 2004, 2009, 2014) *1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2012 Economic Census*. Available
10 online at
11 <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=ECN&_submenuId=&_lang=en&_ts=>.

12 U.S. International Trade Commission (1990 through 2017) “Interactive Tariff and Trade DataWeb: Quick Query.”
13 Available online at <<http://dataweb.usitc.gov/>>. Accessed November 2018.

14 Vallianos, Jean (2018) Personal communication between Drew Stilson of ICF and Jean Vallianos of the American
15 Chemistry Council, October 5, 2018.

16 Vallianos, Jean (2017) Personal communication between Drew Stilson of ICF and Jean Vallianos of the American
17 Chemistry Council, November 1, 2017.

18 Vallianos, Jean (2016) Personal communication between Drew Stilson of ICF and Jean Vallianos of the American
19 Chemistry Council, November 17, 2016.

20 Vallianos, Jean (2015) Personal communication between Tyler Fitch of ICF International and Jean Vallianos of the
21 American Chemistry Council, December 20, 2015.

22 Vallianos, Jean (2014) Personal communication between Sarah Biggar of ICF International and Jean Vallianos of the
23 American Chemistry Council, November 13, 2014.

24 Vallianos, Jean (2013) Personal communication between Sarah Biggar of ICF International and Jean Vallianos of the
25 American Chemistry Council, November 8, 2013.

26 Vallianos, Jean (2012) Personal communication between Ben Eskin of ICF International and Jean Vallianos of the
27 American Chemistry Council, September 14, 2012.

28 Vallianos, Jean (2011) Personal communication between Joe Indvik of ICF International and Jean Vallianos of the
29 American Chemistry Council, January 4, 2011.

ANNEX 3 Methodological Descriptions for Additional Source or Sink Categories

3.1. Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CH₄, N₂O, and Indirect Greenhouse Gases from Stationary Combustion

Estimates of CH₄ and N₂O Emissions

Methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from stationary combustion were estimated using methods from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Estimates were obtained by multiplying emission factors—by sector and fuel type—by fossil fuel and wood consumption data. This “top-down” methodology is characterized by two basic steps, described below. Data are presented in Table A-89 through Table A-94.

Step 1: Determine Energy Consumption by Sector and Fuel Type

Energy consumption from stationary combustion activities was grouped by sector: industrial, commercial, residential, electric power, and U.S. Territories. For CH₄ and N₂O from industrial, commercial, residential, and U.S. Territories, estimates were based upon consumption of coal, gas, oil, and wood. Energy consumption and wood consumption data for the United States were obtained from the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA) *Monthly Energy Review, October 2018* (EIA 2018). Because the United States does not include U.S. Territories in its national energy statistics, fuel consumption data for U.S. Territories were collected from EIA’s International Energy Statistics database (EIA 2017) and Jacobs (2010).³⁹ Fuel consumption for the industrial sector was adjusted to subtract out construction and agricultural use, which is reported under mobile sources.⁴⁰ Construction and agricultural fuel use was obtained from EPA (2018b) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (1996 through 2016). The energy consumption data by sector were then adjusted from higher to lower heating values by multiplying by 0.90 for natural gas and wood and by 0.95 for coal and petroleum fuel. This is a simplified convention used by the International Energy Agency (IEA). Table A-89 provides annual energy consumption data for the years 1990 through 2017.

In this Inventory, the emission estimation methodology for the electric power sector used a Tier 2 methodology as fuel consumption by technology-type for the electric power sector was obtained from the Acid Rain Program Dataset (EPA 2018a). This combustion technology-and fuel-use data was available by facility from 1996 to 2017. Since there was a difference between the EPA (2018a) and EIA (2018) total energy consumption estimates, the remainder between total energy consumption using EPA (2018a) and EIA (2018) was apportioned to each combustion technology type and fuel combination using a ratio of energy consumption by technology type from 1996 to 2017.

Energy consumption estimates were not available from 1990 to 1995 in the EPA (2018a) dataset, and as a result, consumption was calculated using total electric power consumption from EIA (2018) and the ratio of combustion technology and fuel types from EPA (2018a). The consumption estimates from 1990 to 1995 were estimated by applying the 1996 consumption ratio by combustion technology type to the total EIA consumption for each year from 1990 to 1995.

Step 2: Determine the Amount of CH₄ and N₂O Emitted

Activity data for industrial, commercial, residential, and U.S. Territories and fuel type for each of these sectors were then multiplied by default Tier 1 emission factors to obtain emission estimates. Emission factors for the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors were taken from the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006). These N₂O emission factors by fuel type (equivalent across sectors) were also assumed for U.S. Territories. The CH₄ emission factors by fuel type for U.S. Territories were estimated based on the emission factor for the primary sector in which each fuel was combusted. Table A-90 provides emission factors used for each sector and fuel type. For the electric power sector, emissions were estimated by multiplying fossil fuel and wood consumption by technology- and fuel-specific Tier 2 IPCC emission factors shown in Table A-91. Emission factors were taken from U.S. EPA publications on emissions

³⁹ U.S. Territories data also include combustion from mobile activities because data to allocate U.S. Territories’ energy use were unavailable. For this reason, CH₄ and N₂O emissions from combustion by U.S. Territories are only included in the stationary combustion totals.

⁴⁰ Though emissions from construction and farm use occur due to both stationary and mobile sources, detailed data was not available to determine the magnitude from each. Currently, these emissions are assumed to be predominantly from mobile sources.

rates for combustion sources, and EPA's Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42 (EPA 1997) for combined cycle natural gas units. The EPA factors were in large part used in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines as the factors presented.

Estimates of NO_x, CO, and NMVOC Emissions

Emissions estimates for NO_x, CO, and NMVOCs were obtained from data published on the National Emission Inventory (NEI) Air Pollutant Emission Trends web site (EPA 2018c), and disaggregated based on EPA (2003).

For indirect greenhouse gases, the major source categories included coal, fuel oil, natural gas, wood, other fuels (i.e., bagasse, liquefied petroleum gases, coke, coke oven gas, and others), and stationary internal combustion, which includes emissions from internal combustion engines not used in transportation. EPA periodically estimates emissions of NO_x, CO, and NMVOCs by sector and fuel type using a "bottom-up" estimating procedure. In other words, the emissions were calculated either for individual sources (e.g., industrial boilers) or for many sources combined, using basic activity data (e.g., fuel consumption or deliveries, etc.) as indicators of emissions. The national activity data used to calculate the individual categories were obtained from various sources. Depending upon the category, these activity data may include fuel consumption or deliveries of fuel, tons of refuse burned, raw material processed, etc. Activity data were used in conjunction with emission factors that relate the quantity of emissions to the activity.

The basic calculation procedure for most source categories presented in EPA (2003) and EPA (2018c) is represented by the following equation:

$$E_{p,s} = A_s \times EF_{p,s} \times (1 - C_{p,s}/100)$$

where,

E	=	Emissions
p	=	Pollutant
s	=	Source category
A	=	Activity level
EF	=	Emission factor
C	=	Percent control efficiency

The EPA currently derives the overall emission control efficiency of a category from a variety of sources, including published reports, the 1985 National Acid Precipitation and Assessment Program (NAPAP) emissions inventory, and other EPA databases. The U.S. approach for estimating emissions of NO_x, CO, and NMVOCs from stationary combustion as described above is similar to the methodology recommended by the IPCC.

Table A-89: Fuel Consumption by Stationary Combustion for Calculating CH₄ and N₂O Emissions (Tbtu)

Fuel/End-Use Sector	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Coal	19,610	20,888	22,391	22,343	22,576	22,636	22,949	22,458	22,710	22,225	19,670	20,697	18,989	16,715	17,393	17,366	15,110	13,968	13,564
Residential	31	17	12	12	12	11	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial	124	117	97	90	82	103	97	65	70	81	73	70	62	44	41	40	31	24	21
Industrial	1,640	1,527	1,358	1,244	1,249	1,262	1,219	1,189	1,131	1,081	877	952	866	782	800	799	696	620	576
Electric Power	17,807	19,217	20,920	20,987	21,199	21,228	21,591	21,161	21,465	21,026	18,682	19,639	18,024	15,852	16,521	16,483	14,339	13,280	12,923
U.S. Territories	7	10	4	11	34	32	33	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	31	44	44	44	44
Petroleum	6,255	5,899	7,019	6,392	6,740	6,860	6,737	6,442	6,403	5,616	5,134	5,291	5,030	4,728	4,917	4,477	4,957	4,624	4,545
Residential	1,375	1,262	1,465	1,361	1,468	1,468	1,368	1,202	1,220	1,202	1,138	1,115	1,045	840	928	1,016	954	808	835
Commercial	999	726	765	698	827	808	761	723	745	693	736	706	679	557	589	567	948	841	840
Industrial	2,713	2,592	2,882	2,708	2,784	2,926	2,984	3,311	3,243	2,746	2,352	2,542	2,543	2,542	2,716	2,269	2,414	2,347	2,327
Electric Power	797	860	1,279	1,074	1,043	1,007	1,004	590	618	488	383	412	266	273	180	153	169	156	70
U.S. Territories	370	459	628	552	618	652	620	615	577	487	525	515	497	517	504	472	472	472	472
Natural Gas	17,250	19,337	20,224	20,908	20,894	21,152	20,938	20,626	22,019	22,286	21,953	22,914	23,117	24,138	24,949	25,722	26,433	26,567	26,317
Residential	4,487	4,954	4,889	4,995	5,209	4,981	4,946	4,476	4,835	5,010	4,883	4,878	4,805	4,242	5,023	5,242	4,777	4,506	4,568
Commercial	2,680	3,096	3,097	3,212	3,261	3,201	3,073	2,902	3,085	3,228	3,187	3,165	3,216	2,960	3,380	3,572	3,316	3,224	3,276
Industrial	7,708	8,723	7,949	8,086	7,845	7,914	7,330	7,323	7,522	7,572	7,126	7,685	7,876	8,204	8,526	8,818	8,779	8,975	9,170
Electric Power	2,376	2,564	4,266	4,591	4,551	5,032	5,565	5,899	6,550	6,447	6,730	7,159	7,194	8,683	7,964	8,033	9,505	9,805	9,247
U.S. Territories	0	0	23	23	27	25	24	26	27	29	27	28	27	49	57	57	57	57	57
Wood	2,216	2,370	2,006	1,995	2,002	2,121	2,137	2,099	2,089	2,059	1,931	2,116	2,139	2,133	2,347	2,410	2,235	2,131	2,145
Residential	580	520	370	380	400	410	430	380	420	470	500	440	450	420	580	587	436	349	334
Commercial	66	72	67	69	71	70	70	65	70	73	73	72	69	61	70	76	79	84	84
Industrial	1,442	1,652	1,443	1,396	1,363	1,476	1,452	1,472	1,413	1,339	1,178	1,409	1,438	1,462	1,489	1,495	1,476	1,474	1,480
Electric Power	129	125	126	150	167	165	185	182	186	177	180	196	182	190	207	251	244	224	247
U.S. Territories	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE	NE

1 NE (Not Estimated)

2 Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

3

Table A-90: CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors by Fuel Type and Sector (g/GJ)^a

Fuel/End-Use Sector	CH ₄	N ₂ O
Coal		
Residential	300	1.5
Commercial	10	1.5
Industrial	10	1.5
U.S. Territories	1	1.5
Petroleum		
Residential	10	0.6
Commercial	10	0.6
Industrial	3	0.6
U.S. Territories	5	0.6
Natural Gas		
Residential	5	0.1
Commercial	5	0.1
Industrial	1	0.1
U.S. Territories	1	0.1
Wood		
Residential	300	4.0
Commercial	300	4.0
Industrial	30	4.0
U.S. Territories	NA	NA

NA (Not Applicable)

^a GJ (Gigajoule) = 10⁹ joules. One joule = 9.486×10⁻⁴ Btu.**Table A-91: CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors by Technology Type and Fuel Type for the Electric Power Sector (g/GJ)^a**

Technology	Configuration	CH ₄	N ₂ O
Liquid Fuels			
Residual Fuel Oil/Shale Oil Boilers	Normal Firing	0.8	0.3
	Tangential Firing	0.8	0.3
Gas/Diesel Oil Boilers	Normal Firing	0.9	0.4
	Tangential Firing	0.9	0.4
Large Diesel Oil Engines >600 hp (447kW)		4	NA
Solid Fuels			
Pulverized Bituminous Combination Boilers	Dry Bottom, wall fired	0.7	5.8
	Dry Bottom, tangentially fired	0.7	1.4
	Wet bottom	0.9	1.4
Bituminous Spreader Stoker Boilers	With and without re-injection	1	0.7
Bituminous Fluidized Bed Combustor	Circulating Bed	1	61
	Bubbling Bed	1	61
Bituminous Cyclone Furnace		0.2	0.6
Lignite Atmospheric Fluidized Bed		NA	71
Natural Gas			
Boilers		1.0	0.3
Gas-Fired Gas Turbines >3MW		3.7	1.3
Large Dual-Fuel Engines		258	NA
Combined Cycle		3.7	1.3
Peat			
Peat Fluidized Bed Combustion	Circulating Bed	3	7
	Bubbling Bed	3	3
Biomass			
Wood/Wood Waste Boilers		11	7
Wood Recovery Boilers		1	1

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Ibid.

Table A-92: NO_x Emissions from Stationary Combustion (kt)

Sector/Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Electric Power	6,045	5,792	4,454	4,265	3,930	3,595	3,434	3,249	3,064	2,847	2,552	2,226	1,893	1,779	1,666	1,603	1,327	1,166	1,046
Coal	5,119	5,061	3,802	3,634	3,349	3,063	2,926	2,768	2,611	2,426	2,175	1,896	1,613	1,516	1,419	1,366	1,130	994	891
Fuel Oil	200	87	149	142	131	120	114	108	102	95	85	74	63	59	55	53	44	39	35
Natural gas	513	510	325	310	286	262	250	236	223	207	186	162	138	129	121	117	97	85	76
Wood	NA	NA	37	36	33	30	29	27	26	24	21	19	16	15	14	13	11	10	9
Other Fuels ^a	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Internal Combustion	213	134	140	143	132	121	115	109	103	95	86	75	63	60	56	54	44	39	35
Industrial	2,559	2,650	2,296	1,699	1,641	1,580	1,515	1,400	1,285	1,165	1,126	1,087	1,048	1,016	984	952	952	952	952
Coal	530	541	518	384	371	357	342	316	290	263	254	245	237	229	222	215	215	215	215
Fuel Oil	240	224	153	114	110	106	101	94	86	78	75	73	70	68	66	64	64	64	64
Natural gas	877	999	711	526	508	489	469	433	398	361	348	336	324	314	305	295	295	295	295
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	119	111	116	86	83	80	76	70	65	59	57	55	53	51	50	48	48	48	48
Internal Combustion	792	774	798	591	570	549	527	486	446	405	391	378	364	353	342	331	331	331	331
Commercial	671	607	428	438	408	378	490	471	452	433	445	456	548	537	525	454	454	454	454
Coal	36	35	21	19	19	19	19	18	17	15	15	15	15	14	14	14	14	14	14
Fuel Oil	88	94	52	50	49	49	49	46	43	39	39	38	37	37	37	36	36	36	36
Natural gas	181	210	165	157	156	155	145	135	124	122	120	118	117	116	115	115	115	115	115
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	366	269	189	212	183	154	267	263	258	254	269	284	378	368	358	288	288	288	288
Residential	749	813	446	422	422	420	418	390	363	335	329	324	318	315	312	310	310	310	310
Coal ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fuel Oil ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wood	42	44	22	21	21	21	20	19	18	16	16	16	16	15	15	15	15	15	15
Other Fuels ^a	707	769	424	402	401	400	398	371	345	318	313	308	302	300	297	295	295	295	295
Total	10,023	9,862	7,623	6,825	6,401	5,973	5,858	5,511	5,163	4,780	4,452	4,092	3,807	3,647	3,487	3,319	3,042	2,882	2,761

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Other Fuels include LPG, waste oil, coke oven gas, coke, and non-residential wood (EPA 2018c).^b Residential coal, fuel oil, and natural gas emissions are included in the Other Fuels category (EPA 2018c).

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-93: CO Emissions from Stationary Combustion (kt)

Sector/Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Electric Power	329	337	439	594	591	586	582	609	637	660	676	693	710	694	678	661	661	661	661
Coal	213	227	220	298	296	294	292	305	319	330	339	347	356	348	340	331	331	331	331
Fuel Oil	18	9	28	38	37	37	37	38	40	42	43	44	45	44	43	42	42	42	42
Natural gas	46	49	92	125	124	123	122	128	134	138	142	145	149	146	142	139	139	139	139
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	NA	NA	32	44	43	43	43	45	47	48	50	51	52	51	50	48	48	48	48
Internal Combustion	52	52	67	91	90	90	89	93	97	101	103	106	108	106	104	101	101	101	101
Industrial	797	958	1,137	1,150	1,116	1,081	1,045	968	892	815	834	853	872	861	851	840	840	840	840

Coal	95	88	125	127	123	119	115	107	98	90	92	94	96	95	94	93	93	93	93
Fuel Oil	67	64	45	46	44	43	42	39	35	32	33	34	35	34	34	33	33	33	33
Natural gas	205	313	366	370	359	348	336	312	287	262	268	274	281	277	274	270	270	270	270
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	253	270	321	325	316	306	295	274	252	230	236	241	247	244	241	238	238	238	238
Internal Combustion	177	222	279	282	274	266	257	238	219	200	205	209	214	212	209	206	206	206	206
Commercial	205	211	154	177	173	169	166	156	146	137	138	140	142	134	127	120	120	120	120
Coal	13	14	13	15	15	15	14	14	13	12	12	12	12	12	11	10	10	10	10
Fuel Oil	16	17	17	20	19	19	19	18	16	15	16	16	16	15	14	13	13	13	13
Natural gas	40	49	84	97	95	93	91	86	80	75	76	77	78	74	70	66	66	66	66
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	136	132	38	44	43	42	41	39	37	34	35	35	35	34	32	30	30	30	30
Residential	3,668	3,877	2,648	3,044	2,982	2,919	2,856	2,690	2,524	2,357	2,387	2,416	2,446	2,319	2,192	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065
Coal ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fuel Oil ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wood	3,430	3,629	2,424	2,787	2,730	2,673	2,615	2,463	2,310	2,158	2,185	2,212	2,239	2,123	2,007	1,890	1,890	1,890	1,890
Other Fuels ^a	238	248	224	257	252	247	241	227	213	199	202	204	207	196	185	174	174	174	174
Total	5,000	5,383	4,377	4,965	4,862	4,756	4,648	4,423	4,198	3,969	4,036	4,103	4,170	4,009	3,847	3,686	3,686	3,686	3,686

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Other Fuels include LPG, waste oil, coke oven gas, coke, and non-residential wood (EPA 2018c).

^b Residential coal, fuel oil, and natural gas emissions are included in the Other Fuels category (EPA 2018c).

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-94: NMVOC Emissions from Stationary Combustion (kt)

Sector/Fuel Type	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Electric Power	43	40	55	45	45	44	44	42	41	40	39	38	37	36	35	34	34	34	34
Coal	24	26	26	21	21	21	21	20	20	19	18	18	18	17	17	16	16	16	16
Fuel Oil	5	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Natural Gas	2	2	12	10	10	10	10	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	NA	NA	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Internal Combustion	11	9	10	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Industrial	165	187	159	138	132	126	120	113	105	97	99	100	101	101	100	99	99	99	99
Coal	7	5	10	9	9	8	8	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Fuel Oil	11	11	9	7	7	7	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Natural Gas	52	66	54	47	45	43	41	38	36	33	33	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	46	45	29	25	24	23	22	21	19	18	18	18	19	19	18	18	18	18	18
Internal Combustion	49	60	57	49	47	45	43	40	37	35	35	36	36	36	36	35	35	35	35
Commercial	18	21	29	61	54	48	33	34	35	36	38	40	42	40	39	36	36	36	36
Coal	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fuel Oil	3	3	4	6	5	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Natural Gas	7	10	14	23	18	14	9	8	7	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6

Wood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Fuels ^a	8	8	10	31	30	30	22	24	26	28	29	31	32	32	31	28	28	28	28
Residential	686	725	836	1,341	1,067	793	518	465	411	358	378	399	419	389	358	327	327	327	327
Coal ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fuel Oil ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas ^b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wood	651	688	809	1,297	1,032	767	502	450	398	346	366	386	406	376	346	317	317	317	317
Other Fuels ^a	35	37	27	43	35	26	17	15	13	12	12	13	14	13	12	11	11	11	11
Total	912	973	1,080	1,585	1,298	1,011	716	654	593	531	553	576	599	566	532	497	497	497	497

+ Does not exceed 0.5 kt.

NA (Not Applicable)

^a "Other Fuels" include LPG, waste oil, coke oven gas, coke, and non-residential wood (EPA 2018c).

^b Residential coal, fuel oil, and natural gas emissions are included in the "Other Fuels" category (EPA 2018c).

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

References

- EIA (2018) Monthly Energy Review, October 2018, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0035(2018/10).
- EIA (2017) *International Energy Statistics 1980-2016*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<https://www.eia.gov/beta/international/>>.
- EPA (2018a) Acid Rain Program Dataset 1996 - 2016. Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Atmospheric Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- EPA (2018b) Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (Moves) 2014b. Office of Transportation and Air Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/moves/index.htm>>.
- EPA (2018c) “1970 - 2017 Average annual emissions, all criteria pollutants in MS Excel.” National Emissions Inventory (NEI) Air Pollutant Emissions Trends Data. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 2018. Available online at < <https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/air-pollutant-emissions-trends-data>>.
- EPA (2003) E-mail correspondence containing preliminary ambient air pollutant data. Office of Air Pollution and the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. December 22, 2003.
- EPA (1997) Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Research Triangle Park, NC. October 1997.
- FHWA (1996 through 2016) Highway Statistics. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. Report FHWA-PL-96-023-annual. Available online at: <<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/ohpi/hss/hsspubs.htm>>.
- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- Jacobs, G. (2010) Personal communication. Gwendolyn Jacobs, Energy Information Administration and Rubaab Bhangu, ICF International. U.S. Territories Fossil Fuel Consumption. Unpublished. U.S. Energy Information Administration. Washington, DC.

3.2. Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CH₄, N₂O, and Indirect Greenhouse Gases from Mobile Combustion and Methodology for and Supplemental Information on Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Estimating CO₂ Emissions by Transportation Mode

Transportation-related CO₂ emissions, as presented in the CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion section of the Energy chapter, were calculated using the methodology described in Annex 2.1. This section provides additional information on the data sources and approach used for each transportation fuel type. As noted in Annex 2.1, CO₂ emissions estimates for the transportation sector were calculated directly for on-road diesel fuel and motor gasoline based on data sources for individual modes of transportation (considered a bottom up approach). For most other fuel and energy types (aviation gasoline, residual fuel oil, natural gas, LPG, and electricity), CO₂ emissions were calculated based on transportation sector-wide fuel consumption estimates from the Energy Information Administration (EIA 2018a and EIA 2018d) and apportioned to individual modes (considered a “top down” approach). Carbon dioxide emissions from commercial jet fuel use are obtained directly from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA 2018), while CO₂ emissions from other aircraft jet fuel consumption is determined using a top down approach.

Based on interagency discussions between EPA, EIA, and FHWA beginning in 2005, it was agreed that use of “bottom up” data would be more accurate for diesel fuel and motor gasoline consumption in the transportation sector, based on the availability of reliable data sources. A “bottom up” diesel calculation was first implemented in the 1990 through 2005 Inventory, and a bottom-up gasoline calculation was introduced in the 1990 through 2006 Inventory for the calculation of emissions from on-road vehicles. Estimated motor gasoline and diesel consumption data for on-road vehicles by vehicle type come from FHWA’s *Highway Statistics*, Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017),⁴¹ and are based on federal and state fuel tax records. These fuel consumption estimates were then combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE’s Transportation Energy Data Book Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017) to develop an estimate of fuel consumption for each vehicle type (i.e., passenger cars, light-duty trucks, buses, medium- and heavy-duty trucks, motorcycles). The on-road gas and diesel fuel consumption estimates by vehicle type were then adjusted for each year so that the sum of gasoline and diesel fuel consumption across all on-road vehicle categories matched the fuel consumption estimates in *Highway Statistics*’ Table MF-27 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). This resulted in a final “bottom up” estimate of motor gasoline and diesel fuel use by vehicle type, consistent with the FHWA total for on-road motor gasoline and diesel fuel use.

A primary challenge to switching from a top-down approach to a bottom-up approach for the transportation sector relates to potential incompatibilities with national energy statistics. From a multi-sector national standpoint, EIA develops the most accurate estimate of total motor gasoline and diesel fuel supplied and consumed in the United States. EIA then allocates this total fuel consumption to each major end-use sector (residential, commercial, industrial and transportation) using data from the *Fuel Oil and Kerosene Sales* (FOKS) report for distillate fuel oil and FHWA for motor gasoline. However, the “bottom-up” approach used for the on-road and non-road fuel consumption estimate, as described above, is considered to be the most representative of the transportation sector’s share of the EIA total consumption. Therefore, for years in which there was a disparity between EIA’s fuel allocation estimate for the transportation sector and the “bottom-up” estimate, adjustments were made to other end-use sector fuel allocations (residential, commercial and industrial) in order for the consumption of all sectors combined to equal the “top-down” EIA value.

In the case of motor gasoline, estimates of fuel use by recreational boats come from the NONROAD component of EPA’s MOVES2014b model (EPA 2018b), and these estimates, along with those from other sectors (e.g., commercial sector, industrial sector), were adjusted for years in which the bottom-up on-road motor gasoline consumption estimate exceeded the EIA estimate for total gasoline consumption of all sectors. Similarly, to ensure consistency with EIA’s total diesel estimate for all sectors, the diesel consumption totals for the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors were adjusted proportionately.

⁴¹ In 2011 FHWA changed its methods for estimating vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and related data. These methodological changes included how vehicles are classified, moving from a system based on body-type to one that is based on wheelbase. These changes were first incorporated for the 1990 through 2008 Inventory and apply to the 2007 to 2017 time period. This resulted in large changes in VMT and fuel consumption data by vehicle class, thus leading to a shift in emissions among on-road vehicle classes. For example, the category “Passenger Cars” has been replaced by “Light-duty Vehicles-Short Wheelbase” and “Other 2 axle-4 Tire Vehicles” has been replaced by “Light-duty Vehicles, Long Wheelbase.” This change in vehicle classification has moved some smaller trucks and sport utility vehicles from the light truck category to the passenger vehicle category in this emission inventory. These changes are reflected in a large drop in light-truck emissions between 2006 and 2007.

1 Estimates of diesel fuel consumption from rail were taken from the Association of American Railroads (AAR 2008
2 through 2018) for Class I railroads, the American Public Transportation Association (APTA 2007 through 2017 and APTA
3 2006) and Gaffney (2007) for commuter rail, the Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute (Benson 2002 through 2004)
4 and Whorton (2006 through 2014) for Class II and III railroads, and U.S. Department of Energy's *Transportation Energy*
5 *Data Book* (DOE 1993 through 2017) for passenger rail. Estimates of diesel from ships and boats were taken from EIA's
6 *Fuel Oil and Kerosene Sales* (1991 through 2017).

7 As noted above, for fuels other than motor gasoline and diesel, EIA's transportation sector total was apportioned
8 to specific transportation sources. For jet fuel, estimates come from: FAA (2018) for domestic and international commercial
9 aircraft, and DLA Energy (2018) for domestic and international military aircraft. General aviation jet fuel consumption is
10 calculated as the difference between total jet fuel consumption as reported by EIA and the total consumption from
11 commercial and military jet fuel consumption. Commercial jet fuel CO₂ estimates are obtained directly from the Federal
12 Aviation Administration (FAA 2018), while CO₂ emissions from domestic military and general aviation jet fuel consumption
13 is determined using a top down approach. Domestic commercial jet fuel CO₂ from FAA is subtracted from total domestic
14 jet fuel CO₂ emissions, and this remaining value is apportioned among domestic military and domestic general aviation
15 based on their relative proportion of energy consumption. Estimates for biofuels, including ethanol and biodiesel, were
16 discussed separately in Section 3.2 Carbon Emitted from Non-Energy Uses of Fossil Fuels under the methodology for
17 Estimating CO₂ from Fossil Combustion, and in Section 3.11 Wood Biomass and Ethanol Consumption, and were not
18 apportioned to specific transportation sources. Consumption estimates for biofuels were calculated based on data from the
19 Energy Information Administration (EIA 2018a).

20 Table A-95 displays estimated fuel consumption by fuel and vehicle type. Table A-96 displays estimated energy
21 consumption by fuel and vehicle type. The values in both of these tables correspond to the figures used to calculate CO₂
22 emissions from transportation. Except as noted above, they are estimated based on EIA transportation sector energy estimates
23 by fuel type, with activity data used to apportion consumption to the various modes of transport. The motor gasoline and
24 diesel fuel consumption volumes published by EIA and FHWA include ethanol blended with gasoline and biodiesel blended
25 with diesel. Biofuels blended with conventional fuels were subtracted from these consumption totals in order to be consistent
26 with IPCC methodological guidance and UNFCCC reporting obligations, for which net carbon fluxes in biogenic carbon
27 reservoirs in croplands are accounted for in the estimates for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry chapter, not in
28 Energy chapter totals. Ethanol fuel volumes were removed from motor gasoline consumption estimates for years 1990
29 through 2016 and biodiesel fuel volumes were removed from diesel fuel consumption volumes for years 2001 through 2016,
30 as there was negligible use of biodiesel as a diesel blending competent prior to 2001. The subtraction or removal of biofuels
31 blended into motor gasoline and diesel were conducted following the methodology outlined in Step 2 ("Remove Biofuels
32 from Petroleum") of the EIA's *Monthly Energy Review* (MER) Section 12 notes.

33 In order to remove the volume of biodiesel blended into diesel fuel, the refinery and blender net volume inputs of
34 renewable diesel fuel sourced from EIA Petroleum Supply Annual (EIA 2018f) *Table 18 - Refinery Net Input of Crude Oil*
35 *and Petroleum Products* and *Table 20 - Blender Net Inputs of Petroleum Products* were subtracted from the transportation
36 sector's total diesel fuel consumption volume (for both the "top-down" EIA and "bottom-up" FHWA estimates). To remove
37 the fuel ethanol blended into motor gasoline, ethanol energy consumption data sourced from MER *Table 10.2b - Renewable*
38 *Energy Consumption: Industrial and Transportation Sectors* (EIA 2018a) were subtracted from the total EIA and FHWA
39 transportation motor gasoline energy consumption estimates.

40 Total ethanol and biodiesel consumption estimates are shown separately in Table A-97.⁴²

⁴² Note that the refinery and blender net volume inputs of renewable diesel fuel sourced from EIA's Petroleum Supply Annual (PSA) differs from the biodiesel volume presented in Table A-97. The PSA data is representative of the amount of biodiesel that refineries and blenders added to diesel fuel to make low level biodiesel blends. This is the appropriate value to subtract from total diesel fuel volume, as it represents the amount of biofuel blended into diesel to create low-level biodiesel blends. The biodiesel consumption value presented in Table A-95 is representative of the total biodiesel consumed and includes biodiesel components in all types of fuel formulations, from low level (<5 percent) to high level (6–20 percent, 100 percent) blends of biodiesel. This value is sourced from MER Table 10.4 and is calculated as biodiesel production plus biodiesel net imports minus biodiesel stock exchange.

1

Table A-95: Fuel Consumption by Fuel and Vehicle Type (million gallons unless otherwise specified)

Fuel/Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007 ^a	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Motor Gasoline^{b,c}	107,651	114,119	125,232	127,269	121,490	120,863	119,829	117,229	116,810	116,960	121,472	120,631	123,482	123,378
Passenger Cars	67,846	65,554	70,380	86,228	82,317	81,689	81,012	80,445	80,326	80,369	82,325	82,530	83,976	83,902
Light-Duty Trucks	33,745	42,806	49,046	33,995	32,138	32,584	32,376	30,780	30,459	30,510	32,938	31,958	33,214	33,184
Motorcycles	189	193	203	459	473	455	400	390	447	426	425	413	430	429
Buses	38	40	42	77	79	82	80	78	90	93	101	102	102	99
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	4,230	3,928	3,956	5,025	5,072	4,671	4,646	4,267	4,245	4,341	4,486	4,432	4,556	4,552
Recreational Boats ^d	1,604	1,598	1,606	1,485	1,410	1,382	1,315	1,270	1,243	1,220	1,196	1,197	1,205	1,211
Distillate Fuel Oil (Diesel Fuel)^{b,c}	25,631	31,604	39,241	46,427	44,026	39,873	41,477	42,280	42,045	42,672	44,038	45,321	46,593	45,363
Passenger Cars	771	765	356	403	363	354	367	399	401	399	408	423	427	427
Light-Duty Trucks	1,119	1,452	1,961	1,327	1,184	1,180	1,227	1,277	1,271	1,265	1,364	1,370	1,412	1,412
Buses	781	851	997	1,520	1,436	1,335	1,326	1,419	1,515	1,525	1,658	1,684	1,670	1,682
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	18,574	23,240	30,179	37,517	35,726	32,364	33,683	33,859	33,877	34,426	35,529	36,353	37,031	37,051
Recreational Boats	267	269	270	275	270	271	264	258	255	251	249	262	1,342	+
Ships and Non-Recreational Boats	658	1,164	1,372	846	832	840	812	1,092	842	859	733	1,306	1,097	1,065
Rail ^e	3,461	3,863	4,106	4,538	4,215	3,529	3,798	3,975	3,884	3,948	4,096	3,922	3,615	3,725
Jet Fuel^f	19,186	17,991	20,002	18,407	17,749	15,809	15,537	15,036	14,705	15,088	15,217	16,162	17,028	18,008
Commercial Aircraft	11,569	12,136	14,672	14,708	13,400	12,588	11,931	12,067	11,932	12,031	12,131	12,534	12,674	12,674
General Aviation Aircraft	4,034	3,360	3,163	2,043	2,682	1,787	2,322	1,895	1,659	2,033	1,786	2,361	3,184	4,178
Military Aircraft	3,583	2,495	2,167	1,656	1,667	1,434	1,283	1,074	1,114	1,024	1,300	1,267	1,170	1,156
Aviation Gasoline^f	374	329	302	263	235	221	225	225	209	186	181	176	170	174
General Aviation Aircraft	374	329	302	263	235	221	225	225	209	186	181	176	170	174
Residual Fuel Oil^{f,g}	2,006	2,587	2,963	2,579	1,812	1,241	1,818	1,723	1,410	1,345	517	378	1,152	1,420
Ships and Boats	2,006	2,587	2,963	2,579	1,812	1,241	1,818	1,723	1,410	1,345	517	378	1,152	1,420
Natural Gas^f (trillion cubic feet)	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8
Passenger Cars	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Light-Duty Trucks	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Buses	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pipelines	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8
LPG^f	259	200	135	253	463	328	106	115	123	110	108	110	115	118
Passenger Cars	1	0.9	0.6	3	5	5	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	2
Light-Duty Trucks	35	27	18	60	84	81	25	22	12	12	23	16	14	15
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	206	159	107	148	276	186	63	80	95	83	71	71	78	77
Buses	17	13	9	42	97	55	18	14	15	14	13	12	18	24
Electricity^{h,i}	4,751	4,975	5,382	8,173	7,653	7,768	7,712	7,672	7,320	7,626	7,758	7,638	7,499	7,527
Passenger Cars	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Light-Duty Trucks	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Buses	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rail	4,751	4,975	5,382	8,173	7,653	7,768	7,712	7,672	7,320	7,626	7,758	7,638	7,498	7,527

2

+ Does not exceed 0.05 trillion cubic feet

^a In 2011, FHWA changed its methodology for Table VM-1, which impacts estimates for the 2007 to 2017 time period. These methodological changes include how on-road vehicles are classified, moving from a system based on body-type to one that is based on wheelbase. This resulted in large changes in fuel consumption data by vehicle class between 2006 and 2007.

^b Figures do not include ethanol blended in motor gasoline or biodiesel blended into distillate fuel oil. Net carbon fluxes associated with ethanol are accounted for in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry chapter. This table is calculated with the heat content for gasoline without ethanol (from Table A.2 in the EIA Annual Energy Review) rather than the annually variable quantity-weighted heat content for gasoline with ethanol, which varies by year.

^c Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle fuel consumption estimates are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table MF-21, MF-27, and VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017. Data from Table VM-1 is used to estimate the share of consumption between each on-road vehicle class. These fuel consumption estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.

^d Fluctuations in recreational boat gasoline estimates reflect the use of this category to reconcile bottom-up values with EIA total gasoline estimates.

^e Class II and Class III diesel consumption data for 2014 to 2017 are not available, therefore 2013 data are used as a proxy.

^f Estimated based on EIA transportation sector energy estimates by fuel type, with bottom-up activity data used for apportionment to modes. Transportation sector natural gas and LPG consumption are based on data from EIA (2018a). In previous Inventory years, data from DOE TEDB was used to estimate each vehicle class's share of the total natural gas and LPG consumption. Since TEDB does not include estimates for natural gas use by medium- and heavy-duty trucks or LPG use by passenger cars, EIA Alternative Fuel Vehicle Data (Browning 2017) is now used to determine each vehicle class's share of the total natural gas and LPG consumption. These changes were first incorporated in the 1990 to 2016) Inventory and apply to the 1990 through 2017 time period.

^g Fluctuations in reported fuel consumption may reflect data collection problems.

^h Million kilowatt-hours

ⁱ Electricity consumption by passenger cars, light-duty trucks (SUVs), and buses is based on plug-in electric vehicle sales data and engine efficiencies, as outlined in Browning (2018a). In prior Inventory years, CO₂ emissions from electric vehicle charging were allocated to the residential and commercial sectors. They are now allocated to the transportation sector. These changes were first incorporated in the 1990 to 2017 Inventory and are applied to the 2010 through 2017 time period.

Table A-96: Energy Consumption by Fuel and Vehicle Type (TBtu)

Fuel/Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007 ^a	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Motor Gasoline^{b, c}	13,464	14,273	15,663	15,824	15,105	15,027	14,899	14,576	14,523	14,542	15,103	14,999	15,353	15,340
Passenger Cars	8,486	8,199	8,803	10,721	10,235	10,157	10,073	10,002	9,987	9,993	10,236	10,261	10,441	10,432
Light-Duty Trucks	4,221	5,354	6,134	4,227	3,996	4,051	4,025	3,827	3,787	3,793	4,095	3,973	4,130	4,126
Motorcycles	24	24	25	57	59	57	50	49	56	53	53	51	53	53
Buses	5	5	5	10	10	10	10	10	11	12	13	13	13	12
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	529	491	495	625	631	581	578	531	528	540	558	551	566	566
Recreational Boats ^d	201	200	201	185	175	172	163	158	155	152	149	149	150	151
Distillate Fuel Oil (Diesel Fuel)^{b, c}	3,555	4,379	5,437	6,394	6,059	5,488	5,706	5,814	5,780	5,866	6,053	6,229	6,257	6,272
Passenger Cars	107	106	49	55	50	49	51	55	55	55	56	58	59	59
Light-Duty Trucks	155	201	272	183	163	162	169	176	175	174	187	188	194	194
Buses	108	118	138	209	198	184	182	195	208	210	228	232	230	231
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	2,576	3,220	4,181	5,167	4,917	4,455	4,634	4,656	4,657	4,733	4,884	4,997	5,090	5,092
Recreational Boats	37	37	37	38	37	37	36	36	35	35	34	36	37	38
Ships and Non-Recreational Boats	91	161	190	117	114	116	112	150	116	118	101	180	151	146
Rail ^e	480	535	569	625	580	486	523	547	534	543	563	539	497	512
Jet Fuel^f	2,590	2,429	2,700	2,485	2,396	2,134	2,097	2,030	1,985	2,037	2,054	2,182	2,299	2,431
Commercial Aircraft	1,562	1,638	1,981	1,986	1,809	1,699	1,611	1,629	1,611	1,624	1,638	1,692	1,711	1,711
General Aviation Aircraft	545	454	427	276	362	241	314	256	224	274	241	319	430	564

Military Aircraft	484	337	293	224	225	194	173	145	150	138	175	171	158	156
Aviation Gasoline^f	45	40	36	32	28	27	27	27	25	22	22	21	20	21
General Aviation Aircraft	45	40	36	32	28	27	27	27	25	22	22	21	20	21
Residual Fuel Oil^{f, g}	300	387	443	386	271	186	272	258	211	201	77	57	172	213
Ships and Boats	300	387	443	386	271	186	272	258	211	201	77	57	172	213
Natural Gas^f	679	724	672	663	692	715	719	734	780	887	760	745	757	799
Passenger Cars	+	+	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Light-Duty Trucks	+	+	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	+	+	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8
Buses	+	+	3	14	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	17	16	15
Pipelines	679	724	668	649	677	699	703	718	765	872	744	727	740	783
LPG^f	23	18	12	22	40	28	9	10	10	9	9	9	10	10
Passenger Cars	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.1	+	+	+	0.2	1	0	0
Light-Duty Trucks	3	2	2	5	7	7	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	18	14	9	13	24	16	5	7	8	7	6	6	7	6
Buses	1	1	0.8	4	8	5	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Electricity^h	3	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
Passenger Cars	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Light-Duty Trucks	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Buses	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rail	3	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
Total	20,659	22,253	24,967	25,811	24,597	23,609	23,734	23,452	23,319	23,570	24,082	24,245	24,872	25,090

- 1 + Does not exceed 0.05 TBtu
- 2 ^a In 2011, FHWA changed its methodology for Table VM-1, which impacts estimates for the 2007 to 2017 time period. These methodological changes include how on-road vehicles are classified, moving from a system based on body-type to one that is based on wheelbase. This resulted in large changes in fuel consumption data by vehicle class between 2006 and 2007.
- 3 ^b Figures do not include ethanol blended in motor gasoline or biodiesel blended into distillate fuel oil. Net carbon fluxes associated with ethanol are accounted for in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry chapter.
- 4 ^c Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle fuel consumption estimates are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table MF-21, MF-27, and VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Data from Table VM-1 is used to estimate the share of consumption between each on-road vehicle class. These fuel consumption estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.
- 5 ^d Fluctuations in recreational boat gasoline estimates reflect the use of this category to reconcile bottom-up values with EIA total gasoline estimates.
- 6 ^e Class II and Class II diesel consumption data for 2014 to 2017 are not available, therefore 2013 data are used as a proxy.
- 7 ^f Estimated based on EIA transportation sector energy estimates, with bottom-up data used for apportionment to modes. Transportation sector natural gas and LPG consumption are based on data from EIA (2018a). In previous Inventory years, data from DOE TEDB was used to estimate each vehicle class's share of the total natural gas and LPG consumption. Since TEDB does not include estimates for natural gas use by medium- and heavy- duty trucks or LPG use by passenger cars, EIA Alternative Fuel Vehicle Data (Browning 2017) is now used to determine each vehicle class's share of the total natural gas and LPG consumption. These changes were first incorporated in the 2016 Inventory and apply to the 1990 to 2017 time period.
- 8 ^g Fluctuations in reported fuel consumption may reflect data collection problems. Residual fuel oil for ships and boats data is based on EIA's February 2018 Monthly Energy Review data.
- 9 ^h Electricity consumption by passenger cars, light-duty trucks (SUVs), and buses is based on plug-in electric vehicle sales data and engine efficiencies, as outlined in Browning (2018a). In Inventory years prior to 2017, CO₂ emissions from electric vehicle charging were allocated to the residential and commercial sectors. They are now allocated to the transportation sector. These changes were first incorporated in the current (i.e., 1990 to 2017) Inventory and apply to the 2010 through 2017 time period.

1

2

Table A-97: Transportation Sector Biofuel Consumption by Fuel Type (million gallons)

Fuel Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ethanol	699	1,290	1,556	6,215	8,791	10,074	11,836	11,975	11,997	12,157	12,761	12,793	13,261	13,434
Biodiesel	NA	NA	NA	354	304	322	260	886	899	1,429	1,417	1,494	2,085	1,985

3

NA (Not Available)

4

Note: According to the MER, there was no biodiesel consumption prior to 2001.

Estimates of CH₄ and N₂O Emissions

Mobile source emissions of greenhouse gases other than CO₂ are reported by transport mode (e.g., road, rail, aviation, and waterborne), vehicle type, and fuel type. Emissions estimates of CH₄ and N₂O were derived using a methodology similar to that outlined in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006).

Activity data were obtained from a number of U.S. government agencies and other publications. Depending on the category, these basic activity data included fuel consumption and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). These estimates were then multiplied by emission factors, expressed as grams per unit of fuel consumed or per vehicle mile.

Methodology for On-Road Gasoline and Diesel Vehicles

Step 1: Determine Vehicle Miles Traveled by Vehicle Type, Fuel Type, and Model Year

VMT by vehicle type (e.g., passenger cars, light-duty trucks, medium- and heavy-duty trucks,⁴³ buses, and motorcycles) were obtained from the FHWA's *Highway Statistics* (FHWA 1996 through 2017).⁴⁴ As these vehicle categories are not fuel-specific, VMT for each vehicle type was disaggregated by fuel type (gasoline, diesel) so that the appropriate emission factors could be applied. VMT from *Highway Statistics* Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017) was allocated to fuel types (gasoline, diesel, other) using historical estimates of fuel shares reported in the Appendix to the *Transportation Energy Data Book, Tables A.5 and A.6* (DOE 1993 through 2017). These fuel shares are drawn from various sources, including the Vehicle Inventory and Use Survey, the National Vehicle Population Profile, and the American Public Transportation Association. Fuel shares were first adjusted proportionately such that gasoline and diesel shares for each vehicle/fuel type category equaled 100 percent of national VMT. VMT for alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) was calculated separately, and the methodology is explained in the following section on AFVs. Estimates of VMT from AFVs were then subtracted from the appropriate total VMT estimates to develop the final VMT estimates by vehicle/fuel type category.⁴⁵ The resulting national VMT estimates for gasoline and diesel on-road vehicles are presented in Table A-98 and Table A-99, respectively.

Total VMT for each on-road category (i.e., gasoline passenger cars, light-duty gasoline trucks, heavy-duty gasoline vehicles, diesel passenger cars, light-duty diesel trucks, medium- and heavy-duty diesel vehicles, and motorcycles) were distributed across 30 model years shown for 2017 in Table A-104. This distribution was derived by weighting the appropriate age distribution of the U.S. vehicle fleet according to vehicle registrations by the average annual age-specific vehicle mileage accumulation of U.S. vehicles. Age distribution values were obtained from EPA's MOBILE6 model for all years before 1999 (EPA 2000) and EPA's MOVES2014b model for years 2009 forward (EPA 2018b).⁴⁶ Age-specific vehicle mileage accumulations were also obtained from EPA's MOVES2014b model (EPA 2018b).⁴⁷

Step 2: Allocate VMT Data to Control Technology Type

VMT by vehicle type for each model year was distributed across various control technologies as shown in Table A-106 through Table A-109. The categories "EPA Tier 0" and "EPA Tier 1" were used instead of the early three-way catalyst and advanced three-way catalyst categories, respectively, as defined in the *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines*. EPA Tier 0, EPA Tier 1, EPA Tier 2, and EPA Tier 3 refer to U.S. emission regulations and California Air Resources Board (CARB) LEV, CARB LEVII, and CARB LEVII refer to California emissions regulations, rather than control technologies; however, each

⁴³ Medium- and heavy-duty trucks correspond to FHWA's reporting categories of single-unit trucks and combination trucks. Single-unit trucks are defined as single frame trucks that have 2-axes and at least 6 tires or a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) exceeding 10,000 lbs.

⁴⁴ In 2011 FHWA changed its methods for estimated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and related data. These methodological changes included how vehicles are classified, moving from a system based on body-type to one that is based on wheelbase. These changes were first incorporated for the 1990 through 2008 Inventory and apply to the 2007 to 2017 time period. This resulted in large changes in VMT data by vehicle class, thus leading to a shift in emissions among on-road vehicle classes. For example, the category "Passenger Cars" has been replaced by "Light-duty Vehicles-Short Wheelbase" and "Other 2 axle-4 Tire Vehicles" has been replaced by "Light-duty Vehicles, Long Wheelbase." This change in vehicle classification has moved some smaller trucks and sport utility vehicles from the light truck category to the passenger vehicle category in this emission inventory. These changes are reflected in a large drop in light-truck emissions between 2006 and 2007.

⁴⁵ In Inventories through 2002, gasoline-electric hybrid vehicles were considered part of an "alternative fuel and advanced technology" category. However, vehicles are now only separated into gasoline, diesel, or alternative fuel categories, and gas-electric hybrids are now considered within the gasoline vehicle category.

⁴⁶ Age distributions were held constant for the period 1990 to 1998, and reflect a 25-year vehicle age span. EPA (2018b) provides a variable age distribution and 31-year vehicle age span beginning in year 1999.

⁴⁷ The updated vehicle distribution and mileage accumulation rates by vintage obtained from the MOVES2014b model resulted in a decrease in emissions due to more miles driven by newer light-duty gasoline vehicles.

does correspond to particular combinations of control technologies and engine design. EPA Tier 2 and Tier 3 and its predecessors EPA Tier 1 and Tier 0 as well as CARB LEV, LEVII, and LEVIII apply to vehicles equipped with three-way catalysts. The introduction of “early three-way catalysts,” and “advanced three-way catalysts,” as described in the *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines*, roughly correspond to the introduction of EPA Tier 0 and EPA Tier 1 regulations (EPA 1998).⁴⁸ EPA Tier 2 regulations affect vehicles produced starting in 2004 and are responsible for a noticeable decrease in N₂O emissions compared EPA Tier 1 emissions technology (EPA 1999b). EPA Tier 3 regulations affect vehicles produced starting in 2015 and are fully phased in by 2025. ARB LEVII regulations affect California vehicles produced starting in 2004 while ARB LEVIII affect California vehicles produced starting in 2015.

Control technology assignments for light and heavy-duty conventional fuel vehicles for model years 1972 (when regulations began to take effect) through 1995 were estimated in EPA (1998). Assignments for 1998 through 2017 were determined using confidential engine family sales data submitted to EPA (EPA 2017d). Vehicle classes and emission standard tiers to which each engine family was certified were taken from annual certification test results and data (EPA 2018c). This information was used to determine the fraction of sales of each class of vehicle that met EPA Tier 0, EPA Tier 1, EPA Tier 2, and CARB LEV, CARB LEVII and EPA Tier 3/CARB LEVII standards. Assignments for 1996 and 1997 were estimated based on the fact that EPA Tier 1 standards for light-duty vehicles were fully phased in by 1996. Tier 2 began initial phase-in by 2004.

Step 3: Determine CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors by Vehicle, Fuel, and Control Technology Type

Emission factors for gasoline and diesel on-road vehicles utilizing EPA Tier 2, EPA Tier 3, and CARB LEV, LEVII, and LEVIII technologies were developed by ICF (2017a). These emission factors were calculated for N₂O based upon a regression analysis done by EPA and for CH₄ based on the ratio of NMOG emission standards. Emission factors for earlier standards and technologies were developed by ICF (2004) based on EPA, CARB and Environment Canada laboratory test results of different vehicle and control technology types. The EPA, CARB and Environment Canada tests were designed following the Federal Test Procedure (FTP), which covers three separate driving segments, since vehicles emit varying amounts of greenhouse gases depending on the driving segment. These driving segments are: (1) a transient driving cycle that includes cold start and running emissions, (2) a cycle that represents running emissions only, and (3) a transient driving cycle that includes hot start and running emissions. For each test run, a bag was affixed to the tailpipe of the vehicle and the exhaust was collected; the content of this bag was later analyzed to determine quantities of gases present. The emission characteristics of Segment 2 was used to define running emissions, and subtracted from the total FTP emissions to determine start emissions. These were then recombined based upon MOBILE6.2’s ratio of start to running emissions for each vehicle class to approximate average driving characteristics.

Step 4: Determine the Amount of CH₄ and N₂O Emitted by Vehicle, Fuel, and Control Technology Type

Emissions of CH₄ and N₂O were then calculated by multiplying total VMT by vehicle, fuel, and control technology type by the emission factors developed in Step 3.

Methodology for Alternative Fuel Vehicles (AFVs)

Step 1: Determine Vehicle Miles Traveled by Vehicle and Fuel Type

VMT for alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicles were calculated from “Updated Methodology for Estimating CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Highway Vehicle Alternative Fuel Vehicles” (Browning, 2017). Alternative Fuels include Compressed Natural Gas (CNG), Liquid Natural Gas (LNG), Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG), Ethanol, Methanol, Biodiesel, Hydrogen and Electricity. Most of the vehicles that use these fuels run on an Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) powered by the alternative fuel, although many of the vehicles can run on either the alternative fuel or gasoline (or diesel), or some combination.⁴⁹ Except for electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid vehicles, the alternative fuel vehicle VMT were calculated using the Energy Information Administration (EIA) Alternative Fuel Vehicle Data. The EIA data provides vehicle counts and fuel use for fleet vehicles used by electricity providers, federal agencies, natural gas providers, propane providers, state agencies and transit agencies, for calendar years 2003 through 2015. For 1992 to 2002, EIA Data Tables were used to estimate fuel consumption and vehicle counts by vehicle type. These tables give total vehicle fuel use and vehicle counts by fuel and calendar year for the United States over the period 1992 through 2010. Breakdowns by vehicle type for 1992 through

⁴⁸ For further description, see “Definitions of Emission Control Technologies and Standards” section of this annex below.

⁴⁹ Fuel types used in combination depend on the vehicle class. For light-duty vehicles, gasoline is generally blended with ethanol and diesel is blended with biodiesel; dual-fuel vehicles can run on gasoline or an alternative fuel – either natural gas or LPG – but not at the same time, while flex-fuel vehicles are designed to run on E85 (85 percent ethanol) or gasoline, or any mixture of the two in between. Heavy-duty vehicles are more likely to run on diesel fuel, natural gas, or LPG.

2002 (both fuel consumed and vehicle counts) were assumed to be at the same ratio as for 2003 where data existed. For 1990, 1991 and 2016, fuel consumed by alternative fuel and vehicle type were extrapolated based on a regression analysis using the best curve fit based upon R^2 using the nearest five years of data.

For the current Inventory, counts of electric vehicles (EVs) and plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles (PHEVs) were taken from data compiled by the Hybridcars.com from 2010 to 2017 (Hybridcars.com, 2017). EVs were divided into cars and trucks using confidential engine family sales data submitted to EPA (EPA 2017d). Fuel use per vehicle for personal EVs and PHEVs were assumed to be the same as those for the public fleet vehicles surveyed by EIA and provided in their data tables.

Because AFVs run on different fuel types, their fuel use characteristics are not directly comparable. Accordingly, fuel economy for each vehicle type is expressed in gasoline equivalent terms, i.e., how much gasoline contains the equivalent amount of energy as the alternative fuel. Energy economy ratios (the ratio of the gasoline equivalent fuel economy of a given technology to that of conventional gasoline or diesel vehicles) were taken from the Argonne National Laboratory's GREET2017 model (ANL 2017). These ratios were used to estimate fuel economy in miles per gasoline gallon equivalent for each alternative fuel and vehicle type. Energy use per fuel type was then divided among the various weight categories and vehicle technologies that use that fuel. Total VMT per vehicle type for each calendar year was then determined by dividing the energy usage by the fuel economy. Note that for AFVs capable of running on both/either traditional and alternative fuels, the VMT given reflects only those miles driven that were powered by the alternative fuel, as explained in Browning (2017). VMT estimates for AFVs by vehicle category (passenger car, light-duty truck, medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles) are shown in Table A-100, while more detailed estimates of VMT by control technology are shown in Table A-101.

Step 2: Determine CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors by Vehicle and Alternative Fuel Type

Methane and N₂O emission factors for alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) are calculated using Argonne National Laboratory's GREET model (ANL 2017) and are reported in Browning (2017). These emission factors are shown in Table A-111 and Table A-112.

Step 3: Determine the Amount of CH₄ and N₂O Emitted by Vehicle and Fuel Type

Emissions of CH₄ and N₂O were calculated by multiplying total VMT for each vehicle and fuel type (Step 1) by the appropriate emission factors (Step 2).

Methodology for Non-Road Mobile Sources

Methane and N₂O emissions from non-road mobile sources were estimated by applying emission factors to the amount of fuel consumed by mode and vehicle type.

Activity data for non-road vehicles include annual fuel consumption statistics by transportation mode and fuel type, as shown in Table A-105. Consumption data for ships and boats (i.e., vessel bunkering) were obtained from DHS (2008) and EIA (1991 through 2017) for distillate fuel, and DHS (2008) and EIA (2018a) for residual fuel; marine transport fuel consumption data for U.S. Territories (EIA 2015) were added to domestic consumption, and this total was reduced by the amount of fuel used for international bunkers.⁵⁰ Gasoline consumption by recreational boats was obtained from the NONROAD component of EPA's MOVES2014b model (EPA 2018b). Annual diesel consumption for Class I rail was obtained from the Association of American Railroads (AAR 2008 through 2018), diesel consumption from commuter rail was obtained from APTA (2007 through 2017) and Gaffney (2007), and consumption by Class II and III rail was provided by Benson (2002 through 2004) and Whorton (2006 through 2014).⁵¹ Diesel consumption by commuter and intercity rail was obtained from DOE (1993 through 2016). Data on the consumption of jet fuel and aviation gasoline in aircraft were obtained from EIA (2018a) and FAA (2018), as described in Annex 2.1: Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CO₂ from Fossil Fuel Combustion, and were reduced by the amount allocated to international bunker fuels (DLA 2018 and FAA 2018). Pipeline fuel consumption was obtained from EIA (2007 through 2018) (note: pipelines are a transportation source but are stationary, not mobile sources). Data on fuel consumption by non-transportation mobile sources were obtained from the NONROAD component of EPA's MOVES2014b model (EPA 2018b) for gasoline and diesel powered equipment, and from FHWA (1996 through 2017) for gasoline consumption by off-road trucks used in the agriculture, industrial,

⁵⁰ See International Bunker Fuels section of the Energy chapter.

⁵¹ Diesel consumption from Class II and Class III railroad were unavailable for 2014 to 2016. Values are proxied from 2013, which is the last year the data were available.

commercial, and construction sectors.⁵² Specifically, this Inventory uses FHWA's Agriculture, Construction, and Commercial/Industrial MF-24 fuel volumes along with the MOVES NONROAD model gasoline volumes to estimate non-road mobile source CH₄ and N₂O emissions for these categories. For agriculture, the MF-24 gasoline volume is used directly because it includes both off-road trucks and equipment. For construction and commercial/industrial gasoline estimates, the 2014 and older MF-24 volumes represented off-road trucks only; therefore, the MOVES NONROAD gasoline volumes for construction and commercial/industrial are added to the respective categories in the Inventory. Beginning in 2015, this addition is no longer necessary since the FHWA updated its method for estimating on-road and non-road gasoline consumption. Among the method updates, FHWA now incorporates MOVES NONROAD equipment gasoline volumes in the construction and commercial/industrial categories.

Emissions of CH₄ and N₂O from non-road mobile sources were calculated using the updated 2006 IPCC Tier 3 guidance and EPA's MOVES2014b model. CH₄ emission factors were calculated directly from MOVES. N₂O emission factors were calculated using NONROAD activity and emission factors by fuel type from the European Environment Agency (EEA 2009). Equipment using liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and compressed natural gas (CNG) were included (see Table A-113 and Table A-114).

Estimates of NO_x, CO, and NMVOC Emissions

The emission estimates of NO_x, CO, and NMVOCs from mobile combustion (transportation) were obtained from EPA's National Emission Inventory (NEI) Air Pollutant Emission Trends web site (EPA 2016g). This EPA report provides emission estimates for these gases by fuel type using a procedure whereby emissions were calculated using basic activity data, such as amount of fuel delivered or miles traveled, as indicators of emissions. Table A-115 through Table A-117 provides complete emission estimates for 1990 through 2017.

Table A-98: Vehicle Miles Traveled for Gasoline On-Road Vehicles (billion miles)

Year	Passenger Cars	Light-Duty Trucks	Heavy-Duty Vehicles ^a	Motorcycles
1990	1,391.4	554.8	25.8	9.6
1991	1,341.9	627.8	25.4	9.2
1992	1,355.1	683.4	25.1	9.6
1993	1,356.8	721.0	24.9	9.9
1994	1,387.7	739.2	25.3	10.2
1995	1,421.0	763.0	25.1	9.8
1996	1,455.1	788.6	24.5	9.9
1997	1,489.0	821.7	24.1	10.1
1998	1,537.1	837.7	24.1	10.3
1999	1,559.6	868.3	24.3	10.6
2000	1,592.2	887.6	24.2	10.5
2001	1,620.1	906.0	24.0	9.6
2002	1,650.0	926.8	23.9	9.6
2003	1,663.6	944.1	24.3	9.6
2004	1,691.2	985.5	24.6	10.1
2005	1,699.7	998.8	24.8	10.5
2006	1,681.9	1,038.6	24.8	12.0
2007 ^b	2,093.7	562.8	34.2	21.4
2008	2,014.5	580.9	35.0	20.8
2009	2,005.4	592.5	32.5	20.8
2010	2,015.4	597.4	32.3	18.5
2011	2,035.7	579.6	30.2	18.5
2012	2,051.7	576.8	30.5	21.4
2013	2,062.5	578.7	31.2	20.4
2014	2,059.2	612.4	31.7	20.0
2015	2,133.5	606.1	31.8	19.6
2016	2,176.1	630.8	32.7	20.4
2017	2,211.2	640.2	33.2	20.7

^a Heavy-Duty Vehicles includes Medium-Duty Trucks, Heavy-Duty Trucks, and Buses.

⁵² "Non-transportation mobile sources" are defined as any vehicle or equipment not used on the traditional road system, but excluding aircraft, rail and watercraft. This category includes snowmobiles, golf carts, riding lawn mowers, agricultural equipment, and trucks used for off-road purposes, among others.

^b In 2011, FHWA changed its methodology for Table VM-1, which impacts estimates for the 2007 to 2017 time period. These methodological changes include how on-road vehicles are classified, moving from a system based on body-type to one that is based on wheelbase. This resulted in large changes in VMT data by vehicle class between 2006 and 2007.

Note: In 2015, EIA changed its methods for estimating AFV fuel consumption. These methodological changes included how vehicle counts are estimated, moving from estimates based on modeling to one that is based on survey data. EIA now publishes data about fuel use and number of vehicles for only four types of AFV fleets: federal government, state government, transit agencies, and fuel providers. These changes were first incorporated in the 1990 through 2014 Inventory and apply to the 1990 through 2017 time period. This resulted in large reductions in AFV VMT, thus leading to a shift in VMT to conventional on-road vehicle classes.

Note: Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle mileage are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017. These mileage consumption estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.

Source: Derived from FHWA (1996 through 2017), DOE (1990 through 2017), Browning (2018a), and Browning (2017).

Table A-99: Vehicle Miles Traveled for Diesel On-Road Vehicles (billion miles)

Year	Passenger Cars	Light-Duty Trucks	Heavy-Duty Vehicles ^a
1990	16.9	19.7	125.7
1991	16.3	21.6	129.5
1992	16.5	23.4	133.7
1993	17.9	24.7	140.7
1994	18.3	25.3	150.9
1995	17.3	26.9	159.1
1996	14.7	27.8	164.7
1997	13.5	29.0	173.8
1998	12.4	30.5	178.9
1999	9.4	32.6	185.6
2000	8.0	35.2	188.4
2001	8.1	37.0	191.5
2002	8.3	38.9	196.8
2003	8.4	39.7	199.7
2004	8.5	41.4	202.1
2005	8.5	41.9	203.4
2006	8.4	43.5	202.2
2007 ^b	10.5	23.4	281.7
2008	10.1	24.2	288.0
2009	10.0	24.7	267.5
2010	10.1	24.9	265.7
2011	10.1	23.8	245.2
2012	10.2	23.5	247.5
2013	10.1	23.1	249.9
2014	10.1	24.6	254.3
2015	10.4	24.3	254.6
2016	10.5	24.9	258.3
2017	11.1	26.9	275.2

^a Heavy-Duty Vehicles includes Medium-Duty Trucks, Heavy-Duty Trucks, and Buses.

^b In 2011, FHWA changed its methodology for Table VM-1, which impacts estimates for the 2007 to 2017 time period. These methodological changes include how on-road vehicles are classified, moving from a system based on body-type to one that is based on wheelbase. This resulted in large changes in VMT data by vehicle class between 2006 and 2007.

Note: Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle mileage are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017. These mileage consumption estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.

Source: Derived from FHWA (1996 through 2017), DOE (1993 through 2017), and Browning (2017), Browning (2018a).

Table A-100: Vehicle Miles Traveled for Alternative Fuel On-Road Vehicles (billion miles)

Year	Passenger Cars	Light-Duty Trucks	Heavy-Duty Vehicles ^a
1990	0.0	0.1	0.4
1991	0.0	0.1	0.4
1992	0.0	0.1	0.3
1993	0.0	0.1	0.4
1994	0.1	0.1	0.4
1995	0.1	0.1	0.4
1996	0.1	0.1	0.4
1997	0.1	0.1	0.4
1998	0.1	0.1	0.4
1999	0.1	0.1	0.4
2000	0.1	0.2	0.5
2001	0.1	0.2	0.6
2002	0.2	0.3	0.7
2003	0.1	0.3	0.8
2004	0.2	0.2	0.9
2005	0.2	0.3	1.3
2006	0.2	0.4	2.3
2007	0.2	0.4	2.8
2008	0.2	0.4	2.5
2009	0.2	0.4	2.6
2010	0.2	0.4	2.3
2011	0.5	0.8	6.0
2012	0.9	0.9	6.0
2013	1.8	1.4	9.1
2014	2.8	1.5	9.1
2015	3.9	1.5	9.7
2016	5.2	2.3	13.3
2017	6.7	2.5	12.8

^aHeavy Duty-Vehicles includes medium-duty trucks, heavy-duty trucks, and buses.

Note: In 2017, estimates of alternative fuel vehicle mileage for the last ten years were revised to reflect updates made to EIA data on alternative fuel use and vehicle counts. These changes were incorporated into this year's Inventory and apply to the 2005 to 2017 time period.

Source: Derived from Browning (2017), Browning (2018a), and EIA (2018e).

1 **Table A-101: Detailed Vehicle Miles Traveled for Alternative Fuel On-Road Vehicles (10⁶ Miles)**

Vehicle Type/Year	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Light-Duty Cars	3.7	60.2	105.9	225.4	220.9	223.2	231.0	511.2	912.2	1,842.1	2,770.5	3,894.4	5,161.6	6,582.1
Methanol-Flex Fuel	0.0	45.9	14.3	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ICE														
Ethanol-Flex Fuel	0.0	0.3	19.6	68.3	79.0	90.3	114.8	111.2	139.8	163.0	127.2	110.4	124.5	162.7
ICE														
CNG ICE	+	0.1	5.2	13.2	11.7	10.8	10.1	10.8	11.1	12.1	11.6	11.7	13.7	16.7
CNG Bi-fuel	+	0.2	16.9	18.0	12.1	9.3	7.4	6.6	4.1	3.2	2.3	1.7	1.4	1.4
LPG ICE	+	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.5	1.5	+	0.1	0.1	0.3	3.1	15.8	6.1	2.1
LPG Bi-fuel	+	2.8	2.8	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.0	+	1.2	51.7	39.3	37.1	32.7	114.3	132.5	255.4	278.5	323.1	485.2	493.7
NEVs	0.0	9.4	43.6	69.8	73.7	71.2	61.5	102.9	98.2	102.9	112.9	126.7	86.3	83.1
Electric Vehicle	0.0	0.3	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.3	113.8	277.0	805.9	1,480.5	2,320.2	3,092.2	4,033.2
SI PHEV - Electricity	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	51.1	249.1	499.1	754.0	984.6	1,351.0	1,787.3
Fuel Cell Hydrogen	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.1	1.8
Light-Duty Trucks	72.7	87.7	167.8	433.5	357.7	376.9	365.6	788.4	920.9	1,448.2	1,453.2	1,513.1	2,302.8	2,613.5
Ethanol-Flex Fuel	+	0.3	21.9	72.3	84.2	96.4	121.7	135.4	180.1	213.6	208.8	218.2	279.1	367.1
ICE														
CNG ICE	+	0.1	5.3	12.4	9.6	9.1	8.0	8.6	8.9	8.7	7.6	6.6	5.8	5.1
CNG Bi-fuel	+	0.4	44.3	57.2	24.5	20.4	19.0	18.2	14.8	16.1	19.3	20.3	26.3	31.9
LPG ICE	21.0	24.9	25.9	21.5	10.5	12.1	9.7	9.6	5.9	6.3	7.3	7.5	7.3	7.3
LPG Bi-fuel	51.7	61.2	63.6	30.2	23.5	26.8	23.8	12.4	4.9	5.9	21.8	8.7	6.5	5.1
LNG	+	+	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Biodiesel (BD100)	+	+	2.9	234.5	200.1	207.4	179.1	600.9	700.9	1,180.8	1,156.3	1,210.3	1,664.0	1,566.7
Electric Vehicle	+	0.8	3.8	5.3	4.9	4.6	4.3	3.1	5.1	16.6	31.3	33.0	268.2	528.2
SI PHEV - Electricity	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	8.0	45.4	102.0
Fuel Cell Hydrogen	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
Medium Duty Trucks	255.4	249.9	244.6	687.2	574.9	622.7	521.5	1,504.3	1,534.7	2,473.1	2,490.5	2,651.1	3,729.8	3,581.2
CNG ICE	+	+	0.8	4.5	6.4	5.7	5.6	7.5	8.9	9.3	10.4	11.7	12.5	13.4
CNG Bi-fuel	+	0.1	7.8	9.0	7.8	6.6	6.3	6.1	6.8	7.1	9.5	10.2	11.3	11.3
LPG ICE	215.6	210.8	192.5	48.7	36.9	33.0	29.0	27.1	25.6	23.6	22.7	17.9	16.0	11.9
LPG Bi-fuel	39.9	39.0	35.6	7.8	12.6	6.4	7.8	7.0	9.4	10.0	12.7	9.5	11.5	10.4
LNG	0.0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	+	0.1	0.1	0.1
Biodiesel (BD100)	+	+	7.8	617.1	511.1	571.2	472.8	1,456.6	1,484.0	2,423.0	2,435.1	2,601.8	3,678.3	3,534.1
Heavy-Duty Trucks	104.4	102.0	115.4	1,481.9	1,284.2	1,339.7	1,073.5	3,655.0	3,705.7	5,805.5	5,783.0	6,133.5	8,605.8	8,290.5
Neat Ethanol ICE	+	+	+	2.2	2.5	2.9	3.6	5.7	9.1	12.6	15.0	20.2	23.9	29.3
CNG ICE	+	+	0.9	2.8	2.6	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.9	4.7	5.2	7.3	9.4	12.8
LPG ICE	98.1	95.9	87.5	52.9	45.2	39.9	33.0	34.7	22.5	22.2	18.0	16.8	15.4	16.3
LPG Bi-fuel	6.3	6.2	5.6	3.6	3.6	4.1	4.3	6.3	4.9	5.2	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2
LNG	+	+	+	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.5
Biodiesel (BD100)	+	+	21.4	1,419.7	1,229.3	1,288.3	1,027.7	3,603.3	3,663.7	5,759.3	5,740.7	6,085.1	8,553.4	8,228.3
Buses	20.0	38.7	144.3	604.6	632.2	662.0	677.3	818.4	755.3	824.4	834.6	921.4	922.1	894.4

Neat Methanol ICE	6.4	10.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neat Ethanol ICE	0.0	4.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	+	0.1	0.2	2.8	3.6	1.4	3.0	
CNG ICE	+	1.1	100.2	491.2	525.9	560.7	584.2	614.6	606.6	627.9	627.6	705.2	654.5	631.2	
LPG ICE	13.2	12.7	11.5	9.8	10.7	7.2	6.5	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.4	3.2	4.4	4.9	
LNG	0.4	8.5	22.3	38.7	38.3	34.7	35.5	38.1	39.7	28.4	36.9	36.3	17.5	15.2	
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.0	0.0	4.9	58.5	50.7	55.0	46.6	156.9	101.8	160.6	159.1	168.3	236.1	226.3	
Electric	0.0	1.1	5.2	6.3	6.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	3.0	3.1	3.6	3.9	7.2	12.2	
Fuel Cell Hydrogen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.8	1.1	1.6	
Total VMT	456.3	538.6	778.0	3,432.7	3,069.9	3,224.6	2,868.9	7,277.3	7,828.8	12,393.4	13,331.8	15,113.5	20,722.1	21,961.7	

1 + Does not exceed 0.05 million vehicle miles traveled

2 Note: Throughout the rest of this Inventory, medium-duty trucks are grouped with heavy-duty trucks; they are reported separately here because these two categories may run on a slightly different range of fuel types.

3 In 2017, estimates of alternative fuel vehicle mileage for the last ten years were revised to reflect updates made to EIA data on alternative fuel use and vehicle counts. These changes were incorporated into this

4 year's Inventory and apply to the 2005 to 2017 time period.

5 Source: Derived from Browning (2017), Browning (2018a), and EIA (2018e).

6

7

Table A-102: Age Distribution by Vehicle/Fuel Type for On-Road Vehicles,^a 2017

Vehicle Age	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
0	7.3%	8.2%	6.5%	11.6%	8.6%	6.1%	7.3%
1	7.2%	8.1%	6.4%	11.5%	8.6%	6.0%	7.3%
2	7.0%	7.8%	6.1%	11.2%	8.2%	5.8%	6.9%
3	6.9%	7.4%	5.7%	11.0%	7.8%	5.3%	6.4%
4	6.6%	6.9%	5.1%	10.5%	7.3%	4.8%	5.7%
5	6.3%	6.5%	4.7%	10.1%	6.8%	4.4%	5.1%
6	3.9%	4.3%	2.6%	6.2%	4.6%	2.7%	4.1%
7	4.3%	3.7%	1.7%	5.9%	2.6%	1.8%	3.7%
8	3.9%	2.7%	1.5%	3.9%	2.3%	2.2%	3.8%
9	4.8%	4.5%	2.9%	0.3%	5.4%	3.2%	6.7%
10	5.2%	4.5%	2.7%	0.2%	4.7%	6.3%	6.0%
11	4.7%	4.4%	3.8%	4.4%	5.8%	5.4%	5.7%
12	4.6%	4.4%	3.0%	3.0%	4.8%	4.9%	5.0%
13	4.1%	4.2%	3.6%	1.7%	4.1%	3.4%	4.2%
14	3.8%	3.7%	3.1%	2.0%	3.6%	3.0%	3.6%
15	3.3%	3.4%	3.1%	1.9%	3.0%	2.4%	3.2%
16	2.8%	2.8%	2.6%	1.1%	3.2%	3.2%	2.7%
17	2.6%	2.5%	5.0%	0.9%	1.6%	4.8%	2.1%
18	2.0%	2.1%	4.7%	0.5%	2.3%	3.8%	1.6%
19	1.5%	1.6%	2.0%	0.5%	0.8%	2.6%	1.4%
20	1.4%	1.4%	3.6%	0.2%	1.0%	2.4%	1.3%
21	1.1%	1.0%	2.1%	0.2%	0.8%	2.2%	1.2%
22	1.1%	0.9%	3.0%	0.1%	0.5%	2.6%	0.9%
23	0.8%	0.8%	2.3%	0.0%	0.3%	2.0%	1.0%
24	0.7%	0.5%	1.8%	0.1%	0.3%	1.4%	0.8%
25	0.6%	0.4%	1.4%	0.1%	0.3%	1.0%	0.7%
26	0.5%	0.3%	1.1%	0.2%	0.2%	1.0%	0.5%
27	0.4%	0.3%	1.5%	0.1%	0.1%	1.2%	0.4%
28	0.3%	0.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.1%	1.1%	0.3%
29	0.2%	0.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	0.3%
30	0.3%	0.2%	2.9%	0.6%	0.0%	1.8%	0.3%
Total	100.0%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

^a The following abbreviations correspond to vehicle types: LDGV (light-duty gasoline vehicles), LDGT (light-duty gasoline trucks), HDGV (heavy-duty gasoline vehicles), LDDV (light-duty diesel vehicles), LDDT (light-duty diesel trucks), HDDV (heavy-duty diesel vehicles), and MC (motorcycles).

Note: This year's Inventory includes updated vehicle population data based on the MOVES2014b Model.

Source: EPA (2018b).

Table A-103: Annual Average Vehicle Mileage Accumulation per Vehicle^a (miles)

Vehicle Age	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC ^b
0	13,545	15,309	18,470	13,545	15,309	41,804	7,616
1	13,288	15,021	18,469	13,288	15,021	41,748	4,067
2	13,010	14,697	18,468	13,010	14,697	41,761	3,077
3	12,713	14,342	18,472	12,713	14,342	41,490	2,544
4	12,400	13,959	17,488	12,399	13,959	39,163	2,201
5	12,071	13,552	16,504	12,071	13,552	37,779	1,957
6	11,730	13,124	14,460	11,730	13,124	42,406	1,774
7	11,379	12,681	12,425	11,379	12,680	41,342	1,630
8	11,020	12,224	11,887	11,019	12,224	42,443	1,508
9	10,653	11,760	12,262	10,653	11,760	29,359	1,409
10	10,283	11,290	10,175	10,283	11,290	38,840	1,325
11	9,911	10,820	10,140	9,911	10,820	32,215	1,249
12	9,539	10,354	8,496	9,539	10,354	30,118	1,188
13	9,168	9,894	8,120	9,168	9,894	24,431	1,127
14	8,803	9,446	7,048	8,803	9,446	23,197	1,074
15	8,443	9,011	6,232	8,443	9,011	19,390	1,028
16	8,092	8,596	5,144	8,092	8,596	16,777	990
17	7,751	8,203	5,673	7,751	8,203	16,362	952

18	7,423	7,837	5,352	7,423	7,837	14,909	914
19	7,109	7,501	4,936	7,109	7,501	14,453	883
20	6,812	7,200	4,427	6,812	7,200	10,692	853
21	6,535	6,937	4,172	6,535	6,937	11,250	830
22	6,278	6,715	4,127	6,278	6,715	9,275	807
23	6,044	6,540	3,690	6,044	6,540	8,021	762
24	5,835	6,414	3,682	5,835	6,414	7,488	716
25	5,654	6,341	2,992	5,653	6,341	6,805	670
26	5,501	6,327	2,969	5,501	6,327	6,165	617
27	5,381	6,327	2,745	5,381	6,327	5,180	571
28	5,294	6,327	2,577	5,294	6,327	4,180	541
29	5,242	6,327	2,290	5,242	6,327	3,701	503
30	5,242	6,327	2,140	5,242	6,327	3,436	465

^a The following abbreviations correspond to vehicle types: LDGV (light-duty gasoline vehicles), LDGT (light-duty gasoline trucks), HDGV (heavy-duty gasoline vehicles), LDDV (light-duty diesel vehicles), LDDT (light-duty diesel trucks), HDDV (heavy-duty diesel vehicles), and MC (motorcycles).

^b Because of a lack of data, all motorcycles over 12 years old are considered to have the same emissions and travel characteristics, and therefore are presented in aggregate.

Source: EPA (2018b).

Table A-104: VMT Distribution by Vehicle Age and Vehicle/Fuel Type,^a 2017

Vehicle Age	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
0	9.15%	10.35%	11.34%	13.19%	10.71%	8.98%	25.34%
1	8.92%	10.11%	11.23%	12.86%	10.45%	8.87%	13.48%
2	8.51%	9.48%	10.78%	12.27%	9.78%	8.53%	9.73%
3	8.17%	8.78%	9.95%	11.78%	9.05%	7.78%	7.38%
4	7.59%	8.00%	8.48%	10.95%	8.24%	6.59%	5.68%
5	7.09%	7.29%	7.31%	10.24%	7.52%	5.91%	4.52%
6	4.22%	4.62%	3.59%	6.10%	4.89%	4.11%	3.28%
7	4.55%	3.86%	2.04%	5.65%	2.69%	2.63%	2.72%
8	3.96%	2.72%	1.73%	3.57%	2.27%	3.28%	2.61%
9	4.78%	4.35%	3.41%	0.31%	5.21%	3.37%	4.32%
10	4.95%	4.23%	2.60%	0.21%	4.33%	8.70%	3.62%
11	4.34%	3.96%	3.63%	3.65%	5.10%	6.17%	3.23%
12	4.08%	3.77%	2.39%	2.38%	4.05%	5.26%	2.69%
13	3.46%	3.46%	2.80%	1.31%	3.32%	2.94%	2.17%
14	3.11%	2.91%	2.11%	1.49%	2.80%	2.46%	1.77%
15	2.63%	2.52%	1.85%	1.38%	2.18%	1.65%	1.49%
16	2.12%	2.02%	1.25%	0.77%	2.25%	1.87%	1.22%
17	1.89%	1.71%	2.69%	0.59%	1.09%	2.80%	0.93%
18	1.36%	1.35%	2.41%	0.31%	1.44%	2.01%	0.68%
19	1.02%	0.99%	0.93%	0.27%	0.50%	1.31%	0.56%
20	0.86%	0.81%	1.53%	0.09%	0.59%	0.91%	0.52%
21	0.65%	0.56%	0.85%	0.10%	0.43%	0.86%	0.44%
22	0.62%	0.51%	1.17%	0.07%	0.30%	0.87%	0.32%
23	0.45%	0.42%	0.81%	0.01%	0.17%	0.56%	0.35%
24	0.37%	0.29%	0.64%	0.03%	0.17%	0.38%	0.27%
25	0.29%	0.21%	0.41%	0.04%	0.16%	0.24%	0.21%
26	0.24%	0.18%	0.32%	0.08%	0.09%	0.21%	0.15%
27	0.19%	0.16%	0.40%	0.02%	0.07%	0.22%	0.11%
28	0.16%	0.16%	0.45%	0.02%	0.06%	0.17%	0.08%
29	0.12%	0.14%	0.33%	0.00%	0.05%	0.13%	0.06%
30	0.17%	0.10%	0.59%	0.26%	0.02%	0.22%	0.07%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

^a The following abbreviations correspond to vehicle types: LDGV (light-duty gasoline vehicles), LDGT (light-duty gasoline trucks), HDGV (heavy-duty gasoline vehicles), LDDV (light-duty diesel vehicles), LDDT (light-duty diesel trucks), HDDV (heavy-duty diesel vehicles), and MC (motorcycles).

Note: Estimated by weighting data in by data in Table A-103. This year's Inventory includes updated vehicle population data based on the MOVES 2014b. Model that affects this distribution.

Table A-105: Fuel Consumption for Off-Road Sources by Fuel Type (million gallons unless otherwise noted)

Vehicle Type/Year	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Aircraft^a	19,560	18,320	20,304	18,670	17,984	16,030	15,762	15,262	14,914	15,274	15,397	16,338	17,198	18,182
Aviation Gasoline	374	329	302	263	235	221	225	225	209	186	181	176	170	174
Jet Fuel	19,186	17,991	20,002	18,407	17,749	15,809	15,537	15,036	14,705	15,088	15,217	16,162	17,028	18,008
Commercial Aviation ^b	11,569	12,136	14,672	14,708	13,400	12,588	11,931	12,067	11,932	12,031	12,131	12,534	12,674	12,674
Ships and Boats	4,826	5,932	6,544	5,570	4,778	4,201	4,693	4,833	4,239	4,175	3,191	3,652	4,235	4,485
Diesel	1,156	1,661	1,882	1,365	1,384	1,395	1,361	1,641	1,389	1,414	1,284	1,881	1,680	1,653
Gasoline	1,611	1,626	1,636	1,558	1,514	1,498	1,446	1,401	1,372	1,349	1,323	1,325	1,335	1,344
Residual	2,060	2,646	3,027	2,647	1,880	1,308	1,886	1,791	1,477	1,413	584	445	1,219	1,488
Construction/Mining Equipment^c														
Diesel	4,317	4,718	5,181	6,488	6,175	5,885	5,727	5,650	5,533	5,447	5,313	5,200	5,483	5,978
Gasoline	472	437	357	613	610	583	678	634	651	1,100	710	367	375	375
CNG (million cubic ft)	5,082	5,463	6,032	7,056	6,708	6,378	6,219	6,121	5,957	5,802	5,598	5,430	5,629	6,018
LPG	22	24	27	30	28	27	26	25	24	24	23	22	23	25
Agricultural Equipment^d														
Diesel	3,514	3,400	3,278	4,129	4,111	3,938	3,942	3,876	3,932	3,900	3,925	3,862	3,760	3,728
Gasoline	813	927	652	1,061	634	676	692	799	875	655	644	159	168	168
CNG (million cubic ft)	1,758	1,712	1,678	1,847	1,796	1,677	1,647	1,600	1,611	1,588	1,590	1,561	1,517	1,503
LPG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rail	3,461	3,864	4,106	4,539	4,216	3,535	3,807	3,999	3,921	4,025	4,175	4,000	3,693	3,803
Diesel	3,461	3,864	4,106	4,539	4,216	3,535	3,807	3,999	3,921	4,025	4,175	4,000	3,693	3,803
Other^e														
Diesel	2,095	2,071	2,047	2,500	2,478	2,375	2,450	2,523	2,639	2,725	2,811	2,832	2,851	2,919
Gasoline ^f	4,371	4,482	4,673	5,536	5,455	5,291	5,525	5,344	5,189	5,201	5,281	5,083	5,137	5,157
CNG (million cubic ft)	20,894	22,584	25,035	28,749	29,028	28,163	29,891	32,035	35,085	37,436	39,705	38,069	37,709	38,674
LPG	1,412	1,809	2,191	2,343	2,286	2,130	2,165	2,168	2,181	2,213	2,248	2,279	2,316	2,408
Total gallons	44,863	45,984	49,361	51,479	48,755	44,671	45,467	45,113	44,099	44,740	43,718	43,795	45,239	47,229
Total million cubic ft	27,735	29,759	32,745	37,652	37,532	36,218	37,757	39,755	42,653	44,826	46,893	45,060	44,854	46,194

^a For aircraft, this is aviation gasoline. For all other categories, this is motor gasoline.

^b Commercial aviation, as modeled in FAA's AEDT, consists of passenger aircraft, cargo, and other chartered flights.

^c Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.

^d Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.

^e "Other" includes snowmobiles and other recreational equipment, logging equipment, lawn and garden equipment, railroad equipment, airport equipment, commercial equipment, and industrial equipment, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road for commercial/industrial purposes.

Note: In 2015, EPA incorporated the NONROAD2008 model into MOVES2014a. This year's Inventory uses the NONROAD component of MOVES2014b for years 1999 through 2017.

Sources: AAR (2008 through 2018), APTA (2007 through 2017), BEA (1991 through 2017), Benson (2002 through 2004), DHS (2008), DOC (1991 through 2018), DESC (2018), DOE (1993 through 2017), DOT (1991 through 2018), EIA (2002), EIA (2007b), EIA (2018d), EIA (2007 through 2017), EIA (1991 through 2017), EPA (2018b), FAA (2018), Gaffney (2007), and Whorton (2006 through 2014).

Table A-106: Control Technology Assignments for Gasoline Passenger Cars (Percent of VMT)

Model Years	Non-catalyst	Oxidation	EPA Tier 0	EPA Tier 1	CARB LEV	CARB LEV 2	EPA Tier 2	CARB LEV 3/ EPA Tier 3
1973-1974	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1975	20%	80%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1976-1977	15%	85%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1978-1979	10%	90%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1980	5%	88%	7%	-	-	-	-	-
1981	-	15%	85%	-	-	-	-	-
1982	-	14%	86%	-	-	-	-	-
1983	-	12%	88%	-	-	-	-	-
1984-1993	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-
1994	-	-	80%	20%	-	-	-	-
1995	-	-	60%	40%	-	-	-	-
1996	-	-	40%	54%	6%	-	-	-
1997	-	-	20%	68%	12%	-	-	-
1998	-	-	<1%	82%	18%	-	-	-
1999	-	-	<1%	67%	33%	-	-	-
2000	-	-	-	44%	56%	-	-	-
2001	-	-	-	3%	97%	-	-	-
2002	-	-	-	1%	99%	-	-	-
2003	-	-	-	<1%	85%	2%	12%	-
2004	-	-	-	<1%	24%	16%	60%	-
2005	-	-	-	-	13%	27%	60%	-
2006	-	-	-	-	18%	35%	47%	-
2007	-	-	-	-	4%	43%	53%	-
2008	-	-	-	-	2%	42%	56%	-
2009	-	-	-	-	<1%	43%	57%	-
2010	-	-	-	-	-	44%	56%	-
2011	-	-	-	-	-	42%	58%	-
2012	-	-	-	-	-	41%	59%	-
2013	-	-	-	-	-	40%	60%	-
2014	-	-	-	-	-	37%	62%	1%
2015	-	-	-	-	-	33%	56%	11%
2016	-	-	-	-	-	25%	50%	24%
2017	-	-	-	-	-	20%	44%	35%

- Not Applicable

Note: Detailed descriptions of emissions control technologies are provided in the following section of this Annex. In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data was re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, which emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore were not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are now classified as gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

Sources: EPA (1998), EPA (2018c), and EPA (2017d).

Table A-107: Control Technology Assignments for Gasoline Light-Duty Trucks (Percent of VMT)^a

Model Years	Non-catalyst	Oxidation	EPA Tier 0	EPA Tier 1	CARB LEV ^b	CARB LEV 2	EPA Tier 2	CARB LEV 3/EPA Tier 3
1973-1974	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1975	30%	70%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1976	20%	80%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1977-1978	25%	75%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1979-1980	20%	80%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1981	-	95%	5%	-	-	-	-	-
1982	-	90%	10%	-	-	-	-	-
1983	-	80%	20%	-	-	-	-	-
1984	-	70%	30%	-	-	-	-	-
1985	-	60%	40%	-	-	-	-	-
1986	-	50%	50%	-	-	-	-	-
1987-1993	-	5%	95%	-	-	-	-	-
1994	-	-	60%	40%	-	-	-	-
1995	-	-	20%	80%	-	-	-	-
1996	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
1997	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
1998	-	-	-	87%	13%	-	-	-
1999	-	-	-	61%	39%	-	-	-
2000	-	-	-	63%	37%	-	-	-
2001	-	-	-	24%	76%	-	-	-
2002	-	-	-	31%	69%	-	-	-
2003	-	-	-	25%	69%	-	6%	-
2004	-	-	-	1%	26%	8%	65%	-
2005	-	-	-	-	17%	17%	66%	-
2006	-	-	-	-	24%	22%	54%	-
2007	-	-	-	-	14%	25%	61%	-
2008	-	-	-	-	<1%	34%	66%	-
2009	-	-	-	-	-	34%	66%	-
2010	-	-	-	-	-	30%	70%	-
2011	-	-	-	-	-	27%	73%	-
2012	-	-	-	-	-	24%	76%	-
2013	-	-	-	-	-	31%	69%	-
2014	-	-	-	-	-	26%	73%	1%
2015	-	-	-	-	-	22%	72%	6%
2016	-	-	-	-	-	20%	62%	18%
2017	-	-	-	-	-	17%	58%	25%

- Not Applicable

^a Detailed descriptions of emissions control technologies are provided in the following section of this Annex.

^b The proportion of LEVs as a whole has decreased since 2001, as carmakers have been able to achieve greater emission reductions with certain types of LEVs, such as ULEVs. Because ULEVs emit about half the emissions of LEVs, a carmaker can reduce the total number of LEVs they need to build to meet a specified emission average for all of their vehicles in a given model year.

Note: In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data was re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, which emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore were not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are now classified as gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

Sources: EPA (1998), EPA (2018c), and EPA (2017d).

Table A-108: Control Technology Assignments for Gasoline Heavy-Duty Vehicles (Percent of VMT)^a

Model Years	Uncontrolled	Non-catalyst	Oxidation	EPA Tier 0	EPA Tier 1	CARB LEV ^b	CARB LEV 2	EPA Tier 2	CARB LEV 3/EPA Tier 3
≤1980	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1981-1984	95%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1985-1986	-	95%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
1987	-	70%	15%	15%	-	-	-	-	-
1988-1989	-	60%	25%	15%	-	-	-	-	-
1990-1995	-	45%	30%	25%	-	-	-	-	-
1996	-	-	25%	10%	65%	-	-	-	-

1997	-	-	10%	5%	85%	-	-	-	-
1998	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
1999	-	-	-	-	98%	2%	-	-	-
2000	-	-	-	-	93%	7%	-	-	-
2001	-	-	-	-	78%	22%	-	-	-
2002	-	-	-	-	94%	6%	-	-	-
2003	-	-	-	-	85%	14%	-	1%	-
2004	-	-	-	-	-	33%	-	67%	-
2005	-	-	-	-	-	15%	-	85%	-
2006	-	-	-	-	-	50%	-	50%	-
2007	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%	73%	-
2008	-	-	-	-	-	-	46%	54%	-
2009-2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-
2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	24%	10%	66%
2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	5%	75%

- Not Applicable

^a Detailed descriptions of emissions control technologies are provided in the following section of this Annex.

^b The proportion of LEVs as a whole has decreased since 2000, as carmakers have been able to achieve greater emission reductions with certain types of LEVs, such as ULEVs. Because ULEVs emit about half the emissions of LEVs, a manufacturer can reduce the total number of LEVs they need to build to meet a specified emission average for all of their vehicles in a given model year.

Note: In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data was re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, which emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore were not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are now classified as gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

Sources: EPA (1998), EPA (2018c), and EPA (2017d).

Table A-109: Control Technology Assignments for Diesel On-Road Vehicles and Motorcycles

Vehicle Type/Control Technology	Model Years
Diesel Passenger Cars and Light-Duty Trucks	
Uncontrolled	1960–1982
Moderate control	1983–1995
Advanced control	1996–2017
Diesel Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	
Uncontrolled	1960–1990
Moderate control	1991–2003
Advanced control	2004–2006
Aftertreatment	2007–2017
Motorcycles	
Uncontrolled	1960–1995
Non-catalyst controls	1996–2017

Note: Detailed descriptions of emissions control technologies are provided in the following section of this Annex.

Source: EPA (1998) and Browning (2005).

Table A-110: Emission Factors for CH₄ and N₂O for On-Road Vehicles

Vehicle Type/Control Technology	N ₂ O (g/mi)	CH ₄ (g/mi)
Gasoline Passenger Cars		
EPA Tier 3 / ARB LEV III	0.0067	0.0022
EPA Tier 2	0.0082	0.0078
ARB LEV II	0.0082	0.0061
ARB LEV	0.0205	0.0100
EPA Tier 1 ^a	0.0429	0.0271
EPA Tier 0 ^a	0.0647	0.0704
Oxidation Catalyst	0.0504	0.1355
Non-Catalyst Control	0.0197	0.1696
Uncontrolled	0.0197	0.1780
Gasoline Light-Duty Trucks		
EPA Tier 3 / ARB LEV III	0.0067	0.0020
EPA Tier 2	0.0082	0.0080
ARB LEV II	0.0082	0.0056
ARB LEV	0.0223	0.0148

EPA Tier 1 ^a	0.0871	0.0452
EPA Tier 0 ^a	0.1056	0.0776
Oxidation Catalyst	0.0639	0.1516
Non-Catalyst Control	0.0218	0.1908
Uncontrolled	0.022	0.0020
Gasoline Heavy-Duty Vehicles		
EPA Tier 3 / ARB LEV III	0.0160	0.0115
EPA Tier 2	0.0082	0.0085
ARB LEV II	0.0175	0.0212
ARB LEV	0.0466	0.0300
EPA Tier 1 ^a	0.1750	0.0655
EPA Tier 0 ^a	0.2135	0.2630
Oxidation Catalyst	0.1317	0.2356
Non-Catalyst Control	0.0473	0.4181
Uncontrolled	0.0497	0.4604
Diesel Passenger Cars		
Advanced	0.0010	0.0005
Moderate	0.0010	0.0005
Uncontrolled	0.0012	0.0006
Diesel Light-Duty Trucks		
Advanced	0.0015	0.0010
Moderate	0.0014	0.0009
Uncontrolled	0.0017	0.0011
Diesel Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses		
Aftertreatment	0.0048	0.0051
Advanced	0.0048	0.0051
Moderate	0.0048	0.0051
Uncontrolled	0.0048	0.0051
Motorcycles		
Non-Catalyst Control	0.0069	0.0672
Uncontrolled	0.0087	0.0899

^a The categories "EPA Tier 0" and "EPA Tier 1" were substituted for the early three-way catalyst and advanced three-way catalyst categories, respectively, as defined in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Detailed descriptions of emissions control technologies are provided at the end of this Annex. Source: ICF (2006b and 2017a).

1

Table A-111: Emission Factors for N₂O for Alternative Fuel Vehicles (g/mi)

	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Light-Duty Cars														
Methanol-Flex Fuel ICE	0.035	0.035	0.034	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007
Ethanol-Flex Fuel ICE	0.035	0.035	0.034	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007
CNG ICE	0.021	0.021	0.027	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007
CNG Bi-fuel	0.021	0.021	0.027	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007
LPG ICE	0.021	0.021	0.027	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007
LPG Bi-fuel	0.021	0.021	0.027	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Light-Duty Trucks														
Ethanol-Flex Fuel ICE	0.068	0.069	0.072	0.039	0.031	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.014	0.012
CNG ICE	0.041	0.041	0.058	0.039	0.031	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.014	0.012
CNG Bi-fuel	0.041	0.041	0.058	0.039	0.031	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.014	0.012
LPG ICE	0.041	0.041	0.058	0.039	0.031	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.015	0.014
LPG Bi-fuel	0.041	0.041	0.058	0.039	0.031	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.015	0.014
LNG	0.041	0.041	0.058	0.039	0.031	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.014	0.012
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Medium Duty Trucks														
CNG ICE	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
CNG Bi-fuel	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
LPG ICE	0.055	0.055	0.069	0.061	0.052	0.043	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034
LPG Bi-fuel	0.055	0.055	0.069	0.061	0.052	0.043	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034
LNG	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Heavy-Duty Trucks														
Neat Methanol ICE	0.040	0.040	0.049	0.048	0.041	0.034	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028
Neat Ethanol ICE	0.040	0.040	0.049	0.048	0.041	0.034	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028
CNG ICE	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
LPG ICE	0.045	0.045	0.049	0.046	0.039	0.032	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026
LPG Bi-fuel	1.229	0.045	0.049	0.046	0.039	0.032	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026
LNG	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Buses														
Neat Methanol ICE	0.045	0.045	0.058	0.056	0.048	0.040	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032
Neat Ethanol ICE	0.045	0.045	0.058	0.056	0.048	0.040	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032
CNG ICE	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
LPG ICE	0.051	0.051	0.058	0.054	0.046	0.038	0.030	0.028	0.025	0.022	0.020	0.017	0.017	0.017
LNG	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002

2 Source: Developed by ICF (Browning 2017) using ANL (2017)

3 Note: When driven in all-electric mode, plug-in electric vehicles have zero tailpipe emissions. Therefore, emissions factors for battery electric vehicle (BEVs) and the electric portion of plug-in hybrid electric
4 vehicles (PHEVs) are not included in this table.

5

1

Table A-112: Emission Factors for CH₄ for Alternative Fuel Vehicles (g/mi)

	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Light-Duty Cars														
Methanol-Flex Fuel ICE	0.034	0.034	0.019	0.014	0.014	0.015	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.011	0.010	0.009	0.008	0.008
Ethanol-Flex Fuel ICE	0.034	0.034	0.019	0.014	0.014	0.015	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.011	0.010	0.009	0.008	0.008
CNG ICE	0.489	0.489	0.249	0.155	0.154	0.153	0.153	0.139	0.126	0.113	0.100	0.086	0.085	0.083
CNG Bi-fuel	0.489	0.489	0.249	0.155	0.154	0.153	0.153	0.139	0.126	0.113	0.100	0.086	0.085	0.083
LPG ICE	0.049	0.049	0.025	0.016	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.011	0.010	0.009	0.008	0.008
LPG Bi-fuel	0.049	0.049	0.025	0.016	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.011	0.010	0.009	0.008	0.008
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Light-Duty Trucks														
Ethanol-Flex Fuel ICE	0.051	0.051	0.053	0.033	0.033	0.033	0.033	0.029	0.025	0.021	0.017	0.013	0.013	0.013
CNG ICE	0.728	0.725	0.709	0.383	0.366	0.349	0.332	0.292	0.251	0.210	0.170	0.129	0.127	0.125
CNG Bi-fuel	0.728	0.725	0.709	0.383	0.366	0.349	0.332	0.292	0.251	0.210	0.170	0.129	0.127	0.125
LPG ICE	0.073	0.072	0.071	0.038	0.037	0.035	0.033	0.029	0.025	0.021	0.017	0.013	0.013	0.013
LPG Bi-fuel	0.073	0.072	0.071	0.038	0.037	0.035	0.033	0.029	0.025	0.021	0.017	0.013	0.013	0.013
LNG	0.728	0.725	0.709	0.383	0.366	0.349	0.332	0.292	0.251	0.210	0.170	0.129	0.127	0.125
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Medium Duty Trucks														
CNG ICE	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.280	5.760	5.240	4.720	4.200	4.200	4.200
CNG Bi-fuel	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.280	5.760	5.240	4.720	4.200	4.200	4.200
LPG ICE	0.262	0.262	0.248	0.026	0.024	0.023	0.021	0.020	0.018	0.017	0.016	0.014	0.014	0.014
LPG Bi-fuel	0.262	0.262	0.248	0.026	0.024	0.023	0.021	0.020	0.018	0.017	0.016	0.014	0.014	0.014
LNG	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.800	6.280	5.760	5.240	4.720	4.200	4.200	4.200
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.017	0.032
Heavy-Duty Trucks														
Neat Methanol ICE	0.296	0.296	0.095	0.106	0.121	0.136	0.151	0.136	0.120	0.105	0.090	0.075	0.075	0.075
Neat Ethanol ICE	0.296	0.296	0.095	0.106	0.121	0.136	0.151	0.136	0.120	0.105	0.090	0.075	0.075	0.075
CNG ICE	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.020	3.940	3.860	3.780	3.700	3.700	3.700
LPG ICE	0.158	0.158	0.149	0.016	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013
LPG Bi-fuel	0.158	0.158	0.149	0.016	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013
LNG	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.100	4.020	3.940	3.860	3.780	3.700	3.700	3.700
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.012	0.012	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.004
Buses														
Neat Methanol ICE	0.086	0.086	0.067	0.055	0.062	0.068	0.075	0.067	0.060	0.052	0.045	0.037	0.032	0.027
Neat Ethanol ICE	0.086	0.086	0.067	0.055	0.062	0.068	0.075	0.067	0.060	0.052	0.045	0.037	0.032	0.027
CNG ICE	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	17.040	15.280	13.520	11.760	10.000	10.000	10.000
LPG ICE	0.725	0.725	0.686	0.072	0.068	0.063	0.058	0.053	0.048	0.044	0.039	0.034	0.034	0.034
LNG	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	18.800	17.040	15.280	13.520	11.760	10.000	10.000	10.000
Biodiesel (BD100)	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002

2 Source: Developed by ICF (Browning 2017) using ANL (2017)

3 Note: When driven in all-electric mode, plug-in electric vehicles have zero tailpipe emissions. Therefore, emissions factors for battery electric vehicle (BEVs) and the electric portion of plug-in hybrid electric
4 vehicles (PHEVs) are not included in this table.

Table A-113: Emission Factors for N₂O Emissions from Non-Road Mobile Combustion (g/kg fuel)

	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ships and Boats														
Residual Fuel Oil	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.155
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.023
4 Stroke	0.075	0.075	0.076	0.078	0.078	0.079	0.079	0.080	0.080	0.081	0.081	0.082	0.082	0.083
Distillate Fuel Oil	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156
Rail														
Diesel	0.080	0.080	0.080	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.080
Aircraft														
Jet Fuel	0.100	0.100	0.100	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.100
Aviation Gasoline	0.040	0.040	0.040	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.040
Agricultural Equipment^a														
Gasoline-Equipment														
2 Stroke	0.012	0.013	0.014	0.019	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020
4 Stroke	0.064	0.065	0.066	0.072	0.073	0.073	0.074	0.074	0.075	0.075	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.077
Gasoline-Off-road Trucks	0.064	0.065	0.066	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.077
Diesel-Equipment	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152
Diesel-Off-Road Trucks	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155
CNG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.183	0.187	0.191	0.195	0.198	0.199	0.200	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.202
LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.176	0.178	0.180	0.182	0.184	0.185	0.186	0.187	0.188	0.189	0.189
Construction/Mining Equipment^b														
Gasoline-Equipment														
2 Stroke	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.025	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.026
4 Stroke	0.054	0.057	0.060	0.068	0.068	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070
Gasoline-Off-road Trucks	0.054	0.057	0.060	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.070
Diesel-Equipment	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.148	0.148
Diesel-Off-Road Trucks	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155
CNG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.171	0.171	0.171	0.173	0.175	0.176	0.178	0.179	0.181	0.184	0.188
LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.177	0.179	0.181	0.184	0.186	0.188	0.190	0.192	0.193	0.195	0.197
Lawn and Garden Equipment														
Gasoline-Residential														
2 Stroke	0.012	0.012	0.013	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.019
4 Stroke	0.047	0.050	0.053	0.061	0.062	0.062	0.062	0.063	0.063	0.063	0.063	0.063	0.063	0.063
Gasoline-Commercial														
2 Stroke	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022
4 Stroke	0.050	0.055	0.059	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.065	0.066	0.066	0.066	0.066	0.066	0.066	0.066
Diesel-Residential														
Diesel-Commercial	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146
LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.182	0.185	0.189	0.193	0.196	0.198	0.200	0.201	0.201	0.202	0.202
Airport Equipment														
Gasoline														
4 Stroke	0.071	0.073	0.075	0.084	0.086	0.087	0.088	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090
Diesel	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154

LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.183	0.188	0.191	0.194	0.197	0.199	0.200	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.202
Industrial/Commercial Equipment														
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	0.012	0.013	0.014	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020
4 Stroke	0.056	0.058	0.060	0.068	0.068	0.069	0.069	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.071	0.071
Diesel	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147
CNG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.188	0.190	0.192	0.195	0.197	0.199	0.200	0.200	0.201	0.201	0.201
LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.179	0.183	0.185	0.189	0.193	0.197	0.198	0.199	0.200	0.201	0.201
Logging Equipment														
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	0.018	0.018	0.019	0.026	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027
4 Stroke	0.053	0.053	0.055	0.060	0.061	0.061	0.062	0.062	0.063	0.064	0.065	0.065	0.066	0.066
Diesel	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155
Railroad Equipment														
Gasoline														
4 Stroke	0.052	0.055	0.057	0.065	0.066	0.066	0.066	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067
Diesel	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131	0.131
LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.175	0.177	0.178	0.179	0.184	0.186	0.189	0.191	0.193	0.194	0.197
Recreational Equipment														
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	0.013	0.013	0.015	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014
4 Stroke	0.076	0.077	0.078	0.082	0.082	0.082	0.083	0.083	0.083	0.083	0.083	0.083	0.083	0.083
Diesel	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127
LPG	0.162	0.162	0.162	0.168	0.169	0.171	0.172	0.174	0.175	0.176	0.178	0.179	0.181	0.182

^a Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.

^b Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.

Source: IPCC (2006) and ICF (2017b), EPA (2018b)

Table A-114: Emission Factors for CH₄ Emissions from Non-Road Mobile Combustion (g/kg fuel)

	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ships and Boats														
Residual Fuel Oil	0.026	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.155
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	5.355	5.259	5.097	4.285	4.100	3.948	3.847	3.771	3.676	3.615	3.558	3.509	3.467	3.436
4 Stroke	3.468	3.334	3.202	2.945	2.739	2.626	2.523	2.464	2.335	2.250	2.169	2.059	1.947	1.844
Distillate Fuel Oil	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.022	0.027	0.035	0.039	0.045	0.051	0.058	0.064	0.074	0.083	0.090
Rail														
Diesel	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250
Aircraft														
Jet Fuel ^c	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Aviation Gasoline	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640	2.640
Agricultural Equipment^a														

Gasoline-Equipment														
2 Stroke	9.981	9.308	8.669	5.163	4.859	4.751	4.681	4.680	4.649	4.654	4.653	4.661	4.674	4.654
4 Stroke	7.579	6.957	6.289	4.834	4.372	4.160	3.857	3.682	3.362	3.198	3.018	2.896	2.813	2.707
Gasoline-Off-road Trucks	7.579	6.957	6.289	4.834	4.372	4.160	3.857	3.682	3.362	3.198	3.018	2.896	2.813	2.707
Diesel-Equipment	0.046	0.042	0.039	0.082	0.086	0.088	0.092	0.094	0.095	0.095	0.094	0.093	0.093	0.090
Diesel-Off-Road Trucks	0.021	0.022	0.025	0.063	0.067	0.072	0.078	0.077	0.075	0.074	0.070	0.065	0.057	0.049
CNG	190.689	190.694	190.543	126.961	109.948	94.762	73.107	57.129	43.001	31.016	23.342	18.978	15.995	13.841
LPG	2.635	2.635	2.633	2.029	1.908	1.830	1.685	1.578	1.446	1.348	1.257	1.206	1.171	1.120
Construction/Mining Equipment^b														
Gasoline-Equipment														
2 Stroke	9.502	8.575	7.813	4.968	4.680	4.534	4.484	4.479	4.453	4.452	4.453	4.452	4.445	4.445
4 Stroke	11.453	9.310	7.341	5.590	4.763	4.253	3.882	3.458	2.902	2.588	2.366	2.221	2.106	2.036
Gasoline-Off-road Trucks	11.453	9.310	7.341	5.590	4.763	4.253	3.882	3.458	2.902	2.588	2.366	2.221	2.106	2.036
Diesel-Equipment	0.033	0.035	0.039	0.098	0.102	0.106	0.111	0.109	0.108	0.104	0.099	0.095	0.084	0.071
Diesel-Off-Road Trucks	0.021	0.022	0.025	0.063	0.067	0.072	0.078	0.077	0.075	0.074	0.070	0.065	0.057	0.049
CNG	187.218	187.298	186.731	162.671	163.056	162.937	158.345	151.900	146.586	140.610	135.182	128.314	113.324	94.767
LPG	2.630	2.631	2.622	2.017	1.921	1.794	1.621	1.444	1.279	1.138	1.018	0.895	0.753	0.612
Lawn and Garden Equipment														
Gasoline-Residential														
2 Stroke	10.178	9.601	8.926	6.835	6.392	6.143	6.027	5.983	5.926	5.918	5.916	5.913	5.911	5.910
4 Stroke	10.653	9.628	8.431	6.775	6.052	5.563	5.091	4.681	4.081	3.628	3.272	2.943	2.641	2.408
Gasoline-Commercial														
2 Stroke	9.951	9.088	8.356	6.039	5.771	5.671	5.611	5.623	5.579	5.574	5.580	5.582	5.580	5.579
4 Stroke	9.883	8.724	7.649	6.312	5.462	4.784	4.222	3.901	3.295	2.775	2.430	2.256	2.159	2.114
Diesel-Commercial	0.037	0.038	0.039	0.080	0.085	0.091	0.098	0.102	0.106	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.107	0.105
LPG	2.645	2.645	2.639	1.789	1.595	1.351	1.094	0.841	0.650	0.494	0.362	0.286	0.233	0.195
Airport Equipment														
Gasoline														
4 Stroke	9.068	7.664	6.531	4.515	3.054	2.772	2.535	2.250	1.368	1.222	1.077	1.005	0.958	0.938
Diesel	0.034	0.032	0.031	0.080	0.085	0.089	0.093	0.092	0.092	0.091	0.087	0.080	0.070	0.061
LPG	2.631	2.632	2.628	1.715	1.386	1.200	1.024	0.819	0.651	0.488	0.345	0.262	0.210	0.181
Industrial/Commercial Equipment														
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	10.429	9.648	9.019	5.705	5.583	5.538	5.492	5.492	5.447	5.440	5.435	5.432	5.429	5.425
4 Stroke	11.661	9.547	7.613	5.800	4.739	4.170	3.737	3.410	2.838	2.495	2.278	2.141	2.051	1.999
Diesel	0.037	0.038	0.041	0.111	0.116	0.118	0.120	0.115	0.110	0.105	0.098	0.092	0.086	0.078
CNG	191.224	190.378	189.512	95.440	78.830	68.724	55.882	44.440	33.735	27.918	23.310	20.658	18.843	17.220
LPG	2.584	2.590	2.597	1.878	1.675	1.534	1.283	1.034	0.775	0.612	0.474	0.358	0.297	0.248
Logging Equipment														
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	9.493	8.567	7.825	4.751	4.391	4.357	4.335	4.335	4.309	4.309	4.309	4.309	4.309	4.309
4 Stroke	8.155	7.486	6.756	5.245	4.902	4.752	4.609	4.433	3.982	3.565	3.136	2.791	2.620	2.503
Diesel	0.021	0.028	0.035	0.113	0.121	0.131	0.126	0.106	0.092	0.084	0.077	0.068	0.055	0.039
Railroad Equipment														
Gasoline														

4 Stroke	10.361	8.503	6.756	5.004	4.222	3.908	3.579	3.258	2.891	2.594	2.361	2.208	2.152	2.101
Diesel	0.056	0.057	0.059	0.140	0.144	0.147	0.149	0.145	0.146	0.145	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.143
LPG	2.473	2.513	2.563	2.083	1.956	1.930	1.849	1.547	1.393	1.210	1.115	0.990	0.893	0.702
Recreational Equipment														
Gasoline														
2 Stroke	4.682	4.634	4.592	4.387	4.183	4.025	3.886	3.762	3.608	3.474	3.338	3.199	3.060	2.925
4 Stroke	8.646	7.628	6.781	5.271	4.825	4.567	4.331	3.898	3.634	3.483	3.373	3.254	3.167	3.093
Diesel	0.079	0.077	0.076	0.118	0.123	0.128	0.133	0.133	0.134	0.135	0.134	0.134	0.132	0.130
LPG	2.592	2.593	2.595	2.359	2.281	2.203	2.122	2.044	1.962	1.880	1.798	1.713	1.626	1.540

^a Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.

^b Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.

^c Emissions of CH₄ from jet fuels have been zeroed out across the time series. Recent research indicates that modern aircraft jet engines are typically net consumers of methane (Santoni et al. 2011). Methane is emitted at low power and idle operation, but at higher power modes aircraft engines consumer methane. Over the range of engine operating modes, aircraft engines are net consumers of methane on average.

Based on this data, CH₄ emissions factors for jet aircraft were changed to zero in this year's Inventory to reflect the latest emissions testing data.

Source: IPCC (2006) and ICF (2017b), EPA (2018b)

Table A-115: NO_x Emissions from Mobile Combustion (kt)

Fuel Type/Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Gasoline On-Road	5,746	4,560	3,812	3,654	3,317	2,966	2,724	2,805	2,647	2,489	2,332	2,124	1,954	1,766
Passenger Cars	3,847	2,752	2,084	1,993	1,810	1,618	1,486	1,530	1,444	1,358	1,272	1,159	1,066	963
Light-Duty Trucks	1,364	1,325	1,303	1,264	1,147	1,026	942	970	915	861	806	735	676	611
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	515	469	411	383	348	311	286	294	278	261	245	223	205	185
Motorcycles	20	14	13	13	12	11	10	10	10	9	9	8	7	6
Diesel On-Road	2,956	3,493	3,803	3,283	2,980	2,665	2,448	2,520	2,379	2,237	2,095	1,908	1,756	1,586
Passenger Cars	39	19	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
Light-Duty Trucks	20	12	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	2,897	3,462	3,791	3,272	2,970	2,656	2,439	2,512	2,370	2,229	2,088	1,902	1,750	1,581
Alternative Fuel On-Road^a	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE
Non-Road	2,160	2,483	2,584	2,249	2,226	2,166	2,118	1,968	1,883	1,797	1,712	1,707	1,703	1,699
Ships and Boats	402	488	506	465	460	448	438	407	389	372	354	353	352	351
Rail	338	433	451	415	411	400	391	363	348	332	316	315	314	314
Aircraft ^b	25	31	40	34	33	32	32	29	28	27	26	26	25	25
Agricultural Equipment ^c	437	478	484	407	402	392	383	356	340	325	309	309	308	307
Construction/Mining Equipment ^d	641	697	697	584	578	563	550	511	489	467	445	444	442	441
Other ^e	318	357	407	344	341	332	324	301	288	275	262	261	261	260
Total	10,862	10,536	10,199	9,186	8,523	7,797	7,290	7,294	6,909	6,523	6,138	5,740	5,413	5,051

IE (Included Elsewhere)

^a NO_x emissions from alternative fuel on-road vehicles are included under gasoline and diesel on-road.^b Aircraft estimates include only emissions related to LTO cycles, and therefore do not include cruise altitude emissions.^c Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.^d Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.^e "Other" includes snowmobiles and other recreational equipment, logging equipment, lawn and garden equipment, railroad equipment, airport equipment, commercial equipment, and industrial equipment, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road for commercial/industrial purposes.

Notes: The source of this data is the National Emissions Inventory. Updates to estimates from MOVES2014b is a change that affects the emissions time series. Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-116: CO Emissions from Mobile Combustion (kt)

Fuel Type/Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Gasoline On-Road	98,328	74,673	60,657	33,298	29,626	24,515	25,235	24,442	23,573	22,704	21,834	20,871	18,532	16,881
Passenger Cars	60,757	42,065	32,867	18,552	16,506	13,659	14,060	13,618	13,134	12,649	12,165	11,628	10,325	9,405
Light-Duty Trucks	29,237	27,048	24,532	13,253	11,792	9,758	10,044	9,729	9,383	9,037	8,690	8,307	7,376	6,719
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	8,093	5,404	3,104	1,416	1,259	1,042	1,073	1,039	1,002	965	928	887	788	718
Motorcycles	240	155	154	77	69	57	58	57	55	53	51	48	43	39
Diesel On-Road	1,696	1,424	1,088	510	454	376	387	375	361	348	335	320	284	259
Passenger Cars	35	18	7	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Light-Duty Trucks	22	16	6	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	1,639	1,391	1,075	504	448	371	382	370	357	343	330	316	280	255
Alternative Fuel On-Road^a	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE
Non-Road	19,337	21,533	21,814	17,001	16,137	14,365	13,853	13,488	12,981	12,474	11,966	11,968	11,970	11,972
Ships and Boats	1,559	1,781	1,825	1,398	1,327	1,182	1,140	1,109	1,068	1,026	984	984	985	985
Rail	85	93	90	69	65	58	56	54	52	50	48	48	48	48
Aircraft ^b	217	224	245	178	169	151	145	141	136	131	125	126	126	126
Agricultural Equipment ^c	581	628	626	474	450	401	386	376	362	348	334	334	334	334
Construction/Mining Equipment ^d	1,090	1,132	1,047	795	755	672	648	631	607	583	560	560	560	560
Other ^e	15,805	17,676	17,981	14,087	13,371	11,903	11,479	11,176	10,756	10,335	9,915	9,916	9,918	9,920
Total	119,360	97,630	83,559	50,809	46,217	39,256	39,475	38,305	36,915	35,525	34,135	33,159	30,786	29,112

IE (Included Elsewhere)

^a CO emissions from alternative fuel on-road vehicles are included under gasoline and diesel on-road.^b Aircraft estimates include only emissions related to LTO cycles, and therefore do not include cruise altitude emissions.^c Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.^d Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.^e "Other" includes snowmobiles and other recreational equipment, logging equipment, lawn and garden equipment, railroad equipment, airport equipment, commercial equipment, and industrial equipment, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road for commercial/industrial purposes.

Notes: The source of this data is the National Emissions Inventory. Updates to estimates from MOVES2014b is a change that affects the emissions time series. Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-117: NMVOCs Emissions from Mobile Combustion (kt)

Fuel Type/Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Gasoline On-Road	8,110	5,819	4,615	3,015	2,641	2,384	2,393	2,485	2,342	2,200	2,058	1,930	1,725	1,558
Passenger Cars	5,120	3,394	2,610	1,684	1,475	1,332	1,336	1,388	1,308	1,229	1,149	1,078	963	870
Light-Duty Trucks	2,374	2,019	1,750	1,171	1,025	926	929	965	910	854	799	750	670	605
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	575	382	232	145	127	115	115	120	113	106	99	93	83	75
Motorcycles	42	24	23	15	14	12	12	13	12	11	11	10	9	8
Diesel On-Road	406	304	216	146	128	115	116	120	113	106	100	93	83	75
Passenger Cars	16	8	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Light-Duty Trucks	14	9	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	377	286	209	141	124	112	112	116	110	103	96	90	81	73
Alternative Fuel On-Road^a	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE	IE
Non-Road	2,415	2,622	2,398	2,383	2,310	2,150	2,082	1,957	1,837	1,717	1,597	1,565	1,534	1,503
Ships and Boats	608	739	744	731	709	660	639	600	564	527	490	480	471	461
Rail	33	36	35	35	34	32	31	29	27	26	24	23	23	22
Aircraft ^b	28	28	24	19	19	17	17	16	15	14	13	13	12	12
Agricultural Equipment ^c	85	86	76	73	70	65	63	60	56	52	49	48	47	46
Construction/Mining Equipment ^d	149	152	130	125	121	113	109	103	96	90	84	82	81	79
Other ^e	1,512	1,580	1,390	1,399	1,356	1,263	1,223	1,149	1,079	1,008	938	919	901	882
Total	10,932	8,745	7,230	5,544	5,078	4,650	4,591	4,562	4,293	4,023	3,754	3,589	3,342	3,137

IE (Included Elsewhere)

^a NMVOC emissions from alternative fuel on-road vehicles are included under gasoline and diesel on-road.^b Aircraft estimates include only emissions related to LTO cycles, and therefore do not include cruise altitude emissions.^c Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.^d Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.^e "Other" includes snowmobiles and other recreational equipment, logging equipment, lawn and garden equipment, railroad equipment, airport equipment, commercial equipment, and industrial equipment, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road for commercial/industrial purposes.

Notes: The source of this data is the National Emissions Inventory. Updates to estimates from MOVES2014b is a change that affects the emissions time series. Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Definitions of Emission Control Technologies and Standards

The N₂O and CH₄ emission factors used depend on the emission standards in place and the corresponding level of control technology for each vehicle type. Table A-106 through Table A-109 show the years in which these technologies or standards were in place and the penetration level for each vehicle type. These categories are defined below and were compiled from EPA (1993, 1994a, 1994b, 1998, 1999) and IPCC/UNEP/OECD/IEA (1997).

Uncontrolled

Vehicles manufactured prior to the implementation of pollution control technologies are designated as uncontrolled. Gasoline passenger cars and light-duty trucks (pre-1973), gasoline heavy-duty vehicles (pre-1984), diesel vehicles (pre-1983), and motorcycles (pre-1996) are assumed to have no control technologies in place.

Gasoline Emission Controls

Below are the control technologies and emissions standards applicable to gasoline vehicles.

Non-catalyst

These emission controls were common in gasoline passenger cars and light-duty gasoline trucks during model years (1973-1974) but phased out thereafter, in heavy-duty gasoline vehicles beginning in the mid-1980s, and in motorcycles beginning in 1996. This technology reduces hydrocarbon (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions through adjustments to ignition timing and air-fuel ratio, air injection into the exhaust manifold, and exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) valves, which also helps meet vehicle NO_x standards.

Oxidation Catalyst

This control technology designation represents the introduction of the catalytic converter, and was the most common technology in gasoline passenger cars and light-duty gasoline trucks made from 1975 to 1980 (cars) and 1975 to 1985 (trucks). This technology was also used in some heavy-duty gasoline vehicles between 1982 and 1997. The two-way catalytic converter oxidizes HC and CO, significantly reducing emissions over 80 percent beyond non-catalyst-system capacity. One reason unleaded gasoline was introduced in 1975 was due to the fact that oxidation catalysts cannot function properly with leaded gasoline.

EPA Tier 0

This emission standard from the Clean Air Act was met through the implementation of early "three-way" catalysts, therefore this technology was used in gasoline passenger cars and light-duty gasoline trucks sold beginning in the early 1980s, and remained common until 1994. This more sophisticated emission control system improves the efficiency of the catalyst by converting CO and HC to CO₂ and H₂O, reducing NO_x to nitrogen and oxygen, and using an on-board diagnostic computer and oxygen sensor. In addition, this type of catalyst includes a fuel metering system (carburetor or fuel injection) with electronic "trim" (also known as a "closed-loop system"). New cars with three-way catalysts met the Clean Air Act's amended standards (enacted in 1977) of reducing HC to 0.41 g/mile by 1980, CO to 3.4 g/mile by 1981 and NO_x to 1.0 g/mile by 1981.

EPA Tier 1

This emission standard created through the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act limited passenger car NO_x emissions to 0.4 g/mi, and HC emissions to 0.25 g/mi. These bounds respectively amounted to a 60 and 40 percent reduction from the EPA Tier 0 standard set in 1981. For light-duty trucks, this standard set emissions at 0.4 to 1.1 g/mi for NO_x, and 0.25 to 0.39 g/mi for HCs, depending on the weight of the truck. Emission reductions were met through the use of more advanced emission control systems, and applied to light-duty gasoline vehicles beginning in 1994. These advanced emission control systems included advanced three-way catalysts, electronically controlled fuel injection and ignition timing, EGR, and air injection.

EPA Tier 2

This emission standard was specified in the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act, limiting passenger car NO_x emissions to 0.07 g/mi on average and aligning emissions standards for passenger cars and light-duty trucks. Manufacturers can meet this average emission level by producing vehicles in 11 emission "Bins," the three highest of which expire in 2006.

These new emission levels represent a 77 to 95 percent reduction in emissions from the EPA Tier 1 standard set in 1994. Emission reductions were met through the use of more advanced emission control systems and lower sulfur fuels and are applied to vehicles beginning in 2004. These advanced emission control systems include improved combustion, advanced three-way catalysts, electronically controlled fuel injection and ignition timing, EGR, and air injection.

CARB Low Emission Vehicles (LEV)

This emission standard requires a much higher emission control level than the Tier 1 standard. Applied to light-duty gasoline passenger cars and trucks beginning in small numbers in the mid-1990s, LEV includes multi-port fuel injection with adaptive learning, an advanced computer diagnostics systems and advanced and close coupled catalysts with secondary air injection. LEVs as defined here include transitional low-emission vehicles (TLEVs), low emission vehicles, ultra-low emission vehicles (ULEVs). In this analysis, all categories of LEVs are treated the same due to the fact that there are very limited CH₄ or N₂O emission factor data for LEVs to distinguish among the different types of vehicles. Zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) are incorporated into the alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicle assessments.

CARB LEVII

This emission standard builds upon ARB's LEV emission standards. They represent a significant strengthening of the emission standards and require light trucks under 8500 lbs gross vehicle weight meet passenger car standards. It also introduces a super ultra-low vehicle (SULEV) emission standard. The LEVII standards decreased emission requirements for LEV and ULEV vehicles as well as increasing the useful life of the vehicle to 150,000. These standards began with 2004 vehicles. In this analysis, all categories of LEVIIs are treated the same due to the fact that there are very limited CH₄ or N₂O emission factor data for LEVIIs to distinguish among the different types of vehicles. Zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) are incorporated into the alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicle assessments.

EPA Tier 3/CARB LEVIII

The EPA Tier 3 and ARB LEVIII standards are harmonized and thus treated as one category. These standards begin in 2017 and are fully phased in by 2025 but some initial vehicles were produced earlier. Tier 3/LEVIII set new vehicle emissions standards and lower the sulfur content of gasoline, considering the vehicle and its fuel as an integrated system. These new tailpipe standards apply to all light-duty vehicles and some heavy-duty vehicles. EPA is also extending the regulatory useful life period during which the standards apply from 120,000 miles to 150,000 miles. In this analysis, all categories of Tier 3/LEVIII are treated the same due to the fact that there are very limited CH₄ or N₂O emission factor data for these vehicles to distinguish among the different types of vehicles. Zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) are incorporated into the alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicle assessments.

Diesel Emission Controls

Below are the three levels of emissions control for diesel vehicles.

Moderate control

Improved injection timing technology and combustion system design for light- and heavy-duty diesel vehicles (generally in place in model years 1983 to 1995) are considered moderate control technologies. These controls were implemented to meet emission standards for diesel trucks and buses adopted by the EPA in 1985 to be met in 1991 and 1994.

Advanced control

EGR and modern electronic control of the fuel injection system are designated as advanced control technologies. These technologies provide diesel vehicles with the level of emission control necessary to comply with standards in place from 1996 through 2006.

Aftertreatment

Use of diesel particulate filters (DPFs), oxidation catalysts and NO_x absorbers or selective catalytic reduction (SCR) systems are designated as aftertreatment control. These technologies provide diesel vehicles with a level of emission control necessary to comply with standards in place from 2007 on.

Supplemental Information on Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Transportation and Other Mobile Sources

This section of this Annex includes supplemental information on the contribution of transportation and other mobile sources to U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. In the main body of the Inventory report, emission estimates are generally

presented by greenhouse gas, with separate discussions of the methodologies used to estimate CO₂, N₂O, CH₄, and HFC emissions. Although the Inventory is not required to provide detail beyond what is contained in the body of this report, the IPCC allows presentation of additional data and detail on emission sources. The purpose of this sub-annex, within the Annex that details the calculation methods and data used for non-CO₂ calculations, is to provide all transportation estimates presented throughout the report in one place.

This section of this Annex reports total greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and other (non-transportation) mobile sources in CO₂ equivalents, with information on the contribution by greenhouse gas and by mode, vehicle type, and fuel type. In order to calculate these figures, additional analyses were conducted to develop estimates of CO₂ from non-transportation mobile sources (e.g., agricultural equipment, construction/mining equipment, recreational vehicles), and to provide more detailed breakdowns of emissions by source.

Estimation of CO₂ from Non-Transportation Mobile Sources

The estimates of N₂O and CH₄ from fuel combustion presented in the Energy chapter of the Inventory include both transportation sources and other mobile sources. Other mobile sources include construction/mining equipment, agricultural equipment, vehicles used off-road, and other sources that have utility associated with their movement but do not have a primary purpose of transporting people or goods (e.g., snowmobiles, riding lawnmowers, etc.). Estimates of CO₂ from non-transportation mobile sources, based on EIA fuel consumption estimates, are included in the industrial and commercial sectors. In order to provide comparable information on transportation and mobile sources, Table A-118 provides estimates of CO₂ from these other mobile sources, developed from EPA's NONROAD components of the MOVES2014b model and FHWA's Highway Statistics. These other mobile source estimates were developed using the same fuel consumption data utilized in developing the N₂O and CH₄ estimates (see Table A-105). Note that the method used to estimate fuel consumption volumes for CO₂ emissions from non-transportation mobile sources for the supplemental information presented in Table A-118, Table A-120, and Table A-121 differs from the method used to estimate fuel consumption volumes for CO₂ in the industrial and commercial sectors in this Inventory, which include CO₂ emissions from all non-transportation mobile sources (see Section 3.1 for a discussion of that methodology).

Table A-118: CO₂ Emissions from Non-Transportation Mobile Sources (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Fuel Type/ Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Agricultural Equipment ^a	43.4	43.1	39.4	51.5	47.4	46.0	46.2	46.4	47.6	45.4	45.5	40.7	39.7	39.4
Construction/ Mining Equipment ^b	48.9	52.6	56.7	72.0	68.7	65.4	64.6	63.4	62.3	65.3	60.5	56.4	59.4	64.4
Other Sources ^c	69.2	71.6	75.1	88.0	86.2	82.6	85.4	84.5	84.7	86.0	87.8	86.4	87.1	88.5
Total	161.5	167.3	171.2	211.5	202.3	194.0	196.2	194.3	194.6	196.6	193.8	183.6	186.3	192.3

^a Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.

^b Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.

^c "Other" includes snowmobiles and other recreational equipment, logging equipment, lawn and garden equipment, railroad equipment, airport equipment, commercial equipment, and industrial equipment, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road for commercial/industrial purposes.

Note: The method used to estimate CO₂ emissions in this supplementary information table differs from the method used to estimate CO₂ in the industrial and commercial sectors in the Inventory, which include CO₂ emissions from all non-transportation mobile sources (see Section 3.1 for the methodology for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion in this Inventory). In 2015, EPA incorporated the NONROAD2008 model into MOVES2014a. The current Inventory uses the NONROAD component of MOVES2014b for years 1999 through 2017.

Estimation of HFC Emissions from Transportation Sources

In addition to CO₂, N₂O and CH₄ emissions, transportation sources also result in emissions of HFCs. HFCs are emitted to the atmosphere during equipment manufacture and operation (as a result of component failure, leaks, and purges), as well as at servicing and disposal events. There are three categories of transportation-related HFC emissions; Mobile air-conditioning represents the emissions from air conditioning units in passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and heavy-duty vehicles; Comfort Cooling represents the emissions from air conditioning units in passenger trains and buses; and Refrigerated Transport represents the emissions from units used to cool freight during transportation.

Table A-119 below presents these HFC emissions. Table A-120 presents all transportation and mobile source greenhouse gas emissions, including HFC emissions.

1 **Table A-119: HFC Emissions from Transportation Sources (MMT CO₂ Eq.)**

Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mobile AC	+	19.4	55.2	68.8	69.2	68.2	64.7	58.5	52.7	46.6	43.4	40.5	36.9	33.2
Passenger Cars	+	11.2	28.0	31.5	31.2	29.9	27.5	23.9	20.6	17.2	15.8	14.7	13.2	11.4
Light-Duty Trucks	+	7.8	25.6	34.5	35.1	35.2	34.1	31.6	29.2	26.5	24.7	23.0	21.1	19.2
Heavy-Duty Vehicles	+	0.5	1.6	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6
Comfort Cooling for Trains and Buses	+	+	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
School and Tour Buses	+	+	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Transit Buses	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.1
Rail	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Refrigerated Transport	+	0.2	0.8	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.9	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.9	5.4	5.9	6.4
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	+	0.1	0.4	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.9	3.0
Rail	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Ships and Boats	+	+	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.2
Total	+	19.6	56.2	71.2	71.8	71.0	68.0	62.4	57.1	51.6	48.7	46.3	43.3	40.1

2 + Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

3 Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Contribution of Transportation and Mobile Sources to Greenhouse Gas Emissions, by Mode/Vehicle Type/Fuel Type

Table A-120 presents estimates of greenhouse gas emissions from an expanded analysis including all transportation and additional mobile sources, as well as emissions from electricity generation by the consuming category, in CO₂ equivalents. In total, transportation and non-transportation mobile sources emitted 2,059.9 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2017, an increase of 21 percent from 1990.⁵³ Transportation sources account for 1,863.4 MMT CO₂ Eq. while non-transportation mobile sources account for 196.5 MMT CO₂ Eq. These estimates include HFC emissions for mobile AC, comfort cooling for trains and buses, and refrigerated transport. These estimates were generated using the estimates of CO₂ emissions from transportation sources reported in Section 3.1 CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion, and CH₄ emissions and N₂O emissions reported in the Mobile Combustion section of the Energy chapter; information on HFCs from mobile air conditioners, comfort cooling for trains and buses, and refrigerated transportation from the Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances section of the IPPU chapter; and estimates of CO₂ emitted from non-transportation mobile sources reported in Table A-118 above.

Although all emissions reported here are based on estimates reported throughout this Inventory, some additional calculations were performed in order to provide a detailed breakdown of emissions by mode and vehicle category. In the case of N₂O and CH₄, additional calculations were performed to develop emission estimates by type of aircraft and type of heavy-duty vehicle (i.e., medium- and heavy-duty trucks or buses) to match the level of detail for CO₂ emissions. N₂O estimates for both jet fuel and aviation gasoline, and CH₄ estimates for aviation gasoline were developed for individual aircraft types by multiplying the emissions estimates for each fuel type (jet fuel and aviation gasoline) by the portion of fuel used by each aircraft type (from FAA 2018 and DLA 2018). Emissions of CH₄ from jet fuels are no longer considered to be emitted from aircraft gas turbine engines burning jet fuel A at higher power settings. This update applies to the entire time series.⁵⁴ Recent research indicates that modern aircraft jet engines are typically net consumers of methane (Santoni et al. 2011). Methane is emitted at low power and idle operation, but at higher power modes aircraft engines consume methane. Over the range of engine operating modes, aircraft engines are net consumers of methane on average. Based on this data, CH₄ emission factors for jet aircraft were reported as zero to reflect the latest emissions testing data.

Similarly, N₂O and CH₄ estimates were developed for medium- and heavy-duty trucks and buses by multiplying the emission estimates for heavy-duty vehicles for each fuel type (gasoline, diesel) from the Mobile Combustion section in the Energy chapter, by the portion of fuel used by each vehicle type (from DOE 1993 through 2017). Carbon dioxide emissions from non-transportation mobile sources are calculated using data from EPA's NONROAD component of MOVES2014b (EPA 2018b). Otherwise, the table and figure are drawn directly from emission estimates presented elsewhere in the Inventory, and are dependent on the methodologies presented in Annex 2.1 (for CO₂), Chapter 4, and Annex 3.9 (for HFCs), and earlier in this Annex (for CH₄ and N₂O).

Transportation sources include on-road vehicles, aircraft, boats and ships, rail, and pipelines (note: pipelines are a transportation source but are stationary, not mobile sources). In addition, transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions also include HFC released from mobile air-conditioners and refrigerated transport, and the release of CO₂ from lubricants (such as motor oil) used in transportation. Together, transportation sources were responsible for 1,863.4 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2017.

On-road vehicles were responsible for about 77 percent of all transportation and non-transportation mobile greenhouse gas emissions in 2017. Although passenger cars make up the largest component of on-road vehicle greenhouse gas emissions, medium- and heavy-duty trucks have been the primary sources of growth in on-road vehicle emissions. Between 1990 and 2017, greenhouse gas emissions from passenger cars increased by 20 percent, while emissions from light-duty trucks increased by one percent. Meanwhile, greenhouse gas emissions from medium- and heavy-duty trucks increased 84 percent between 1990 and 2017, reflecting the increased volume of total freight movement and an increasing share transported by trucks.

⁵³ Recommended Best Practice for Quantifying Speciated Organic Gas Emissions from Aircraft Equipped with Turbofan, Turbojet and Turboprop Engines," EPA-420-R-09-901, May 27, 2009 (see <<https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/organic-gas-speciation-profile-aircraft>>).

⁵⁴ In 2011 FHWA changed how they defined vehicle types for the purposes of reporting VMT for the years 2007 to 2010. The old approach to vehicle classification was based on body type and split passenger vehicles into "Passenger Cars" and "Other 2 Axle 4-Tire Vehicles." The new approach is a vehicle classification system based on wheelbase. Vehicles with a wheelbase less than or equal to 121 inches are counted as "Light-duty Vehicles -Short Wheelbase." Passenger vehicles with a wheelbase greater than 121 inches are counted as "Light-duty Vehicles - Long Wheelbase." This change in vehicle classification has moved some smaller trucks and sport utility vehicles from the light truck category to the passenger vehicle category in this Inventory. These changes are reflected in a large drop in light-truck emissions between 2006 and 2007.

Greenhouse gas emissions from aircraft decreased six percent between 1990 and 2017. Emissions from military aircraft decreased 66 percent between 1990 and 2017. Commercial aircraft emissions rose 27 percent between 1990 and 2007 then dropped 14 percent from 2007 to 2017, a change of approximately 10 percent between 1990 and 2017.

Non-transportation mobile sources, such as construction/mining equipment, agricultural equipment, and industrial/commercial equipment, emitted approximately 196.5 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2017. Together, these sources emitted more greenhouse gases than ships and boats, and rail combined. Emissions from non-transportation mobile sources increased, growing approximately 15 percent between 1990 and 2017. Methane and N₂O emissions from these sources are included in the “Mobile Combustion” section and CO₂ emissions are included in the relevant economic sectors.

Contribution of Transportation and Mobile Sources to Greenhouse Gas Emissions, by Gas

Table A-121 presents estimates of greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and other mobile sources broken down by greenhouse gas. As this table shows, CO₂ accounts for the vast majority of transportation greenhouse gas emissions (approximately 97 percent in 2017). Emissions of CO₂ from transportation and mobile sources increased by 354.1 MMT CO₂ Eq. between 1990 and 2017. In contrast, the combined emissions of CH₄ and N₂O decreased by 34.73 MMT CO₂ Eq. over the same period, due largely to the introduction of control technologies designed to reduce criteria pollutant emissions.⁵⁵ Meanwhile, HFC emissions from mobile air-conditioners and refrigerated transport increased from virtually no emissions in 1990 to 40.1 MMT CO₂ Eq. in 2017 as these chemicals were phased in as substitutes for ozone depleting substances. It should be noted, however, that the ozone depleting substances that HFCs replaced are also powerful greenhouse gases, but are not included in national greenhouse gas inventories per UNFCCC reporting requirements.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Freight and Passenger Transportation

Table A-122 and Table A-123 present greenhouse gas estimates from transportation, broken down into the passenger and freight categories. Passenger modes include light-duty vehicles, buses, passenger rail, aircraft (general aviation and commercial aircraft), recreational boats, and mobile air conditioners, and are illustrated in Table A-122. Freight modes include medium- and heavy-duty trucks, freight rail, refrigerated transport, waterborne freight vessels, pipelines, and commercial aircraft and are illustrated in Table A-123. Commercial aircraft do carry some freight, in addition to passengers, and emissions have been split between passenger and freight transportation. The amount of commercial aircraft emissions to allocate to the passenger and freight categories was calculated using BTS data on freight shipped by commercial aircraft, and the total number of passengers enplaned. Each passenger was considered to weigh an average of 150 pounds, with a luggage weight of 50 pounds. The total freight weight and total passenger weight carried were used to determine percent shares which were used to split the total commercial aircraft emission estimates. The remaining transportation and mobile emissions were from sources not considered to be either freight or passenger modes (e.g., construction/mining and agricultural equipment, lubricants).

The estimates in these tables are derived from the estimates presented in Table A-120. In addition, estimates of fuel consumption from DOE (1993 through 2017) were used to allocate rail emissions between passenger and freight categories.

In 2017, passenger transportation modes emitted 1,288.9 MMT CO₂ Eq., while freight transportation modes emitted 536.6 MMT CO₂ Eq. Between 1990 and 2017, the percentage growth of greenhouse gas emissions from freight sources was 53 percent, while emissions from passenger sources grew by 14 percent. This difference in growth is due largely to the rapid increase in emissions associated with medium- and heavy-duty trucks.

⁵⁵ The decline in CFC emissions is not captured in the official transportation estimates.

Table A-120: Total U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Transportation and Mobile Sources (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Mode / Vehicle Type / Fuel Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Percent Change 1990-2017
Transportation Total^a	1,530.2	1,670.4	1,904.7	1,974.4	1,876.8	1,800.4	1,807.9	1,780.1	1,760.2	1,769.5	1,804.0	1,813.2	1,853.4	1,863.4	22%
On-Road Vehicles	1,206.8	1,341.7	1,545.7	1,639.0	1,560.6	1,517.1	1,516.5	1,490.1	1,479.5	1,478.7	1,527.6	1,524.8	1,552.7	1,547.3	28%
Passenger Cars	639.6	629.9	681.2	824.5	783.2	775.2	766.0	757.1	751.1	746.8	761.4	761.4	771.9	768.7	20%
Gasoline ^b	631.7	610.8	649.5	788.9	748.2	741.7	734.8	729.1	726.4	725.5	741.4	742.4	754.3	752.9	19%
Diesel ^b	7.9	7.8	3.7	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	-45%
AFVs ^c	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	+	+	149%
HFCs from Mobile AC	+	11.2	28.0	31.5	31.2	29.9	27.5	23.9	20.6	17.2	15.8	14.7	13.2	11.4	NA
Light-Duty Trucks	326.7	425.2	503.3	359.3	340.0	343.9	340.8	324.1	317.9	315.0	335.4	324.5	333.8	331.3	1%
Gasoline ^b	315.1	402.4	457.5	310.9	292.5	296.2	294.1	279.3	275.7	275.6	296.8	287.5	298.3	297.6	-6%
Diesel ^b	11.5	14.9	20.1	13.5	12.1	12.0	12.5	13.0	12.9	12.9	13.9	13.9	14.4	14.4	25%
AFVs ^c	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-52%
HFCs from Mobile AC	+	7.8	25.6	34.5	35.1	35.2	34.1	31.6	29.2	26.5	24.7	23.0	21.1	19.2	NA
Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks	230.3	275.7	348.3	433.3	415.9	377.7	390.2	388.6	388.7	395.2	407.6	415.6	423.7	423.9	84%
Gasoline ^b	38.5	35.8	36.2	46.0	46.1	42.4	42.1	38.6	38.4	39.1	40.3	39.8	40.8	40.8	6%
Diesel ^b	190.7	238.4	309.5	382.5	364.0	329.9	343.1	344.7	344.8	350.4	361.6	369.9	376.8	377.0	98%
AFVs ^c	1.1	0.9	0.6	0.8	1.5	1.0	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	-60%
HFCs from Refrigerated Transport and Mobile AC ^d	+	0.6	2.0	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.7	NA
Buses	8.5	9.2	11.0	17.8	17.3	16.1	15.8	16.7	17.8	17.9	19.3	19.6	19.4	19.5	131%
Gasoline ^b	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	158%
Diesel ^b	8.0	8.7	10.2	15.5	14.6	13.6	13.5	14.4	15.4	15.5	16.9	17.1	17.0	17.1	113%
AFVs ^c	0.1	0.1	0.3	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1085%
HFCs from Comfort Cooling	+	+	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	NA
Motorcycles	1.7	1.8	1.8	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	125%
Gasoline ^b	1.7	1.8	1.8	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	125%
Aircraft	189.2	176.7	199.4	183.4	176.7	157.4	154.8	149.9	146.5	150.1	151.3	160.5	169.0	178.7	-6%
General Aviation Aircraft	42.9	35.8	35.9	24.4	30.5	21.2	26.7	22.5	19.9	23.6	20.9	26.8	35.1	45.1	5%
Jet Fuel ^e	39.8	33.0	33.4	22.2	28.5	19.4	24.8	20.6	18.2	22.0	19.4	25.3	33.7	43.6	10%
Aviation Gasoline	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	-53%
Commercial Aircraft	110.9	116.3	140.6	141.0	128.4	120.6	114.4	115.7	114.3	115.4	116.3	120.1	121.5	121.5	10%
Jet Fuel ^e	110.9	116.3	140.6	141.0	128.4	120.6	114.4	115.7	114.3	115.4	116.3	120.1	121.5	121.5	10%
Military Aircraft	35.3	24.5	22.9	18.0	17.7	15.5	13.7	11.7	12.2	11.1	14.1	13.6	12.4	12.1	-66%
Jet Fuel ^e	35.3	24.5	22.9	18.0	17.7	15.5	13.7	11.7	12.2	11.1	14.1	13.6	12.4	12.1	-66%
Ships and Boats^f	47.4	59.3	66.0	55.5	45.9	39.3	45.2	46.8	40.6	40.1	29.4	34.1	41.3	44.4	-6%
Gasoline	14.9	14.8	14.8	13.7	13.0	12.7	12.1	11.6	11.4	11.2	10.9	10.9	11.0	11.1	-26%
Distillate Fuel	9.7	14.9	17.1	11.6	11.4	11.5	11.2	14.0	11.4	11.5	10.2	16.2	14.2	13.9	44%
Residual Fuel ^d	22.9	29.6	33.8	29.5	20.7	14.2	20.8	19.7	16.1	15.4	5.9	4.3	13.2	16.2	-29%

HFCs from Refrigerated Transport ^d	+	+	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.2	NA
Rail	39.0	43.1	46.1	52.0	48.2	41.0	43.7	45.3	44.0	44.8	46.3	44.2	40.8	41.9	7%
Distillate Fuel ^e	35.8	40.0	42.5	46.7	43.3	36.3	39.0	40.8	39.9	40.5	42.0	40.3	37.1	38.2	7%
Electricity	3.1	3.1	3.5	5.1	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.5	12%
Other Emissions from Rail Electricity Use ^g	0.1	0.1	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-31%
HFCs from Comfort Cooling	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA
HFCs from Refrigerated Transport ^d	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	NA
Pipelines^h	36.0	38.4	35.4	34.4	35.9	37.1	37.3	38.1	40.5	46.2	39.4	38.5	39.2	41.5	15%
Natural Gas	36.0	38.4	35.4	34.4	35.9	37.1	37.3	38.1	40.5	46.2	39.4	38.5	39.2	41.5	15%
Other Transportation	11.8	11.3	12.1	10.2	9.5	8.5	10.4	10.0	9.1	9.6	10.0	11.0	10.4	9.6	-19%
Lubricants	11.8	11.3	12.1	10.2	9.5	8.5	10.4	10.0	9.1	9.6	10.0	11.0	10.4	9.6	-19%
Non-Transportation Mobileⁱ															
Total	170.3	176.1	179.9	219.5	209.4	200.5	202.3	200.1	199.9	201.7	198.6	187.9	190.5	196.5	15%
Agricultural Equipment^{i,j}	44.6	44.3	40.4	52.6	48.4	47.0	47.1	47.3	48.5	46.2	46.3	41.3	40.4	40.0	-10%
Gasoline	7.7	8.7	6.1	9.7	5.7	6.1	6.2	7.1	7.8	5.8	5.7	1.4	1.5	1.5	-81%
Diesel	36.6	35.3	34.1	42.7	42.5	40.7	40.7	40.0	40.6	40.2	40.5	39.8	38.8	38.5	5%
CNG	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-66%
LPG	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-14%
Construction/ Mining^k															
Equipment^{i,m}	50.4	54.2	58.3	73.9	70.4	67.1	66.2	64.9	63.8	66.8	61.9	57.7	60.6	65.7	30%
Gasoline	4.6	4.2	3.3	5.7	5.5	5.2	6.1	5.7	5.8	9.7	6.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	-28%
Diesel	44.9	49.0	53.8	67.0	63.8	60.8	59.1	58.3	57.1	56.2	54.8	53.6	56.5	61.6	37%
CNG	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	-19%
LPG	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	5%
Other Equipment^{i,l}	75.3	77.6	81.2	93.0	90.6	86.4	89.1	87.8	87.6	88.7	90.4	88.9	89.5	90.8	21%
Gasoline	42.1	42.2	43.5	51.1	49.5	47.6	49.4	47.6	46.1	46.0	46.6	44.8	45.2	45.4	8%
Diesel	21.8	21.5	21.3	25.8	25.6	24.5	25.3	26.0	27.2	28.1	29.0	29.2	29.4	30.1	38%
CNG	3.4	3.6	4.0	3.1	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5	-24%
LPG	8.0	10.3	12.4	13.0	12.7	11.6	11.8	11.6	11.7	12.0	12.1	12.3	12.4	12.8	59%
Transportation and Non-Transportation Mobile Total^l	1,700.5	1,846.5	2,084.6	2,194.0	2,086.2	2,000.8	2,010.3	1,980.1	1,960.1	1,971.2	2,002.7	2,001.1	2,043.8	2,059.9	21%

1 + Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

2 NA - Not Applicable, as there were no HFC emissions allocated to the transport sector in 1990, and thus a growth rate cannot be calculated.

3 ^a Not including emissions from international bunker fuels.

4 ^b Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle fuel consumption estimates used to develop CO₂ estimates in this Inventory are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table MF-21, MF-27 and VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017.

5 Data from Table VM-1 are used to estimate the share of fuel consumption between each on-road vehicle class. For mobile CH₄ and N₂O emissions estimates, gasoline and diesel highway vehicle mileage estimates are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). These fuel consumption and mileage estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.

6 ^c In 2017, estimates of alternative fuel vehicle mileage for the last ten years were revised to reflect updates made to EIA data on alternative fuel use and vehicle counts. These changes were incorporated into this year's Inventory and apply to the 2005 to 2017 time period.

- ^d Domestic residual fuel for ships and boats is estimated by taking the total amount of residual fuel and subtracting out an estimate of international bunker fuel use.
- ^e Class II and Class III diesel consumption data for 2014 to 2017 are not available, therefore 2013 data are used as a proxy.
- ^f Fluctuations in emission estimates reflect data collection problems. Note that CH₄ and N₂O from U.S. Territories are included in this value, but not CO₂ emissions from U.S. Territories, which are estimated separately in the section on U.S. Territories.
- ^g Other emissions from electricity generation are a result of waste incineration (as the majority of municipal solid waste is combusted in "trash-to-steam" electricity generation plants), electrical transmission and distribution, and a portion of Other Process Uses of Carbonates (from pollution control equipment installed in electricity generation plants).
- ^h Includes only CO₂ from natural gas used to power natural gas pipelines; does not include emissions from electricity use or non-CO₂ gases.
- ⁱ Note that the method used to estimate CO₂ emissions from non-transportation mobile sources in this supplementary information table differs from the method used to estimate CO₂ in the industrial and commercial sectors in the Inventory, which include CO₂ emissions from all non-transportation mobile sources (see Section 3.1 for the methodology for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion in this Inventory).
- ^j Includes equipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agriculture.
- ^k Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.
- ^l "Other" includes snowmobiles and other recreational equipment, logging equipment, lawn and garden equipment, railroad equipment, airport equipment, commercial equipment, and industrial equipment, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road for commercial/industrial purposes.
- Notes: Increases to CH₄ and N₂O emissions from mobile combustion relative to previous Inventories are largely due to updates made to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES2014b) model that is used to estimate on-road gasoline vehicle distribution and mileage across the time series, as well as non-transportation mobile fuel consumption. See Section 3.1 "CH₄ and N₂O from Mobile Combustion" for more detail. In 2015, EPA incorporated the NONROAD2008 model into MOVES2014a. This year's Inventory uses the NONROAD component of MOVES2014b for years 1999 through 2017. In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data were re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First, several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, the emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are classified as gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

Table A-121: Transportation and Mobile Source Emissions by Gas (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Percent Change 1990-2017
CO ₂ ^a	1,645.4	1,762.2	1,966.1	2,081.7	1,976.7	1,894.5	1,908.4	1,885.7	1,874.0	1,893.0	1,929.6	1,932.3	1,979.3	1,999.5	22%
N ₂ O	42.0	52.3	51.4	32.8	30.3	28.7	27.6	26.3	23.9	22.1	20.2	18.8	17.9	17.0	-59%
CH ₄	12.9	12.4	10.8	8.2	7.2	6.5	6.1	5.6	5.0	4.5	4.1	3.6	3.4	3.2	-75%
HFC	+	19.6	56.1	71.2	71.8	71.0	68.0	62.4	57.1	51.6	48.7	46.3	43.3	40.1	NA
Total^b	1,700.4	1,846.5	2,084.5	2,193.9	2,086.1	2,000.7	2,010.2	1,980.0	1,960.0	1,971.1	2,002.6	2,001.0	2,043.8	2,059.9	21%

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.; NA - Not Applicable, as there were no HFC emissions allocated to the transport sector in 1990, and thus a growth rate cannot be calculated.

^a The method used to estimate CO₂ emissions from non-transportation mobile sources in this supplementary information table differs from the method used to estimate CO₂ in the industrial and commercial sectors in the Inventory, which include CO₂ emissions from all non-transportation mobile sources (see Section 3.1 for the methodology for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion in this Inventory).

^b Total excludes other emissions from electricity generation and CH₄ and N₂O emissions from electric rail.

Note: Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle fuel consumption estimates used to develop CO₂ estimates in this Inventory are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table MF-21, MF-27 and VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017. Data from Table VM-1 is used to estimate the share of fuel consumption between each on-road vehicle class. For mobile CH₄ and N₂O emissions estimates, gasoline and diesel highway vehicle mileage estimates are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). These fuel consumption and mileage estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.

Note: In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data was re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, the emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are classified as gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

Figure A-4: Domestic Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Mode and Vehicle Type, 1990 to 2017 (MMT CO₂ Eq.)




Table A-122: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Passenger Transportation (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Vehicle Type	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Percent Change 1990-2017
On-Road															
Vehicles^{a,b}	976.5	1,066.0	1,197.4	1,205.7	1,144.8	1,139.4	1,126.3	1,101.4	1,090.8	1,083.5	1,119.9	1,109.2	1,129.0	1,123.5	15%
Passenger Cars	639.6	629.9	681.2	824.5	783.2	775.2	766.0	757.1	751.1	746.8	761.4	761.4	771.9	768.7	20%
Light-Duty Trucks	326.7	425.2	503.3	359.3	340.0	343.9	340.8	324.1	317.9	315.0	335.4	324.5	333.8	331.3	1%
Buses	8.5	9.2	11.0	17.8	17.3	16.1	15.8	16.7	17.8	17.9	19.3	19.6	19.4	19.5	131%
Motorcycles	1.7	1.8	1.8	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	125%
Aircraft	134.6	132.0	152.2	144.9	140.9	125.2	124.8	122.1	118.5	123.1	120.9	130.5	139.8	149.3	11%
General Aviation	42.9	35.8	35.9	24.4	30.5	21.2	26.7	22.5	19.9	23.6	20.9	26.8	35.1	45.1	5%
Commercial Aircraft	91.7	96.2	116.3	120.4	110.4	103.9	98.0	99.6	98.6	99.5	100.0	103.6	104.7	104.2	14%
Recreational Boats	17.6	17.5	17.6	16.5	15.7	15.4	14.7	14.3	14.0	13.8	13.7	10.9	11.0	11.1	-37%
Passenger Rail	4.4	4.5	5.2	6.6	6.3	6.2	6.2	6.0	5.5	5.8	5.8	5.4	5.2	5.1	17%
Total	1,133.1	1,220.1	1,372.4	1,373.7	1,307.7	1,286.1	1,272.0	1,243.8	1,228.9	1,226.2	1,260.3	1,256.1	1,285.0	1,288.9	14%

^a The current Inventory includes updated vehicle population data based on the MOVES2014b Model.

^b Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle fuel consumption estimates used to develop CO₂ estimates in this Inventory are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table MF-21, MF-27 and VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017. Data from Table VM-1 is used to estimate the share of fuel consumption between each on-road vehicle class. For mobile CH₄ and N₂O emissions estimates, gasoline and diesel highway vehicle mileage estimates are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). These fuel consumption and mileage estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are used as a proxy.

Notes: Data from DOE (1993 through 2017) were used to disaggregate emissions from rail and buses. Emissions from HFCs have been included in these estimates. In 2015, EPA incorporated the NONROAD2008 model into MOVES2014a. This year's Inventory uses the NONROAD component of MOVES2014b for years 1999 through 2017. In 2017, estimates of alternative fuel vehicle mileage for the last ten years were revised to reflect updates made to EIA data on alternative fuel use and vehicle counts. These changes were incorporated into this year's Inventory and apply to the 2005 to 2017 time period. In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data were re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First, several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, the emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are classified as gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

Table A-123: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Domestic Freight Transportation (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

By Mode	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Percent Change 1990-2017
Trucking^{a,b}	230.3	275.2	346.7	430.4	412.8	374.5	387.1	385.6	385.7	392.2	404.7	412.7	420.9	421.3	83%
Freight Rail	34.5	38.6	40.9	45.3	41.9	34.8	37.5	39.3	38.4	39.0	40.5	38.7	35.6	36.7	6%
Ships and Non-Recreational Boats	29.8	41.8	48.4	38.9	30.1	23.8	30.4	32.5	26.6	30.9	19.6	7.2	16.4	19.7	-34%
Pipelines ^c	36.0	38.4	35.4	34.4	35.9	37.1	37.3	38.1	40.5	46.2	39.4	38.5	39.2	41.5	15%
Commercial Aircraft	19.2	20.1	24.3	20.5	18.0	16.7	16.3	16.0	15.8	15.9	16.2	16.5	16.8	17.3	-10%
Total	349.8	414.1	495.8	569.6	538.8	487.0	508.6	511.5	507.0	524.1	520.5	513.7	528.9	536.6	53%

^a The current Inventory includes updated vehicle population data based on the MOVES2014b Model.

^b Gasoline and diesel highway vehicle fuel consumption estimates used to develop CO₂ estimates in this Inventory are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table MF-21, MF-27 and VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). Table VM-1 data for 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2017 mileage data is estimated using the 1.4 percent increase in FHWA Traffic Volume Trends (FHWA 2017) from 2016 to 2017.

1 Data from Table VM-1 is used to estimate the share of fuel consumption between each on-road vehicle class. For mobile CH₄ and N₂O emissions estimates, gasoline and diesel highway vehicle mileage
2 estimates are based on data from FHWA Highway Statistics Table VM-1 (FHWA 1996 through 2017). These fuel consumption and mileage estimates are combined with estimates of fuel shares by vehicle type
3 from DOE's TEDB Annex Tables A.1 through A.6 (DOE 1993 through 2017). TEDB data for 2016 and 2017 has not been published yet, therefore 2015 data are as a proxy.
4 ^c Pipelines reflect CO₂ emissions from natural gas powered pipelines transporting natural gas.
5 Notes: Data from DOE (1993 through 2017) were used to disaggregate emissions from rail and buses. Emissions from HFCs have been included in these estimates. In 2015, EPA incorporated the
6 NONROAD2008 model into MOVES2014a. This year's Inventory uses the NONROAD component of MOVES2014b for years 1999 through 2017. In 2017, estimates of alternative fuel vehicle mileage for the last
7 ten years were revised to reflect updates made to EIA data on alternative fuel use and vehicle counts. These changes were incorporated into this year's Inventory and apply to the 2005 to 2017 time period.
8 In 2016, historical confidential vehicle sales data were re-evaluated to determine the engine technology assignments. First, several light-duty trucks were re-characterized as heavy-duty vehicles based upon
9 gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) and confidential sales data. Second, the emission standards each vehicle type was assumed to have met were re-examined using confidential sales data. Also, in previous
10 Inventories, non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs) were considered alternative fueled vehicles and therefore not included in the engine technology breakouts. For this Inventory, HEVs are classified as
11 gasoline vehicles across the entire time series.

References

- AAR (2008 through 2018) *Railroad Facts*. Policy and Economics Department, Association of American Railroads, Washington, D.C. Obtained from Clyde Crimmel at AAR.
- ANL (2017) *The Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation Model (GREET 2017)*. Argonne National Laboratory. October 2017. Available at <<https://greet.es.anl.gov>>.
- APTA (2007 through 2017) *Public Transportation Fact Book*. American Public Transportation Association, Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://www.apta.com/resources/statistics/Pages/transitstats.aspx>>.
- APTA (2006) *Commuter Rail National Totals*. American Public Transportation Association, Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://www.apta.com/research/stats/rail/crsum.cfm>>.
- BEA (2017) Table 1.1.6. Real Gross Domestic Product, Chained 2009 Dollars. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. March 2017. Available online at: <<http://www.bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?ReqID=9&step=1#reqid=9&step=3&isuri=1&904=1990&903=6&906=a&905=2013&910=x&911=0>>.
- Benson, D. (2002 through 2004) Unpublished data. Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute, North Dakota State University and American Short Line & Regional Railroad Association.
- Browning, L. (2018a). *Updated Methodology for Estimating Electricity Use from Highway Plug-In Electric Vehicles*. Technical Memo, October 2018.
- Browning, L. (2018b). *Updated Non-Highway CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors for U.S. GHG Inventory*. Technical Memo, November 2018.
- Browning, L. (2017) “Updated Methodology for Estimating CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Highway Vehicle Alternative Fuel Vehicles”. Technical Memo, October 2017.
- Browning, L. (2005) Personal communication with Lou Browning, Emission control technologies for diesel highway vehicles specialist, ICF.
- DHS (2008) Email Communication. Elissa Kay, Department of Homeland Security and Joe Aamidor, ICF International. January 11, 2008.
- DLA Energy (2018) Unpublished data from the Defense Fuels Automated Management System (DFAMS). Defense Energy Support Center, Defense Logistics Agency, U.S. Department of Defense. Washington, D.C.
- DOC (1991 through 2018) Unpublished Report of Bunker Fuel Oil Laden on Vessels Cleared for Foreign Countries. Form-563. Foreign Trade Division, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.
- DOE (1993 through 2017) *Transportation Energy Data Book Edition 36*. Office of Transportation Technologies, Center for Transportation Analysis, Energy Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory. ORNL-6978.
- DOT (1991 through 2017) *Airline Fuel Cost and Consumption*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Washington, D.C. DAI-10. Available online at: <<http://www.transtats.bts.gov/fuel.asp>>.
- HybridCars.com (2017). Monthly Plug-In Electric Vehicle Sales Dashboard, 2010-2017. Available online at <<https://www.hybridcars.com/december-2017-dashboard/>>.
- EEA (2009) *EMEP/EAA Air Pollutant Emission Inventory Guidebook*. European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, Denmark. Available online at: <<https://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/air/emep-eea-air-pollutant-emission-inventory-guidebook/emep>>
- EIA (2017a) *Monthly Energy Review, October 2017*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0035(2017/10).
- EIA (2018a) *Monthly Energy Review, October 2018*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0035(2018/10).
- EIA (2018b) *Natural Gas Annual 2017*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, D.C. DOE/EIA-0131(06).
- EIA (2018e) *Alternative Fuels Data Tables*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/fuelalternate.html>>.
- EIA (2018f) *Petroleum Supply Annual 2017*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, D.C. DOE/EIA-810.

- 1 EIA (1991 through 2017) *Fuel Oil and Kerosene Sales*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.
2 Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://www.eia.gov/petroleum/fueloilkerosene/>>.
- 3 EPA (2018b). *Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) 2014b*. Office of Transportation and Air Quality, U.S.
4 Environmental Protection Agency. Available online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/moves>>.
- 5 EPA (2018c) Annual Certification Test Results Report. Office of Transportation and Air Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection
6 Agency. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/compliance-and-fuel-economy-data/annual-certification-test-data-](https://www.epa.gov/compliance-and-fuel-economy-data/annual-certification-test-data-vehicles-and-engines)
7 [vehicles-and-engines](https://www.epa.gov/compliance-and-fuel-economy-data/annual-certification-test-data-vehicles-and-engines)>.
- 8 EPA (2017d) Confidential Engine Family Sales Data Submitted to EPA By Manufacturers. Office of Transportation and Air
9 Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- 10 EPA (2016g) “1970 - 2016 Average annual emissions, all criteria pollutants in MS Excel.” *National Emissions Inventory (NEI)*
11 *Air Pollutant Emissions Trends Data*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Available online at:
12 <<https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/air-pollutant-emissions-trends-data>>.
- 13 EPA (2000) *Mobile6 Vehicle Emission Modeling Software*. Office of Mobile Sources, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
14 Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 15 EPA (1999) Regulatory Announcement: EPA's Program for Cleaner Vehicles and Cleaner Gasoline. Office of Mobile Sources.
16 December 1999. EPA420-F-99-051. Available online at:
17 <<https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P1001Z9W.PDF?Dockey=P1001Z9W.PDF>>.
- 18 EPA (1998) *Emissions of Nitrous Oxide from Highway Mobile Sources: Comments on the Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse*
19 *Gas Emissions and Sinks, 1990–1996*. Office of Mobile Sources, Assessment and Modeling Division, U.S. Environmental
20 Protection Agency. August 1998. EPA420-R-98-009.
- 21 FAA (2018) Personal Communication between FAA and John Steller, Mausami Desai, and Vincent Camobreco for aviation
22 emissions estimates from the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT). January 2018.
- 23 FHWA (1996 through 2017) *Highway Statistics*. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation,
24 Washington, D.C. Report FHWA-PL-96-023-annual. Available online at:
25 <<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/ohpi/hss/hsspubs.htm>>.
- 26 FHWA (2017) *Traffic Volume Trends*. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.
27 Available online at: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/travel_monitoring/tvt.cfm>.
- 28 FHWA (2015) *Off-Highway and Public-Use Gasoline Consumption Estimation Models Used in the Federal Highway*
29 *Administration*, Publication Number FHWA-PL-17-012. Available online at:
30 <<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/pubs/pl17012.pdf>>
- 31 Gaffney, J. (2007) Email Communication. John Gaffney, American Public Transportation Association and Joe Aamidor, ICF
32 International. December 17, 2007.
- 33 IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
34 Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and
35 K. Tanabe (eds.)]. Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- 36 ICF (2004) *Update of Methane and Nitrous Oxide Emission Factors for On-Highway Vehicles*. Final Report to U.S.
37 Environmental Protection Agency. February 2004.
- 38 ICF (2017a) *Updated On-highway CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors for GHG Inventory*. Memorandum from ICF to Sarah Roberts
39 and Justine Geidosch, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. October 2017.
- 40 ICF (2017b) *Updated Non-Highway CH₄ and N₂O Emission Factors for U.S. GHG Inventory*. Memorandum from ICF to Sarah
41 Roberts and Justine Geidosch, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. October
42 2017.
- 43 Santoni, G., B. Lee, E. Wood, S. Herndon, R. Miake-Lye, S. Wofsy, J. McManus, D. Nelson, M. Zahniser (2011) Aircraft
44 emissions of methane and nitrous oxide during the alternative aviation fuel experiment. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2011 Aug 15;
45 45(16):7075-82.
- 46 Whorton, D. (2006 through 2014) Personal communication, Class II and III Rail energy consumption, American Short Line and
47 Regional Railroad Association.
- 48

3.3. Methodology for Estimating Emissions from Commercial Aircraft Jet Fuel Consumption

For this Public Review version of the Inventory, 2017 data for estimating CO₂ emissions from commercial aircraft jet fuel consumption used 2016 data as a proxy in the Energy chapter. This annex contains updated data for 2017 that, due to timing considerations, was unable to be incorporated into the overall results for Public Review, as shown in the Energy chapter. The updated annex is presented here as a means for review prior to being incorporated into the overall results for the Final version of the Inventory.

IPCC Tier 3B Method: Commercial aircraft jet fuel burn and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions estimates were developed by the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) using radar-informed data from the FAA Enhanced Traffic Management System (ETMS) for 2000 through 2017 as modeled with the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT). This bottom-up approach is built from modeling dynamic aircraft performance for each flight occurring within an individual calendar year. The analysis incorporates data on the aircraft type, date, flight identifier, departure time, arrival time, departure airport, arrival airport, ground delay at each airport, and real-world flight trajectories. To generate results for a given flight within AEDT, the radar-informed aircraft data is correlated with engine and aircraft performance data to calculate fuel burn and exhaust emissions. Information on exhaust emissions for in-production aircraft engines comes from the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Aircraft Engine Emissions Databank (EDB). This bottom-up approach is in accordance with the Tier 3B method from the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006).

International Bunkers: The IPCC guidelines define international aviation (International Bunkers) as emissions from flights that depart from one country and arrive in a different country. Bunker fuel emissions estimates for commercial aircraft were developed for this report for 2000 through 2017 using the same radar-informed data modeled with AEDT. Since this process builds estimates from flight-specific information, the emissions estimates for commercial aircraft can include emissions associated with the U.S. Territories (i.e., American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wake Island, and other U.S. Pacific Islands). However, to allow for the alignment of emissions estimates for commercial aircraft with other data that is provided without the U.S. Territories, this annex includes emissions estimates for commercial aircraft both with and without the U.S. Territories included.

Time Series and Analysis Update: The FAA incrementally improves the consistency, robustness, and fidelity of the CO₂ emissions modeling for commercial aircraft, which is the basis of the Tier3B inventories presented in this report. While the FAA does not anticipate significant changes to the AEDT model in the future, recommended improvements are limited by budget and time constraints, as well as data availability. For instance, previous reports included reported annual CO₂ emission estimates for 2000 through 2005 that were modeled using the FAA's System for assessing Aviation's Global Emissions (SAGE). That tool and its capabilities were significantly improved after it was incorporated and evolved into AEDT. For this report, the AEDT model was used to generate annual CO₂ emission estimates for 2000, 2005, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017 only. The reported annual CO₂ emissions values for 2001 through 2004 were estimated from the previously reported SAGE data. Likewise, CO₂ emissions values for 2006 through 2009 were estimated by interpolation to preserve trends from past reports.

Commercial aircraft radar data sets are not available for years prior to 2000. Instead, the FAA applied a Tier 3B methodology by developing Official Airline Guide (OAG) schedule-informed estimates modeled with AEDT and great circle trajectories for 1990, 2000 and 2010. The ratios between the OAG schedule-informed and the radar-informed inventories for the years 2000 and 2010 were applied to the 1990 OAG scheduled-informed inventory to generate the best possible CO₂ inventory estimate for commercial aircraft in 1990. The resultant 1990 CO₂ inventory served as the reference for generating the additional 1991 through 1999 emissions estimates, which were established using previously available trends.

Notes on the 1990 CO₂ Emissions Inventory for Commercial Aircraft: There are uncertainties associated with the modeled 1990 data that do not exist for the modeled 2000 to 2017 data. Radar-based data is not available for 1990. The OAG schedule information generally includes fewer carriers than radar information, and this will result in a different fleet mix, and in turn, different CO₂ emissions than would be quantified using a radar-based data set. For this reason, the FAA adjusted the OAG-informed schedule for 1990 with a ratio based on radar-informed information. In addition, radar trajectories are also generally longer than great circle trajectories. While the 1990 fuel burn data was adjusted to address these differences, it inherently adds greater uncertainty to the revised 1990 commercial aircraft CO₂ emissions as compared to data from 2000 forward. Also, the revised 1990 CO₂ emissions inventory now reflects only commercial aircraft jet fuel consumption, while previous reports may have aggregated jet fuel sales data from non-commercial aircraft into this category. Thus, it would be inappropriate to compare 1990 to future years for other than qualitative purposes.

1 The 1990 commercial aircraft CO₂ emissions inventory is approximately 14.1 percent lower than the 2017 CO₂
2 emissions inventory. It is important to note that the distance flown increased by more than 54 percent over this 27-year
3 period and that fuel burn and aviation activity trends over the past two decades indicate significant improvements in
4 commercial aviation's ability to provide increased service levels while using less fuel.⁵⁶

5 **Methane Emissions:** Contributions of methane (CH₄) emissions from commercial aircraft are reported as zero.
6 Years of scientific measurement campaigns conducted at the exhaust exit plane of commercial aircraft gas turbine engines
7 have repeatedly indicated that CH₄ emissions are consumed over the full mission flight envelope (Santoni et al. 2011). As
8 a result, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published that "...methane is no longer considered to be an emission
9 from aircraft gas turbine engines burning Jet A at higher power settings and is, in fact, consumed in net at these higher
10 powers."⁵⁷ In accordance with the following statements in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (IPCC 2006), the FAA does not
11 calculate CH₄ emissions for either the domestic or international bunker commercial aircraft jet fuel emissions inventories.
12 "Methane (CH₄) may be emitted by gas turbines during idle and by older technology engines, but recent data suggest that
13 little or no CH₄ is emitted by modern engines." "Current scientific understanding does not allow other gases (e.g., N₂O
14 and CH₄) to be included in calculation of cruise emissions" (IPCC 1999).


15 **Results:** For each inventory year the graph and table below include four jet fuel burn values. These values are
16 comprised of domestic and international fuel burn totals for the U.S. 50 States and the U.S. 50 States + Territories. Data are
17 presented for domestic defined as jet fuel burn from any commercial aircraft flight departing and landing in the U.S. 50
18 States and for the U.S. 50 States + Territories. The data presented as international is respective of the two different domestic
19 definitions, and represents flights departing from the specified domestic area and landing anywhere in the world outside of
20 that area.

21 Note that the graph and table present less fuel burn for the international U.S. 50 States + Territories than for the
22 international U.S. 50 States. This is because the flights between the 50 states and U.S. Territories are "international" when
23 only the 50 states are defined as domestic, but they are "domestic" for the U.S. 50 States + Territories definition.

⁵⁶ Additional information on the AEDT modeling process is available at:
<http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/research/models/>.

⁵⁷ Recommended Best Practice for Quantifying Speciated Organic Gas Emissions from Aircraft Equipped with Turbofan, Turbojet
and Turboprop Engines, EPA-420-R-09-901, May 27, 2009. See <<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/aviation.htm>>.

Figure A-5: Commercial Aviation Fuel Burn for the United States and Territories



Note: Hollow markers are estimates from data generated by prior tools and methods. 1990 is estimated using non-radar methods.

Table A-124: Commercial Aviation Fuel Burn for the United States and Territories

Year	Region	Distance Flown (nmi)	Fuel Burn (M Gallon)	Fuel Burn (TBtu)	Fuel Burn (Kg)	CO ₂ (MMT)
1990	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	4,057,195,988	11,568	1,562	34,820,800,463	109.9
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	599,486,893	3,155	426	9,497,397,919	30.0
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	3,984,482,217	11,287	1,524	33,972,832,399	107.2
	International U.S. 50 States	617,671,849	3,228	436	9,714,974,766	30.7
1995 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	NA	12,136	1,638	36,528,990,675	115.2
1996 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	NA	12,492	1,686	37,600,624,534	118.6
1997 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	NA	12,937	1,747	38,940,896,854	122.9
1998 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	NA	12,601	1,701	37,930,582,643	119.7
1999 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	NA	13,726	1,853	41,314,843,250	130.3
2000	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,994,679,944	14,672	1,981	44,161,841,348	139.3
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,309,565,963	6,040	815	18,181,535,058	57.4
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,891,481,028	14,349	1,937	43,191,000,202	136.3
	International U.S. 50 States	1,331,784,289	6,117	826	18,412,169,613	58.1
2001 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,360,977,447	13,121	1,771	39,493,457,147	124.6
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,171,130,679	5,402	729	16,259,550,186	51.3
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,268,687,772	12,832	1,732	38,625,244,409	121.9
	International U.S. 50 States	1,191,000,288	5,470	739	16,465,804,174	51.9
2002 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,219,345,344	12,774	1,725	38,450,076,259	121.3
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,140,190,481	5,259	710	15,829,987,794	49.9
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,129,493,877	12,493	1,687	37,604,800,905	118.6
	International U.S. 50 States	1,159,535,153	5,326	719	16,030,792,741	50.6

2003 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,288,138,079	12,942	1,747	38,956,861,262	122.9
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,155,218,577	5,328	719	16,038,632,384	50.6
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,197,102,340	12,658	1,709	38,100,444,893	120.2
	International U.S. 50 States	1,174,818,219	5,396	728	16,242,084,008	51.2
2004 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,371,498,689	13,146	1,775	39,570,965,441	124.8
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,173,429,093	5,412	731	16,291,460,535	51.4
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,279,027,890	12,857	1,736	38,701,048,784	122.1
	International U.S. 50 States	1,193,337,698	5,481	740	16,498,119,309	52.1
2005	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	6,476,007,697	13,976	1,887	42,067,562,737	132.7
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,373,543,928	5,858	791	17,633,508,081	55.6
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	6,370,544,998	13,654	1,843	41,098,359,387	129.7
	International U.S. 50 States	1,397,051,323	5,936	801	17,868,972,965	56.4
2006 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,894,323,482	14,426	1,948	43,422,531,461	137.0
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,287,642,623	5,939	802	17,877,159,421	56.4
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,792,852,211	14,109	1,905	42,467,943,091	134.0
	International U.S. 50 States	1,309,488,994	6,015	812	18,103,932,940	57.1
2007 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	6,009,247,818	14,707	1,986	44,269,160,525	139.7
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,312,748,383	6,055	817	18,225,718,619	57.5
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,905,798,114	14,384	1,942	43,295,960,105	136.6
	International U.S. 50 States	1,335,020,703	6,132	828	18,456,913,646	58.2
2008 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,475,092,456	13,400	1,809	40,334,124,033	127.3
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,196,059,638	5,517	745	16,605,654,741	52.4
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,380,838,282	13,105	1,769	39,447,430,318	124.5
	International U.S. 50 States	1,216,352,196	5,587	754	16,816,299,099	53.1
2009 ^a	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,143,268,671	12,588	1,699	37,889,631,668	119.5
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,123,571,175	5,182	700	15,599,251,424	49.2
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,054,726,871	12,311	1,662	37,056,676,966	116.9
	International U.S. 50 States	1,142,633,881	5,248	709	15,797,129,457	49.8
2010	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,652,264,576	11,931	1,611	35,912,723,830	113.3
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,474,839,733	6,044	816	18,192,953,916	57.4
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,554,043,585	11,667	1,575	35,116,863,245	110.8
	International U.S. 50 States	1,497,606,695	6,113	825	18,398,996,825	58.0
2011	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,767,378,664	12,067	1,629	36,321,170,730	114.6
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,576,982,962	6,496	877	19,551,631,939	61.7
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,673,689,481	11,823	1,596	35,588,754,827	112.3
	International U.S. 50 States	1,596,797,398	6,554	885	19,727,043,614	62.2
2012	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,735,605,432	11,932	1,611	35,915,745,616	113.3
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,619,012,587	6,464	873	19,457,378,739	61.4
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,636,910,529	11,672	1,576	35,132,961,140	110.8
	International U.S. 50 States	1,637,917,110	6,507	879	19,587,140,347	61.8
2013	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,808,034,123	12,031	1,624	36,212,974,471	114.3
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,641,151,400	6,611	892	19,898,871,458	62.8
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,708,807,315	11,780	1,590	35,458,690,595	111.9
	International U.S. 50 States	1,661,167,498	6,657	899	20,036,865,038	63.2
2014	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,825,999,388	12,131	1,638	36,514,970,659	115.2
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,724,559,209	6,980	942	21,008,818,741	66.3
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,725,819,482	11,882	1,604	35,764,791,774	112.8
	International U.S. 50 States	1,745,315,059	7,027	949	21,152,418,387	66.7
2015	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,900,440,363	12,534	1,692	37,727,860,796	119.0
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,757,724,661	7,227	976	21,752,301,359	68.6
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,801,594,806	12,291	1,659	36,997,658,406	116.7
	International U.S. 50 States	1,793,787,700	7,310	987	22,002,733,062	69.4
2016	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	5,929,429,373	12,674	1,711	38,148,578,811	120.4
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,817,739,570	7,453	1006	22,434,619,940	70.8
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	5,827,141,640	12,422	1,677	37,391,339,601	118.0
	International U.S. 50 States	1,839,651,091	7,504	1013	22,588,366,704	71.3
2017	Domestic U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	6,264,650,997	13,475	1,819	40,560,206,261	128.0
	International U.S. 50 States and U.S. Territories	1,944,104,275	7,841	1,059	23,602,935,694	74.5
	Domestic U.S. 50 States	6,214,083,068	13,358	1,803	40,207,759,885	126.9
	International U.S. 50 States	1,912,096,739	7,755	1,047	23,343,627,689	73.6

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Estimates for these years were derived from previously reported tools and methods

References

- IPCC (2006) 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.)]. Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- IPCC (1999) Aviation and the Global Atmosphere. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [J.E. Penner, et al. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Santoni, G., B. Lee, E. Wood, S. Herndon, R. Miake-Lye, S. Wofsy, J. McManus, D. Nelson, M. Zahniser (2011) Aircraft emissions of methane and nitrous oxide during the alternative aviation fuel experiment. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2011 Aug 15; 45(16):7075-82.

3.4. Methodology for Estimating CH₄ Emissions from Coal Mining

The methodology for estimating CH₄ emissions from coal mining consists of two steps:

- **Estimate emissions from underground mines.** These emissions have two sources: ventilation systems and degasification systems. They are estimated using mine-specific data, then summed to determine total CH₄ liberated. The CH₄ recovered and used is then subtracted from this total, resulting in an estimate of net emissions to the atmosphere.
- **Estimate emissions from surface mines and post-mining activities.** This step does not use mine-specific data; rather, it consists of multiplying coal-basin-specific coal production by coal-basin-specific gas content and an emission factor.

Step 1: Estimate CH₄ Liberated and CH₄ Emitted from Underground Mines

Underground mines generate CH₄ from ventilation systems and from degasification systems. Some mines recover and use the generated CH₄, thereby reducing emissions to the atmosphere. Total CH₄ emitted from underground mines equals the CH₄ liberated from ventilation systems, plus the CH₄ liberated from degasification systems, minus CH₄ recovered and used.

Step 1.1: Estimate CH₄ Liberated from Ventilation Systems

All coal mines with detectable CH₄ emissions use ventilation systems to ensure that CH₄ levels remain within safe concentrations. Many coal mines do not have detectable levels of CH₄; others emit several million cubic feet per day (MMCFD) from their ventilation systems. On a quarterly basis, the U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) measures CH₄ emissions levels at underground mines. MSHA maintains a database of measurement data from all underground mines with detectable levels of CH₄ in their ventilation air (MSHA 2018).⁵⁸ Based on the four quarterly measurements, MSHA estimates average daily CH₄ liberated at each of these underground mines.

For 1990 through 1999, average daily CH₄ emissions from MSHA were multiplied by the number of days in the year (i.e., coal mine assumed in operation for all four quarters) to determine the annual emissions for each mine. For 2000 through 2017, the average daily CH₄ emissions were multiplied by the number of days corresponding to the number of quarters the mine vent was operating. For example, if the mine vent was operational in one out of the four quarters, the average daily CH₄ emissions were multiplied by 92 days. Total ventilation emissions for a particular year were estimated by summing emissions from individual mines.

Since 2011, the nation's "gassiest" underground coal mines—those that liberate more than 36,500,000 actual cubic feet of CH₄ per year (about 17,525 MT CO₂ Eq.)—have been required to report to EPA's GHGRP (EPA 2018).⁵⁹ Mines that report to EPA's GHGRP must report quarterly measurements of CH₄ emissions from ventilation systems to EPA; they have the option of recording their own measurements, or using the measurements taken by MSHA as part of that agency's quarterly safety inspections of all mines in the United States with detectable CH₄ concentrations.⁶⁰

Since 2013, ventilation emission estimates have been calculated based on both EPA's GHGRP⁶¹ data submitted by underground mines, and on quarterly measurement data obtained directly from MSHA for the remaining mines. The quarterly measurements are used to determine the average daily emission rate for the reporting year quarter. The CH₄ liberated from ventilation systems was estimated by summing the emissions from the EPA's GHGRP mines and emissions based on MSHA quarterly measurements for the remaining mines not reporting to EPA's GHGRP.

⁵⁸ MSHA records coal mine methane readings with concentrations of greater than 50 ppm (parts per million) methane. Readings below this threshold are considered non-detectable.

⁵⁹ Underground coal mines report to EPA under subpart FF of EPA's GHGRP (40 CFR part 98). In 2017, 78 underground coal mines reported to the program.

⁶⁰ MSHA records coal mine CH₄ readings with concentrations of greater than 50 ppm (parts per million) CH₄. Readings below this threshold are considered non-detectable.

⁶¹ In implementing improvements and integrating data from EPA's GHGRP, the EPA followed the latest guidance from the IPCC on the use of facility-level data in national inventories (IPCC 2011).

Table A-125: Mine-Specific Data Used to Estimate Ventilation Emissions

Year	Individual Mine Data Used
1990	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
1991	1990 Emissions Factors Used Instead of Mine-Specific Data
1992	1990 Emissions Factors Used Instead of Mine-Specific Data
1993	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
1994	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
1995	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.5 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 94.1% of Total) ^a
1996	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.5 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 94.1% of Total) ^a
1997	All Mines with Detectable Emissions (Assumed to Account for 100% of Total)
1998	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
1999	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2000	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2001	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2002	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2003	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2004	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2005	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2006	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 97.8% of Total) ^a
2007	All Mines with Detectable Emissions (Assumed to Account for 100% of Total)
2008	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 98.96% of Total) ^b
2009	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 98.96% of Total) ^b
2010	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 98.96% of Total) ^b
2011	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 98.96% of Total) ^b
2012	All Mines Emitting at Least 0.1 MMCFD (Assumed to Account for 98.96% of Total) ^b
2013	All Mines with Detectable Emissions and GHGRP reported data (Assumed to account for 100% of Total)
2014	All Mines with Detectable Emissions and GHGRP reported data (Assumed to account for 100% of Total)
2015	All Mines with Detectable Emissions and GHGRP reported data (Assumed to account for 100% of Total)
2016	All Mines with Detectable Emissions and GHGRP reported data (Assumed to account for 100% of Total)
2017	All Mines with Detectable Emissions and GHGRP reported data (Assumed to account for 100% of Total)

^a Factor derived from a complete set of individual mine data collected for 1997.

^b Factor derived from a complete set of individual mine data collected for 2007.

Step 1.2: Estimate CH₄ Liberated from Degasification Systems

Coal mines use several types of degasification systems to remove CH₄, including pre-mining vertical and horizontal wells (to recover CH₄ before mining) and post-mining vertical wells and horizontal boreholes (to recover CH₄ during mining of the coal seam). Post-mining gob wells and cross-measure boreholes recover CH₄ from the overburden (i.e., gob area) after mining of the seam (primarily in longwall mines).

Nineteen mines employed degasification systems in 2017, and the CH₄ liberated through these systems was reported to the EPA's GHGRP (EPA 2018). Thirteen of these mines reported CH₄ recovery and use projects, and the other six reported emitting CH₄ from degasification systems to the atmosphere. Several of the mines venting CH₄ from degasification systems use a small portion of the gas to fuel gob well blowers or compressors in remote locations where electricity is not available. However, this CH₄ use is not considered to be a formal recovery and use project.

Degasification information reported to EPA's GHGRP by underground coal mines is the primary source of data used to develop estimates of CH₄ liberated from degasification systems. Data reported to EPA's GHGRP were used exclusively to estimate CH₄ liberated from degasification systems at 14 of the 19 mines that used degasification systems in 2017.

Degasification volumes for the life of mined through pre-mining wells are attributed to the mine as emissions in the year in which the well is mined through.⁶² EPA's GHGRP does not require gas production from virgin coal seams (coalbed methane) to be reported by coal mines under subpart FF. Most pre-mining wells drilled from the surface are considered coalbed methane wells and are reported under another subpart of the program (subpart W, "Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems"). As a result, for the five mines with degasification systems that include pre-mining wells that were mined

⁶² A well is "mined through" when coal mining development or the working face intersects the borehole or well.

through in 2017, EPA's GHGRP information was supplemented with historical data from state gas well production databases (DMME 2018; GSA 2018; WVGES 2018), as well as with mine-specific information regarding the dates on which pre-mining wells were mined through (JWR 2010; El Paso 2009). For pre-mining wells, the cumulative CH₄ production from the well is totaled using gas sales data, and is considered liberated from the mine's degasification system the year in which the well is mined through.

EPA's GHGRP reports with CH₄ liberated from degasification systems are reviewed for errors in reporting. For some mines, GHGRP data are corrected for the Inventory based on expert judgment. Common errors include reporting CH₄ liberated as CH₄ destroyed and vice versa. Other errors include reporting CH₄ destroyed without reporting any CH₄ liberated by degasification systems. In the rare cases where GHGRP data are inaccurate and gas sales data unavailable, estimates of CH₄ liberated are based on historical CH₄ liberation rates. However, for 2017 GHGRP data corrections or revisions were not needed.

Step 1.3: Estimate CH₄ Recovered from Ventilation and Degasification Systems, and Utilized or Destroyed (Emissions Avoided)

There were 13 active coal mines with operational CH₄ recovery and use projects in 2017. Twelve of these projects involved degasification systems and one involved ventilation air methane (VAM). Eleven of these mines sold the recovered CH₄ to a pipeline, including one mine that used CH₄ to fuel a thermal coal dryer. Two mines used CH₄ to heat mine ventilation air.

EPA's GHGRP data was exclusively used to estimate the CH₄ recovered and used from the 12 mines that deployed degasification systems in 2017. Based on weekly measurements of gas flow and CH₄ concentrations, the GHGRP summary data for degasification destruction at each mine were added together to estimate the CH₄ recovered and used from degasification systems. For the single mine that employed VAM for CH₄ recovery and use, the estimates of CH₄ recovered and used were obtained from the mine's offset verification statement (OVS) submitted to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) (McElroy OVS 2018).

Of the 13 mines with CH₄ recovery in 2017, five intersected pre-mining wells in 2017. EPA's GHGRP and supplemental data were used to estimate CH₄ recovered and used at these five mines. Supplemental information was used for these five mines because estimating CH₄ recovery and use from pre-mining wells requires additional data (not reported under subpart FF of EPA's GHGRP; see discussion in step 1.2 above) to account for the emissions avoided. The supplemental data came from state gas production databases (GSA 2018; WVGES 2018), as well as mine-specific information on the timing of mined-through pre-mining wells (JWR 2010; El Paso 2009). For pre-mining wells, the cumulative CH₄ production from the wells was totaled using gas sales data, and was considered to be CH₄ recovered and used from the mine's degasification system the year in which the well is mined through.

EPA's GHGRP reports with CH₄ recovered and used from degasification systems are reviewed for errors in reporting. For some mines, GHGRP data are corrected for the Inventory based on expert judgment (see further discussion in Step 1.2). However, for the 2017 GHGRP data, corrections were not needed.

Step 2: Estimate CH₄ Emitted from Surface Mines and Post-Mining Activities

Mine-specific data were not available for estimating CH₄ emissions from surface coal mines or for post-mining activities. For surface mines, basin-specific coal production obtained from the Energy Information Administration's *Annual Coal Report* was multiplied by basin-specific gas contents and a 150 percent emission factor (to account for CH₄ from over- and under-burden) to estimate CH₄ emissions (see King 1994; Saghafi 2013). For post-mining activities, basin-specific coal production was multiplied by basin-specific gas contents and a mid-range 32.5 percent emission factor accounting for CH₄ desorption during coal transportation and storage (Creedy 1993). Basin-specific *in situ* gas content data were compiled from AAPG (1984) and USBM (1986). Beginning in 2006, revised data on *in situ* CH₄ content and emissions factors have been used (EPA 1996, 2005).

Step 2.1: Define the Geographic Resolution of the Analysis and Collect Coal Production Data

The first step in estimating CH₄ emissions from surface mining and post-mining activities was to define the geographic resolution of the analysis and to collect coal production data at that level of resolution. The analysis was conducted by coal basin as defined in Table A-126, which presents coal basin definitions by basin and by state.

The Energy Information Administration's *Annual Coal Report* (EIA 2018) includes state- and county-specific underground and surface coal production by year. To calculate production by basin, the state level data were grouped into coal basins using the basin definitions listed in Table A-126. For two states—West Virginia and Kentucky—county-level

production data were used for the basin assignments because coal production occurred in geologically distinct coal basins within these states. Table A-127 presents the coal production data aggregated by basin.

Step 2.2: Estimate Emission Factors for Each Emissions Type

Emission factors for surface-mined coal were developed from the *in situ* CH₄ content of the surface coal in each basin. Based on analyses conducted in Canada and Australia on coals similar to those present in the United States (King 1994; Saghafi 2013), the surface mining emission factor used was conservatively estimated to be 150 percent of the *in situ* CH₄ content of the basin. Furthermore, the post-mining emission factors used were estimated to be 25 to 40 percent of the average *in situ* CH₄ content in the basin. For this analysis, the post-mining emission factor was determined to be 32.5 percent of the *in situ* CH₄ content in the basin. Table A-128 presents the average *in situ* content for each basin, along with the resulting emission factor estimates.

Step 2.3: Estimate CH₄ Emitted

The total amount of CH₄ emitted from surface mines and post-mining activities was calculated by multiplying the coal production in each basin by the appropriate emission factors.

Table A-126 lists each of the major coal mine basins in the United States and the states in which they are located. As shown in Figure A-6, several coal basins span several states. Table A-127 shows annual underground, surface, and total coal production (in short tons) for each coal basin. Table A-128 shows the surface, post-surface, and post-underground emission factors used for estimating CH₄ emissions for each of the categories. Table A-129 presents annual estimates of CH₄ emissions for ventilation and degasification systems, and CH₄ used and emitted by underground coal mines. Table A-130 presents annual estimates of total CH₄ emissions from underground, post-underground, surface, and post-surface activities. Table A-131 provides the total net CH₄ emissions by state.

Table A-126: Coal Basin Definitions by Basin and by State

Basin	States
Northern Appalachian Basin	Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia North
Central Appalachian Basin	Kentucky East, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia South
Warrior Basin	Alabama, Mississippi
Illinois Basin	Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky West
South West and Rockies Basin	Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah
North Great Plains Basin	Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming
West Interior Basin	Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas
Northwest Basin	Alaska, Washington
State	Basin
Alabama	Warrior Basin
Alaska	Northwest Basin
Arizona	South West and Rockies Basin
Arkansas	West Interior Basin
California	South West and Rockies Basin
Colorado	South West and Rockies Basin
Illinois	Illinois Basin
Indiana	Illinois Basin
Iowa	West Interior Basin
Kansas	West Interior Basin
Kentucky (east)	Central Appalachian Basin
Kentucky (west)	Illinois Basin
Louisiana	West Interior Basin
Maryland	Northern Appalachian Basin
Mississippi	Warrior Basin
Missouri	West Interior Basin
Montana	North Great Plains Basin
New Mexico	South West and Rockies Basin
North Dakota	North Great Plains Basin
Ohio	Northern Appalachian Basin
Oklahoma	West Interior Basin
Pennsylvania	Northern Appalachian Basin
Tennessee	Central Appalachian Basin
Texas	West Interior Basin
Utah	South West and Rockies Basin
Virginia	Central Appalachian Basin
Washington	Northwest Basin

West Virginia South
West Virginia North
Wyoming

Central Appalachian Basin
Northern Appalachian Basin
North Great Plains Basin

Figure A-6: Locations of U.S. Coal Basins




Table A-127: Annual Coal Production (Thousand Short Tons)

Basin	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Underground Coal Production	423,556	368,611	341,216	354,705	306,820	252,106	273,130
N. Appalachia Cent.	103,865	111,151	104,198	116,700	103,578	94,685	97,742
Appalachia	198,412	123,083	70,440	64,219	53,230	39,800	46,052
Warrior	17,531	13,295	13,391	12,516	9,897	7,434	10,491
Illinois	69,167	59,180	98,331	105,211	96,361	76,577	80,855
S. West/Rockies	32,754	60,865	41,232	44,302	33,762	26,413	30,047
N. Great Plains	1,722	572	13,126	11,272	9,510	6,776	7,600
West Interior	105	465	498	485	482	421	343
Northwest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surface Coal Production	602,753	762,191	640,740	643,721	588,736	475,410	500,783
N. Appalachia Cent.	60,761	28,873	19,339	17,300	13,201	8,739	9,396
Appalachia	94,343	112,222	57,173	52,399	37,530	26,759	31,796
Warrior	11,413	11,599	8,695	7,584	6,437	5,079	4,974
Illinois	72,000	33,702	33,798	31,969	27,360	21,707	22,427
S. West/Rockies	43,863	42,756	28,968	27,654	26,020	18,951	19,390
N. Great Plains	249,356	474,056	444,740	458,112	436,928	350,899	372,875
West Interior	64,310	52,263	46,477	47,201	40,083	42,344	38,966
Northwest	6,707	6,720	1,550	1,502	1,177	932	959
Total Coal Production	1,026,309	1,130,802	981,956	998,426	895,556	727,516	773,913
N. Appalachia Cent.	164,626	140,024	123,537	134,000	116,799	103,424	107,138
Appalachia	292,755	235,305	127,613	116,618	90,760	66,559	77,848
Warrior	28,944	24,894	22,086	20,100	16,334	12,513	15,465
Illinois	141,167	92,882	132,129	137,180	123,721	98,284	103,282
S. West/Rockies	76,617	103,621	70,200	71,956	59,782	45,364	49,437
N. Great Plains	251,078	474,628	457,866	469,384	446,438	357,675	380,475
West Interior	64,415	52,728	46,975	47,686	40,565	42,765	39,309
Northwest	6,707	6,720	1,550	1,502	1,177	932	959

Table A-128: Coal Underground, Surface, and Post-Mining CH₄ Emission Factors (ft³ per Short Ton)

Basin	Surface Average In Situ Content	Underground Average In Situ Content	Surface Mine Factors	Post-Mining Surface Factors	Post-Mining Underground
Northern Appalachia	59.5	138.4	89.3	19.3	45.0
Central Appalachia (WV)	24.9	136.8	37.4	8.1	44.5
Central Appalachia (VA)	24.9	399.1	37.4	8.1	129.7
Central Appalachia (E KY)	24.9	61.4	37.4	8.1	20.0
Warrior	30.7	266.7	46.1	10.0	86.7
Illinois	34.3	64.3	51.5	11.1	20.9
Rockies (Piceance Basin)	33.1	196.4	49.7	10.8	63.8
Rockies (Uinta Basin)	16.0	99.4	24.0	5.2	32.3
Rockies (San Juan Basin)	7.3	104.8	11.0	2.4	34.1
Rockies (Green River Basin)	33.1	247.2	49.7	10.8	80.3
Rockies (Raton Basin)	33.1	127.9	49.7	10.8	41.6
N. Great Plains (WY, MT)	20.0	15.8	30.0	6.5	5.1
N. Great Plains (ND)	5.6	15.8	8.4	1.8	5.1
West Interior (Forest City, Cherokee Basins)	34.3	64.3	51.5	11.1	20.9
West Interior (Arkoma Basin)	74.5	331.2	111.8	24.2	107.6
West Interior (Gulf Coast Basin)	11.0	127.9	16.5	3.6	41.6
Northwest (AK)	16.0	160.0	24.0	5.2	52.0
Northwest (WA)	16.0	47.3	24.0	5.2	15.4

Sources: 1986 USBM Circular 9067, *Results of the Direct Method Determination of the Gas Contents of U.S. Coal Basins*; U.S. DOE Report DOE/METC/83-76, *Methane Recovery from Coalbeds: A Potential Energy Source*; 1986–1988 Gas Research Institute Topical Report, *A Geologic Assessment of Natural Gas from Coal Seams*; 2005 U.S. EPA Draft Report, *Surface Mines Emissions Assessment*.

Table A-129: Underground Coal Mining CH₄ Emissions (Billion Cubic Feet)

Activity	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ventilation Output	112	75	89	89	84	76	78
Adjustment Factor for Mine Data	98%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Adjusted Ventilation Output	114	77	89	89	84	76	78
Degasification System Liberated	54	48	45	42	43	42	48
Total Underground Liberated	168	124	134	131	127	118	126
Recovered & Used	(14)	(37)	(38)	(35)	(34)	(34)	(26)
Total	154	87	96	96	93	85	101

Table A-130: Total Coal Mining CH₄ Emissions (Billion Cubic Feet)

Activity	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Underground Mining	154	87	96	96	93	85	10
Surface Mining	22	25	20	20	18	14	15
Post-Mining (Underground)	19	16	14	14	12	10	11
Post-Mining (Surface)	5	5	4	4	4	3	3
Total	200	133	134	134	127	112	130

Table A-131: Total Coal Mining CH₄ Emissions by State (Million Cubic Feet)

State	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Alabama	32,097	15,789	17,486	16,301	12,675	10,752	12,884
Alaska	50	42	45	44	34	27	28
Arizona	151	161	101	107	91	72	83
Arkansas	5	+	214	176	559	247	770
California	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	10,187	13,441	4,838	4,038	3,248	2,272	1,940
Illinois	10,180	6,488	8,920	9,217	10,547	11,034	8,513
Indiana	2,232	3,303	6,427	7,159	6,891	6,713	6,036
Iowa	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	45	11	1	4	12	2	0
Kentucky	10,018	6,898	8,098	8,219	6,378	4,880	4,636
Louisiana	64	84	56	52	69	56	42
Maryland	474	361	166	169	171	131	152
Mississippi	0	199	200	209	176	161	146
Missouri	166	37	26	23	9	15	15
Montana	1,373	1,468	1,269	1,379	1,353	1,004	1,102
New Mexico	363	2,926	2,845	2,219	2,648	1,954	1,728
North Dakota	299	306	282	298	294	287	294
Ohio	4,406	3,120	3,182	3,267	2,718	1,998	1,473
Oklahoma	226	825	282	112	735	867	2,407
Pennsylvania	21,864	18,605	20,953	19,803	19,554	17,932	20,208
Tennessee	276	115	31	22	40	27	14
Texas	1,119	922	854	876	721	783	730
Utah	3,587	4,787	2,733	1,605	1,737	788	678
Virginia	46,041	8,649	8,141	6,980	6,396	6,692	19,470
Washington	146	154	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	48,335	29,745	32,998	37,498	36,460	32,309	35,089
Wyoming	6,671	14,745	14,025	14,339	13,624	10,812	11,497
Total	200,399	133,182	134,173	134,118	127,139	111,816	129,936

+ Does not exceed 0.5 million cubic feet.

Note: The emission estimates provided above are inclusive of emissions from underground mines, surface mines and post-mining activities. The following states have neither underground nor surface mining and thus report no emissions as a result of coal mining: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

References

- AAPG (1984) Coalbed Methane Resources of the United States. AAPG Studies in Geology Series #17.
- Creedy, D.P. (1993) Chemosphere. Vol. 26, pp. 419-440.

- 1 DMME (2018) *DGO Data Information System*. Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy of Virginia. Available online
2 at <<https://www.dmme.virginia.gov/dgoenquiry/frmmain.aspx>>.
- 3 EIA (2018) Annual Coal Report 2017. Table 1. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.
- 4 El Paso (2009) Shoal Creek Mine Plan, El Paso Exploration & Production.
- 5 EPA (2018) Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) 2017 Envirofacts. Subpart FF: Underground Coal Mines.
6 Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting/ghgdata/reported/coalmines.html>>.
- 7 EPA (2005) Surface Mines Emissions Assessment. Draft. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- 8 EPA (1996) Evaluation and Analysis of Gas Content and Coal Properties of Major Coal Bearing Regions of the United
9 States. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA/600/R-96-065.
- 10 Geological Survey of Alabama State Oil and Gas Board (GSA) (2018) Well Records Database. Available online at
11 <<http://www.gsa.state.al.us/ogb/database.aspx>>.
- 12 IPCC (2011) Use of Models and Facility-Level Data in Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Report of IPCC Expert Meeting on
13 Use of Models and Measurements in Greenhouse Gas Inventories 9-11 August 2010, Sydney, Australia. Eds:
14 Eggleston H.S., Srivastava N., Tanabe K., Baasansuren J., Fukuda M. IGES.
- 15 JWR (2010) No. 4 & 7 Mines General Area Maps. Walter Energy: Jim Walter Resources.
- 16 King, B. (1994) Management of Methane Emissions from Coal Mines: Environmental, Engineering, Economic and
17 Institutional Implication of Options, Neil and Gunter Ltd., Halifax, March 1994.
- 18 McElroy OVS (2018) Marshall County VAM Abatement Project Offset Verification Statement submitted to California Air
19 Resources Board, August 2018.
- 20 MSHA (2018) Data Transparency at MSHA. Mine Safety and Health Administration. Available online at
21 <<http://www.msha.gov/>>.
- 22 Mutmanský, Jan M., and Yanbei Wang (2000) Analysis of Potential Errors in Determination of Coal Mine Annual
23 Methane Emissions. Department of Energy and Geo-Environmental Engineering, Pennsylvania State University.
24 University Park, PA.
- 25 Saghafi, Abouna (2013) Estimation of fugitive emissions from open cut coal mining and measurable gas content, 13th
26 Coal Operators' Conference, University of Wollongong, The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy & Mine
27 Managers Association of Australia, 2013, 306-313.
- 28 USBM (1986) Results of the Direct Method Determination of the Gas Contents of U.S. Coal Basins. Circular 9067, U.S.
29 Bureau of Mines.
- 30 West Virginia Geological & Economic Survey (WVGES) (2018) Oil & Gas Production Data. Available online at
31 <<http://www.wvgs.wvnet.edu/www/datastat/datastat.htm>>.

3.5. Methodology for Estimating CH₄ and CO₂ Emissions from Petroleum Systems

As described in the main body text on Petroleum Systems, the Inventory methodology involves the calculation of emissions for 65 activities that emit CH₄ and 35 activities that emit non-combustion CO₂ from petroleum systems sources, and then the summation of emissions for each petroleum systems segment. The approach for calculating emissions for petroleum systems generally involves the application of emission factors to activity data.

For details on the emission factors, activity data, data sources and methodologies, please see Excel file annexes for the current (i.e., 1990 to 2017) Inventory, available at <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems>. The text discussion below will be updated for the final 1990 to 2017 Inventory.

Emission Factors – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

Table 3.5-2 and Table 3.5-7 show CH₄ and CO₂ emissions, respectively, for all sources in Petroleum Systems, for all time series years. Table 3.5-3 and Table 3.5-8 show the CH₄ and CO₂ effective emission factors, respectively, for all sources in Petroleum Systems, for all time series years. These emission factors are calculated by dividing net emissions by activity. Therefore, in a given year, these emission factors reflect the estimated contribution from controlled and uncontrolled fractions of the source population.

Additional detail on the basis for emission factors used across the time series is provided in Table 3.5-4 and Table 3.5-9, and below.

In addition to the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP), key references for emission factors for CH₄ and non-combustion-related CO₂ emissions from the U.S. petroleum industry include a 1999 EPA/Radian report *Methane Emissions from the U.S. Petroleum Industry* (EPA/Radian 1999), which contained the most recent and comprehensive determination of CH₄ emission factors for CH₄-emitting activities in the oil industry at that time, a 1999 EPA/ICF draft report *Estimates of Methane Emissions from the U.S. Oil Industry* (EPA/ICF 1999) which is largely based on the 1999 EPA/Radian report, and a detailed study by the Gas Research Institute and EPA *Methane Emissions from the Natural Gas Industry* (EPA/GRI 1996). These studies still represent best available data in many cases—in particular, for the early years of the time series.

In recent Inventories, EPA has revised the emission estimation methodology for many sources in Petroleum Systems. New data from studies and EPA's GHGRP (EPA 2017a,b) allows for emission factors to be calculated that account for adoption of control technologies and emission reduction practices. For several sources, EPA has developed control category-specific emission factors from recent data that are used over the time series (paired with control category-specific activity data that fluctuates to reflect control adoption over time).

For oil well completions with hydraulic fracturing, the controlled and uncontrolled emission factors were developed using data analyzed for the 2015 NSPS OOOOa proposal (EPA 2015a). For associated gas, separate emission estimates are developed from GHGRP data for venting and flaring. For oil tanks, emissions estimates were developed for large and small tanks with flaring or VRU control, without control devices, and with upstream malfunctioning separator dump valves. For pneumatic controllers, separate estimates are developed for low bleed, high bleed, and intermittent controllers. For chemical injection pumps, the estimate is calculated with an emission factor developed with GHGRP data, which is based on the previous GRI/EPA factor but takes into account operating hours. Some sources in Petroleum Systems that use methodologies based on GHGRP data use a basin-level aggregation approach, wherein EPA calculates basin-specific emissions and/or activity factors for basins that contribute at least 10 percent of total annual emissions (on a CO₂ Eq. basis) from the source in any year—and combines all other basins into one grouping. This methodology is currently applied for associated gas venting and flaring and miscellaneous production flaring.

For the refining segment, EPA has directly used the GHGRP data for all emission sources for recent years (2010 forward) (EPA 2017b) and developed source level throughput-based emission factors from GHGRP data to estimate emissions in earlier time series years (1990-2009). For some sources, EPA continues to apply the historical emission factors for all time series years. All refineries have been required to report CH₄ and CO₂ emissions for all major activities since 2010. The national totals of these emissions for each activity were used for the 2010 to 2016 emissions. The national emission totals for each activity were divided by refinery feed rates for those four Inventory years to develop average activity-specific emission factors, which were used to estimate national emissions for each refinery activity from 1990 to 2009 based on national refinery feed rates for each year (EPA 2015c).

Offshore emissions from shallow water and deep water oil platforms are taken from analysis of the *2011 Gulf-wide Emission Inventory Study* (EPA 2015b; BOEM 2014). The emission factors were assumed to be representative of emissions from each source type over the period 1990 through 2016, and are used for each year throughout this period.

When a CO₂-specific emission factor is not available for a source, the CO₂ emission factors were derived from the corresponding source CH₄ emission factors. The amount of CO₂ in the crude oil stream changes as it passes through various equipment in petroleum production operations. As a result, four distinct stages/streams with varying CO₂ contents exist. The four streams that are used to estimate the emissions factors are the associated gas stream separated from crude oil, hydrocarbons flashed out from crude oil (such as in storage tanks), whole crude oil itself when it leaks downstream, and gas emissions from offshore oil platforms. For this approach, CO₂ emission factors are estimated by multiplying the existing CH₄ emissions factors by a conversion factor, which is the ratio of CO₂ content to methane content for the particular stream. Ratios of CO₂ to CH₄ volume in emissions are presented in Table 3.5-1.

1990-2016 Inventory updates to emission factors

Summary information for emission factors for sources with revisions in this year's Inventory is below. The details are presented in three memoranda, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Additional Revisions Under Consideration* (2018a), *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to Create Year-Specific Emissions and Activity Factors* (2018b), and *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to CO₂ Emissions Estimation Methodologies* (2018c), as well as the "Recalculations Discussion" section of the main body text.

In the exploration segment, EPA developed new CH₄ and CO₂ estimates for vented and flared oil well testing (during non-completion events) using GHGRP emissions and activity data.

In the production segment, EPA developed new CH₄ and CO₂ estimates for associated gas venting and flaring and miscellaneous production flaring; for these sources, EPA uses a basin-level aggregation and production-based scaling approach to calculate emission factors from GHGRP data. EPA developed CO₂ emissions estimates for oil tanks using GHGRP data and a throughput-based approach to calculate emission factors, which is identical to the methodology to calculate CH₄ emissions.

Activity Data

Table 3.5-5 shows the activity data for all sources in Petroleum Systems, for all time series years. Additional detail on the basis for activity data used across the time series is provided in Table 3.5-6, and below.

For many sources, complete activity data were not available for all years of the time series. In such cases, one of three approaches was employed. Where appropriate, the activity data were calculated from related statistics using ratios developed based on EPA 1996, and/or GHGRP data. For major equipment, pneumatic controllers, and chemical injection pumps, GHGRP subpart W data were used to develop activity factors (i.e., count per well) that are applied to calculated activity in recent years; to populate earlier years of the time series, linear interpolation is used to connect GHGRP-based estimates with existing estimates in years 1990 to 1995. In other cases, the activity data were held constant from 1990 through 2014 based on EPA (1999). Lastly, the previous year's data were used when data for the current year were unavailable. For offshore production, the number of platforms in shallow water and the number of platforms in deep water are used as activity data and are taken from Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) (formerly Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement (BOEMRE)) datasets (BOEM 2011a,b,c). The activity data for the total crude transported in the transportation segment is not available, therefore the activity data for the refining sector (i.e., refinery feed in 1000 bbl/year) was used also for the transportation sector, applying an assumption that all crude transported is received at refineries. In the few cases where no data were located, oil industry data based on expert judgment was used. In the case of non-combustion CO₂ emission sources, the activity factors are the same as for CH₄ emission sources. In some instances, where recent time series data (e.g., year 2016) are not yet available, year 2015 or prior data has been used as proxy.

Methodology for well counts and events

For hydraulically fractured oil well completions, EPA developed activity data specific to each year of the time series using the date of completion or first reported production available from a data set licensed by DrillingInfo, Inc. For more information on the DrillingInfo data processing, please see Annex 3.6 Methodology for Estimating CH₄ and CO₂ from Natural Gas Systems.

1990-2016 Inventory updates to activity data

Summary information for activity data for sources with revisions in this year's Inventory is below. The details are presented in three memoranda, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Additional Revisions*

Under Consideration (2018a), *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to Create Year-Specific Emissions and Activity Factors* (2018b), and *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to CO₂ Emissions Estimation Methodologies* (2018c), as well as the “Recalculations Discussion” section of the main body text.

In the exploration segment, EPA developed new CH₄ and CO₂ estimates for vented and flared oil well testing (during non-completion events) using GHGRP emissions and activity data.

In the production segment, EPA developed new CH₄ and CO₂ estimates for associated gas venting and flaring and miscellaneous production flaring; for these sources, EPA uses a basin-level aggregation and production-based scaling approach to calculate activity data from GHGRP data. EPA developed CO₂ emissions estimates for oil tanks using GHGRP data and a throughput-based approach to calculate activity, which is identical to the methodology to calculate CH₄ emissions. EPA also used a more recent version of the DrillingInfo data set to update well counts data in the Inventory; though this does not reflect a methodological revision or major changes to the activity data. Lastly, EPA recalculated activity factors of equipment per well using the latest GHGRP RY2015 data, which included some resubmissions. This resulted in minor changes across the time series

Methane and Carbon Dioxide Emissions by Emission Source for Each Year

Annual CH₄ emissions and CO₂ emissions for each source were estimated by multiplying the activity data for each year by the corresponding emission factor. These annual emissions for each activity were then summed to estimate the total annual CH₄ and CO₂ emissions, respectively. Emissions at a segment level are shown in Table 3.5-2 and Table 3.5-7.

Refer to the 1990-2016 Inventory section at <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems> for the following data tables, in Excel format:

- Table 3.5-1: Ratios of CO₂ to CH₄ Volume in Emissions from Petroleum Production Field Operations
- Table 3.5-2: CH₄ Emissions (kt) for Petroleum Systems, by Segment and Source, for All Years
- Table 3.5-3: Effective CH₄ Emission Factors (kg/unit activity) for Petroleum Systems Sources, for All Years
- Table 3.5-4: CH₄ Emission Factors for Petroleum Systems, Data Sources/Methodology
- Table 3.5-5: Activity Data for Petroleum Systems Sources, for All Years
- Table 3.5-6: Activity Data for Petroleum Systems, Data Sources/Methodology
- Table 3.5-7: CO₂ Emissions (kt) for Petroleum Systems, by Segment and Source, for All Years
- Table 3.5-8: Effective CO₂ Emission Factors (kg/unit activity) for Petroleum Systems Sources, for All Years
- Table 3.5-9: CO₂ Emission Factors for Petroleum Systems, Data Sources/Methodology

References

- API (1989) Aboveground Storage Tank Survey report prepared by Entropy Limited for American Petroleum Institute, April 1989.
- API (1995) API 4615: Emission Factors For Oil and Gas Production Operations. American Petroleum Institute. Washington, DC.
- API (1996) API 4638: Calculation Workbook For Oil And Gas Production Equipment Fugitive Emissions. American Petroleum Institute. Washington, DC.
- API (2000) API 4697: Production Tank Emissions Model - A Program For Estimating Emissions From Hydrocarbon Production Tanks - E&P Tank Version 2.0. American Petroleum Institute. Washington, DC.
- API (2003) Basic Petroleum Data Book, 1990-2003. American Petroleum Institute. Washington, DC.
- BOEM (2014) Year 2011 Gulfwide Emission Inventory Study. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, U.S. Department of Interior. OCS Study BOEM 2014-666. Available online at: <http://www.data.boem.gov/PI/PDFImages/ESPIS/5/5440.pdf>
- BOEMRE (2011a) Gulf of Mexico Region Offshore Information. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- BOEMRE (2011b) Pacific OCS Region Offshore Information. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- BOEMRE (2011c) GOM and Pacific OCS Platform Activity. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- CAPP (1992) Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), A Detailed Inventory of CH₄ and VOC Emissions from Upstream Oil & Gas Operations in Alberta. March 1992.
- DrillingInfo (2016) April 2016 Download. DI Desktop® DrillingInfo, Inc.
- EIA (2017a) Monthly Energy Review, 1995-2017 editions. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, DC. Available online at: <http://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/index.cfm> >.
- EIA (2017b) Petroleum Supply Annual, 2001-2017 editions. U.S Department of Energy Washington, DC. Available online at: <http://www.eia.gov/petroleum/supply/annual/volume1/>>.
- EIA (2017c) Refinery Capacity Report, 2005-2017 editions. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, DC. Available online at: <http://www.eia.gov/petroleum/refinerycapacity/>>.
- EPA (1997) Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Research Triangle Park, NC. October 1997.
- EPA (2015a) Background Technical Support Document for the Proposed New Source Performance Standards 40 CFR Part 60, subpart OOOOa. Available online at: <https://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505-5021>
- EPA (2015b) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2013: Update to Offshore Oil and Gas Platforms Emissions Estimate. Available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-updates-1990-2013-inventory-published>>.
- EPA (2015c) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2013: Update to Refineries Emissions Estimate. Available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-updates-1990-2013-inventory-published> >.
- EPA (2015d) Inventory of U.S. GHG Emissions and Sinks 1990-2013: Revision to Well Counts Data. Available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/revision-data-source-well-counts-4-10-2015.pdf>>.
- EPA (2016a) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2014: Revisions to Natural Gas and Petroleum Production Emissions. Available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg> >.
- EPA (2017a) *Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program - Subpart W - Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems*. Environmental Protection Agency. Data reported as of August 5, 2017.

1 EPA (2017b) *Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program - Subpart Y - Petroleum Refineries*. Environmental Protection Agency.
2 Data reported as of August 5, 2017.

3 EPA (2017c) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2015: Revisions to Natural Gas and Petroleum
4 Production Emissions. Available online at: < [https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg)
5 [ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg) >.

6 EPA (2018a) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Additional Revisions Under
7 Consideration. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)
8 [inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)>.

9 EPA (2018b) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to Create Year-Specific
10 Emissions and Activity Factors. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)
11 [systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)>.

12 EPA (2018c) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to CO₂ Emissions Estimation
13 Methodologies. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)
14 [inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)>.

15 EPA/GRI (1996) Methane Emissions from the Natural Gas Industry. Prepared by Radian. U.S. Environmental Protection
16 Agency. April 1996.

17 EPA/ICF (1999) Estimates of Methane Emissions from the U.S. Oil Industry (Draft Report). Prepared by ICF
18 International. Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. October 1999.

19 EPA/Radian (1999) Methane Emissions from the U.S. Petroleum Industry. Prepared by Radian International. U.S.
20 Environmental Protection Agency. February 1999.

21 OGJ (2016) Special Report: Pipeline Economics, 2005-2016 Editions. *Oil & Gas Journal*, PennWell Corporation, Tulsa,
22 OK. Available online at: <[http:// http://www.ogj.com/](http://http://www.ogj.com/)>.

23 Radian/API (1992) "Global Emissions of Methane from Petroleum Sources." American Petroleum Institute, Health and
24 Environmental Affairs Department, Report No. DR140, February 1992.

25 WCUS (2015) Waterborne Commerce of the United States, Part 5: National Summaries, 2000-2015 Editions. United States
26 Army Corps of Engineers. Washington, DC, July 20, 2015. Latest edition available online at:
27 <<http://www.navigationdatacenter.us/wcsc/pdf/wcusnatl14.pdf>>.

3.6. Methodology for Estimating CH₄ and CO₂ Emissions from Natural Gas Systems

As described in the main body text on Natural Gas Systems, the Inventory methodology involves the calculation of CH₄ and CO₂ emissions for over 100 emissions sources, and then the summation of emissions for each natural gas sector stage. The approach for calculating emissions for natural gas systems generally involves the application of emission factors to activity data. For many sources, the approach uses technology-specific emission factors or emission factors that vary over time and take into account changes to technologies and practices, which are used to calculate net emissions directly. For others, the approach uses what are considered “potential methane factors” and reduction data to calculate net emissions.

For details on the emission factors, activity data, data sources and methodologies, please see excel file annexes for the current (i.e., 1990 to 2017) Inventory, available at <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems>. The text discussion below will be updated for the final 1990 to 2017 Inventory.

Emission Factors – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

Table 3.6-1 and Table 3.6-10 show CH₄ and CO₂ emissions, respectively, for all sources in Natural Gas Systems, for all time series years. Table 3.6-2 and Table 3.6-12 show the CH₄ and CO₂ effective emission factors, respectively, for all sources in Natural Gas Systems, for all time series years. These emission factors are calculated by dividing net emissions by activity. Therefore, in a given year, these emission factors reflect the estimated contribution from controlled and uncontrolled fractions of the source population and any source-specific reductions (see below section “Reductions Data”); additionally, for sources based on the GRI/EPA study, the values take into account methane compositions from GTI 2001 adjusted year to year using gross production for National Energy Modeling System (NEMS) oil and gas supply module regions from the EIA. These adjusted region-specific annual CH₄ compositions are presented in Table 3.6-3 (for general sources), Table 3.6-4 (for gas wells without hydraulic fracturing), and Table 3.6-5 (for gas wells with hydraulic fracturing).

Additional detail on the basis for the CH₄ and CO₂ emission factors used across the time series is provided in Table 3.6-6 and Table 3.6-13, and below.

Key references for emission factors for CH₄ and non-combustion-related CO₂ emissions from the U.S. natural gas industry include the 1996 Gas Research Institute (GRI) and EPA study (EPA/GRI 1996), the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP), and others.

The EPA/GRI study developed over 80 CH₄ emission factors to characterize emissions from the various components within the operating stages of the U.S. natural gas system for base year 1992. Since the time of this study, practices and technologies have changed. This study still represents best available data in many cases—in particular, for early years of the time series.

In recent Inventories, EPA has revised the CH₄ and CO₂ emission estimation methodology for many sources in Natural Gas Systems. New data from studies and EPA’s GHGRP (EPA 2017a) allows for emission factors to be calculated that account for adoption of control technologies and emission reduction practices. For some sources, EPA has developed control category-specific emission factors from recent data that are used over the time series (paired with control category-specific activity data that fluctuates to reflect control adoption over time). In other cases, EPA retains emission factors from the EPA/GRI study for early time series years (1990-1992), applies updated emission factors in recent years (e.g., 2011 forward), and uses interpolation to calculate emission factors for intermediate years. For some sources, EPA continues to apply the EPA/GRI emission factors for all time series years, and accounts for emission reductions through data reported to Gas STAR or estimated based on regulations (see below section “Reductions Data”). For gas well completions and workovers with hydraulic fracturing, separate emissions estimates were developed for hydraulically fractured completions and workovers that vent, flared hydraulic fracturing completions and workovers, hydraulic fracturing completions and workovers with reduced emissions completions (RECs), and hydraulic fracturing completions and workovers with RECs that flare. For gas well completions without hydraulic fracturing, separate emissions estimates were developed for completions that event and completions that flare. In addition, net emissions are calculated for miscellaneous production flaring. For liquids unloading, separate emissions estimates were developed for wells with plunger lifts and wells without plunger lifts. Likewise, for condensate tanks, emissions estimates were developed for large and small tanks with flaring or VRU control, without control devices, and with upstream malfunctioning separator dump valves. For pneumatic controllers, separate estimates are developed for low bleed, high bleed, and intermittent controllers. Chemical injection pumps estimates are calculated with an emission factor developed with GHGRP data, which is based on the previous GRI/EPA factor but takes into account operating hours. For all sources in the processing and distribution segments, and most sources in the transmission and storage segment, net emission factors have been developed for application in recent years of the time series, while the existing emission factors are applied in early time series years.

When a CO₂-specific emission factor is not available for a source, the CO₂ emission factors were derived from the corresponding source CH₄ emission factors using default gas composition data. CO₂ emission factors are estimated by multiplying the CH₄ emission factors by the ratio of the CO₂-to-CH₄ gas content. This approach is applied for certain sources in the natural gas production, gas processing (only for early time series years), transmission and storage, and distribution segments. The default gas composition data are specific to segment and are provided in Table 3.6-11. The default values were derived from EPA/GRI (1996), EIA (1994), and GTI (2001).

1990-2016 Inventory updates to emission factors

Summary information for emission factors for sources with revisions in this year's Inventory is below. The details are presented in memoranda,⁶³ *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Additional Revisions Under Consideration* (2018a), *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to Create Year-Specific Emissions and Activity Factors* (2018b), and *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to CO₂ Emissions Estimation Methodologies* (2018c), as well as the "Recalculations Discussion" section of the main body text.

In the exploration segment, EPA developed new CH₄ and CO₂ estimates for vented and flared oil well testing (during non-completion events) using GHGRP emissions and activity data. EPA also developed year-specific emission factors for non-hydraulically fractured gas well completions and hydraulically fractured gas well completions (for years 2011-2016).

For the production segment, EPA developed control category- and year-specific CO₂ and CH₄ emission factors from GHGRP data for non-hydraulically fractured gas well workovers, hydraulically fractured gas well workovers, liquids unloading, and miscellaneous production flaring. Control category-specific CO₂ emission factors were developed from GHGRP data for production storage tanks.

For the processing segment, CO₂ emission factors were developed from GHGRP data using the same methodology as for CH₄ emission factors. EPA calculated CO₂ emission factors for plant fugitives, compressors, dehydrators, flares, blowdowns, and acid gas removal vents from GHGRP data for years 2011 to 2016. In order to create time series consistency for emission factors between earlier years' estimates (1990 to 1992) that generally rely on data from GRI/EPA 1996 and the most recent years' estimates (2011 to 2016) that were calculated using data from the GHGRP, linear interpolation between the data endpoints of 1992 (GRI/EPA) and 2011 (GHGRP) was used for calculations.

For the transmission and storage segment, CO₂ and CH₄ emission factors were newly developed from GHGRP data for station flares. For the storage segment, the emission estimate for year 2016 was adjusted upward to account for the Aliso Canyon leak.

Activity Data

Table 3.6-7 shows the activity data for all sources in Natural Gas Systems, for all time series years. Additional detail on the basis for activity data used across the time series is provided in Table 3.6-8, and below.

For a few sources, recent direct activity data were not available. For these sources, either 2015 data were used as proxy for 2016 data or a set of industry activity data drivers was developed and was used to update activity data. Key drivers include statistics on gas production, number of wells, system throughput, miles of various kinds of pipe, and other statistics that characterize the changes in the U.S. natural gas system infrastructure and operations.

Methodology for well counts and events

EPA used DI Desktop, a production database maintained by DrillingInfo, Inc. (DrillingInfo 2017), covering U.S. oil and natural gas wells to populate activity data for gas wells, oil wells (in petroleum systems) gas well completions and workovers with hydraulic fracturing for 1990-2010, and oil well completions for all years of the time series. EPA queried DI Desktop for relevant data on an individual well basis—including location, natural gas and liquids (i.e., oil and condensate) production by year, drill type (e.g., horizontal or vertical), and date of completion or first production. Non-associated gas wells were classified as any well within DI Desktop that had non-zero gas production in a given year, and with a gas-to-oil ratio (GOR) of greater than 100 mcf/bbl in that year. Oil wells were classified as any well that had non-zero liquids production in a given year, and with a GOR of less than or equal to 100 mcf/bbl in that year. Gas wells with hydraulic fracturing were assumed to be the subset of the non-associated gas wells that were horizontally drilled and/or located in an unconventional formation (i.e., shale, tight sands, or coalbed). Unconventional formations were identified based on well

⁶³ Draft and final memoranda for the 1990-2016 Inventory are available here < <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems>>.

basin, reservoir, and field data reported in DI Desktop referenced against a formation type crosswalk developed by EIA (EIA 2012a).

For 1990 through 2010, gas well completions with hydraulic fracturing were identified as a subset of the gas wells with hydraulic fracturing that had a date of completion or first production in the specified year. To calculate workovers for 1990 through 2016, EPA applied a refracture rate of 1 percent (i.e., 1 percent of all wells with hydraulic fracturing are assumed to be refractured in a given year) to the total counts of wells with hydraulic fracturing from the DrillingInfo data. For 2011 through 2016, EPA used GHGRP data for the total number of well completions. The GHGRP data represents a subset of the national completions, due to the reporting threshold, and therefore using this data without scaling it up to national level results in an underestimate. However, because EPA's GHGRP counts of completions were higher than national counts of completions, obtained using DI Desktop data, EPA directly used the GHGRP data for completions for 2011 through 2016.

EPA calculated the percentage of gas well completions and workovers with hydraulic fracturing in each of the four control categories using 2011 through 2016 Subpart W data. EPA assumed no REC use from 1990 through 2000, used GHGRP RECs percentage for 2011 through 2016, and then used linear interpolation between the 2000 and 2011 percentages. For flaring, EPA used an assumption of 10 percent (the average of the percent of completions and workovers that were flared in 2011 through 2013 GHGRP data) flaring from 1990 through 2010 to recognize that some flaring has occurred over that time period. For 2011 through 2016, EPA used the GHGRP data on flaring.

1990-2016 Inventory updates to activity data

Summary information for activity data for sources with revisions in this year's Inventory is below. The details are presented in memoranda,⁶⁴ *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Additional Revisions Under Consideration* (2018a), *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to Create Year-Specific Emissions and Activity Factors* (2018b), and *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to CO₂ Emissions Estimation Methodologies* (2018c), as well as the "Recalculations Discussion" section of the main body text.

In the exploration segment, EPA developed new CH₄ and CO₂ estimates for vented and flared gas well testing (during non-completion events) using GHGRP emissions and activity data. EPA also developed year-specific activity factors for non-hydraulically fractured gas well completions and hydraulically fractured gas well completions (for years 2011-2016).

For the production segment, EPA developed control category- and year-specific CO₂ and CH₄ activity factors from GHGRP data for non-hydraulically fractured gas well workovers, hydraulically fractured gas well workovers, liquids unloading, and miscellaneous production flaring. For miscellaneous production flaring, EPA uses a basin-level aggregation and production-based scaling approach to calculate activity data from GHGRP data. EPA also used a more recent version of the DrillingInfo data set to update well counts data in the Inventory; though this does not reflect a methodological revision or major changes to the activity data. Lastly, EPA recalculated activity factors of equipment per well using the latest GHGRP RY2015 data, which included some resubmissions. This resulted in minor changes across the time series.

For the transmission and storage segment, the flares emission factors developed from GHGRP data are at a station-level and the methodology to determine the number of stations did not change from previous Inventories.

Reductions Data

As described under "Emission Factors" above, some sources in Natural Gas Systems rely on CH₄ emission factors developed from the 1996 EPA/GRI study. Application of these emission factors across the time series represents potential emissions and does not take into account any use of technologies or practices that reduce emissions. To take into account use of such technologies for emission sources that use potential factors, data were collected on relevant voluntary and regulatory reductions.

Voluntary and regulatory emission reductions by segment, for all time series years, are included in Table 3.6-1. Reductions by emission source, for all time series years, are shown in Table 3.6-9.

Voluntary reductions

Voluntary reductions included in the Inventory were those reported to Gas STAR for activities such as replacing gas engines with electric compressor drivers, installing automated air-to-fuel ratio controls for engines, and implementing gas recovery for pipeline maintenance operations.

⁶⁴ Draft and final memoranda for the 1990-2016 Inventory are available here <<https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems>>.

Most Gas STAR reductions in the production segment are not classified as applicable to specific emission sources. As many sources in production are now calculated with net factor approaches, to address potential double-counting of reductions, a scaling factor was applied to the “other voluntary reductions” to reduce this reported amount based on an estimate of the fraction of those reductions that occur in the sources that are now calculated using net emissions approaches. This fraction was developed by dividing the net emissions from sources with net approaches, by the total production segment emissions (without deducting the Gas STAR reductions). The result for 2016, is that around 80 percent of the reductions were estimated to occur in sources for which net emissions are now calculated, which yields an adjusted “other reductions” estimate of 3 MMT CO₂ Eq.

Federal regulations

Regulatory actions reducing emissions in the current Inventory include National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations for dehydrator vents in the production segment. In regards to the oil and natural gas industry, the NESHAP regulation addresses HAPs from the oil and natural gas production sectors and the natural gas transmission and storage sectors of the industry. Though the regulation deals specifically with HAPs reductions, methane emissions are also incidentally reduced.

The NESHAP regulation requires that glycol dehydration unit vents that have HAP emissions and exceed a gas throughput threshold be connected to a closed loop emission control system that reduces emissions by 95 percent. The emissions reductions achieved as a result of NESHAP regulations for glycol dehydrators in the production segment were calculated using data provided in the Federal Register Background Information Document (BID) for this regulation. The BID provides the levels of control measures in place before the enactment of regulation. The emissions reductions were estimated by analyzing the portion of the industry without control measures already in place that would be impacted by the regulation.

Previous Inventories also took into account NESHAP driven reductions from storage tanks and from dehydrators in the processing segment; these sources are now estimated with net emission methodologies that take into account controls implemented due to regulations. In addition to the NESHAP applicable to natural gas, the Inventory reflects the 2012 New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) subpart OOOO for oil and gas, through the use of a net factor approach that captures shifts to lower emitting technologies required by the regulation. Examples include separating gas well completions and workovers with hydraulic fracturing into four categories and developing control technology-specific methane emission factors and year-specific activity data for each category; establishing control category-specific emission factors and associated year-specific activity data for condensate tanks; calculating year-specific activity data for pneumatic controller bleed categories; and estimating year-specific activity data for wet versus dry seal centrifugal compressors.

Methane and Carbon Dioxide Emissions by Emission Source for Each Year

Annual CH₄ emissions and CO₂ emissions for each source were estimated by multiplying the activity data for each year by the corresponding emission factor. These annual emissions for each activity were then summed to estimate the total annual CH₄ and CO₂ emissions, respectively. As a final step for CH₄ emissions, any relevant reductions data from each segment is summed for each year and deducted from the total emissions to estimate net CH₄ emissions for the Inventory. CH₄ potential emissions, reductions, and net emissions at a segment level are shown in Table 3.6-1. CO₂ emissions by segment and source are summarized in Table 3.6-10.

Refer to the 1990-2016 Inventory section at <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems> for the following data tables, in Excel format:

- Table 3.6-1: CH₄ Emissions (kt) for Natural Gas Systems, by Segment and Source, for All Years
- Table 3.6-2: Effective CH₄ Emission Factors (kg/unit activity) for Natural Gas Systems Sources, for All Years
- Table 3.6-3: U.S. Production Sector CH₄ Content in Natural Gas by NEMS Region (General Sources)
- Table 3.6-4: U.S. Production Sector CH₄ Content in Natural Gas by NEMS Region (Gas Wells Without Hydraulic Fracturing)
- Table 3.6-5: U.S. Production Sector CH₄ Content in Natural Gas by NEMS Region (Gas Wells With Hydraulic Fracturing)
- Table 3.6-6: CH₄ Emission Factors for Natural Gas Systems, Data Sources/Methodology
- Table 3.6-7: Activity Data for Natural Gas Systems Sources, for All Years
- Table 3.6-8: Activity Data for Natural Gas Systems, Data Sources/Methodology
- Table 3.6-9: Voluntary and Regulatory CH₄ Reductions for Natural Gas Systems (kt)
- Table 3.6-10: CO₂ Emissions (kt) for Natural Gas Systems, by Segment and Source, for All Years

- Table 3.6-11: Default Gas Content by Segment, for All Years
- Table 3.6-12: Effective CO₂ Emission Factors (kg/unit activity) for Natural Gas Systems Sources, for All Years
- Table 3.6-13: CO₂ Emission Factors for Natural Gas Systems, Data Sources/Methodology

References

- Alabama (2013) Alabama State Oil and Gas Board. Available online at <<http://www.ogb.state.al.us>>.
- API/ANGA (2012) *Characterizing Pivotal Sources of Methane Emissions from Natural Gas Production – Summary and Analysis of API and ANGA Survey Responses*. Final Report. American Petroleum Institute and America’s Natural Gas Alliance. September 21.
- BOEM (2014) Year 2011 Gulfwide Emission Inventory Study. OCS Study BOEM 2014-666. Available online at <<https://www.boem.gov/ESPIS/5/5440.pdf>>
- BOEMRE (2008) Personal communication. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- BOEMRE (2011a) Gulf of Mexico Region Offshore Information. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- BOEMRE (2011b) Pacific OCS Region Offshore Information. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- BOEMRE (2011c) GOM and Pacific OCS Platform Activity. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, U.S. Department of Interior.
- Clearstone (2011) Clearstone Engineering, Development of Updated Emission Factors for Residential Meters, May 2011.
- DrillingInfo (2017) DI Desktop® January 2017 Download. DrillingInfo, Inc.
- EIA (1994) “Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States: 1987-1992.” Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.
- EIA (1996) “Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States: 1987-1994.” Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.
- EIA (2004) *U.S. LNG Markets and Uses*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. June 2004. Available online at: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/pub/oil_gas/natural_gas/feature_articles/2004/lng/lng2004.pdf>.
- EIA (2011) "Monthly Energy Review" Table 5.2, Crude Oil and Natural Gas Resource Development. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at: <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/mer/resource.html>>.
- EIA (2012) Formation crosswalk. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Provided July 7.
- EIA (2017a) “Natural Gas Gross Withdrawals and Production: Marketed Production.” Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at: <<http://www.eia.doe.gov>>.
- EIA (2017b) Lease Condensate Production, 1989-2011, Natural Gas Navigator. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at <http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_prod_lc_s1_a.htm>.
- EIA (2017c) “Table 1—Summary of natural gas supply and disposition in the United States 2011-2017.” Natural Gas Monthly, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at <<http://www.eia.doe.gov>>.
- EIA (2017d) “Table 2—Natural Gas Consumption in the United States 2011-2016.” Natural Gas Monthly, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at <<http://www.eia.doe.gov>>.
- EIA (2017e) “Natural Gas Annual Respondent Query System. Report 191 Field Level Storage Data (Annual).” Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at <https://www.eia.gov/cfapps/ngqs/ngqs.cfm?f_report=RP7>.

1 EIA (2017f) "U.S. Natural Gas Imports, 2015-2017." Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy,
2 Washington, DC. Available online at <http://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/monthly/pdf/table_04.pdf>.

3 EIA (2017g) Number of Natural Gas Consumers – Residential. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of
4 Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at: <[http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/
5 ng_cons_num_a_EPG0_VN3_Count_a.htm](http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_cons_num_a_EPG0_VN3_Count_a.htm)>.

6 EIA (2017h) Number of Natural Gas Consumers – Commercial. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of
7 Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at: <[http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/
8 ng_cons_num_a_EPG0_VN5_Count_a.htm](http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_cons_num_a_EPG0_VN5_Count_a.htm)>.

9 EIA (2017i) Number of Natural Gas Consumers – Industrial. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of
10 Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at: <[http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/
11 ng_cons_num_a_EPG0_VN7_Count_a.htm](http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_cons_num_a_EPG0_VN7_Count_a.htm)>.EIA (2014a) U.S. Imports by Country. Energy Information
12 Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at: <<http://www.eia.doe.gov>>.

13 EIA (2017j) "Monthly Energy Review" Table A4, Approximate Heat Content of Natural Gas. Energy Information
14 Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. Available online at:
15 <<https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/previous.php>>.

16 EPA (2013) Updating GHG Inventory Estimate for Hydraulically Fractured Gas Well Completions and Workovers.
17 Available online at: <[http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/memo-update-emissions-for-
18 hydraulically-workovers.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/memo-update-emissions-for-hydraulically-workovers.pdf)>.

19 EPA (2015a) Inventory of U.S. GHG Emissions and Sinks 1990-2013: Revision to Well Counts Data. Available online at:
20 <<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/revision-data-source-well-counts-4-10-2015.pdf>>.

21 EPA (2015b) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2013: Update to Offshore Oil and Gas
22 Platforms Emissions Estimate. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-
23 systems-ghg-inventory-updates-1990-2013-inventory-published](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-updates-1990-2013-inventory-published)>.

24 EPA (2016a) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2014: Revisions to Natural Gas and Petroleum
25 Production Emissions. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-
26 ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg)>.

27 EPA (2016b) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2014: Revisions to Natural Gas Gathering and
28 Boosting Emissions. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-
29 ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg)>.

30 EPA (2016c) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2014: Revisions to Natural Gas Transmission
31 and Storage Emissions. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-
32 ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg)>.

33 EPA (2016d) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2014: Revisions to Natural Gas Distribution
34 Emissions. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-
35 inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2014-ghg)>.

36 EPA (2017a) *Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program- Subpart W – Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems*. Environmental
37 Protection Agency. Data reported as of August 5, 2017.

38 EPA (2017b) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2015: Revisions to Natural Gas and Petroleum
39 Production Emissions. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-
40 ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg)>.

41 EPA (2017c) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2015: Revisions to Natural Gas Processing
42 Emissions. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-
43 inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg)>.

44 EPA (2017d) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2015: Incorporating an Estimate for the Aliso
45 Canyon Leak. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-
46 inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2015-ghg)>.

47 EPA (2018a) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Additional Revisions Under
48 Consideration. Available online at: <[https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-
49 inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg)>.

EPA (2018b) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to Create Year-Specific Emissions and Activity Factors. Available online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg>>.

EPA (2018c) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2016: Revisions to CO₂ Emissions Estimation Methodologies. Available online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems-ghg-inventory-additional-information-1990-2016-ghg>>.

EPA/GRI (1996) *Methane Emissions from the Natural Gas Industry*. Prepared by Harrison, M., T. Shires, J. Wessels, and R. Cowgill, eds., Radian International LLC for National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Air Pollution Prevention and Control Division, Research Triangle Park, NC. EPA-600/R-96-080a.

EPA/ICF (1997) Additional Changes to Activity Factors for Portions of the Gas Industry. September 18, 1997.

EPA/ICF (2008) Natural Gas Model Activity Factor Basis Change. January 7, 2008.

EPA/ICF (2010) Emissions from Centrifugal Compressors. December, 2010.

FERC (2017) *North American LNG Terminals*. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC.

GTI (2001) Gas Resource Database: Unconventional Natural Gas and Gas Composition Databases. Second Edition. GRI-01/0136.

GTI (2009) Gas Technology Institute and Innovative Environmental Solutions, Field Measurement Program to Improve Uncertainties for Key Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for Distribution Sources, November 2009. GTI Project Number 20497. OTD Project Number 7.7.b.

Lamb, et al. (2015) Direct Measurements Show Decreasing Methane Emissions from Natural Gas Local Distribution Systems in the United States. *Environmental Science & Technology*, Vol. 49 5161-5169.

Marchese, et al. (2015) Methane Emissions from United States Natural Gas Gathering and Processing. *Environmental Science and Technology*, Vol. 49 10718–10727.

OGJ (1997-2014) “Worldwide Gas Processing.” *Oil & Gas Journal*, PennWell Corporation, Tulsa, OK. Available online at: <<http://http://www.ogj.com/>>.

PHMSA (2017a) “Annual Report Mileage for Natural Gas Transmission and Gathering Systems.” Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC. Available online at: <<http://phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/library/data-stats>>.

PHMSA (2017b) “Annual Report Mileage for Natural Gas Distribution Systems.” Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC. Available online at: <<http://phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/library/data-stats>>.

Radian/API (1992) “Global Emissions of Methane from Petroleum Sources.” American Petroleum Institute, Health and Environmental Affairs Department, Report No. DR140, February 1992.

Wyoming (2013) Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission. Available online at: <<http://wogcc.state.wy.us/coalbedchart.cfm>>.

Zimmerle, et al. (2015) Methane Emissions from the Natural Gas Transmission and Storage System in the United States. *Environmental Science and Technology*, Vol. 49 9374–9383.

3.7. Methodology for Estimating CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O Emissions from the Incineration of Waste

Emissions of CO₂ from the incineration of waste include CO₂ generated by the incineration of plastics, synthetic rubber and synthetic fibers in municipal solid waste (MSW), and incineration of tires (which are composed in part of synthetic rubber and C black) in a variety of other combustion facilities (e.g., cement kilns). Incineration of waste also results in emissions of CH₄ and N₂O. The emission estimates are calculated for all four sources on a mass-basis based on the data available. The methodology for calculating emissions from each of these waste incineration sources is described in this Annex.

CO₂ from Plastics Incineration

In the *Municipal Solid Waste Generation, Recycling, and Disposal in the United States: Facts and Figures* reports (EPA 1999 through 2003, 2005 through 2014), *Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures – Assessing Trends in Material Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States* (EPA 2015; EPA 2016; EPA 2018) the flows of plastics in the U.S. waste stream are reported for seven resin categories. For 2017, the quantity generated, recovered, and discarded for each resin is shown in Table A-132. The data set for 1990 through 2017 is incomplete, and several assumptions were employed to bridge the data gaps. The EPA reports do not provide estimates for individual materials landfilled and incinerated, although they do provide such an estimate for the waste stream as a whole. To estimate the quantity of plastics landfilled and incinerated, total discards were apportioned based on the proportions of landfilling and incineration for the entire U.S. waste stream for each year in the time series according to *Biocycle's State of Garbage in America* (van Haaren et al. 2010), and Shin (2014). For those years when distribution by resin category was not reported (1990 through 1994), total values were apportioned according to 1995 (the closest year) distribution ratios. Generation and recovery figures for 2002 and 2004 were linearly interpolated between surrounding years' data.

Table A-132: 2017 Plastics in the Municipal Solid Waste Stream by Resin (kt)

Waste Pathway	PET	HDPE	PVC	LDPE/ LLDPE	PP	PS	Other	Total
Generation	4,627	5,479	807	7,194	7,013	2,150	4,028	31,298
Recovery	853	562	0	445	64	27	898	2,849
Discard	3,774	4,917	807	6,750	6,949	2,123	3,130	28,450
Landfill	3,336	4,346	714	5,966	6,143	1,876	2,767	25,148
Combustion	438	571	94	783	806	246	363	3,302
Recovery ^a	18%	10%	0%	6%	1%	1%	22%	9%
Discard ^a	82%	90%	100%	94%	99%	99%	78%	91%
Landfill ^a	75%	83%	92%	87%	92%	91%	72%	84%
Combustion ^a	6%	7%	8%	7%	8%	8%	6%	7%

^a As a percent of waste generation.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Abbreviations: PET (polyethylene terephthalate), HDPE (high density polyethylene), PVC (polyvinyl chloride), LDPE/LLDPE (linear low density polyethylene), PP (polypropylene), PS (polystyrene).

Fossil fuel-based CO₂ emissions were calculated as the product of plastic combusted, C content, and fraction oxidized (see Table A-133). The C content of each of the six types of plastics is listed, with the value for “other plastics” assumed equal to the weighted average of the six categories. The fraction oxidized was assumed to be 98 percent.

Table A-133: 2017 Plastics Incinerated (kt), Carbon Content (%), Fraction Oxidized (%) and Carbon Incinerated (kt)

Factor	PET	HDPE	PVC	LDPE/ LLDPE	PP	PS	Other	Total
Quantity Combusted	287	374	61	513	528	161	238	2,162
Carbon Content of Resin	63%	86%	38%	86%	86%	92%	66%	NA
Fraction Oxidized	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	NA
Carbon in Resin Combusted	176	314	23	431	444	146	153	1,687
Emissions (MMT CO₂ Eq.)	0.6	1.2	0.1	1.6	1.6	0.5	0.6	6.2

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Weighted average of other plastics produced.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

CO₂ from Incineration of Synthetic Rubber and Carbon Black in Tires

Emissions from tire incineration require two pieces of information: the amount of tires incinerated and the C content of the tires. “2015 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary” (RMA 2018) reports that 1,736 thousand of the 3,303 thousand tons of scrap tires generated in 2017 (approximately 53 percent of generation) were used for fuel purposes. Using RMA’s estimates of average tire composition and weight, the mass of synthetic rubber and C black in scrap tires was determined:

- Synthetic rubber in tires was estimated to be 90 percent C by weight, based on the weighted average C contents of the major elastomers used in new tire consumption.⁶⁵ Table A-134 shows consumption and C content of elastomers used for tires and other products in 2002, the most recent year for which data are available.
- C black is 100 percent C (Aslett Rubber Inc. n.d.).

Multiplying the mass of scrap tires incinerated by the total C content of the synthetic rubber, C black portions of scrap tires, and then by a 98 percent oxidation factor, yielded CO₂ emissions, as shown in Table A-135. The disposal rate of rubber in tires (0.3 MMT C/year) is smaller than the consumption rate for tires based on summing the elastomers listed in Table A-134 (1.3 MMT/year); this is due to the fact that much of the rubber is lost through tire wear during the product’s lifetime and may also reflect the lag time between consumption and disposal of tires. Tire production and fuel use for 1990 through 2017 were taken from RMA 2006; RMA 2009; RMA 2011; RMA 2014a; RMA 2016; RMA 2018, where data were not reported, they were linearly interpolated between bracketing years’ data or, for the ends of time series, set equal to the closest year with reported data.

In 2009, RMA changed the reporting of scrap tire data from millions of tires to thousands of short tons of scrap tire. As a result, the average weight and percent of the market of light duty and commercial scrap tires was used to convert the previous years from millions of tires to thousands of short tons (STMC 1990 through 1997; RMA 2002 through RMA 2006; RMA 2014b; RMA 2016; RMA 2018).

Table A-134: Elastomers Consumed in 2002 (kt)

Elastomer	Consumed	Carbon Content	Carbon Equivalent
Styrene butadiene rubber solid	768	91%	700
For Tires	660	91%	602
For Other Products ^a	108	91%	98
Polybutadiene	583	89%	518
For Tires	408	89%	363
For Other Products	175	89%	155
Ethylene Propylene	301	86%	258
For Tires	6	86%	5
For Other Products	295	86%	253
Polychloroprene	54	59%	32
For Tires	0	59%	0
For Other Products	54	59%	32
Nitrile butadiene rubber solid	84	77%	65
For Tires	1	77%	1
For Other Products	83	77%	64
Polyisoprene	58	88%	51
For Tires	48	88%	42
For Other Products	10	88%	9
Others	367	88%	323
For Tires	184	88%	161
For Other Products	184	88%	161
Total	2,215	NA	1,950
For Tires	1,307	NA	1,174

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Used to calculate C content of non-tire rubber products in municipal solid waste.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

⁶⁵ The carbon content of tires (1,174 kt C) divided by the mass of rubber in tires (1,307 kt) equals 90 percent.

Table A-135: Scrap Tire Constituents and CO₂ Emissions from Scrap Tire Incineration in 2017

Material	Weight of Material (MMT)	Fraction Oxidized	Carbon Content	Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Synthetic Rubber	0.3	98%	90%	1.2
Carbon Black	0.4	98%	100%	1.4
Total	0.7	NA	NA	2.6

NA (Not Applicable)

CO₂ from Incineration of Synthetic Rubber in Municipal Solid Waste

Similar to the methodology for scrap tires, CO₂ emissions from synthetic rubber in MSW were estimated by multiplying the amount of rubber incinerated by an average rubber C content. The amount of rubber discarded in the MSW stream was estimated from generation and recycling data⁶⁶ provided in the *Municipal Solid Waste Generation, Recycling, and Disposal in the United States: Facts and Figures* reports (EPA 1999 through 2003, 2005 through 2014), *Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures: Assessing Trends in Material Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States* (EPA 2015; EPA 2016; EPA 2018), and unpublished backup data (Schneider 2007). The reports divide rubber found in MSW into three product categories: other durables (not including tires), non-durables (which includes clothing and footwear and other non-durables), and containers and packaging. EPA (2018) did not report rubber found in the product category “containers and packaging;” however, containers and packaging from miscellaneous material types were reported for 2009 through 2017. As a result, EPA assumes that rubber containers and packaging are reported under the “miscellaneous” category; and therefore, the quantity reported for 2009 through 2017 were set equal to the quantity reported for 2008. Since there was negligible recovery for these product types, all the waste generated is considered to be discarded. Similar to the plastics method, discards were apportioned into landfilling and incineration based on their relative proportions, for each year, for the entire U.S. waste stream. The report aggregates rubber and leather in the MSW stream; an assumed synthetic rubber content of 70 percent was assigned to each product type, as shown in Table A-136.⁶⁷ A C content of 85 percent was assigned to synthetic rubber for all product types (based on the weighted average C content of rubber consumed for non-tire uses), and a 98 percent fraction oxidized was assumed.

Table A-136: Rubber and Leather in Municipal Solid Waste in 2017

Product Type	Incinerated (kt)	Synthetic Rubber (%)	Carbon Content (%)	Fraction Oxidized (%)	Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Durables (not Tires)	248	70%	85%	98%	0.8
Non-Durables	78	NA	NA	NA	0.2
Clothing and Footwear	59	70%	85%	98%	0.2
Other Non-Durables	19	70%	85%	98%	0.1
Containers and Packaging	2	70%	85%	98%	0.0
Total	328	NA	NA	NA	1.0

NA (Not Applicable)

CO₂ from Incineration of Synthetic Fibers

Carbon dioxide emissions from synthetic fibers were estimated as the product of the amount of synthetic fiber discarded annually and the average C content of synthetic fiber. Fiber in the MSW stream was estimated from data provided in the *Municipal Solid Waste Generation, Recycling, and Disposal in the United States: Facts and Figures* reports (EPA 1999 through 2003, 2005 through 2014) and *Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures – Assessing Trends in Material Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States* (EPA 2015; EPA 2016; EPA 2018) for textiles. Production data for the synthetic fibers was based on data from the American Chemical Society (FEB 2009). The amount of synthetic fiber in MSW was estimated by subtracting (a) the amount recovered from (b) the waste generated (see Table A-137). As with the other materials in the MSW stream, discards were apportioned based on the annually variable proportions of landfilling and incineration for the entire U.S. waste stream, as found in van Haaren et al. (2010), and Shin (2014). It was assumed that approximately 55 percent of the fiber was synthetic in origin, based on information received from the Fiber Economics Bureau (DeZan 2000). The average C content of 71 percent was assigned to synthetic fiber using the production-weighted average of the C contents of the four major fiber types (polyester, nylon, olefin, and acrylic) based on 2017 fiber production (see Table A-138). The equation relating CO₂ emissions to the amount of textiles combusted is shown below.

⁶⁶ Discards = Generation minus recycling.⁶⁷ As a sustainably harvested biogenic material, the incineration of leather is assumed to have no net CO₂ emissions.

$$\text{CO}_2 \text{ Emissions from the Incineration of Synthetic Fibers} = \text{Annual Textile Incineration (kt)} \times (\text{Percent of Total Fiber that is Synthetic}) \times (\text{Average C Content of Synthetic Fiber}) \times (44 \text{ g CO}_2/12 \text{ g C})$$

Table A-137: Synthetic Textiles in MSW (kt)

Year	Generation	Recovery	Discards	Incineration
1990	2,884	328	2,557	332
1995	3,674	447	3,227	442
1996	3,832	472	3,361	467
1997	4,090	526	3,564	458
1998	4,269	556	3,713	407
1999	4,498	611	3,887	406
2000	4,706	655	4,051	417
2001	4,870	715	4,155	432
2002	5,123	750	4,373	459
2003	5,297	774	4,522	472
2004	5,451	884	4,567	473
2005	5,714	908	4,805	481
2006	5,893	933	4,959	479
2007	6,041	953	5,088	470
2008	6,305	968	5,337	470
2009	6,424	978	5,446	458
2010	6,563	1,018	5,545	444
2011	6,513	1,003	5,510	419
2012	7,198	1,137	6,061	461
2013	7,605	1,181	6,424	488
2014	7,565	1,122	6,444	490
2015	7,958	1,216	6,741	512
2016	7,958	1,216	6,741	512
2017	7,958	1,216	6,741	512

Table A-138: Synthetic Fiber Production in 2017

Fiber	Production (MMT)	Carbon Content
Polyester	1.4	63%
Nylon	0.6	64%
Olefin	1.0	86%
Acrylic	0.0	68%
Total	3.0	71%

CH₄ and N₂O from Incineration of Waste

Estimates of N₂O emissions from the incineration of waste in the United States are based on the methodology outlined in the EPA's Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (EPA 1995) and presented in the Municipal Solid Waste Generation, Recycling, and Disposal in the United States: Facts and Figures reports (EPA 1999 through 2003, 2005 through 2014), Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures: Assessing Trends in Material Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States (EPA 2015; EPA 2016; EPA 2018) and unpublished backup data (Schneider 2007). According to this methodology, emissions of N₂O from waste incineration are the product of the mass of waste incinerated, an emission factor of N₂O emitted per unit mass of waste incinerated, and an N₂O emissions control removal efficiency. The mass of waste incinerated was derived from the results of the biannual national survey of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Generation and Disposition in the U.S., published in BioCycle (van Haaren et al. 2010), and Shin (2014). For waste incineration in the United States, an emission factor of 50 g N₂O/metric ton MSW based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and an estimated emissions control removal efficiency of zero percent were used (IPCC 2006). It was assumed that all MSW incinerators in the United States use continuously-fed stoker technology (Bahor 2009; ERC 2009).

Estimates of CH₄ emissions from the incineration of waste in the United States are based on the methodology outlined in IPCC's 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC 2006). According to this methodology, emissions of CH₄ from waste incineration are the product of the mass of waste incinerated and an emission factor of CH₄ emitted per unit mass of waste incinerated. Similar to the N₂O emissions methodology, the mass of waste incinerated was derived from the information published in BioCycle (van Haaren et al. 2010) for 1990 through 2008. Data

for 2011 were derived from information in Shin (2014). For waste incineration in the United States, an emission factor of 0.20 kg CH₄/kt MSW was used based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and assuming that all MSW incinerators in the United States use continuously-fed stoker technology (Bahor 2009; ERC 2009). No information was available on the mass of waste incinerated for 2012 through 2017, so these values were assumed to be equal to the 2011 value.

Despite the differences in methodology and data sources, the two series of references (EPA 2014; van Haaren, Rob, Themelis, N., and Goldstein, N. 2010) provide estimates of total solid waste incinerated that are relatively consistent (see Table A-139).

Table A-139: U.S. Municipal Solid Waste Incinerated, as Reported by EPA and BioCycle (Metric Tons)

Year	EPA	BioCycle
1990	28,939,680	30,632,057
1995	32,241,888	29,639,040
2000	30,599,856	25,974,978
2001	30,481,920	25,942,036 ^a
2002	30,255,120	25,802,917
2003	30,028,320	25,930,542 ^b
2004	28,585,872	26,037,823
2005	28,685,664	25,973,520 ^c
2006	28,985,040	25,853,401
2007	29,003,184	24,788,539 ^d
2008	28,622,160	23,674,017
2009	26,317,872	22,714,122 ^e
2010	26,544,672	21,741,734 ^e
2011	26,544,672	20,756,870
2012	26,544,672	20,756,870 ^f
2013	29,629,152	20,756,870 ^f
2014	30,136,361	20,756,870 ^f
2015	30,599,262	20,756,870 ^f
2016	30,599,262 ^g	20,756,870 ^f
2017	30,599,262 ^g	20,756,870 ^f

^a Interpolated between 2000 and 2002 values.

^b Interpolated between 2002 and 2004 values.

^c Interpolated between 2004 and 2006 values.

^d Interpolated between 2006 and 2008 values.

^e Interpolated between 2011 and 2008 values.

^f Set equal to the 2011 value.

^g Set equal to the 2015 value.

References

- ArSova, Ljupka, Rob van Haaren, Nora Goldstein, Scott M. Kaufman, and Nickolas J. Themelis (2008) “16th Annual BioCycle Nationwide Survey: The State of Garbage in America” Biocycle, JG Press, Emmaus, PA. December.
- Bahor, B (2009) Covanta Energy’s public review comments re: *Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2007*. Submitted via email on April 9, 2009 to Leif Hockstad, U.S. EPA.
- De Soete, G.G. (1993) “Nitrous Oxide from Combustion and Industry: Chemistry, Emissions and Control.” In A. R. Van Amstel, (ed) Proc. of the International Workshop Methane and Nitrous Oxide: Methods in National Emission Inventories and Options for Control, Amersfoort, NL. February 3-5, 1993.
- DeZan, D. (2000) Personal Communication between Diane DeZan, Fiber Economics Bureau and Joe Casola, ICF Consulting. 4 August 2000.
- Energy Recovery Council (2009) “2007 Directory of Waste-to-Energy Plants in the United States.” Accessed September 29, 2009.
- EPA (2018) *Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2015 Data Tables*. Office of Land and Emergency Managements, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-07/documents/smm_2015_tables_and_figures_07252018_fnl_508_0.pdf>
- EPA (2016) *Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2014 Fact Sheet – Assessing Trends in Material Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States*. Office of Land and Emergency Managements, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-11/documents/2014_smmfactsheet_508.pdf>.
- EPA (2015) *Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: Facts and Figures 2013 – Assessing Trends in Material Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Available online at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/2013_advncng_smm_rpt.pdf>.
- EPA (1999 through 2003, 2005 through 2014) *Municipal Solid Waste in the United States: Facts and Figures*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC. Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/municipal/msw99.htm>>.
- EPA (2006) *Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases: A Life-Cycle Assessment of Emissions and Sinks*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC.
- EPA (2000) *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States: Source Data on the 1999 Update*. Office of Solid Waste, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC. EPA530-F-00-024.
- EPA (1995) AP 42, Fifth Edition Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Office of Air and Radiation. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-factors-and-quantification/ap-42-compilation-air-emission-factors>>.
- FEB (2009) Fiber Economics Bureau, as cited in C&EN (2009) Chemical Output Slipped In Most Regions Chemical & Engineering News, American Chemical Society, 6 July. Available online at <<http://www.cen-online.org/>>.
- Goldstein, N. and C. Madtes (2001) 13th Annual BioCycle Nationwide Survey: The State of Garbage in America. BioCycle, JG Press, Emmaus, PA. December 2001.
- IPCC (2006) 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- Kaufman, et al. (2004) “14th Annual BioCycle Nationwide Survey: The State of Garbage in America 2004” Biocycle, JG Press, Emmaus, PA. January, 2004. RMA (2018) 2017 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Washington, DC. July 2018. https://www.ustires.org/system/files/USTMA_scraptire_summ_2017_072018.pdf. September 27, 2018
- RMA (2016) “2015 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary.” Rubber Manufacturers Association. August 2016. Available online at: <https://rma.org/sites/default/files/RMA_scraptire_summ_2015.pdf>.

- 1 RMA (2014a) "2013 U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary." Rubber Manufacturers Association. November 2014.
2 Available online at: <http://www.rma.org/download/scrap-tires/market-reports/US_STMarket2013.pdf>. Accessed 17
3 November 2014.
- 4 RMA (2014b) "Scrap Tire Markets: Facts and Figures – Scrap Tire Characteristics." Available online at
5 <http://www.stref.orgwww.stref.org/scrap_tires/scrap_tire_markets/scrap_tire_characteristics/>. Accessed 17
6 November 2014.
- 7 RMA (2012) "Rubber FAQs." Rubber Manufacturers Association. Available online at <[http://www.rma.org/about-](http://www.rma.org/about-rma/rubber-faqs/)
8 [rma/rubber-faqs/](http://www.rma.org/about-rma/rubber-faqs/)>. Accessed 19 November 2014.
- 9 RMA (2011) "U.S. Scrap Tire Management Summary 2005-2009." Rubber Manufacturers Association. October 2011.
10 Available online at: <http://www.rma.org/scrap_tires/scrap_tire_markets/2009_summary.pdf>.
- 11 RMA (2009) Scrap Tire Markets in the United States: 9th Biennial Report. Rubber Manufacturers Association.
12 Washington, DC. May 2009.
- 13 RMA (2002 through 2006) U.S. Scrap Tire Markets. Rubber Manufacturers Association. Washington, DC. Available
14 online at: <https://www.rma.org/publications/scrap_tires/index.cfm?CategoryID=614>.
- 15 Schneider, S. (2007) E-mail between Shelly Schneider of Franklin Associates (a division of ERG) and Sarah Shapiro of
16 ICF International, January 10, 2007.
- 17 Shin, D. (2014) Generation and Disposition of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) in the United States–A National Survey.
18 Thesis. Columbia University, Department of Earth and Environmental Engineering, January 3, 2014.
- 19 Simmons, et al. (2006) "15th Nationwide Survey of Municipal Solid Waste Management in the United States: The State of
20 Garbage in America" BioCycle, JG Press, Emmaus, PA. April 2006.
- 21 STMC (1990 through 1997) Scrap Tire Use/Disposal Study. Rubber Manufacturers Association: Scrap Tire Management
22 Council. Available online at: <https://www.rma.org/publications/scrap_tires/index.cfm?CategoryID=614>.
- 23 Themelis and Shin (2014) U.S. Survey of Generation and Disposition of Municipal Solid Waste. Waste Management.
24 Columbia University. January 2014. <http://www.seas.columbia.edu/earth/wtert/sofos/Dolly_Shin_Thesis.pdf>.
- 25 van Haaren, Rob, Themelis, N., and Goldstein, N. (2010) "The State of Garbage in America." BioCycle, October 2010.
26 Volume 51, Number 10, pg. 16-23.

3.8. Methodology for Estimating Emissions from International Bunker Fuels used by the U.S. Military

Bunker fuel emissions estimates for the Department of Defense (DoD) were developed using data generated by the Defense Logistics Agency Energy (DLA Energy) for aviation and naval fuels. DLA Energy prepared a special report based on data in the Fuels Automated System (FAS) for calendar year 2017 fuel sales in the Continental United States (CONUS).⁶⁸ The following steps outline the methodology used for estimating emissions from international bunker fuels used by the U.S. Military.

Step 1: Omit Extra-Territorial Fuel Deliveries

Beginning with the complete FAS data set for each year, the first step in quantifying DoD-related emissions from international bunker fuels was to identify data that would be representative of international bunker fuel consumption as defined by decisions of the UNFCCC (i.e., fuel sold to a vessel, aircraft, or installation within the United States or its territories and used in international maritime or aviation transport). Therefore, fuel data were categorized by the location of fuel delivery in order to identify and omit all international fuel transactions/deliveries (i.e., sales abroad).

Step 2: Allocate JP-8 between Aviation and Land-based Vehicles

As a result of DoD⁶⁹ and NATO⁷⁰ policies on implementing the Single Fuel For the Battlefield concept, DoD activities have been increasingly replacing diesel fuel with jet fuel in compression ignition and turbine engines of land-based equipment. Based on this concept and examination of all data describing jet fuel used in land-based vehicles, it was determined that a portion of jet fuel consumption should be attributed to ground vehicle use. Based on available Military Service data and expert judgment, a small fraction of jet fuel use (i.e., between 1.78 and 2.7 times the quantity of diesel fuel used, depending on the Service) was reallocated from the aviation subtotal to a new land-based jet fuel category for 1997 and subsequent years. As a result of this reallocation, the jet fuel use reported for aviation was reduced and the fuel use for land-based equipment increased. DoD's total fuel use did not change. DoD has been undergoing a transition from JP-8 jet fuel to commercial specification Jet A fuel with additives (JAA) for non-naval aviation and ground assets. To account for this transition jet fuel used for ground based vehicles was reallocated from JP8 prior to 2014 and from JAA in 2014 and subsequent years. The transition was completed in 2016.

Table A-140 displays DoD's consumption of transportation fuels, summarized by fuel type, that remain at the completion of Step 1, and reflects the adjustments for jet fuel used in land-based equipment, as described above.

Step 3: Omit Land-Based Fuels

Navy and Air Force land-based fuels (i.e., fuel not used by ships or aircraft) were omitted for the purpose of calculating international bunker fuels. The remaining fuels, listed below, were considered potential DoD international bunker fuels.

- **Aviation:** jet fuels (JP8, JP5, JP4, JAA, JA1, and JAB).
- **Marine:** naval distillate fuel (F76), marine gas oil (MGO), and intermediate fuel oil (IFO).

Step 4: Omit Fuel Transactions Received by Military Services that are not considered to be International Bunker Fuels

Only Navy and Air Force were deemed to be users of military international bunker fuels after sorting the data by Military Service and applying the following assumptions regarding fuel use by Service.

- Only fuel delivered to a ship, aircraft, or installation in the United States was considered a potential international bunker fuel. Fuel consumed in international aviation or marine transport was included in

⁶⁸ FAS contains data for 1995 through 2017, but the dataset was not complete for years prior to 1995. Using DLA aviation and marine fuel procurement data, fuel quantities from 1990 to 1994 were estimated based on a back-calculation of the 1995 data in the legacy database, the Defense Fuels Automated Management System (DFAMS). The back-calculation was refined in 1999 to better account for the jet fuel conversion from JP4 to JP8 that occurred within DoD between 1992 and 1995.

⁶⁹ DoD Directive 4140.25-M-V1, Fuel Standardization and Cataloging, 2013; DoD Instruction 4140.25, DoD Management Policy for Energy Commodities and Related Services, 2015.

⁷⁰ NATO Standard Agreement NATO STANAG 4362, Fuels for Future Ground Equipment Using Compression Ignition or Turbine Engines, 2012.

the bunker fuel estimate of the country where the ship or aircraft was fueled. Fuel consumed entirely within a country's borders was not considered a bunker fuel.

- Based on previous discussions with the Army staff, only an extremely small percentage of Army aviation emissions, and none of Army watercraft emissions, qualified as bunker fuel emissions. The magnitude of these emissions was judged to be insignificant when compared to Air Force and Navy emissions. Based on this research, Army bunker fuel emissions were assumed to be zero.
- Marine Corps aircraft operating while embarked consumed fuel that was reported as delivered to the Navy. Bunker fuel emissions from embarked Marine Corps aircraft were reported in the Navy bunker fuel estimates. Bunker fuel emissions from other Marine Corps operations and training were assumed to be zero.
- Bunker fuel emissions from other DoD and non-DoD activities (i.e., other federal agencies) that purchased fuel from DLA Energy were assumed to be zero.

Step 5: Determine Bunker Fuel Percentages

It was necessary to determine what percent of the aviation and marine fuels were used as international bunker fuels. Military aviation bunkers include international operations (i.e., sorties that originate in the United States and end in a foreign country), operations conducted from naval vessels at sea, and operations conducted from U.S. installations principally over international water in direct support of military operations at sea (e.g., anti-submarine warfare flights). Methods for quantifying aviation and marine bunker fuel percentages are described below.

- **Aviation:** The Air Force Aviation bunker fuel percentage was determined to be 13.2 percent. A bunker fuel weighted average was calculated based on flying hours by major command. International flights were weighted by an adjustment factor to reflect the fact that they typically last longer than domestic flights. In addition, a fuel use correction factor was used to account for the fact that transport aircraft burn more fuel per hour of flight than most tactical aircraft. This percentage was multiplied by total annual Air Force aviation fuel delivered for U.S. activities, producing an estimate for international bunker fuel consumed by the Air Force.

The Naval Aviation bunker fuel percentage was calculated to be 40.4 percent by using flying hour data from Chief of Naval Operations Flying Hour Projection System Budget for fiscal year 1998 and estimates of bunker fuel percent of flights provided by the fleet. This Naval Aviation bunker fuel percentage was then multiplied by total annual Navy aviation fuel delivered for U.S. activities, yielding total Navy aviation bunker fuel consumed.

- **Marine:** For marine bunkers, fuels consumed while ships were underway were assumed to be bunker fuels. The Navy maritime bunker fuel percentage was determined to be 79 percent because the Navy reported that 79 percent of vessel operations were underway, while the remaining 21 percent of operations occurred in port (i.e., pierside) in the year 2000.⁷¹

Table A-141 and Table A-142 display DoD bunker fuel use totals for the Navy and Air Force.

Step 6: Calculate Emissions from International Bunker Fuels

Bunker fuel totals were multiplied by appropriate emission factors to determine greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. CO₂ emissions from Aviation Bunkers and distillate Marine Bunkers are the total of military aviation and marine bunker fuels, respectively.

The rows labeled "U.S. Military" and "U.S. Military Naval Fuels" in the tables in the International Bunker Fuels section of the Energy chapter were based on the totals provided in Table A-141 and Table A-142, below. CO₂ emissions from aviation bunkers and distillate marine bunkers are presented in Table A-145, and are based on emissions from fuels tallied in Table A-141 and Table A-142.

⁷¹ Note that 79 percent is used because it is based on Navy data, but the percentage of time underway may vary from year-to-year depending on vessel operations. For example, for years prior to 2000, the bunker fuel percentage was 87 percent.

Table A-140: Transportation Fuels from Domestic Fuel Deliveries^a (Million Gallons)

Vehicle Type/Fuel	1990	1995	2000	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Aviation	4,598.4	3,099.9	2,664.4	2,338.1	2,092.0	2,081.0	2,067.8	1,814.5	1,663.9	1,405.0	1,449.7	1,336.4	1,679.5	1,663.7	1,558.0	1,537.7
Total Jet Fuels	4,598.4	3,099.9	2,664.4	2,338.0	2,091.9	2,080.9	2,067.7	1,814.3	1,663.7	1,404.8	1,449.5	1,336.2	1,679.2	1,663.5	1,557.7	1,537.5
JP8	285.7	2,182.8	2,122.7	1,838.8	1,709.3	1,618.5	1,616.2	1,358.2	1,100.1	882.8	865.2	718.0	546.6	126.6	(+)	(+)
JP5	1,025.4	691.2	472.1	421.6	325.5	376.1	362.2	361.2	399.3	372.3	362.5	316.4	311.0	316.4	320.4	316.3
Other Jet Fuels	3,287.3	225.9	69.6	77.6	57.0	86.3	89.2	94.8	164.3	149.7	221.8	301.7	821.6	1,220.5	1,246.9	1,232.7
Aviation Gasoline	+	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2
Marine	686.8	438.9	454.4	604.9	531.6	572.8	563.4	485.8	578.8	489.9	490.4	390.4	427.9	421.7	412.4	395.2
Middle Distillate (MGO)	+	+	48.3	54.0	45.8	45.7	55.2	56.8	48.4	37.3	52.9	40.9	62.0	56.0	23.1	24.4
Naval Distillate (F76)	686.8	438.9	398.0	525.9	453.6	516.0	483.4	399.0	513.7	440.0	428.4	345.7	362.7	363.3	389.1	370.8
Intermediate Fuel Oil (IFO) ^b	+	+	8.1	25.0	32.2	11.1	24.9	30.0	16.7	12.5	9.1	3.8	3.2	2.4	0.1	+
Other^c	717.1	310.9	248.2	205.6	107.3	169.0	173.6	206.8	224.0	208.6	193.8	180.6	190.7	181.1	178.3	165.8
Diesel	93.0	119.9	126.6	56.8	30.6	47.3	49.1	58.3	64.1	60.9	57.9	54.9	57.5	54.8	54.7	50.4
Gasoline	624.1	191.1	74.8	24.3	11.7	19.2	19.7	25.2	25.5	22.0	19.6	16.9	16.5	16.2	15.9	15.6
Jet Fuel ^d	+	+	46.7	124.4	65.0	102.6	104.8	123.3	134.4	125.6	116.2	108.8	116.7	110.1	107.6	99.9
Total (Including Bunkers)	6,002.4	3,849.8	3,367.0	3,148.6	2,730.9	2,822.8	2,804.9	2,507.1	2,466.7	2,103.5	2,133.9	1,907.5	2,298.2	2,266.5	2,148.7	2,098.7

+ Indicates value does not exceed 0.05 million gallons.

^a Includes fuel distributed in the United States and U.S. Territories.

^b Intermediate fuel oil (IFO 180 and IFO 380) is a blend of distillate and residual fuels. IFO is used by the Military Sealift Command.

^c Prior to 2001, gasoline and diesel fuel totals were estimated using data provided by the Military Services for 1990 and 1996. The 1991 through 1995 data points were interpolated from the Service inventory data.

The 1997 through 1999 gasoline and diesel fuel data were initially extrapolated from the 1996 inventory data. Growth factors used for other diesel and gasoline were 5.2 and -21.1 percent, respectively. However,

prior diesel fuel estimates from 1997 through 2000 were reduced according to the estimated consumption of jet fuel that is assumed to have replaced the diesel fuel consumption in land-based vehicles. Datasets

for other diesel and gasoline consumed by the military in 2000 were estimated based on ground fuels consumption trends. This method produced a result that was more consistent with expected consumption for

2000. Since 2001, other gasoline and diesel fuel totals were generated by DLA Energy.

^d The fraction of jet fuel consumed in land-based vehicles was estimated based on DLA Energy data as well as Military Service and expert judgment.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values. The negative values in this table represent returned products.

1 **Table A-141: Total U.S. Military Aviation Bunker Fuel (Million Gallons)**

Fuel Type/Service	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Jet Fuels																			
JP8	56.7	300.4	341.2	309.5	305.1	309.8	285.6	262.5	249.1	229.4	211.4	182.5	143.4	141.2	122.0	88.0	17.2	2.4	2.5
Navy	56.7	38.3	73.8	86.6	76.3	79.2	70.9	64.7	62.7	59.2	55.4	60.8	47.1	50.4	48.9	31.2	0.8	5.5	6.4
Air Force	+	262.2	267.4	222.9	228.7	230.6	214.7	197.8	186.5	170.3	156.0	121.7	96.2	90.8	73.0	56.7	16.4	(3.1)	(3.9)
JP5	370.5	249.8	169.7	158.3	146.1	157.9	160.6	125.0	144.5	139.2	137.0	152.5	144.9	141.2	124.9	121.9	124.1	126.1	124.7
Navy	365.3	246.3	163.7	153.0	141.3	153.8	156.9	122.8	141.8	136.5	133.5	149.7	143.0	139.5	123.6	120.2	122.6	124.7	123.4
Air Force	5.3	3.5	6.1	5.3	4.9	4.1	3.7	2.3	2.7	2.6	3.5	2.8	1.8	1.7	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.3
JP4	420.8	21.5	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	0.0	0.0	+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Navy	+	+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	+	0.0	0.0	0.0	+	+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Air Force	420.8	21.5	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	0.0	0.0	+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
JAA	13.7	9.2	12.6	13.7	21.7	30.0	15.5	11.7	15.6	16.8	18.1	31.4	31.1	38.6	46.5	128.0	199.8	203.7	198.9
Navy	8.5	5.7	8.0	9.8	15.5	21.5	11.6	9.1	11.7	12.5	12.3	13.7	14.6	14.8	13.4	36.1	71.7	72.9	67.8
Air Force	5.3	3.5	4.6	3.8	6.2	8.6	3.9	2.6	3.9	4.3	5.9	17.7	16.5	23.8	33.1	91.9	128.1	130.8	131.1
JA1	+	+	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.4	1.1	1.0	0.6	0.3	(0.5)	(0.3)	0.6	1.1	0.3	0.5	0.2
Navy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	(0.5)	(0.3)	0.6	0.7	+	0.1	(+)
Air Force	+	+	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8	0.5	0.1	(0.1)	(+)	+	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.2
JAB	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Navy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Air Force	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Navy Subtotal	430.5	290.2	245.5	249.4	233.1	254.4	239.4	196.6	216.3	208.3	201.3	224.4	204.3	204.5	186.5	188.2	195.0	203.2	197.5
Air Force Subtotal	431.3	290.7	278.1	232.7	239.9	243.7	222.9	203.1	194.0	178.1	165.9	142.4	114.5	116.3	107.4	150.7	146.4	129.5	128.8
Total	861.8	580.9	523.6	482.1	473.0	498.1	462.3	399.7	410.3	386.3	367.2	366.7	318.8	320.8	293.9	339.0	341.4	332.8	326.3

+ Does not exceed 0.05 million gallons.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values. The negative values in this table represent returned products.

Table A-142: Total U.S. DoD Maritime Bunker Fuel (Million Gallons)

Marine Distillates	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Navy – MGO	0.0	0.0	22.5	27.1	63.7	56.2	38.0	33.0	31.6	40.9	39.9	32.9	25.5	36.5	32.3	43.3	37.8	5.7	13.2
Navy – F76	522.4	333.8	282.6	305.6	347.8	434.4	413.1	355.9	404.1	376.9	311.4	402.2	346.6	337.9	273.1	286.2	286.7	307.8	293.3
Navy – IFO	0.0	0.0	12.9	15.4	47.5	39.4	19.7	25.4	8.8	19.0	23.1	12.9	9.5	6.1	3.0	1.5	1.9	+	0.0
Total	522.4	333.8	318.0	348.2	459.0	530.0	470.7	414.3	444.4	436.7	374.4	448.0	381.5	380.6	308.5	331.0	326.3	313.6	306.5

+ Does not exceed 0.05 million gallons.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-143: Aviation and Marine Carbon Contents (MMT Carbon/QBtu) and Fraction Oxidized

Mode (Fuel)	Carbon Content Coefficient	Fraction Oxidized
Aviation (Jet Fuel)	Variable	1.00
Marine (Distillate)	20.17	1.00
Marine (Residual)	20.48	1.00

Source: EPA (2010) and IPCC (2006).

Table A-144: Annual Variable Carbon Content Coefficient for Jet Fuel (MMT Carbon/QBtu)

Fuel	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Jet Fuel	19.40	19.34	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70	19.70

Source: EPA (2010)

Table A-145: Total U.S. DoD CO₂ Emissions from Bunker Fuels (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Mode	1990	1995	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Aviation	8.1	5.5	5.1	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.5	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2
Marine	5.4	3.4	3.3	3.6	4.7	5.4	4.8	4.2	4.6	4.5	3.8	4.6	3.9	3.9	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1
Total	13.4	9.0	8.3	8.3	9.3	10.3	9.3	8.1	8.5	8.2	7.4	8.2	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.7	6.7	6.5	6.3

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

References

DLA Energy (2018) Unpublished data from the Defense Fuels Automated Management System (DFAMS). Defense Energy Support Center, Defense Logistics Agency, U.S. Department of Defense. Washington, D.C.

IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.

3.9. Methodology for Estimating HFC and PFC Emissions from Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances

Emissions of HFCs and PFCs from the substitution of ozone depleting substances (ODS) are developed using a country-specific modeling approach. The Vintaging Model was developed as a tool for estimating the annual chemical emissions from industrial sectors that have historically used ODS in their products. Under the terms of the Montreal Protocol and the United States Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, the domestic U.S. consumption of ODS—chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, carbon tetrachloride, methyl chloroform, and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs)—has been drastically reduced, forcing these industrial sectors to transition to more ozone friendly chemicals. As these industries have moved toward ODS alternatives such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and perfluorocarbons (PFCs), the Vintaging Model has evolved into a tool for estimating the rise in consumption and emissions of these alternatives, and the decline of ODS consumption and emissions.

The Vintaging Model estimates emissions from five ODS substitute (i.e., HFC-emitting) end-use sectors: refrigeration and air-conditioning, foams, aerosols, solvents, and fire-extinguishing. Within these sectors, there are 67 independently modeled end-uses. The model requires information on the market growth for each of the end-uses, a history of the market transition from ODS to alternatives, and the characteristics of each end-use such as market size or charge sizes and loss rates. As ODS are phased out, a percentage of the market share originally filled by the ODS is allocated to each of its substitutes.

The model, named for its method of tracking the emissions of annual “vintages” of new equipment that enter into service, is a “bottom-up” model. It models the consumption of chemicals based on estimates of the quantity of equipment or products sold, serviced, and retired each year, and the amount of the chemical required to manufacture and/or maintain the equipment. The Vintaging Model makes use of this market information to build an inventory of the in-use stocks of the equipment and ODS and ODS substitute in each of the end-uses. The simulation is considered to be a “business-as-usual” baseline case, and does not incorporate measures to reduce or eliminate the emissions of these gases other than those regulated by U.S. law or otherwise common in the industry. Emissions are estimated by applying annual leak rates, service emission rates, and disposal emission rates to each population of equipment. By aggregating the emission and consumption output from the different end-uses, the model produces estimates of total annual use and emissions of each chemical.

The Vintaging Model synthesizes data from a variety of sources, including data from the ODS Tracking System maintained by the Stratospheric Protection Division, the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program maintained by the Climate Change Division, and information from submissions to EPA under the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program. Published sources include documents prepared by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Technical Options Committees, reports from the Alternative Fluorocarbons Environmental Acceptability Study (AFEAS), and conference proceedings from the International Conferences on Ozone Protection Technologies and Earth Technologies Forums. EPA also coordinates extensively with numerous trade associations and individual companies. For example, the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy; the Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute; the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers; the American Automobile Manufacturers Association; and many of their member companies have provided valuable information over the years. In some instances the unpublished information that the EPA uses in the model is classified as Confidential Business Information (CBI). The annual emissions inventories of chemicals are aggregated in such a way that CBI cannot be inferred. Full public disclosure of the inputs to the Vintaging Model would jeopardize the security of the CBI that has been entrusted to the EPA.

The following sections discuss the emission equations used in the Vintaging Model for each broad end-use category. These equations are applied separately for each chemical used within each of the different end-uses. In the majority of these end-uses, more than one ODS substitute chemical is used.

In general, the modeled emissions are a function of the amount of chemical consumed in each end-use market. Estimates of the consumption of ODS alternatives can be inferred by determining the transition path of each regulated ODS used in the early 1990s. Using data gleaned from a variety of sources, assessments are made regarding which alternatives have been used, and what fraction of the ODS market in each end-use has been captured by a given alternative. By combining this with estimates of the total end-use market growth, a consumption value can be estimated for each chemical used within each end-use.

Methodology

The Vintaging Model estimates the use and emissions of ODS alternatives by taking the following steps:

1. *Gather historical data.* The Vintaging Model is populated with information on each end-use, taken from published sources and industry experts.

2. *Simulate the implementation of new, non-ODS technologies.* The Vintaging Model uses detailed characterizations of the existing uses of the ODS, as well as data on how the substitutes are replacing the ODS, to simulate the implementation of new technologies that enter the market in compliance with ODS phase-out policies. As part of this simulation, the ODS substitutes are introduced in each of the end-uses over time as seen historically and as needed to comply with the ODS phase-out and other regulations.

3. *Estimate emissions of the ODS substitutes.* The chemical use is estimated from the amount of substitutes that are required each year for the manufacture, installation, use, or servicing of products. The emissions are estimated from the emission profile for each vintage of equipment or product in each end-use. By aggregating the emissions from each vintage, a time profile of emissions from each end-use is developed.

Each set of end-uses is discussed in more detail in the following sections.

Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning

For refrigeration and air conditioning products, emission calculations are split into two categories: emissions during equipment lifetime, which arise from annual leakage and service losses, and disposal emissions, which occur at the time of discard. Two separate steps are required to calculate the lifetime emissions from leakage and service, and the emissions resulting from disposal of the equipment. The model assumes that equipment is serviced annually so that the amount equivalent to average annual emissions for each product (and hence for the total of what was added to the bank in a previous year in equipment that has not yet reached end-of-life) is replaced/applied to the starting charge size (or chemical bank). For any given year, these lifetime emissions (for existing equipment) and disposal emissions (from discarded equipment) are summed to calculate the total emissions from refrigeration and air-conditioning. As new technologies replace older ones, it is generally assumed that there are improvements in their leak, service, and disposal emission rates.

Step 1: Calculate lifetime emissions

Emissions from any piece of equipment include both the amount of chemical leaked during equipment operation and the amount emitted during service. Emissions from leakage and servicing can be expressed as follows:

$$Es_j = (l_a + l_s) \times \sum Qc_{j-i+1} \text{ for } i = 1 \rightarrow k$$

where:

Es	=	Emissions from Equipment Serviced. Emissions in year j from normal leakage and servicing (including recharging) of equipment.
l_a	=	Annual Leak Rate. Average annual leak rate during normal equipment operation (expressed as a percentage of total chemical charge).
l_s	=	Service Leak Rate. Average leakage during equipment servicing (expressed as a percentage of total chemical charge).
Qc	=	Quantity of Chemical in New Equipment. Total amount of a specific chemical used to charge new equipment in a given year by weight.
i	=	Counter, runs from 1 to lifetime (k).
j	=	Year of emission.
k	=	Lifetime. The average lifetime of the equipment.

Step 2: Calculate disposal emissions

The disposal emission equations assume that a certain percentage of the chemical charge will be emitted to the atmosphere when that vintage is discarded. Disposal emissions are thus a function of the quantity of chemical contained in the retiring equipment fleet and the proportion of chemical released at disposal:

$$Ed_j = Qc_{j-k+1} \times [1 - (rm \times rc)]$$

where:

Ed	=	Emissions from Equipment Disposed. Emissions in year j from the disposal of equipment.

1	Q_c	=	Quantity of Chemical in New Equipment. Total amount of a specific chemical used to
2			charge new equipment in year $j-k+1$, by weight.
3	rm	=	Chemical Remaining. Amount of chemical remaining in equipment at the time of
4			disposal (expressed as a percentage of total chemical charge).
5	rc	=	Chemical Recovery Rate. Amount of chemical that is recovered just prior to disposal
6			(expressed as a percentage of chemical remaining at disposal (rm)).
7	j	=	Year of emission.
8	k	=	Lifetime. The average lifetime of the equipment.

9 **Step 3: Calculate total emissions**

10 Finally, lifetime and disposal emissions are summed to provide an estimate of total emissions.

$$11 \qquad \qquad \qquad E_j = Es_j + Ed_j$$

12 where:

13	E	=	Total Emissions. Emissions from refrigeration and air conditioning equipment in year
14			j .
15	Es	=	Emissions from Equipment Serviced. Emissions in year j from leakage and servicing
16			(including recharging) of equipment.
17	Ed	=	Emissions from Equipment Disposed. Emissions in year j from the disposal of
18			equipment.
19	j	=	Year of emission.

20 **Assumptions**

21 The assumptions used by the Vintaging Model to trace the transition of each type of equipment away from ODS
22 are presented in Table A-146, below. As new technologies replace older ones, it is generally assumed that there are
23 improvements in their leak, service, and disposal emission rates. Additionally, the market for each equipment type is
24 assumed to grow independently, according to annual growth rates.

1 **Table A-146: Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Market Transition Assumptions**

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
Centrifugal Chillers													
CFC-11	HCFC-123	1993	1993	45%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2016	2016	1%	None				1.6%
					R-514A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					HCFO-1233zd(E)	2017	2020	49%	None				
					R-514A	2018	2020	49%	None				
	HCFC-22	1991	1993	16%	HFC-134a	2000	2010	100%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%	
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%	
	HFC-134a	1992	1993	39%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					R-513A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					R-450A	2018	2024	49%	None				
					R-513A	2018	2024	49%	None				
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1992	1994	53%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None			1.5%	
					R-513A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					R-450A	2018	2024	49%	None				
					R-513A	2018	2024	49%	None				
	HCFC-22	1991	1994	16%	HFC-134a	2000	2010	100%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%	
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%	
	HCFC-123	1993	1994	31%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2016	2016	1%	None				
					R-514A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					HCFO-1233zd(E)	2017	2020	49%	None				
					R-514A	2018	2020	49%	None				
R-500	HFC-134a	1992	1994	53%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None			1.5%	
					R-513A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					R-450A	2018	2024	49%	None				
					R-513A	2018	2024	49%	None				
	HCFC-22	1991	1994	16%	HFC-134a	2000	2010	100%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%	
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%	
	HCFC-123	1993	1994	31%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2016	2016	1%	None				
					R-514A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					HCFO-1233zd(E)	2017	2020	49%	None				
					R-514A	2018	2020	49%	None				

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
CFC-114	HFC-236fa	1993	1996	100%	HFC-134a	1998	2009	100%	None.				1.4%
Cold Storage													
CFC-12	HCFC-22	1990	1993	65%	R-404A	1996	2010	75%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	3.1%
	R-404A	1994	1996	26%	R-507	1996	2010	25%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	
	R-507	1994	1996	9%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	None				
HCFC-22	HCFC-22	1992	1993	100%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	None				
					R-404A	1996	2009	8%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	3.0%
					R-507	1996	2009	3%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	
					R-404A	2009	2010	68%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	
					R-507	2009	2010	23%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	
R-502	HCFC-22	1990	1993	40%	R-404A	1996	2010	38%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	2.6%
					R-507	1996	2010	12%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	1996	2010	50%	None				
	R-404A	1993	1996	45%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	None				
	R-507	1994	1996	15%	R-407F	2017	2023	100%	None				
Commercial Unitary Air Conditioners (Large)													
HCFC-22	HCFC-22	1992	1993	100%	R-410A	2001	2005	5%	None				1.3%
					R-407C	2006	2009	1%	None				
					R-410A	2006	2009	9%	None				
					R-407C	2009	2010	5%	None				
					R-410A	2009	2010	81%	None				
Commercial Unitary Air Conditioners (Small)													
HCFC-22	HCFC-22	1992	1993	100%	R-410A	1996	2000	3%	None				1.3%
					R-410A	2001	2005	18%	None				
					R-410A	2006	2009	8%	None				
					R-410A	2009	2010	71%	None				
Dehumidifiers													
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	1997	1997	89%	None								1.3%
	R-410A	2007	2010	11%	None								
Ice Makers													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1993	1995	25%	None								2.1%
	R-404A	1993	1995	75%	None								
Industrial Process Refrigeration													
CFC-11	HCFC-123	1992	1994	70%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2016	2016	2%	None				3.2%
					HCFO-1233zd(E)	2017	2020	98%	None				
	HFC-134a	1992	1994	15%	None								

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
CFC-12	HCFC-22	1991	1994	15%	HFC-134a	1995	2010	100%	None				3.1%
	HCFC-22	1991	1994	10%	HFC-134a	1995	2010	15%	None				
					R-404A	1995	2010	50%	None				
					R-410A	1999	2010	20%	None				
					R-507	1995	2010	15%	None				
	HCFC-123	1992	1994	35%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2016	2016	2%	None				
					HCFO-1233zd(E)	2017	2020	98%	None				
	HFC-134a	1992	1994	50%	None								
	R-401A	1995	1996	5%	HFC-134a	1997	2000	100%	None				
	HFC-134a	1995	2009	2%	None								
	R-404A	1995	2009	5%	None								
	R-410A	1999	2009	2%	None								
	R-507	1995	2009	2%	None								
	HFC-134a	2009	2010	14%	None								
	R-404A	2009	2010	45%	None								
	R-410A	2009	2010	18%	None								
	R-507	2009	2010	14%	None								
Mobile Air Conditioners (Passenger Cars)													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1992	1994	100%	HFO-1234yf	2012	2015	1%	None				0.3%
					HFO-1234yf	2016	2021	99%	None				
Mobile Air Conditioners (Light Duty Trucks)													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1993	1994	100%	HFO-1234yf	2012	2015	1%	None				1.4%
					HFO-1234yf	2016	2021	99%	None				
Mobile Air Conditioners (Heavy Duty Vehicles)													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1993	1994	100%	None								0.8%
Mobile Air Conditioners (School and Tour Buses)													
CFC-12	HCFC-22	1994	1995	0.5%	HFC-134a	2006	2007	100%	None				0.3%
	HFC-134a	1994	1997	99.5%	None								
Mobile Air Conditioners (Transit Buses)													
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	1995	2009	100%	None								0.3%
Mobile Air Conditioners (Trains)													
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	2002	2009	50%	None								0.3%
	R-407C	2002	2009	50%	None								
Packaged Terminal Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps													
HCFC-22	R-410A	2006	2009	10%	None								3.0%
	R-410A	2009	2010	90%	None								

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷	
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration		
Positive Displacement Chillers (Reciprocating and Screw)														
CFC-12	HFC-134a	2000	2009	9%	R-407C	2010	2020	60%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	2.5%	
HCFC-22 ²									R-513A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-450A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%		
		R-407C	2000	2009	1%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None	2018	2024		49%
						R-513A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-450A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-513A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-450A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-513A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-450A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-513A	2018	2024	49%					
		HFC-134a	2009	2010	81%	R-407C	2010	2020	60%	R-450A	2017	2017		1%
						R-513A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-450A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-513A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-450A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-513A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-450A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-513A	2018	2024	49%					
	R-407C	2009	2010	9%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None	2018	2024	49%		
					R-513A	2017	2017	1%						
					R-450A	2018	2024	49%						
					R-513A	2018	2024	49%						
					R-450A	2017	2017	1%						
					R-513A	2017	2017	1%						
					R-450A	2018	2024	49%						
					R-513A	2018	2024	49%						
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	2000	2009	9%	R-407C	2010	2020	60%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-450A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%		
		R-407C	2000	2009	1%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None	2018	2024	49%	
						R-513A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-450A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-513A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-450A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-513A	2017	2017	1%					
						R-450A	2018	2024	49%					
						R-513A	2018	2024	49%					
	HFC-134a	2009	2010	81%	R-407C	2010	2020	60%	R-450A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-450A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%		
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%		
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%		

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
	R-407C	2009	2010	9%	R-410A	2010	2020	40%	R-450A	2018	2024	49%	
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%	
									R-450A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-513A	2017	2017	1%	
									R-450A	2018	2024	49%	
									R-513A	2018	2024	49%	
					R-450A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					R-513A	2017	2017	1%	None				
					R-450A	2018	2024	49%	None				
					R-513A	2018	2024	49%	None				
Positive Displacement Chillers (Scroll)													
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	2000	2009	9%	R-407C	2010	2020	60%	R-452B	2024	2024	100%	2.5%
					R-410A	2010	2020	40%	R-452B	2024	2024	100%	
	R-407C	2000	2009	1%	R-452B	2024	2024	100%	None				
	HFC-134a	2009	2010	81%	R-407C	2010	2020	60%	R-452B	2024	2024	100%	
					R-410A	2010	2020	40%	R-452B	2024	2024	100%	
	R-407C	2009	2010	9%	R-452B	2024	2024	100%	None				
Refrigerated Appliances													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1994	1995	100%	Non-ODP/GWP	2019	2021	86%	None				1.7%
					R-450A	2021	2021	7%	None				
					R-513A	2021	2021	7%	None				
Refrigerated Food Processing and Dispensing Equipment													
CFC-12	HCFC-22	1990	1994	100%	HFC-134a	1995	1998	70%	None				2.1%
					R-404A	1995	1998	30%	R-448A	2021	2021	50%	
									R-449A	2021	2021	50%	
Residential Unitary Air Conditioners													
HCFC-22	HCFC-22	2006	2006	70%	R-410A	2007	2010	29%	None				1.3%
					R-410A	2010	2010	71%	None				
	R-410A	2000	2005	5%	R-410A	2006	2006	100%	None				
	R-410A	2000	2006	5%	None								
	R-410A	2006	2006	20%	None								
Retail Food (Large; Technology Transition)													
DX ³	DX	2001	2006	67.5%	DX	2006	2015	62%	None				1.7%
					DR ⁴	2000	2015	23%	None				
					SLS ⁵	2000	2015	15%	None				
	DR	2000	2006	22.5%	None								
	SLS	2000	2006	10%	None								
Retail Food (Large; Refrigerant Transition)													

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
CFC-12 R-502 ⁶	R-404A	1995	2000	17.5%	R-404A	2000	2000	3.3%	R-407A	2017	2017	100%	1.7%
					R-407A	2011	2015	63.3%	None				
					R-407A	2017	2017	33.3%	None				
	R-507	1995	2000	7.5%	R-404A	2006	2010	71%	R-407A	2017	2017	100%	
					R-407A	2006	2010	30%	None				
	HCFC-22	1995	2000	75%	R-404A	2006	2010	13.3%	R-407A	2011	2015	100%	
					R-407A	2001	2005	1.3%	None				
					R-404A	2001	2005	12%	R-407A	2017	2017	100%	
					R-507	2001	2005	6.7%	R-407A	2011	2015	100%	
					R-404A	2006	2010	34%	R-407A	2011	2015	100%	
				R-404A	2006	2010	7.3%	R-407A	2017	2017	100%		
				R-407A	2006	2010	25.3%	None					
Retail Food (Large Condensing Units)													
HCFC-22	R-402A	1995	2005	5%	R-404A	2006	2006	100%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%	1.5%
	R-404A	1995	2005	25%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%	None				
	R-507	1995	2005	10%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%	None				
	R-404A	2008	2010	45%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%	None				
	R-507	2008	2010	15%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%	None				
Retail Food (Small Condensing Units)													
HCFC-22	R-401A	1995	2005	6%	HFC-134a	2006	2006	100%	None				1.6%
	R-402A	1995	2005	4%	HFC-134a	2006	2006	100%	None				
	HFC-134a	1993	2005	30%	None								
	R-404A	1995	2005	30%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%					
	R-404A	2008	2010	30%	R-407A	2018	2018	100%					
Retail Food (Small)													
CFC-12	HCFC-22	1990	1993	91%	HFC-134a	1993	1995	91%	CO ₂	2012	2015	1%	2.2%
									Non-ODP/GWP	2012	2015	3.7%	
									Non-ODP/GWP	2014	2019	31%	
									Non-ODP/GWP	2016	2016	17.3%	
									R-450A	2016	2020	23%	
									R-513A	2016	2020	23%	
					HFC-134a	2000	2009	9%	Non-ODP/GWP	2014	2019	30%	
									R-450A	2016	2020	35%	
									R-513A	2016	2020	35%	
	R-404A	1990	1993	9%	Non-ODP/GWP	2016	2016	30%	None				
				R-448A	2019	2020	35%	None					
				R-449A	2019	2020	35%	None					
Transport Refrigeration (Road Transport)													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1993	1995	10%	None								5.5%

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
	R-404A	1993	1995	60%	R-452A	2017	2021	5%					
	HCFC-22	1993	1995	30%	R-452A	2021	2030	95%					
					R-410A	2000	2003	5%	None				
					R-404A	2006	2010	95%	R-452A	2017	2021	5%	
									R-452A	2021	2030	95%	
Transport Refrigeration (Intermodal Containers)													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1993	1993	60%	CO ₂	2017	2021	5%	None				7.3%
	R-404A	1993	1993	5%	CO ₂	2017	2021	5%	None				
	HCFC-22	1993	1993	35%	HFC-134a	2000	2010	100%	CO ₂	2017	2021	5%	
Transport Refrigeration (Merchant Fishing Transport)													
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	1993	1995	10%	None								5.7%
	R-507	1994	1995	10%	None								
	R-404A	1993	1995	10%	None								
	HCFC-22	1993	1995	70%	R-407C	2000	2005	3%	R-410A	2005	2007	100%	
					R-507	2006	2010	49%	None				
					R-404A	2006	2010	49%	None				
Transport Refrigeration (Reefer Ships)													
HCFC-22	HFC-134a	1993	1995	3.3%	None								4.2%
	R-507	1994	1995	3.3%	None								
	R-404A	1993	1995	3.3%	None								
	HCFC-22	1993	1995	90%	HFC-134a	2006	2010	25%	None				
					R-507	2006	2010	25%	None				
					R-404A	2006	2010	25%	None				
					R-407C	2006	2010	25%	None				
Transport Refrigeration (Vintage Rail Transport)													
CFC-12	HCFC-22	1993	1995	100%	HFC-134a	1996	2000	100%	None				-100%
Transport Refrigeration (Modern Rail Transport)													
HFC-134a	R-404A	1999	1999	50%	None								0.3%
	HFC-134A	2005	2005	50%	None								
Vending Machines													
CFC-12	HFC-134a	1995	1998	90%	CO ₂	2012	2012	1%	Propane	100%	2019	2019	-0.03%
					Propane	2013	2017	39%	None				
					Propane	2014	2014	1%	None				
					Propane	2019	2019	49%	None				
					R-450A	2019	2019	5%	None				
					R-513A	2019	2019	5%	None				
	R-404A	1995	1998	10%	R-450A	2019	2019	50%	None				
					R-513A	2019	2019	50%	None				

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁷
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
Water-Source and Ground-Source Heat Pumps													
HCFC-22	R-407C	2000	2006	5%	None								1.3%
	R-410A	2000	2006	5%	None								
	HFC-134a	2000	2009	2%	None								
	R-407C	2006	2009	2.5%	None								
	R-410A	2006	2009	4.5%	None								
	HFC-134a	2009	2010	18%	None								
	R-407C	2009	2010	22.5%	None								
	R-410A	2009	2010	40.5%	None								
Window Units													
HCFC-22	R-410A	2008	2009	10%	None								4.0%
	R-410A	2009	2010	90%	None								

¹ Transitions between the start year and date of full penetration in new equipment are assumed to be linear so that in total 100 percent of the market is assigned to the original ODS or the various ODS substitutes.

² The CFC-12 reciprocating chillers market for new systems transitioned to HCFC-22 overnight in 1993. This transition is not shown in the table in order to provide the HFC transitions in greater detail.

³ DX refers to direct expansion systems where the compressors are mounted together in a rack and share suction and discharge refrigeration lines that run throughout the store, feeding refrigerant to the display cases in the sales area.

⁴ DR refers to distributed refrigeration systems that consist of multiple smaller units that are located close to the display cases that they serve such as on the roof above the cases, behind a nearby wall, or on top of or next to the case in the sales area.

⁵ SLS refers to secondary loop systems wherein a secondary fluid such as glycol or carbon dioxide is cooled by the primary refrigerant in the machine room and then pumped throughout the store to remove heat from the display equipment.

⁶ The CFC-12 large retail food market for new systems transitioned to R-502 from 1988 to 1990, and subsequently transitioned to HCFC-22 from 1990 to 1993. These transitions are not shown in the table in order to provide the HFC transitions in greater detail.

⁷ Growth Rate is the average annual growth rate for individual market sectors from the base year to 2030.

Table A-147 presents the average equipment lifetimes and annual HFC emission rates (for servicing, leaks, and disposal) for each end-use assumed by the Vintaging Model.

Table A-147: Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Lifetime Assumptions

End-Use	Lifetime (Years)	HFC Emission Rates (Servicing and Leaks) (%)	HFC Emission Rates (Disposal) ¹ (%)
Centrifugal Chillers	20 – 27	2.0 – 10.9	10
Cold Storage	20 – 25	15.0	10
Commercial Unitary A/C	15	7.9 – 8.6	18 – 40
Dehumidifiers	11	0.5	50
Ice Makers	8	3.0	49
Industrial Process Refrigeration	25	3.6 – 12.3	10
Mobile Air Conditioners	5 – 16	2.3 – 18.0	43 – 50
Positive Displacement Chillers	20	0.5 – 1.5	10
PTAC/PTHP	12	3.9	40
Retail Food	10 – 20	1.0 – 25	10 – 35
Refrigerated Appliances	14	0.6	42
Residential Unitary A/C	15	5.3 – 10.6	20 – 40
Transport Refrigeration	9 – 40	19.4 – 36.4	10 – 65
Water & Ground Source Heat Pumps	20	3.9	43
Window Units	12	0.6	50

¹ Disposal emissions rates are developed based on consideration of the original charge size, the percentage of refrigerant likely to remain in equipment at the time of disposal, and recovery practices assumed to vary by gas type. Because equipment lifetime emissions are annualized, equipment is assumed to reach the end of its lifetime with a full charge. Therefore, recovery rate is equal to 100 percent - Disposal Loss Rate (%).

Aerosols

ODSs, HFCs, and many other chemicals are used as propellant aerosols. Pressurized within a container, a nozzle releases the chemical, which allows the product within the can to also be released. Two types of aerosol products are modeled: metered dose inhalers (MDI) and consumer aerosols. In the United States, the use of CFCs in consumer aerosols was banned in 1978, and many products transitioned to hydrocarbons or “not-in-kind” technologies, such as solid deodorants and finger-pump hair sprays. However, MDIs continued to use CFCs as propellants because their use was deemed essential. Essential use exemptions granted to the United States under the Montreal Protocol for CFC use in MDIs were limited to the treatment of asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

All HFCs used in aerosols are assumed to be emitted in the year of manufacture. Since there is currently no aerosol recycling, it is assumed that all of the annual production of aerosol propellants is released to the atmosphere. The following equation describes the emissions from the aerosols sector.

$$E_j = Qc_j$$

where:

E = Emissions. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j from use in aerosol products, by weight.

Qc = Quantity of Chemical. Total quantity of a specific chemical contained in aerosol products sold in year j , by weight.

j = Year of emission.

Transition Assumptions

Transition assumptions and growth rates for those items that use ODSs or HFCs as propellants, including vital medical devices and specialty consumer products, are presented in Table A-148.

Table A-148: Aerosol Product Transition Assumptions

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Growth Rate ⁴
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
MDIs									
CFC Mix ²	HFC-134a	1997	1997	6%	None				0.8%
	Non-ODP/GWP	1998	2007	7%	None				
	CFC Mix ^a	2000	2000	87%	HFC-134a	2002	2002	34%	
					HFC-134a	2003	2009	47%	
					HFC-227ea	2006	2009	5%	
					HFC-134a	2010	2011	6%	
					HFC-227ea	2010	2011	1%	
					HFC-134a	2011	2012	3%	
					HFC-227ea	2011	2012	0.3%	
					HFC-134a	2014	2014	3%	
				HFC-227ea	2014	2014	0.3%		
Consumer Aerosols (Non-MDIs)									
NA ³	HFC-152a	1990	1991	50%	None				2.0%
	HFC-134a	1995	1995	50%	HFC-152a	1997	1998	44%	
					HFC-152a	2001	2005	36%	
					HFO-1234ze(E)	2016	2018	7%	

¹ Transitions between the start year and date of full penetration in new products are assumed to be linear so that in total 100% of the market is assigned to the original ODS or the various ODS substitutes.

² CFC Mix consists of CFC-11, CFC-12 and CFC-114 and represents the weighted average of several CFCs consumed for essential use in MDIs from 1993 to 2008. It is assumed that CFC mix was stockpiled in the United States and used in new products through 2013.

³ Consumer Aerosols transitioned away from ODS prior to 1985, the year in which the Vintaging Model begins. The portion of the market that is now using HFC propellants is modeled.

⁴ Growth Rate is the average annual growth rate for individual market sectors from the base year to 2030.

Solvents

ODSs, HFCs, PFCs and other chemicals are used as solvents to clean items. For example, electronics may need to be cleaned after production to remove any manufacturing process oils or residues left. Solvents are applied by moving the item to be cleaned within a bath or stream of the solvent. Generally, most solvents are assumed to remain in the liquid phase and are not emitted as gas. Thus, emissions are considered “incomplete,” and are a fixed percentage of the amount of solvent consumed in a year. The solvent is assumed to be recycled or continuously reused through a distilling and cleaning process until it is eventually almost entirely emitted. The remainder of the consumed solvent is assumed to be entrained in sludge or wastes and disposed of by incineration or other destruction technologies without being released to the atmosphere (U.S. EPA 2004). The following equation calculates emissions from solvent applications.

$$E_j = l \times Qc_j$$

where:

E = Emissions. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j from use in solvent applications, by weight.

l = Percent Leakage. The percentage of the total chemical that is leaked to the atmosphere, assumed to be 90 percent.

Qc = Quantity of Chemical. Total quantity of a specific chemical sold for use in solvent applications in the year j , by weight.

j = Year of emission.

Transition Assumptions

The transition assumptions and growth rates used within the Vintaging Model for electronics cleaning, metals cleaning, precision cleaning, and adhesives, coatings and inks, are presented in Table A-149.

Table A-149: Solvent Market Transition Assumptions

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Growth Rate ³
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
Adhesives									
CH ₃ CCl ₃	Non-ODP/GWP	1994	1995	100%	None				2.0%
Electronics									
CFC-113	Semi-Aqueous	1994	1995	52%	None				2.0%
	HCFC-225ca/cb	1994	1995	0.2%	Unknown				
	HFC-43-10mee	1995	1996	0.7%	None				
	HFE-7100	1994	1995	0.7%	None				
	nPB	1992	1996	5%	None				
	Methyl Siloxanes	1992	1996	0.8%	None				
	No-Clean	1992	2013 ²	40%	None				
CH ₃ CCl ₃	Non-ODP/GWP	1996	1997	99.8%	None				2.0%
	PFC/PFPE	1996	1997	0.2%	Non-ODP/GWP	2000	2003	90%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2005	2009	10%	
Metals									
CH ₃ CCl ₃	Non-ODP/GWP	1992	1996	100%	None				2.0%
CFC-113	Non-ODP/GWP	1992	2013 ²	100%	None				2.0%
CCl ₄	Non-ODP/GWP	1992	1996	100%	None				2.0%
Precision									
CH ₃ CCl ₃	Non-ODP/GWP	1995	1996	99.3%	None				2.0%
	HFC-43-10mee	1995	1996	0.6%	None				
	PFC/PFPE	1995	1996	0.1%	Non-ODP/GWP	2000	2003	90%	
CFC-113					Non-ODP/GWP	2005	2009	10%	2.0%
	Non-ODP/GWP	1995	2013 ²	90%	None				
	Methyl Siloxanes	1995	1996	6%					
	HCFC-225ca/cb	1995	1996	1%	Unknown				
	HFE-7100	1995	1996	3%	None				

¹ Transitions between the start year and date of full penetration in new equipment or chemical supply are assumed to be linear so that in total 100 percent of the market is assigned to the original ODS or the various ODS substitutes.

Note: Non-ODP/GWP includes chemicals with zero ODP and low GWP, such as hydrocarbons and ammonia, as well as not-in-kind alternatives such as "no clean" technologies.

² Transition assumed to be completed in 2013 to mimic CFC-113 stockpile use.

³ Growth Rate is the average annual growth rate for individual market sectors from the base year to 2030.

Fire Extinguishing

ODSs, HFCs, PFCs and other chemicals are used as fire-extinguishing agents, in both hand-held "streaming" applications as well as in built-up "flooding" equipment similar to water sprinkler systems. Although these systems are generally built to be leak-tight, some leaks do occur and emissions occur when the agent is released. Total emissions from fire extinguishing are assumed, in aggregate, to equal a percentage of the total quantity of chemical in operation at a given time. For modeling purposes, it is assumed that fire extinguishing equipment leaks at a constant rate for an average equipment lifetime, as shown in the equation below. In streaming systems, non-halon emissions are assumed to be 3.5 percent of all chemical in use in each year, while in flooding systems 2.5 percent of the installed base of chemical is assumed to leak annually. Halon systems are assumed to leak at higher rates. The equation is applied for a single year, accounting for all fire protection equipment in operation in that year. The model assumes that equipment is serviced annually so that the amount equivalent to average annual emissions for each product (and hence for the total of what was added to the bank in a previous year in equipment that has not yet reached end-of-life) is replaced/applied to the starting charge size (or chemical bank). Each fire protection agent is modeled separately. In the Vintaging Model, streaming applications have a 12-year lifetime and flooding applications have a 20-year lifetime.

$$E_i = r \times \sum Q_{C_{j-i+1}} \text{ for } i=1 \rightarrow k$$

where:

E	=	Emissions. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j for streaming fire extinguishing equipment, by weight.
r	=	Percent Released. The percentage of the total chemical in operation that is released to the atmosphere.
Q_c	=	Quantity of Chemical. Total amount of a specific chemical used in new fire extinguishing equipment in a given year, $j-i+1$, by weight.
i	=	Counter, runs from 1 to lifetime (k).
j	=	Year of emission.
k	=	Lifetime. The average lifetime of the equipment.

Transition Assumptions

Transition assumptions and growth rates for these two fire extinguishing types are presented in Table A-150.

Table A-150: Fire Extinguishing Market Transition Assumptions

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Growth Rate ³
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
Flooding Agents									
Halon-1301	Halon-1301 ²	1994	1994	4%	Unknown				2.2%
	HFC-23	1994	1999	0.2%	None				
	HFC-227ea	1994	1999	50.2%	FK-5-1-12	2003	2020	35%	
					HFC-125	2001	2012	10%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2005	2020	13%	
	Non-ODP/GWP	1994	1994	22%	FK-5-1-12	2003	2020	7%	
	Non-ODP/GWP	1995	2003	7%	None				
	CO ₂	1998	2006	7%	None				
	C ₄ F ₁₀	1994	1999	0.5%	FK-5-1-12	2003	2003	100%	
	HFC-125	1997	2006	9.1%	FK-5-1-12	2003	2020	35%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2005	2020	10%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2005	2019	3%	
Streaming Agents									
Halon-1211	Halon-1211 ²	1992	1992	5%	Unknown				3.0%
	HFC-236fa	1997	1999	3%	None				
	Halotron	1994	1995	0.1%	Unknown				
	Halotron	1996	2000	5.4%	Non-ODP/GWP	2020	2020	56%	
	Non-ODP/GWP	1993	1994	56%	None				
	Non-ODP/GWP	1995	2024	20%	None				
	Non-ODP/GWP	1999	2018	10%	None				

¹ Transitions between the start year and date of full penetration in new equipment are assumed to be linear so that in total 100 percent of the market is assigned to the original ODS or the various ODS substitutes.

² Despite the 1994 consumption ban, a small percentage of new halon systems are assumed to continue to be built and filled with stockpiled or recovered supplies.

³ Growth Rate is the average annual growth rate for individual market sectors from the base year to 2030.

Foam Blowing

ODSs, HFCs, and other chemicals are used to produce foams, including such items as the foam insulation panels around refrigerators, insulation sprayed on buildings, etc. The chemical is used to create pockets of gas within a substrate, increasing the insulating properties of the item. Foams are given emission profiles depending on the foam type (open cell or closed cell). Open cell foams are assumed to be 100 percent emissive in the year of manufacture. Closed cell foams are

assumed to emit a portion of their total HFC content upon manufacture, a portion at a constant rate over the lifetime of the foam, a portion at disposal, and a portion after disposal; these portions vary by end-use.

Step 1: Calculate manufacturing emissions (open-cell and closed-cell foams)

Manufacturing emissions occur in the year of foam manufacture, and are calculated as presented in the following equation.

$$Em_j = lm \times Qc_j$$

where:

Em_j = Emissions from manufacturing. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j due to manufacturing losses, by weight.

lm = Loss Rate. Percent of original blowing agent emitted during foam manufacture. For open-cell foams, lm is 100%.

Qc = Quantity of Chemical. Total amount of a specific chemical used to manufacture closed-cell foams in a given year.

j = Year of emission.

Step 2: Calculate lifetime emissions (closed-cell foams)

Lifetime emissions occur annually from closed-cell foams throughout the lifetime of the foam, as calculated as presented in the following equation.

$$Eu_j = lu \times \sum Qc_{j-i+1} \text{ for } i=1 \rightarrow k$$

where:

Eu_j = Emissions from Lifetime Losses. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j due to lifetime losses during use, by weight.

lu = Leak Rate. Percent of original blowing agent emitted each year during lifetime use.

Qc = Quantity of Chemical. Total amount of a specific chemical used to manufacture closed-cell foams in a given year.

i = Counter, runs from 1 to lifetime (k).

j = Year of emission.

k = Lifetime. The average lifetime of foam product.

Step 3: Calculate disposal emissions (closed-cell foams)

Disposal emissions occur in the year the foam is disposed, and are calculated as presented in the following equation.

$$Ed_j = ld \times Qc_{j-k}$$

where:

Ed_j = Emissions from disposal. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j at disposal, by weight.

ld = Loss Rate. Percent of original blowing agent emitted at disposal.

Qc = Quantity of Chemical. Total amount of a specific chemical used to manufacture closed-cell foams in a given year.

j = Year of emission.

k = Lifetime. The average lifetime of foam product.

Step 4: Calculate post-disposal emissions (closed-cell foams)

Post-disposal emissions occur in the years after the foam is disposed; for example, emissions might occur while the disposed foam is in a landfill. Currently, the only foam type assumed to have post-disposal emissions is polyurethane foam used as domestic refrigerator and freezer insulation, which is expected to continue to emit for 26 years post-disposal, calculated as presented in the following equation.

$$Ep_j = lp \times \sum Q_{Cj-m} \text{ for } m=k \rightarrow k+26$$

where:

Ep_j = Emissions from post disposal. Total post-disposal emissions of a specific chemical in year j , by weight.

lp = Leak Rate. Percent of original blowing agent emitted post disposal.

Q_c = Quantity of Chemical. Total amount of a specific chemical used to manufacture closed-cell foams in a given year.

k = Lifetime. The average lifetime of foam product.

m = Counter. Runs from lifetime (k) to ($k+26$).

j = Year of emission.

Step 5: Calculate total emissions (open-cell and closed-cell foams)

To calculate total emissions from foams in any given year, emissions from all foam stages must be summed, as presented in the following equation.

$$E_j = Em_j + Eu_j + Ed_j + Ep_j$$

where:

E_j = Total Emissions. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j , by weight.

Em_j = Emissions from manufacturing. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j due to manufacturing losses, by weight.

Eu_j = Emissions from Lifetime Losses. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j due to lifetime losses during use, by weight.

Ed_j = Emissions from disposal. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j at disposal, by weight.

Ep_j = Emissions from post disposal. Total post-disposal emissions of a specific chemical in year j , by weight.

Assumptions

The Vintaging Model contains thirteen foam types, whose transition assumptions away from ODS and growth rates are presented in Table A-151. The emission profiles of these thirteen foam types are shown in Table A-152.

Table A-151: Foam Blowing Market Transition Assumptions

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ³
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
Commercial Refrigeration Foam													
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1989	1996	40%	HFC-245fa	2002	2003	80%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	70%	6.0%
					Non-ODP/GWP	2002	2003	20%	Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2020	30%	
	HCFC-142b	1989	1996	8%	Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	80%	None				
					HFC-245fa	2009	2010	20%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	70%	
					Non-ODP/GWP				Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2020	30%	
	HCFC-22	1989	1996	52%	Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	80%	None				
				HFC-245fa	2009	2010	20%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	70%		
								Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2020	30%		
Flexible PU Foam: Integral Skin Foam													
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1989	1990	100%	HFC-134a	1993	1996	25%	CO ₂	2015	2017	50%	2.0%
					HFC-134a	1994	1996	25%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2017	50%	
					CO ₂	1993	1996	25%	CO ₂	2015	2017	50%	
					CO ₂	1994	1996	25%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2017	50%	
									None				
Flexible PU Foam: Slabstock Foam, Moulded Foam													
CFC-11	Non-ODP/GWP	1992	1992	100%	None								2.0%
Phenolic Foam													
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1989	1990	100%	Non-ODP/GWP	1992	1992	100%	None				2.0%
Polyolefin Foam													
CFC-114	HFC-152a	1989	1993	10%	Non-ODP/GWP	2005	2010	100%	None				2.0%
	HCFC-142b	1989	1993	90%	Non-ODP/GWP	1994	1996	100%	None				
PU and PIR Rigid: Boardstock													
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1993	1996	100%	Non-ODP/GWP	2000	2003	95%	None				6.0%
					HC/HFC-245fa Blend	2000	2003	5%	Non-ODP/GWP	2017	2017	100%	
PU Rigid: Domestic Refrigerator and Freezer Insulation													
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1993	1995	100%	HFC-134a	1996	2001	7%	Non-ODP/GWP	2002	2003	100%	0.8%
					HFC-245fa	2001	2003	50%	Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2020	50%	
									HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	50%	
					HFC-245fa	2006	2009	10%	Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2020	50%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2002	2005	10%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	50%	
								None					

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ³	
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration		
					Non-ODP/GWP Non-ODP/GWP	2006 2009	2009 2014	3% 20%	None None					
PU Rigid: One Component Foam														
CFC-12	HCFC-142b/22 Blend	1989	1996	70%	Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	80%	None	2018	2020	100%	4.0%	
					HFC-134a	2009	2010	10%	HFO-1234ze(E)					
					HFC-152a	2009	2010	10%	None					
	HCFC-22	1989	1996	30%	Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	80%	None	2018	2020	100%		
					HFC-134a	2009	2010	10%	HFO-1234ze(E)					
					HFC-152a	2009	2010	10%	None					
PU Rigid: Other: Slabstock Foam														
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1989	1996	100%	CO ₂	1999	2003	45%	None	2009	2010	100%	2.0%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2001	2003	45%	None					
					HCFC-22	2003	2003	10%	Non-ODP/GWP					
PU Rigid: Sandwich Panels: Continuous and Discontinuous														
HCFC-141b ²	HCFC-22/Water Blend	2001	2003	20%	HFC-245fa/CO ₂ Blend	2009	2010	50%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	100%	6.0%	
					Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	50%	None					
					HCFO-1233zd(E)	2015	2020	100%	None					
	HCFC-22	2002	2004	20%	Non-ODP/GWP	2001	2004	40%	None	2015	2020	100%		
					HFC-134a	2002	2004	20%	Non-ODP/GWP					
					HFC-245fa/CO ₂ Blend	2009	2010	40%	HCFO-1233zd(E)					
					Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	20%	None					
					CO ₂	2009	2010	20%	None					
					HFC-134a	2009	2010	20%	Non-ODP/GWP					
					Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2020	100%	None					
PU Rigid: Spray Foam														
CFC-11	HCFC-141b	1989	1996	100%	HFC-245fa	2002	2003	30%	HCFO-1233zd(E)	2016	2020	100%	6.0%	
					HFC-245fa/CO ₂ Blend	2002	2003	60%	None					
					Non-ODP/GWP	2001	2003	10%	None					
XPS: Boardstock Foam														
CFC-12	HCFC-142b/22 Blend	1989	1994	10%	HFC-134a	2009	2010	70%	Non-ODP/GWP	2021	2021	100%	2.5%	
					HFC-152a	2009	2010	10%	None					
					CO ₂	2009	2010	10%	None					
					Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	10%	None					
	HCFC-142b	1989	1994	90%	HFC-134a	2009	2010	70%	Non-ODP/GWP	2021	2021	100%		

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate ³
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	
					HFC-152a	2009	2010	10%	None				
					CO ₂	2009	2010	10%	None				
					Non-ODP/GWP	2009	2010	10%	None				
XPS: Sheet Foam													
CFC-12	CO ₂	1989	1994	1%	None								2.0%
	Non-ODP/GWP	1989	1994	99%	CO ₂	1995	1999	9%	None				
					HFC-152a	1995	1999	10%	None				

¹ Transitions between the start year and date of full penetration in new equipment are assumed to be linear so that in total 100 percent of the market is assigned to the original ODS or the various ODS substitutes.

² The CFC-11 PU Rigid: Sandwich Panels: Continuous and Discontinuous market for new systems transitioned to 82 percent HCFC-141b and 18 percent HCFC-22 from 1989 to 1996. These transitions are not shown in the table in order to provide the HFC transitions in greater detail.

³ Growth Rate is the average annual growth rate for individual market sectors from the base year to 2030.

Table A-152: Emission Profile for the Foam End-Uses

Foam End-Use	Loss at Manufacturing (%)	Annual Leakage Rate (%)	Leakage Lifetime (years)	Loss at Disposal (%)	Total ^a (%)
Flexible PU Foam: Slabstock Foam, Moulded Foam	100	0	1	0	100
Commercial Refrigeration	4	0.25	15	92.25	100
Rigid PU: Spray Foam	15	1.5	50	10.0	100
Rigid PU: Slabstock and Other	32.5	0.875	15	54.375	100
Phenolic Foam	28	0.875	32	44.0	100
Polyolefin Foam	40	3	20	0	100
Rigid PU: One Component Foam	95	2.5	2	0	100
XPS: Sheet Foam	50	25	2	0	100
XPS: Boardstock Foam	25	0.75	25	56.25	100
Flexible PU Foam: Integral Skin Foam	95	2.5	2	0	100
Rigid PU: Domestic Refrigerator and Freezer Insulation (HFC-134a) ^a	6.5	0.5	14	37.2	50.7
Rigid PU: Domestic Refrigerator and Freezer Insulation (all others) ^a	3.75	0.25	14	39.9	47.15
PU and PIR Rigid: Boardstock	6	1	25	69.0	100
PU Sandwich Panels: Continuous and Discontinuous	8.5-11.25	0.5	50	63.75-66.5	100

PIR (Polyisocyanurate)

PU (Polyurethane)

XPS (Extruded Polystyrene)

^a In general, total emissions from foam end-uses are assumed to be 100 percent. In the Rigid PU Domestic Refrigerator and Freezer Insulation end-use, the source of emission rates and lifetimes did not yield 100 percent emission; the remainder is anticipated to be emitted at a rate of 2.0 percent/year post-disposal.

Sterilization

Sterilants kill microorganisms on medical equipment and devices. The principal ODS used in this sector was a blend of 12 percent ethylene oxide (EtO) and 88 percent CFC-12, known as “12/88.” In that blend, ethylene oxide sterilizes the equipment and CFC-12 is a diluent solvent to form a non-flammable blend. The sterilization sector is modeled as a single end-use. For sterilization applications, all chemicals that are used in the equipment in any given year are assumed to be emitted in that year, as shown in the following equation.

$$E_j = Qc_j$$

where:

E = Emissions. Total emissions of a specific chemical in year j from use in sterilization equipment, by weight.

Qc = Quantity of Chemical. Total quantity of a specific chemical used in sterilization equipment in year j , by weight.

j = Year of emission.

Assumptions

The Vintaging Model contains one sterilization end-use, whose transition assumptions away from ODS and growth rates are presented in Table A-153.

1 **Table A-153: Sterilization Market Transition Assumptions**

Initial Market Segment	Primary Substitute				Secondary Substitute				Tertiary Substitute				Growth Rate
	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment ¹	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment	Maximum Market Penetration	Name of Substitute	Start Date	Date of Full Penetration in New Equipment	Maximum Market Penetration	
12/88	EtO	1994	1995	95%	None								2.0%
	Non-ODP/GWP	1994	1995	0.8%	None								
	HCFC-124/EtO Blend	1993	1994	1.4%	Non-ODP/GWP	2015	2015	100%	None				
	HCFC-22/HCFC-124/EtO Blend	1993	1994	3.1%	Non-ODP/GWP	2010	2010	100%	None				

2 ¹ Transitions between the start year and date of full penetration in new equipment are assumed to be linear so that in total 100 percent of the market is assigned to the original ODS or the various ODS substitutes.

Model Output

By repeating these calculations for each year, the Vintaging Model creates annual profiles of use and emissions for ODS and ODS substitutes. The results can be shown for each year in two ways: 1) on a chemical-by-chemical basis, summed across the end-uses, or 2) on an end-use or sector basis. Values for use and emissions are calculated both in metric tons and in million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (MMT CO₂ Eq.). The conversion of metric tons of chemical to MMT CO₂ Eq. is accomplished through a linear scaling of tonnage by the global warming potential (GWP) of each chemical.

Throughout its development, the Vintaging Model has undergone annual modifications. As new or more accurate information becomes available, the model is adjusted in such a way that both past and future emission estimates are often altered.

Bank of ODS and ODS Substitutes

The bank of an ODS or an ODS substitute is “the cumulative difference between the chemical that has been consumed in an application or sub-application and that which has already been released” (IPCC 2006). For any given year, the bank is equal to the previous year’s bank, less the chemical in equipment disposed of during the year, plus chemical in new equipment entering the market during that year, less the amount emitted but not replaced, plus the amount added to replace chemical emitted prior to the given year, as shown in the following equation:

$$BC_j = BC_{j-1} - Qd_j + Qp_j + E_e - Q_r$$

where:

BC_j	=	Bank of Chemical. Total bank of a specific chemical in year j , by weight.
Qd_j	=	Quantity of Chemical in Equipment Disposed. Total quantity of a specific chemical in equipment disposed of in year j , by weight.
Qp_j	=	Quantity of Chemical Penetrating the Market. Total quantity of a specific chemical that is entering the market in year j , by weight.
E_e	=	Emissions of Chemical Not Replaced. Total quantity of a specific chemical that is emitted during year j but is not replaced in that year. The Vintaging Model assumes all chemical emitted from refrigeration, air conditioning and fire extinguishing equipment is replaced in the year it is emitted, hence this term is zero for all sectors except foam blowing.
Q_r	=	Chemical Replacing Previous Year’s Emissions. Total quantity of a specific chemical that is used to replace emissions that occurred prior to year j . The Vintaging Model assumes all chemical emitted from refrigeration, air conditioning and fire extinguishing equipment is replaced in the year it is emitted, hence this term is zero for all sectors.
j	=	Year of emission.

Table A-154 provides the bank for ODS and ODS substitutes by chemical grouping in metric tons (MT) for 1990 to 2017.

Table A-154: Banks of ODS and ODS Substitutes, 1990-2017 (MT)

Year	CFC	HCFC	HFC
1990	695,056	182,823	872
1995	768,574	421,188	50,476
2000	638,658	872,079	188,673
2001	610,089	947,445	217,780
2002	585,608	1,007,213	246,831
2003	561,341	1,050,545	281,638
2004	536,594	1,094,766	318,012
2005	506,767	1,141,564	356,687
2006	476,460	1,184,381	401,312
2007	448,847	1,215,280	446,888
2008	426,406	1,232,231	488,956
2009	413,431	1,224,559	535,405
2010	376,199	1,192,755	600,722
2011	339,448	1,153,001	669,511
2012	302,837	1,110,693	739,950
2013	267,100	1,062,933	813,160
2014	231,330	1,014,886	889,352
2015	195,498	968,119	960,318
2016	159,713	919,986	1,026,487
2017	123,043	872,434	1,036,691

References

- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- U.S. EPA (2004) The U.S. Solvent Cleaning Industry and the Transition to Non Ozone Depleting Substances. September 2004. Available online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-11/documents/epasolventmarketreport.pdf>>.
- Data are also taken from various government sources, including rulemaking analyses from the U.S. Department of Energy and from the Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES) model from EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality.

3.10. Methodology for Estimating CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation

The steps outlined in this annex were used to estimate methane emissions from enteric fermentation for the years 1990 through 2017. Methane emissions from enteric fermentation were estimated for seven livestock categories: cattle, horses, sheep, swine, goats, American bison, and the non-horse equines (mules and asses). Emissions from cattle represent the majority of U.S. emissions from enteric fermentation; consequently, a more detailed IPCC Tier 2 methodology was used to estimate emissions from cattle. The IPCC Tier 1 methodology was used to estimate emissions for the other types of livestock, including horses, goats, sheep, swine, American bison, and mules and asses (IPCC 2006).

Estimate Methane Emissions from Cattle

This section describes the process used to estimate CH₄ emissions from enteric fermentation from cattle using the Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model (CEFM). The CEFM was developed based on recommendations provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC 2006) and uses information on population, energy requirements, digestible energy, and CH₄ conversion rates to estimate CH₄ emissions.⁷² The emission methodology consists of the following three steps: (1) characterize the cattle population to account for animal population categories with different emission profiles; (2) characterize cattle diets to generate information needed to estimate emission factors; and (3) estimate emissions using these data and the IPCC Tier 2 equations.

Step 1: Characterize U.S. Cattle Population

The CEFM's state-level cattle population estimates are based on data obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) National Agricultural Statistics Service Quick Stats database (USDA 2018). State-level cattle population estimates are shown by animal type for 2017 in Table A-155. A national-level summary of the annual average populations upon which all livestock-related emissions are based is provided in Table A-156. Cattle populations used in the Enteric Fermentation source category were estimated using the cattle transition matrix in the CEFM, which uses January 1 USDA population estimates and weight data to simulate the population of U.S. cattle from birth to slaughter, and results in an estimate of the number of animals in a particular cattle grouping while taking into account the monthly rate of weight gain, the average weight of the animals, and the death and calving rates. The use of supplemental USDA data and the cattle transition matrix in the CEFM results in cattle population estimates for this sector differing slightly from the January 1 or July 1 USDA point estimates and the cattle population data obtained from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Table A-155: 2017 Cattle Population Estimates from the CEFM Transition Matrix, by Animal Type and State (1,000 head)

State	Dairy		Dairy Repl. Heif. 7-11	Dairy Repl. Heif. 12-23	Bulls	Beef		Beef Repl. Heif. 7-11	Beef Repl. Heif. 12-23	Steer Stockers	Heifer Stockers	Feedlot
	Calves	Cows	Months	Months		Calves	Cows	Months	Months			
Alabama	4	7	1	3	50	355	693	28	68	24	19	6
Alaska	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	1	0	0	0
Arizona	100	196	35	82	20	94	184	9	21	129	18	278
Arkansas	3	6	1	2	60	468	914	40	98	53	34	12
California	899	1,755	227	534	70	335	655	30	73	291	79	475
Colorado	79	155	30	70	55	412	805	44	107	413	274	1,024
Conn.	10	19	3	7	1	3	5	0	1	1	1	0
Delaware	3	5	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	0
Florida	62	122	10	25	60	465	908	29	71	15	16	4
Georgia	42	83	9	21	33	254	497	26	62	18	26	6
Hawaii	1	2	0	1	4	38	74	3	7	5	2	1
Idaho	307	600	93	218	40	256	500	28	68	151	100	292
Illinois	48	93	16	37	25	198	387	17	42	117	57	281
Indiana	95	185	24	56	17	107	210	12	28	52	26	122
Iowa	110	215	40	95	70	494	965	43	105	636	285	1,286
Kansas	77	150	30	70	95	803	1,570	72	175	996	755	2,506
Kentucky	29	57	12	28	70	523	1,023	35	85	104	61	20
Louisiana	6	12	1	3	31	229	448	20	48	12	11	3
Maine	15	30	4	11	2	6	11	1	2	2	2	0
Maryland	24	47	9	20	4	22	43	3	6	7	3	10
Mass.	6	12	2	5	1	3	7	0	1	1	1	0

⁷² Additional information on the Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model can be found in ICF (2006).

Michigan	218	425	51	120	16	61	120	6	14	82	21	164
Minn.	236	460	88	207	35	189	370	22	54	243	87	417
Miss.	5	9	2	4	38	244	476	22	53	20	16	5
Missouri	44	85	13	32	120	1,051	2,055	86	209	223	124	118
Montana	7	14	3	6	100	760	1,486	99	240	112	135	50
Nebraska	31	60	7	18	110	982	1,920	87	212	1,112	728	2,718
Nevada	15	30	3	8	14	113	220	10	23	22	15	3
N.Hamp.	7	14	2	4	1	3	5	0	1	1	1	0
N.Jersey	3	7	1	3	1	4	8	0	1	1	1	0
N.Mexico	166	325	33	77	35	238	465	23	56	58	47	14
NewYork	317	620	106	250	20	56	110	10	25	22	26	21
N.Car.	23	45	7	15	31	189	370	16	39	21	13	5
N.Dakota	8	16	3	6	65	488	954	48	116	124	113	56
Ohio	134	262	36	84	30	147	288	17	42	107	32	167
Oklahoma	18	35	6	14	160	1,072	2,095	101	246	437	245	333
Oregon	63	124	19	46	40	279	546	24	59	75	61	91
Penn	269	525	94	222	25	95	185	15	37	78	32	102
R.Island	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
S.Car.	8	15	2	5	15	87	170	8	19	4	5	1
S.Dakota	59	116	13	32	100	851	1,664	92	223	359	280	428
Tenn.	21	41	10	25	65	465	909	34	82	66	47	16
Texas	251	490	78	183	340	2,282	4,460	189	458	1,258	712	2,665
Utah	47	92	16	39	27	173	338	20	48	39	32	23
Vermont	66	129	17	39	3	7	14	1	3	2	3	1
Virginia	45	87	11	27	40	329	643	26	63	80	37	22
Wash.	141	275	36	84	18	115	225	14	33	92	62	209
W.Virg.	4	8	1	3	15	106	207	9	21	19	9	4
Wisconsin	655	1,280	212	499	30	148	290	19	45	194	26	297
Wyoming	3	6	1	2	40	365	714	43	105	78	72	81

Table A-156: Cattle Population Estimates from the CEFM Transition Matrix for 1990–2017 (1,000 head)

Livestock Type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Dairy											
Dairy Calves (0–6 months)	5,369	5,091	4,951	4,628	4,709	4,770	4,758	4,740	4,771	4,758	4,785
Dairy Cows	10,015	9,482	9,183	9,004	9,156	9,236	9,221	9,208	9,307	9,310	9,346
Dairy Replacements 7–11 months	1,214	1,216	1,196	1,257	1,362	1,348	1,341	1,377	1,415	1,414	1,419
Dairy Replacements 12–23 months	2,915	2,892	2,812	2,905	3,215	3,233	3,185	3,202	3,310	3,371	3,343
Beef											
Beef Calves (0–6 months)	16,909	18,177	17,431	16,918	15,817	15,288	14,859	14,741	15,000	15,563	15,971
Bulls	2,160	2,385	2,293	2,214	2,165	2,100	2,074	2,038	2,109	2,142	2,244
Beef Cows	32,455	35,190	33,575	32,674	30,913	30,282	29,631	29,085	29,302	30,166	31,213
Beef Replacements 7–11 months	1,269	1,493	1,313	1,363	1,232	1,263	1,291	1,385	1,479	1,515	1,484
Beef Replacements 12–23 months	2,967	3,637	3,097	3,171	2,889	2,968	3,041	3,121	3,424	3,578	3,598
Steer Stockers	10,321	11,716	8,724	8,185	7,568	7,173	7,457	7,374	7,496	8,150	7,957
Heifer Stockers	5,946	6,699	5,371	5,015	4,752	4,456	4,455	4,280	4,385	4,810	4,754
Feedlot Cattle	9,549	11,064	13,006	12,652	13,601	13,328	13,267	13,219	12,883	13,450	14,340

The population transition matrix in the CEFM simulates the U.S. cattle population over time and provides an estimate of the population age and weight structure by cattle type on a monthly basis.⁷³ Since cattle often do not remain in a single population type for an entire year (e.g., calves become stockers, stockers become feedlot animals), and emission profiles vary both between and within each cattle type, these monthly age groups are tracked in the enteric fermentation model to obtain more accurate emission estimates than would be available from annual point estimates of population (such as available from USDA statistics) and weight for each cattle type.

The transition matrix tracks both dairy and beef populations, and divides the populations into males and females, and subdivides the population further into specific cattle groupings for calves, replacements, stockers, feedlot, and mature animals. The matrix is based primarily on two types of data: population statistics and weight statistics (including target

⁷³ Mature animal populations are not assumed to have significant monthly fluctuations, and therefore the populations utilized are the January estimates downloaded from USDA (2016).

weights, slaughter weights, and weight gain). Using the weight data, the transition matrix simulates the growth of animals over time by month. The matrix also relies on supplementary data, such as feedlot placement statistics, slaughter statistics, death rates, and calving rates, described in further detail below.

The basic method for tracking population of animals per category is based on the number of births (or graduates) into the monthly age group minus those animals that die or are slaughtered and those that graduate to the next category (such as stockers to feedlot placements).

Each stage in the cattle lifecycle was modeled to simulate the cattle population from birth to slaughter. This level of detail accounts for the variability in CH₄ emissions associated with each life stage. Given that a stage can last less than one year (e.g., calves are usually weaned between 4 and 6 months of age), each is modeled on a per-month basis. The type of cattle also influences CH₄ emissions (e.g., beef versus dairy). Consequently, there is an independent transition matrix for each of three separate lifecycle phases, 1) calves, 2) replacements and stockers, and 3) feedlot animals. In addition, the number of mature cows and bulls are tabulated for both dairy and beef stock. The transition matrix estimates total monthly populations for all cattle subtypes. These populations are then reallocated to the state level based on the percent of the cattle type reported in each state in the January 1 USDA data. Each lifecycle is discussed separately below, and the categories tracked are listed in Table A-157.

Table A-157: Cattle Population Categories Used for Estimating CH₄ Emissions

Dairy Cattle	Beef Cattle
Calves	Calves
Heifer Replacements	Heifer Replacements
Cows	Heifer and Steer Stockers
	Animals in Feedlots (Heifers & Steer)
	Cows
	Bulls ^a

^a Bulls (beef and dairy) are accounted for in a single category.

The key variables tracked for each of these cattle population categories are as follows:

Calves. Although enteric emissions are only calculated for 4- to 6-month old calves, it is necessary to calculate populations from birth as emissions from manure management require total calf populations and the estimates of populations for older cattle rely on the available supply of calves from birth. The number of animals born on a monthly basis was used to initiate monthly cohorts and to determine population age structure. The number of calves born each month was obtained by multiplying annual births by the percentage of births per month. Annual birth information for each year was taken from USDA (2016). For dairy cows, the number of births is assumed to be distributed equally throughout the year (approximately 8.3 percent per month) while beef births are distributed according to Table A-158, based on approximations from the National Animal Health Monitoring System (NAHMS) (USDA/APHIS/VS 1998, 1994, 1993). To determine whether calves were born to dairy or beef cows, the dairy cow calving rate (USDA/APHIS/VS 2002, USDA/APHIS/VS 1996) was multiplied by the total dairy cow population to determine the number of births attributable to dairy cows, with the remainder assumed to be attributable to beef cows. Total annual calf births are obtained from USDA and distributed into monthly cohorts by cattle type (beef or dairy). Calf growth is modeled by month, based on estimated monthly weight gain for each cohort (approximately 61 pounds per month). The total calf population is modified through time to account for veal calf slaughter at 4 months and a calf death loss of 0.35 percent annually (distributed across age cohorts up to 6 months of age). An example of a transition matrix for calves is shown in Table A-159. Note that 1- to 6-month old calves in January of each year have been tracked through the model based on births and death loss from the previous year.

Table A-158: Estimated Beef Cow Births by Month

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
7%	15%	28%	22%	9%	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%

Table A-159: Example of Monthly Average Populations from Calf Transition Matrix (1,000 head)

Age (month)	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
6	1,138	1,131	1,389	1,612	1,554	1,538	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522
5	1,131	1,389	1,612	1,554	1,538	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522	1,153
4	1,389	1,612	1,554	1,538	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522	1,153	1,144
3	1,612	1,554	1,538	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522	1,153	1,144	1,402
2	1,554	1,538	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522	1,153	1,144	1,402	1,625
1	1,538	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522	1,153	1,144	1,402	1,625	1,565
0	2,431	4,488	7,755	6,298	2,971	1,522	1,153	1,144	1,402	1,625	1,565	1,547

Note: The cohort starting at age 0 months on January 1 is tracked in order to illustrate how a single cohort moves through the transition matrix. Each month, the cohort reflects the decreases in population due to the estimated 0.35 percent annual death loss, and between months 4 and 5, a more significant loss is seen than in other months due to estimated veal slaughter.

Replacements and Stockers. At 7 months of age, calves “graduate” and are separated into the applicable cattle types: replacements (cattle raised to give birth), or stockers (cattle held for conditioning and growing on grass or other forage diets). First the number of replacements required for beef and dairy cattle are calculated based on estimated death losses and population changes between beginning and end of year population estimates. Based on the USDA estimates for “replacement beef heifers” and “replacement dairy heifers,” the transition matrix for the replacements is back-calculated from the known animal totals from USDA, and the number of calves needed to fill that requirement for each month is subtracted from the known supply of female calves. All female calves remaining after those needed for beef and dairy replacements are removed and become “stockers” that can be placed in feedlots (along with all male calves). During the stocker phase, animals are subtracted out of the transition matrix for placement into feedlots based on feedlot placement statistics from USDA (2016).

The data and calculations that occur for the stocker category include matrices that estimate the population of backgrounding heifers and steer, as well as a matrix for total combined stockers. The matrices start with the beginning of year populations in January and model the progression of each cohort. The age structure of the January population is based on estimated births by month from the previous two years, although in order to balance the population properly, an adjustment is added that slightly reduces population percentages in the older populations. The populations are modified through addition of graduating calves (added in month 7, bottom row of Table A-160) and subtraction through death loss and animals placed in feedlots. Eventually, an entire cohort population of stockers may reach zero, indicating that the complete cohort has been transitioned into feedlots. An example of the transition matrix for stockers is shown in Table A-160.

Table A-160: Example of Monthly Average Populations from Stocker Transition Matrix (1,000 head)

Age (month)	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
23	185	180	104	37	15	9	8	8	6	3	1	0
22	320	146	49	19	12	9	9	9	6	3	17	181
21	260	69	25	14	11	11	11	8	6	68	218	313
20	123	35	19	14	14	13	10	8	133	331	387	254
19	63	27	19	17	16	13	10	196	472	615	318	120
18	48	27	23	20	16	13	241	610	900	514	149	61
17	47	33	27	19	15	295	709	1,179	759	237	129	47
16	58	38	26	19	363	828	1,380	1,000	348	340	47	46
15	67	36	25	452	977	1,619	1,172	456	603	47	46	57
14	65	36	599	1,172	1,921	1,378	534	862	47	46	57	66
13	64	845	1,478	2,309	1,639	629	1,117	47	46	57	66	63
12	982	1,602	2,556	1,858	755	1,512	214	46	57	66	63	63
11	1,814	2,770	2,056	855	1,872	277	138	76	89	81	80	1,016
10	3,133	2,255	945	2,241	385	189	184	231	209	185	1,135	2,445
9	2,545	1,062	2,502	484	335	341	420	372	371	1,292	2,786	5,299
8	1,200	2,951	664	482	557	759	658	649	1,503	3,247	5,984	4,877
7	3,381	800	794	956	1,160	1,109	1,100	1,876	3,666	6,504	5,243	2,353

Note: The cohort starting at age 7 months on January 1 is tracked in order to illustrate how a single cohort moves through the transition matrix. Each month, the cohort reflects the decreases in population due to the estimated 0.35 percent annual death loss and loss due to placement in feedlots (the latter resulting in the majority of the loss from the matrix).

In order to ensure a balanced population of both stockers and placements, additional data tables are utilized in the stocker matrix calculations. The tables summarize the placement data by weight class and month, and is based on the total number of animals within the population that are available to be placed in feedlots and the actual feedlot placement statistics provided by USDA (2016). In cases where there are discrepancies between the USDA estimated placements by weight class and the calculated animals available by weight, the model pulls available stockers from one higher weight category if available. If there are still not enough animals to fulfill requirements the model pulls animals from one lower weight category. In the current time series, this method was able to ensure that total placement data matched USDA estimates, and no shortfalls have occurred.

In addition, average weights were tracked for each monthly age group using starting weight and monthly weight gain estimates. Weight gain (i.e., pounds per month) was estimated based on weight gain needed to reach a set target weight, divided by the number of months remaining before target weight was achieved. Birth weight was assumed to be 88 pounds for both beef and dairy animals. Weaning weights were estimated at 515 pounds. Other reported target weights were

available for 12-, 15-, 24-, and 36-month-old animals, depending on the animal type. Beef cow mature weight was taken from measurements provided by a major British Bos taurus breed (Enns 2008) and increased during the time series through 2007.⁷⁴ Bull mature weight was calculated as 1.5 times the beef cow mature weight (Doren et al. 1989). Beef replacement weight was calculated as 70 percent of mature weight at 15 months and 85 percent of mature weight at 24 months. As dairy weights are not a trait that is typically tracked, mature weight for dairy cows was estimated at 1,500 pounds for all years, based on a personal communication with Kris Johnson (2010) and an estimate from Holstein Association USA (2010).⁷⁵ Dairy replacement weight at 15 months was assumed to be 875 pounds and 1,300 pounds at 24 months. Live slaughter weights were estimated from dressed slaughter weight (USDA 2018) divided by 0.63. This ratio represents the dressed weight (i.e., weight of the carcass after removal of the internal organs), to the live weight (i.e., weight taken immediately before slaughter). The annual typical animal mass for each livestock type are presented in Table A-161.

Weight gain for stocker animals was based on monthly gain estimates from Johnson (1999) for 1989, and from average daily estimates from Lippke et al. (2000), Pinchack et al. (2004), Platter et al. (2003), and Skogerboe et al. (2000) for 2000. Interim years were calculated linearly, as shown in Table A-162, and weight gain was held constant starting in 2000. Table A-162 provides weight gains that vary by year in the CEFM.

Table A-161: Typical Animal Mass (lbs)

Year/Cattle Type	Calves	Dairy Cows ^a	Dairy Replacements ^b	Beef Cows ^a	Bulls ^a	Beef Replacements ^b	Steer Stockers ^b	Heifer Stockers ^b	Steer Feedlot ^b	Heifer Feedlot ^b
1990	269	1,499	899	1,220	1,830	819	691	651	923	845
1991	270	1,499	897	1,224	1,836	821	694	656	933	855
1992	269	1,499	897	1,262	1,893	840	714	673	936	864
1993	270	1,499	898	1,279	1,918	852	721	683	929	863
1994	270	1,499	897	1,279	1,918	853	720	688	943	875
1995	270	1,499	897	1,281	1,921	857	735	700	947	879
1996	269	1,499	898	1,284	1,926	858	739	707	939	878
1997	270	1,499	899	1,285	1,927	860	736	707	938	876
1998	270	1,499	896	1,295	1,942	865	736	709	956	892
1999	270	1,499	899	1,291	1,936	861	730	708	959	894
2000	270	1,499	896	1,271	1,906	849	719	702	960	898
2001	270	1,499	897	1,271	1,906	850	725	707	963	900
2002	270	1,499	896	1,275	1,912	851	725	707	981	915
2003	270	1,499	899	1,307	1,960	871	718	701	972	904
2004	270	1,499	896	1,322	1,983	877	719	702	966	904
2005	270	1,499	894	1,326	1,989	879	717	706	974	917
2006	270	1,499	897	1,340	2,010	889	724	712	983	925
2007	270	1,499	896	1,347	2,020	894	720	706	991	928
2008	270	1,499	897	1,347	2,020	894	720	704	999	938
2009	270	1,499	895	1,347	2,020	894	730	715	1007	947
2010	270	1,499	897	1,347	2,020	896	726	713	996	937
2011	270	1,499	897	1,347	2,020	891	721	712	989	932
2012	270	1,499	899	1,347	2,020	892	714	706	1003	945
2013	270	1,499	898	1,347	2,020	892	718	709	1016	958
2014	270	1,499	895	1,347	2,020	888	722	714	1022	962
2015	270	1,499	896	1,347	2,020	890	717	714	1037	982
2016	269	1,499	899	1,220	1,830	819	691	651	923	845
2017	269	1,499	899	1,220	1,830	819	691	651	923	845

^a Input into the model.

^b Annual average calculated in model based on age distribution.

⁷⁴ Mature beef weight is held constant after 2007 but future inventory submissions will incorporate known trends through 2007 and extrapolate to future years, as noted in the Planned Improvements section of 5.1 Enteric Fermentation.

⁷⁵ Mature dairy weight is based solely on Holstein weight, so could be higher than the national average. Future Inventory submissions will consider other dairy breeds, as noted in the Planned Improvements section of 5.1 Enteric Fermentation.

Table A-162: Weight Gains that Vary by Year (lbs)

Year/Cattle Type	Steer Stockers to 12 months(lbs/day)	Steer Stockers to 24 months (lbs/day)	Heifer Stockers to 12 months(lbs/day)	Heifer Stockers to 24 months(lbs/day)
1990	1.53	1.23	1.23	1.08
1991	1.56	1.29	1.29	1.15
1992	1.59	1.35	1.35	1.23
1993	1.62	1.41	1.41	1.30
1994	1.65	1.47	1.47	1.38
1995	1.68	1.53	1.53	1.45
1996	1.71	1.59	1.59	1.53
1997	1.74	1.65	1.65	1.60
1998	1.77	1.71	1.71	1.68
1999	1.80	1.77	1.77	1.75
2000–onwards	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83

Sources: Enns (2008), Johnson (1999), Lippke et al. (2000), NRC (1999), Pinchack et al. (2004), Platter et al. (2003), Skogerboe et al. (2000).

Feedlot Animals. Feedlot placement statistics from USDA provide data on the placement of animals from the stocker population into feedlots on a monthly basis by weight class. The model uses these data to shift a sufficient number of animals from the stocker cohorts into the feedlot populations to match the reported placement data. After animals are placed in feedlots they progress through two steps. First, animals spend 25 days on a step-up diet to become acclimated to the new feed type (e.g., more grain than forage, along with new dietary supplements), during this time weight gain is estimated to be 2.7 to 3 pounds per day (Johnson 1999). Animals are then switched to a finishing diet (concentrated, high energy) for a period of time before they are slaughtered. Weight gain during finishing diets is estimated to be 2.9 to 3.3 pounds per day (Johnson 1999). The length of time an animal spends in a feedlot depends on the start weight (i.e., placement weight), the rate of weight gain during the start-up and finishing phase of diet, and the target weight (as determined by weights at slaughter). Additionally, animals remaining in feedlots at the end of the year are tracked for inclusion in the following year's emission and population counts. For 1990 to 1995, only the total placement data were available, therefore placements for each weight category (categories displayed in Table A-163) for those years are based on the average of monthly placements from the 1996 to 1998 reported figures. Placement data is available by weight class for all years from 1996 onward. Table A-163 provides a summary of the reported feedlot placement statistics for 2017.

Table A-163: Feedlot Placements in the United States for 2017 (Number of animals placed/1,000 Head)

Weight Placed When:	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
< 600 lbs	380	315	350	348	400	375	360	360	405	675	610	470
600 – 700 lbs	445	330	295	255	315	315	235	285	340	590	545	410
700 – 800 lbs	585	490	630	490	529	430	385	418	490	510	455	445
> 800 lbs	571	559	842	755	875	650	635	865	915	618	489	474
Total	1,981	1,694	2,117	1,848	2,119	1,770	1,615	1,928	2,150	2,393	2,099	1,799

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Source: USDA (2018).

Mature Animals. Energy requirements and hence, composition of diets, level of intake, and emissions for particular animals, are greatly influenced by whether the animal is pregnant or lactating. Information is therefore needed on the percentage of all mature animals that are pregnant each month, as well as milk production, to estimate CH₄ emissions. A weighted average percent of pregnant cows each month was estimated using information on births by month and average pregnancy term. For beef cattle, a weighted average total milk production per animal per month was estimated using information on typical lactation cycles and amounts (NRC 1999), and data on births by month. This process results in a range of weighted monthly lactation estimates expressed as pounds per animal per month. The monthly estimates for daily milk production by beef cows are shown in Table A-164. Annual estimates for dairy cows were taken from USDA milk production statistics. Dairy lactation estimates for 1990 through 2017 are shown in Table A-165. Beef and dairy cow and bull populations are assumed to remain relatively static throughout the year, as large fluctuations in population size are assumed to not occur. These estimates are taken from the USDA beginning and end of year population datasets.

Table A-164: Estimates of Average Monthly Milk Production by Beef Cows (lbs/cow)

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Beef Cow Milk Production (lbs/ head)	3.3	5.1	8.7	12.0	13.6	13.3	11.7	9.3	6.9	4.4	3.0	2.8

Table A-165: Dairy Lactation Rates by State (lbs/ year/cow)

State/Year	1990	1995	2000	2005	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Alabama	12,214	14,176	13,920	14,000	14,300	13,000	13,000	13,625	12,625	13,143	14,833
Alaska	13,300	17,000	14,500	12,273	13,800	14,250	10,667	11,667	11,667	11,667	9,667
Arizona	17,500	19,735	21,820	22,679	23,473	23,979	23,626	24,368	24,402	24,679	24,680
Arkansas	11,841	12,150	12,436	13,545	11,917	13,300	11,667	13,714	13,000	13,333	13,167
California	18,456	19,573	21,130	21,404	23,438	23,457	23,178	23,786	23,028	22,968	22,755
Colorado	17,182	18,687	21,618	22,577	23,430	24,158	24,292	24,951	25,733	25,993	26,181
Connecticut	15,606	16,438	17,778	19,200	19,000	19,889	20,556	20,158	20,842	21,526	22,105
Delaware	13,667	14,500	14,747	16,622	18,300	19,542	19,521	20,104	19,700	19,100	18,560
Florida	14,033	14,698	15,688	16,591	19,067	19,024	19,374	20,390	20,656	20,285	20,129
Georgia	12,973	15,550	16,284	17,259	18,354	19,138	19,600	20,877	21,651	21,786	21,905
Hawaii	13,604	13,654	14,358	12,889	14,421	14,200	13,409	13,591	15,909	14,542	16,913
Idaho	16,475	18,147	20,816	22,332	22,926	23,376	23,440	24,127	24,126	24,647	24,378
Illinois	14,707	15,887	17,450	18,827	18,510	19,061	19,063	19,681	20,149	20,340	20,742
Indiana	14,590	15,375	16,568	20,295	20,657	21,440	21,761	21,865	22,115	22,571	22,802
Iowa	15,118	16,124	18,298	20,641	21,191	22,015	22,149	22,449	22,929	23,634	23,725
Kansas	12,576	14,390	16,923	20,505	21,016	21,683	21,881	22,085	22,210	22,801	23,000
Kentucky	10,947	12,469	12,841	12,896	14,342	15,135	15,070	15,905	17,656	18,052	18,589
Louisiana	11,605	11,908	12,034	12,400	12,889	13,059	12,875	13,600	13,429	14,083	13,333
Maine	14,619	16,025	17,128	18,030	18,688	18,576	19,548	19,967	19,800	21,000	21,000
Maryland	13,461	14,725	16,083	16,099	18,654	19,196	19,440	19,740	20,061	19,938	19,854
Massachusetts	14,871	16,000	17,091	17,059	16,923	18,250	17,692	17,923	18,083	18,417	17,583
Michigan	15,394	17,071	19,017	21,635	23,164	23,976	24,116	24,638	25,150	25,957	26,302
Minnesota	14,127	15,894	17,777	18,091	18,996	19,512	19,694	19,841	20,570	20,967	21,537
Mississippi	12,081	12,909	15,028	15,280	14,571	14,214	13,286	14,462	15,000	14,400	15,222
Missouri	13,632	14,158	14,662	16,026	14,611	14,979	14,663	15,539	15,511	14,824	14,588
Montana	13,542	15,000	17,789	19,579	20,571	21,357	21,286	21,500	21,357	21,071	22,154
Nebraska	13,866	14,797	16,513	17,950	20,579	21,179	21,574	22,130	22,930	23,317	24,067
Nevada	16,400	18,128	19,000	21,680	22,966	22,931	22,034	23,793	23,069	22,000	22,156
New Hampshire	15,100	16,300	17,333	18,875	20,429	19,643	20,923	20,143	20,143	20,500	21,000
New Jersey	13,538	13,913	15,250	16,000	16,875	18,571	18,143	18,143	18,143	17,429	19,833
New Mexico	18,815	18,969	20,944	21,192	24,854	24,694	24,944	25,093	24,245	24,479	24,960
New York	14,658	16,501	17,378	18,639	21,046	21,623	22,070	22,325	22,806	23,834	23,936
North Carolina	15,220	16,314	16,746	18,741	20,089	20,435	20,326	20,891	20,957	20,978	21,156
North Dakota	12,624	13,094	14,292	14,182	18,158	19,278	18,944	20,250	20,750	21,500	21,563
Ohio	13,767	15,917	17,027	17,567	19,194	19,833	20,178	20,318	20,573	20,936	21,259
Oklahoma	12,327	13,611	14,440	16,480	17,415	17,896	17,311	18,150	18,641	18,703	18,667
Oregon	16,273	17,289	18,222	18,876	20,488	20,431	20,439	20,565	20,408	20,744	20,395
Pennsylvania	14,726	16,492	18,081	18,722	19,495	19,549	19,797	20,121	20,377	20,454	20,834
Rhode Island	14,250	14,773	15,667	17,000	17,909	16,636	19,000	19,000	17,667	17,625	16,250
South Carolina	12,771	14,481	16,087	16,000	17,438	17,250	16,500	16,438	17,400	16,667	16,467
South Dakota	12,257	13,398	15,516	17,741	20,582	21,391	21,521	21,753	22,255	22,139	22,376
Tennessee	11,825	13,740	14,789	15,743	16,200	16,100	15,938	16,196	16,489	16,571	17,325
Texas	14,350	15,244	16,503	19,646	22,232	22,009	21,991	22,268	22,248	22,680	23,589
Utah	15,838	16,739	17,573	18,875	22,161	22,863	22,432	22,989	23,125	22,772	23,316
Vermont	14,528	16,210	17,199	18,469	18,940	19,316	19,448	20,197	20,197	20,977	21,147
Virginia	14,213	15,116	15,833	16,990	17,906	17,990	18,337	19,129	19,462	19,144	19,954
Washington	18,532	20,091	22,644	23,270	23,727	23,794	23,820	24,088	23,848	24,094	23,818
West Virginia	11,250	12,667	15,588	14,923	15,700	15,400	15,200	15,556	15,667	14,889	15,875
Wisconsin	13,973	15,397	17,306	18,500	20,599	21,436	21,693	21,869	22,697	23,542	23,725
Wyoming	12,337	13,197	13,571	14,878	20,517	20,650	21,367	21,583	22,567	23,300	23,033

Source: USDA (2018).

Step 2: Characterize U.S. Cattle Population Diets

To support development of digestible energy (DE, the percent of gross energy intake digested by the animal) and CH₄ conversion rate (Y_m, the fraction of gross energy converted to CH₄) values for each of the cattle population categories, data were collected on diets considered representative of different regions. For both grazing animals and animals being fed mixed rations, representative regional diets were estimated using information collected from state livestock specialists, the

USDA, expert opinion, and other literature sources. The designated regions for this analysis for dairy cattle for all years and foraging beef cattle from 1990 through 2006 are shown in Table A-166. For foraging beef cattle from 2007 onwards, the regional designations were revised based on data available from the NAHMS 2007 through 2008 survey on cow-calf system management practices (USDA:APHIS:VS 2010) and are shown in and Table A-167. The data for each of the diets (e.g., proportions of different feed constituents, such as hay or grains) were used to determine feed chemical composition for use in estimating DE and Y_m for each animal type.

Table A-166: Regions used for Characterizing the Diets of Dairy Cattle (all years) and Foraging Cattle from 1990–2006

West	California	Northern Plains	Great	Midwestern	Northeast	Southcentral	Southeast
Alaska	California	Colorado		Illinois	Connecticut	Arkansas	Alabama
Arizona		Kansas		Indiana	Delaware	Louisiana	Florida
Hawaii		Montana		Iowa	Maine	Oklahoma	Georgia
Idaho		Nebraska		Michigan	Maryland	Texas	Kentucky
Nevada		North Dakota		Minnesota	Massachusetts		Mississippi
New Mexico		South Dakota		Missouri	New Hampshire		North Carolina
Oregon		Wyoming		Ohio	New Jersey		South Carolina
Utah				Wisconsin	New York		Tennessee
Washington					Pennsylvania		Virginia
					Rhode Island		
					Vermont		
					West Virginia		

Source: USDA (1996).

Table A-167: Regions used for Characterizing the Diets of Foraging Cattle from 2007–2017

West	Central	Northeast	Southeast
Alaska	Illinois	Connecticut	Alabama
Arizona	Indiana	Delaware	Arkansas
California	Iowa	Maine	Florida
Colorado	Kansas	Maryland	Georgia
Hawaii	Michigan	Massachusetts	Kentucky
Idaho	Minnesota	New Hampshire	Louisiana
Montana	Missouri	New Jersey	Mississippi
Nevada	Nebraska	New York	North Carolina
New Mexico	North Dakota	Pennsylvania	Oklahoma
Oregon	Ohio	Rhode Island	South Carolina
Utah	South Dakota	Vermont	Tennessee
Washington	Wisconsin	West Virginia	Texas
Wyoming			Virginia

Note: States in **bold** represent a change in region from the 1990 to 2006 assessment.

Source: Based on data from USDA:APHIS:VS (2010).

DE and Y_m vary by diet and animal type. The IPCC recommends Y_m values of 3.0 ± 1.0 percent for feedlot cattle and 6.5 ± 1.0 percent for all other cattle (IPCC 2006). Given the availability of detailed diet information for different regions and animal types in the United States, DE and Y_m values unique to the United States were developed for dairy and beef cattle. Digestible energy and Y_m values were estimated across the time series for each cattle population category based on physiological modeling, published values, and/or expert opinion.

For dairy cows, ruminant digestion models were used to estimate Y_m . The three major categories of input required by the models are animal description (e.g., cattle type, mature weight), animal performance (e.g., initial and final weight, age at start of period), and feed characteristics (e.g., chemical composition, habitat, grain or forage). Data used to simulate ruminant digestion is provided for a particular animal that is then used to represent a group of animals with similar characteristics. The Y_m values were estimated for 1990 using the Donovan and Baldwin model (1999), which represents physiological processes in the ruminant animals, as well as diet characteristics from USDA (1996). The Donovan and Baldwin model is able to account for differing diets (i.e., grain-based or forage-based), so that Y_m values for the variable feeding characteristics within the U.S. cattle population can be estimated. Subsequently, a literature review of dairy diets was conducted and nearly 250 diets were analyzed from 1990 through 2009 across 23 states—the review indicated highly variable diets, both temporally and spatially. Kebreab et al. (2008) conducted an evaluation of models and found that the COWPOLL model was the best model for estimating Y_m for dairy, so COWPOLL was used to determine the Y_m value associated with each of the evaluated diets. The statistical analysis of the resulting Y_m estimates showed a downward trend in predicting Y_m , which inventory team experts modeled using the following best-fit non-linear curve:

$$Y_m = 4.52e^{\left(\frac{1.22}{Year-1980}\right)}$$

The team determined that the most comprehensive approach to estimating annual, region-specific Y_m values was to use the 1990 baseline Y_m values derived from Donovan and Baldwin and then scale these Y_m values for each year beyond 1990 with a factor based on this function. The scaling factor is the ratio of the Y_m value for the year in question to the 1990 baseline Y_m value. The scaling factor for each year was multiplied by the baseline Y_m value. The resulting Y_m equation (incorporating both Donovan and Baldwin (1999) and COWPOLL) is shown below (and described in ERG 2016):

$$Y_m = Y_m(1990) \text{EXP}\left(\frac{1.22}{(Year - 1980)}\right) / \text{EXP}\left(\frac{1.22}{(1990 - 1980)}\right)$$

DE values for dairy cows were estimated from the literature search based on the annual trends observed in the data collection effort. The regional variability observed in the literature search was not statistically significant, and therefore DE was not varied by region, but did vary over time, and was grouped by the following years 1990 through 1993, 1994 through 1998, 1999 through 2003, 2004 through 2006, 2007, and 2008 onwards.

Considerably less data was available for dairy heifers and dairy calves. Therefore, for dairy heifers assumptions were based on the relationship of the collected data in the literature on dairy heifers to the data on dairy cow diets. From this relationship, DE was estimated as the mature cow DE minus three percent, and Y_m was estimated as that of the mature dairy cow plus 0.1 percent.

To calculate the DE values for grazing beef cattle, diet composition assumptions were used to estimate weighted DE values for a combination of forage and supplemental diets. The forage portion makes up an estimated 85 to 95 percent of grazing beef cattle diets, and there is considerable variation of both forage type and quality across the United States. Currently there is no comprehensive survey of this data, so for this analysis two regional DE values were developed to account for the generally lower forage quality in the “West” region of the United States versus all other regions in Table A-166 (California, Northern Great Plains, Midwestern, Northeast, Southcentral, Southeast) and Table A-167 (Central, Northeast, and Southeast). For all non-western grazing cattle, the forage DE was an average of the estimated seasonal values for grass pasture diets for a calculated DE of 64.2 percent. For foraging cattle in the west, the forage DE was calculated as the seasonal average for grass pasture, meadow and range diets, for a calculated DE of 61.3 percent. The assumed specific components of each of the broad forage types, along with their corresponding DE value and the calculated regional DE values can be found in Table A-168. In addition, beef cattle are assumed to be fed a supplemental diet, consequently, two sets of supplemental diets were developed, one for 1990 through 2006 (Donovan 1999) and one for 2007 onwards (Preston 2010, Archibeque 2011, USDA:APHIS:VS 2010) as shown in Table A-169 and Table A-170 along with the percent of each total diet that is assumed to be made up of the supplemental portion. By weighting the calculated DE values from the forage and supplemental diets, the DE values for the composite diet were calculated.⁷⁶ These values are used for steer and heifer stockers and beef replacements. Finally, for mature beef cows and bulls, the DE value was adjusted downward by two percent to reflect the lower digestibility diets of mature cattle based on Johnson (2002). Y_m values for all grazing beef cattle were set at 6.5 percent based on Johnson (2002). The Y_m values and the resulting final weighted DE values by region for 2007 onwards are shown in Table A-171.

For feedlot animals, DE and Y_m are adjusted over time as diet compositions in actual feedlots are adjusted based on new and improved nutritional information and availability of feed types. Feedlot diets are assumed to not differ significantly by state, and therefore only a single set of national diet values is utilized for each year. The DE and Y_m values for 1990 were estimated by Dr. Don Johnson (1999). In the CEFM, the DE values for 1991 through 1999 were linearly extrapolated based on values for 1990 and 2000. DE and Y_m values from 2000 through the current year were estimated using the MOLLY model as described in Kebreab et al. (2008), based on a series of average diet feed compositions from Galyean and Gleghorn (2001) for 2000 through 2006 and Vasconcelos and Galyean (2007) for 2007 onwards. In addition, feedlot animals are assumed to spend the first 25 days in the feedlot on a “step-up” diet to become accustomed to the higher quality feedlot diets. The step-up DE and Y_m are calculated as the average of all state forage and feedlot diet DE and Y_m values.

For calves aged 4 through 6 months, a gradual weaning from milk is simulated, with calf diets at 4 months assumed to be 25 percent forage, increasing to 50 percent forage at age 5 months, and 75 percent forage at age 6 months. The portion of the diet allocated to milk results in zero emissions, as recommended by the IPCC (2006). For calves, the DE for the remainder of the diet is assumed to be similar to that of slightly older replacement heifers (both beef and dairy are calculated separately). The Y_m for beef calves is also assumed to be similar to that of beef replacement heifers (6.5 percent), as literature does not provide an alternative Y_m for use in beef calves. For dairy calves, the Y_m is assumed to be 7.8 percent at 4 months,

⁷⁶ For example, the West has a forage DE of 61.3 which makes up 90 percent of the diet and a supplemented diet DE of 67.4 percent was used for 10 percent of the diet, for a total weighted DE of 61.9 percent, as shown in Table A-171.

8.03 percent at 5 months, and 8.27 percent at 6 months based on estimates provided by Soliva (2006) for Y_m at 4 and 7 months of age and a linear interpolation for 5 and 6 months.

Table A-172 shows the regional DE and Y_m for U.S. cattle in each region for 2017.

Table A-168: Feed Components and Digestible Energy Values Incorporated into Forage Diet Composition Estimates

Forage Type	DE (% of GE)	Grass pasture - Spring	Grass pasture - Summer	Grass pasture - Fall	Range June	Range July	Range August	Range September	Range Winter	Meadow - Spring	Meadow - Fall
Bahiagrass Paspalum notatum, fresh	61.38			x							
Bermudagrass Cynodon dactylon, fresh	66.29		x								
Bermudagrass, Coastal Cynodon dactylon, fresh	65.53		x								
Bluegrass, Canada Poa compressa, fresh, early vegetative	73.99	x									
Bluegrass, Kentucky Poa pratensis, fresh, early vegetative	75.62	x									
Bluegrass, Kentucky Poa pratensis, fresh, mature	59.00		x	x							
Bluestem Andropogon spp, fresh, early vegetative	73.17				x						
Bluestem Andropogon spp, fresh, mature	56.82					x	x	x	x		x
Brome Bromus spp, fresh, early vegetative	78.57	x									
Brome, Smooth Bromus inermis, fresh, early vegetative	75.71	x									
Brome, Smooth Bromus inermis, fresh, mature	57.58		x	x					x		
Buffalograss, Buchloe dactyloides, fresh	64.02				x	x					
Clover, Alsike Trifolium hybridum, fresh, early vegetative	70.62	x									
Clover, Ladino Trifolium repens, fresh, early vegetative	73.22	x									
Clover, Red Trifolium pratense, fresh, early bloom	71.27	x									
Clover, Red Trifolium pratense, fresh, full bloom	67.44		x		x						
Corn, Dent Yellow Zea mays indentata, aerial part without ears, without husks, sun-cured, (stover)(straw)	55.28			x							
Dropseed, Sand Sporobolus cryptandrus, fresh, stem cured	64.69				x	x	x			x	
Fescue Festuca spp, hay, sun-cured, early vegetative	67.39	x									
Fescue Festuca spp, hay, sun-cured, early bloom	53.57			x							
Grama Bouteloua spp, fresh, early vegetative	67.02	x									
Grama Bouteloua spp, fresh, mature	63.38		x	x						x	
Millet, Foxtail Setaria italica, fresh	68.20	x			x						
Napiergrass Pennisetum purpureum, fresh, late bloom	57.24		x	x							
Needleandthread Stipa comata, fresh, stem cured	60.36					x	x	x			
Orchardgrass Dactylis glomerata, fresh, early vegetative	75.54	x									
Orchardgrass Dactylis glomerata, fresh, midbloom	60.13		x								
Pearlmillet Pennisetum glaucum, fresh	68.04	x									
Prairie plants, Midwest, hay, sun-cured	55.53			x							x
Rape Brassica napus, fresh, early bloom	80.88	x									
Rye Secale cereale, fresh	71.83	x									
Ryegrass, Perennial Lolium perenne, fresh	73.68	x									
Saltgrass Distichlis spp, fresh, post ripe	58.06		x	x							
Sorghum, Sudangrass Sorghum bicolor sudanense, fresh, early vegetative	73.27	x									
Squirreltail Stanion spp, fresh, stem-cured	62.00		x			x					
Summercypress, Gray Kochia vestita, fresh, stem-cured	65.11			x	x	x					
Timothy Phleum pratense, fresh, late vegetative	73.12	x									

Forage Type	DE (% of GE)	Grass pasture - Spring	Grass pasture - Summer	Grass pasture - Fall	Range June	Range July	Range August	Range September	Range Winter	Meadow - Spring	Meadow - Fall
Timothy Phleum pratense, fresh, midbloom	66.87		x								
Trefoil, Birdsfoot Lotus corniculatus, fresh	69.07	x									
Vetch Vicia spp, hay, sun-cured	59.44			x							
Wheat Triticum aestivum, straw	45.77			x							
Wheatgrass, Crested Agropyron desertorum, fresh, early vegetative	79.78	x									
Wheatgrass, Crested Agropyron desertorum, fresh, full bloom	65.89		x			x					
Wheatgrass, Crested Agropyron desertorum, fresh, post ripe	52.99			x					x		x
Winterfat, Common Eurotia lanata, fresh, stem-cured	40.89								x		
Weighted Average DE		72.99	62.45	57.26	67.11	62.70	60.62	58.59	52.07	64.03	55.11
Forage Diet for West	61.3	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Forage Diet for All Other Regions	64.2	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Sources: Preston (2010) and Archibeque (2011).

Note that forages marked with an x indicate that the DE from that specific forage type is included in the general forage type for that column (e.g., grass pasture, range, meadow or meadow by month or season).

1 **Table A-169: DE Values with Representative Regional Diets for the Supplemental Diet of Grazing Beef Cattle for 1990–2006**

Feed	Source of DE (NRC 1984)	Unweighted DE (% of GE)	Northern Great Plains							
			California ^a	West	Southcentral	Northeast	Midwest	Southeast		
Alfalfa Hay	Table 8, feed #006	61.79	65%	30%	30%	29%	12%	30%		
Barley		85.08	10%	15%						
Bermuda	Table 8, feed #030	66.29								35%
Bermuda Hay	Table 8, feed #031	50.79			40%					
Corn	Table 8, feed #089	88.85	10%	10%	25%	11%	13%	13%		
Corn Silage	Table 8, feed #095	72.88			25%		20%	20%		
Cotton Seed Meal						7%				
Grass Hay	Table 8, feed #126, 170, 274	58.37		40%				30%		
Orchard	Table 8, feed #147	60.13								40%
Soybean Meal Supplement		77.15		5%	5%					5%
Sorghum	Table 8, feed #211	84.23								20%
Soybean Hulls		66.86						7%		
Timothy Hay	Table 8, feed #244	60.51					50%			
Whole Cotton Seed		75.75	5%				5%			
Wheat Middlings	Table 8, feed #257	68.09			15%	13%				
Wheat	Table 8, feed #259	87.95	10%							
Weighted Supplement DE (%)			70.1	67.4	73.0	62.0	67.6	66.9		68.0
Percent of Diet that is Supplement			5%	10%	15%	10%	15%	10%		5%

Source of representative regional diets: Donovan (1999).

^a Note that emissions are currently calculated on a state-by-state basis, but diets are applied by the regions shown in the table above.

Table A-170: DE Values and Representative Regional Diets for the Supplemental Diet of Grazing Beef Cattle for 2007–2017

Feed	Source of DE (NRC1984)	Unweighted DE (% of GE)	West ^a	Central ^a	Northeast ^a	Southeast ^a
Alfalfa Hay	Table 8, feed #006	61.79	65%	30%	12%	
Bermuda	Table 8, feed #030	66.29				20%
Bermuda Hay	Table 8, feed #031	50.79				20%
Corn	Table 8, feed #089	88.85	10%	15%	13%	10%
Corn Silage	Table 8, feed #095	72.88		35%	20%	
Grass Hay	Table 8, feed #126, 170, 274	58.37	10%			
Orchard	Table 8, feed #147	60.13				30%
Protein supplement (West)	Table 8, feed #082, 134, 225 ^b	81.01	10%			
Protein Supplement (Central and Northeast)	Table 8, feed #082, 134, 225 ^b	80.76		10%	10%	
Protein Supplement (Southeast)	Table 8, feed #082, 134, 101 ^b	77.89				10%
Sorghum	Table 8, feed #211	84.23		5%		10%
Timothy Hay	Table 8, feed #244	60.51			45%	
Wheat Middlings	Table 8, feed #257	68.09		5%		
Wheat	Table 8, feed #259	87.95	5%			
Weighted Supplement DE			67.4	73.1	68.9	66.6
Percent of Diet that is Supplement			10%	15%	5%	15%

^a Note that emissions are currently calculated on a state-by-state basis, but diets are applied by the regions shown in the table above.

^b Not in equal proportions.

Sources of representative regional diets: Donovan (1999), Preston (2010), Archibeque (2011), and USDA:APHIS:VS (2010).

Table A-171: Foraging Animal DE (% of GE) and Y_m Values for Each Region and Animal Type for 2007–2017

Animal Type	Data	West ^a	Central	Northeast	Southeast
Beef Repl. Heifers	DE ^b	61.9	65.6	64.5	64.6
	Y _m ^c	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Beef Calves (4–6 mo)	DE	61.9	65.6	64.5	64.6
	Y _m	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Steer Stockers	DE	61.9	65.6	64.5	64.6
	Y _m	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Heifer Stockers	DE	61.9	65.6	64.5	64.6
	Y _m	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Beef Cows	DE	59.9	63.6	62.5	62.6
	Y _m	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Bulls	DE	59.9	63.6	62.5	62.6
	Y _m	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%

^a Note that emissions are currently calculated on a state-by-state basis, but diets are applied by the regions shown in the table above. To see the regional designation per state, please see Table A-167.

^b DE is the digestible energy in units of percent of GE (MJ/Day).

^c Y_m is the methane conversion rate, the fraction of GE in feed converted to methane.

Table A-172: Regional DE (% of GE) and Y_m Rates for Dairy and Feedlot Cattle by Animal Type for 2017

Animal Type	Data	Northern						
		California ^a	West	Great Plains	Southcentral	Northeast	Midwest	Southeast
Dairy Repl. Heifers	DE ^b	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7
	Y _m ^c	6.0%	6.0%	5.7%	6.5%	6.4%	5.7%	7.0%
Dairy Calves (4–6 mo)	DE	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7
	Y _m	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Dairy Cows	DE	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Y _m	5.9%	5.9%	5.6%	6.4%	6.3%	5.6%	6.9%
Steer Feedlot	DE	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5
	Y _m	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%
Heifer Feedlot	DE	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5
	Y _m	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%

^a Note that emissions are currently calculated on a state-by-state basis, but diets are applied in Table A-166 by the regions shown in the table above. To see the regional designation for foraging cattle per state, please see Table A-166.

^b DE is the digestible energy in units of percent of GE (MJ/Day).

^c Y_m is the methane conversion rate, the fraction of GE in feed converted to methane.

Step 3: Estimate CH₄ Emissions from Cattle

Emissions by state were estimated in three steps: a) determine gross energy (GE) intake using the Tier 2 IPCC (2006) equations, b) determine an emission factor using the GE values, Y_m and a conversion factor, and c) sum the daily emissions for each animal type. Finally, the state emissions were aggregated to obtain the national emissions estimate. The necessary data values for each state and animal type include:

- Body Weight (kg)
- Weight Gain (kg/day)
- Net Energy for Activity (C_a, MJ/day)⁷⁷
- Standard Reference Weight (kg)⁷⁸
- Milk Production (kg/day)
- Milk Fat (percent of fat in milk = 4)
- Pregnancy (percent of population that is pregnant)
- DE (percent of GE intake digestible)
- Y_m (the fraction of GE converted to CH₄)
- Population

Step 3a: Determine Gross Energy, GE

As shown in the following equation, GE is derived based on the net energy estimates and the feed characteristics. Only variables relevant to each animal category are used (e.g., estimates for feedlot animals do not require the NE_l factor). All net energy equations are provided in IPCC (2006). Calculated GE values for 2015 are shown by state and animal type in Table A-173.

$$GE = \left[\frac{\left(\frac{NE_m + NE_a + NE_l + NE_{work} + NE_p}{REM} \right) + \left(\frac{NE_g}{REG} \right)}{\frac{DE\%}{100}} \right]$$

where,

- GE = Gross energy (MJ/day)
- NE_m = Net energy required by the animal for maintenance (MJ/day)
- NE_a = Net energy for animal activity (MJ/day)
- NE_l = Net energy for lactation (MJ/day)
- NE_{work} = Net energy for work (MJ/day)
- NE_p = Net energy required for pregnancy (MJ/day)
- REM = Ratio of net energy available in a diet for maintenance to digestible energy consumed
- NE_g = Net energy needed for growth (MJ/day)
- REG = Ratio of net energy available for growth in a diet to digestible energy consumed
- DE = Digestible energy expressed as a percent of gross energy (percent)

⁷⁷ Zero for feedlot conditions, 0.17 for high quality confined pasture conditions, and 0.36 for extensive open range or hilly terrain grazing conditions. C_a factor for dairy cows is weighted to account for the fraction of the population in the region that grazes during the year (IPCC 2006).

⁷⁸ Standard Reference Weight is the mature weight of a female animal of the animal type being estimated, used in the model to account for breed potential.

Table A-173: Calculated Annual GE by Animal Type and State, for 2017 (MJ/1,000 head)

State	Dairy Calves	Dairy Cows	Dairy Replacement Heifers 7-11 Months	Dairy Replacement Heifers 12-23 Months	Bulls	Beef Calves	Beef Cows	Beef Replacement Heifers 7-11 Months	Beef Replacement Heifers 12-23 Months	Steer Stockers	Heifer Stockers	Feedlot
Alabama	31	851	55	195	4,166	3,179	55,838	1,432	4,017	1,204	978	285
Alaska	1	29	1	5	240	23	404	13	36	13	15	3
Arizona	857	31,012	1,603	5,698	1,779	911	15,827	489	1,365	6,869	1,025	13,100
Arkansas	26	673	41	146	4,999	4,192	73,645	2,064	5,791	2,649	1,739	577
California	7,670	262,323	10,412	37,010	6,226	3,243	56,341	1,673	4,670	15,553	4,391	22,265
Colorado	677	25,460	1,370	4,870	4,892	3,986	69,243	2,446	6,825	22,033	15,223	48,673
Conn.	83	2,810	130	463	42	23	404	24	67	48	27	10
Delaware	22	668	30	107	25	12	202	8	24	46	11	8
Florida	533	17,431	479	1,704	4,999	4,165	73,162	1,491	4,184	722	815	199
Georgia	363	12,451	411	1,461	2,749	2,280	40,045	1,312	3,682	891	1,359	288
Hawaii	10	305	14	49	356	364	6,331	167	467	259	117	46
Idaho	2,622	94,209	4,247	15,096	3,558	2,476	43,008	1,545	4,311	8,036	5,562	13,980
Illinois	406	13,244	712	2,532	2,036	1,729	30,484	872	2,451	5,636	2,861	13,463
Indiana	809	27,876	1,096	3,896	1,385	938	16,542	581	1,634	2,536	1,324	5,696
Iowa	940	33,194	1,849	6,574	5,701	4,312	76,014	2,151	6,045	30,762	14,303	60,064
Kansas	656	22,722	1,370	4,870	7,738	7,016	123,670	3,604	10,129	48,139	37,878	119,093
Kentucky	249	7,791	548	1,948	5,832	4,692	82,428	1,790	5,021	5,178	3,125	932
Louisiana	52	1,355	55	195	2,583	2,055	36,097	1,014	2,845	602	543	149
Maine	131	4,303	205	730	125	51	889	48	134	97	82	23
Maryland	205	6,525	397	1,412	334	198	3,474	132	369	338	164	466
Mass.	50	1,492	96	341	84	30	525	24	67	48	27	10
Michigan	1,857	70,016	2,329	8,278	1,303	536	9,452	291	817	3,969	1,060	7,508
Minn.	2,010	66,977	4,041	14,366	2,851	1,653	29,145	1,105	3,104	11,741	4,370	19,417
Miss.	39	1,108	82	292	3,166	2,183	38,353	1,110	3,113	1,011	842	242
Missouri	371	10,003	616	2,191	9,774	9,183	161,874	4,302	12,090	10,802	6,225	5,696
Montana	61	2,073	123	438	8,894	7,358	127,821	5,470	15,266	5,962	7,494	2,330
Nebraska	262	9,346	342	1,217	8,959	8,580	151,240	4,360	12,253	53,774	36,553	127,896
Nevada	131	4,443	151	536	1,245	1,089	18,924	528	1,473	1,166	849	155
N. Hamp.	59	1,936	82	292	42	23	404	12	34	36	27	8
N. Jersey	28	902	51	180	84	35	606	19	54	51	33	11
N. Mexico	1,420	51,790	1,507	5,357	3,113	2,302	39,998	1,287	3,592	3,111	2,635	696
New York	2,710	96,247	4,863	17,287	1,671	506	8,888	539	1,511	1,087	1,363	1,036
N. Car.	197	6,615	301	1,071	2,583	1,697	29,813	823	2,310	1,036	679	225
N. Dakota	70	2,331	123	438	5,294	4,263	75,147	2,395	6,731	5,988	5,695	2,589
Ohio	1,145	37,854	1,644	5,844	2,443	1,287	22,686	872	2,451	5,166	1,589	7,767
Oklahoma	153	4,701	274	974	13,330	9,610	168,803	5,190	14,562	21,674	12,635	16,052
Oregon	542	17,486	890	3,165	3,558	2,703	46,965	1,351	3,772	4,018	3,367	4,401
Penn.	2,294	74,958	4,315	15,339	2,089	851	14,948	778	2,182	3,865	1,635	4,919
R. Island	3	99	7	24	8	6	113	5	13	12	5	2
S. Car.	66	1,922	96	341	1,250	780	13,698	394	1,105	193	272	60
S. Dakota	507	17,281	616	2,191	8,145	7,436	131,075	4,593	12,906	17,377	14,039	19,676
Tenn.	179	5,396	479	1,704	5,415	4,169	73,242	1,730	4,854	3,251	2,445	746
Texas	2,142	75,504	3,562	12,661	28,327	20,457	359,362	9,665	27,115	62,372	36,682	125,824
Utah	402	14,053	753	2,678	2,401	1,674	29,074	1,094	3,053	2,074	1,756	1,036
Vermont	564	18,581	767	2,727	251	64	1,131	66	185	97	177	35
Virginia	380	12,369	521	1,850	3,333	2,949	51,809	1,336	3,749	3,973	1,902	1,036
Wash.	1,202	42,560	1,644	5,844	1,601	1,114	19,354	747	2,083	4,925	3,425	9,838
W. Virg.	35	983	55	195	1,253	953	16,725	455	1,276	942	463	207
Wisconsin	5,594	197,617	9,727	34,575	2,443	1,296	22,844	930	2,614	9,393	1,324	13,980
Wyoming	26	910	41	146	3,558	3,535	61,416	2,381	6,645	4,147	4,011	3,883

Step 3b: Determine Emission Factor

The daily emission factor (DayEmit) was determined using the GE value and the methane conversion factor (Y_m) for each category. This relationship is shown in the following equation:

$$\text{DayEmit} = \frac{GE \times Y_m}{55.65}$$

where,

DayEmit = Emission factor (kg CH₄/head/day)

GE = Gross energy intake (MJ/head/day)

Y_m = CH₄ conversion rate, which is the fraction of GE in feed converted to CH₄ (%)

55.65 = A factor for the energy content of methane (MJ/kg CH₄)

The daily emission factors were estimated for each animal type and state. Calculated annual national emission factors are shown by animal type in Table A-174. State-level emission factors are shown by animal type for 2017 in Table A-175.

Table A-174: Calculated Annual National Emission Factors for Cattle by Animal Type, for 2017 (kg CH₄/head/year)

Cattle Type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Dairy												
Calves	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Cows	124	125	132	133	142	142	144	144	145	146	147	147
Replacements 7–11 months	48	46	46	45	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46
Replacements 12–23 months	73	69	70	67	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69
Beef												
Calves	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Bulls	91	94	94	97	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98
Cows	89	92	91	94	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Replacements 7–11 months	54	57	56	59	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Replacements 12–23 months	63	66	66	68	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Steer Stockers	55	57	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Heifer Stockers	52	56	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Feedlot Cattle	38	36	38	38	42	41	42	42	42	43	43	43

Note: To convert to a daily emission factor, the yearly emission factor can be divided by 365 (the number of days in a year).

Table A-175: Emission Factors for Cattle by Animal Type and State, for 2017 (kg CH₄/head/year)

State	Dairy		Dairy Replace-ment	Dairy Replace-ment	Bulls	Beef		Beef Replace-ment	Beef Replace-ment	Steer Stockers	Heifer Stockers	Feedlot
	Calves	Cows	Heifers 7-11 Months	Heifers 12-23 Months		Calves	Cows	Heifers 7-11 Months	Heifers 12-23 Months			
Alabama	12	138	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Alaska	12	95	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	35
Arizona	12	154	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	34
Arkansas	12	118	49	74	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	34
California	12	146	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	34
Colorado	12	151	43	65	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	35
Conn.	12	153	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
Delaware	12	138	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
Florida	12	162	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	36
Georgia	12	170	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	37
Hawaii	12	124	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	35
Idaho	12	153	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	35
Illinois	12	131	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	35
Indiana	12	139	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34

Iowa	12	142	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Kansas	12	140	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	35
Kentucky	12	155	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Louisiana	12	118	49	74	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Maine	12	148	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	36
Maryland	12	143	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
Mass.	12	134	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
Michigan	12	152	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	33
Minn.	12	134	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Miss.	12	140	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Missouri	12	109	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	35
Montana	12	137	43	65	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	34
Nebraska	12	144	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Nevada	12	144	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	37
N. Hamp.	12	148	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
N. Jersey	12	143	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	36
N. Mexico	12	155	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	36
New York	12	160	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	36
N. Car.	12	167	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	36
N. Dakota	12	134	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Ohio	12	133	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Oklahoma	12	141	49	74	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Oregon	12	137	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	35
Penn.	12	147	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
R. Island	12	128	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
S. Car.	12	145	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	33
S. Dakota	12	137	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Tenn.	12	149	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Texas	12	161	49	74	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	35
Utah	12	149	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	32
Vermont	12	149	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	36
Virginia	12	161	53	80	97	10	94	60	69	58	60	34
Wash.	12	151	46	69	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	34
W. Virg.	12	127	48	73	98	11	94	60	69	58	60	35
Wisconsin	12	142	43	65	95	10	92	58	68	56	59	34
Wyoming	12	140	43	65	104	11	100	65	74	62	65	35

Note: To convert to a daily emission factor, the yearly emission factor can be divided by 365 (the number of days in a year).

For quality assurance purposes, U.S. emission factors for each animal type were compared to estimates provided by the other Annex I member countries of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (the most recently available summarized results for Annex I countries are through 2012 only). Results, presented in Table A-176, indicate that U.S. emission factors are comparable to those of other Annex I countries. Results in Table A-176 are presented along with Tier I emission factors provided by IPCC (2006). Throughout the time series, beef cattle in the United States generally emit more enteric CH₄ per head than other Annex I member countries, while dairy cattle in the United States generally emit comparable enteric CH₄ per head.

Table A-176: Annex I Countries' Implied Emission Factors for Cattle by Year (kg CH₄/head/year)⁷⁹

Year	Dairy Cattle		Beef Cattle	
	United States Implied Emission Factor	Mean of Implied Emission Factors for Annex I countries (excluding U.S.)	United States Implied Emission Factor	Mean of Implied Emission Factors for Annex I countries (excluding U.S.)
1990	107	96	71	53
1991	107	97	71	53
1992	107	96	72	54
1993	106	97	72	54
1994	106	98	73	54
1995	106	98	72	54
1996	105	99	73	54

⁷⁹ Excluding calves.

1997	106	100	73	54
1998	107	101	73	55
1999	110	102	72	55
2000	111	103	72	55
2001	110	104	73	55
2002	111	105	73	55
2003	111	106	73	55
2004	109	107	74	55
2005	110	109	74	55
2006	110	110	74	55
2007	114	111	75	55
2008	115	112	75	55
2009	115	112	75	56
2010	115	113	75	55
2011	116	113	75	55
2012	117	112	75	51
2013	117	NA	75	NA
2014	118	NA	74	NA
2015	117	NA	75	NA
2016	118	NA	75	NA
2017	119	NA	74	NA
Tier I EFs For North America, from IPCC (2006)		121		53

Step 3c: Estimate Total Emissions

Emissions were summed for each month and for each state population category using the daily emission factor for a representative animal and the number of animals in the category. The following equation was used:

$$\text{Emissions}_{\text{state}} = \text{DayEmit}_{\text{state}} \times \text{Days/Month} \times \text{SubPop}_{\text{state}}$$

where,

$\text{Emissions}_{\text{state}}$ = Emissions for state during the month (kg CH₄)
 $\text{DayEmit}_{\text{state}}$ = Emission factor for the subcategory and state (kg CH₄/head/day)
 Days/Month = Number of days in the month
 $\text{SubPop}_{\text{state}}$ = Number of animals in the subcategory and state during the month

This process was repeated for each month, and the monthly totals for each state subcategory were summed to achieve an emission estimate for a state for the entire year and state estimates were summed to obtain the national total. The estimates for each of the 10 subcategories of cattle are listed in Table A-177. The emissions for each subcategory were then aggregated to estimate total emissions from beef cattle and dairy cattle for the entire year.

Table A-177: CH₄ Emissions from Cattle (kt)

Cattle Type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Dairy	1,574	1,498	1,519	1,503	1,645	1,670	1,664	1,679	1,706	1,722	1,730
Calves (4–6 months)	62	59	59	54	57	58	58	58	58	58	58
Cows	1,242	1,183	1,209	1,197	1,302	1,326	1,325	1,337	1,355	1,367	1,377
Replacements 7–11 months	58	56	55	56	63	62	61	63	65	65	65
Replacements 12–23 months	212	201	196	196	223	224	220	221	228	232	230
Beef	4,763	5,419	5,070	5,007	4,873	4,763	4,722	4,660	4,722	4,919	5,052
Calves (4–6 months)	182	193	186	179	166	161	157	156	158	164	168
Bulls	196	225	215	214	212	206	203	200	207	210	220
Cows	2,884	3,222	3,058	3,056	2,927	2,868	2,806	2,754	2,774	2,856	2,954
Replacements 7–11 months	69	85	74	80	74	76	78	83	89	91	90
Replacements 12–23 months	188	241	204	217	202	208	213	218	239	250	251
Steer Stockers	563	662	509	473	436	413	431	426	433	472	461
Heifer Stockers	306	375	323	299	283	266	267	256	263	289	286
Feedlot Cattle	375	416	502	488	573	565	568	567	558	587	621
Total	6,338	6,917	6,589	6,510	6,518	6,433	6,386	6,339	6,427	6,641	6,783

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Emission Estimates from Other Livestock

“Other livestock” include horses, sheep, swine, goats, American bison, and mules and asses. All livestock population data, except for American bison for years prior to 2002, were taken from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) agricultural statistics database (USDA 2018) or the Census of Agriculture (USDA 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2012). The Manure Management Annex discusses the methods for obtaining annual average populations and disaggregating into state data where needed and provides the resulting population data for the other livestock that were used for estimating all livestock-related emissions (see Table A-179). For each animal category, the USDA publishes monthly, annual, or multi-year livestock population and production estimates. American bison estimates prior to 2002 were estimated using data from the National Bison Association (1999).

Methane emissions from sheep, goats, swine, horses, mules and asses were estimated by multiplying national population estimates by the default IPCC emission factor (IPCC 2006). For American bison the emission factor for buffalo (IPCC 2006) was used and adjusted based on the ratio of live weights of 300 kg for buffalo (IPCC 2006) and 1,130 pounds (513 kg) for American Bison (National Bison Association 2011) to the 0.75 power. This methodology for determining emission factors is recommended by IPCC (2006) for animals with similar digestive systems. Table A-178 shows the emission factors used for these other livestock. National enteric fermentation emissions from all livestock types are shown in Table A-179 and Table A-180. Enteric fermentation emissions from most livestock types, broken down by state, for 2017 are shown in Table A-181 and Table A-182. Livestock populations are shown in Table A-183.

Table A-178: Emission Factors for Other Livestock (kg CH₄/head/year)

Livestock Type	Emission Factor
Swine	1.5
Horses	18
Sheep	8
Goats	5
American Bison	82.2
Mules and Asses	10.0

Source: IPCC (2006), except American Bison, as described in text.

Table A-179: CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Livestock Type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beef Cattle	119.1	135.5	126.7	125.2	121.8	119.1	118.0	116.5	118.0	123.0	126.3
Dairy Cattle	39.4	37.5	38.0	37.6	41.1	41.7	41.6	42.0	42.6	43.0	43.3
Swine	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.7
Horses	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4
Sheep	2.3	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
Goats	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
American Bison	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Mules and Asses	+	+	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total	164.2	178.7	170.6	168.9	168.9	166.7	165.5	164.2	166.5	171.9	175.4

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-180: CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation (kt)

Livestock Type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beef Cattle	4,763	5,419	5,070	5,007	4,873	4,763	4,722	4,660	4,722	4,919	5,052
Dairy Cattle	1,574	1,498	1,519	1,503	1,645	1,670	1,664	1,679	1,706	1,722	1,730
Swine	81	88	88	92	98	100	98	96	102	105	108
Horses	40	47	61	70	67	65	64	62	61	59	58
Sheep	91	72	56	49	44	43	43	42	42	42	42
Goats	13	12	12	14	14	13	13	12	12	11	11
American Bison	4	9	16	17	14	13	13	13	13	13	13
Mules and Asses	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	6,566	7,146	6,824	6,755	6,757	6,670	6,620	6,568	6,661	6,875	7,018

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-181: CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation from Cattle (metric tons), by State, for 2017

State	Dairy Calves	Dairy Cows	Dairy Replacement Heifers 7-11 Months	Dairy Replacement Heifers 12-23 Months	Bulls	Beef Calves	Beef Cows	Beef Replacement Heifers 7-11 Months	Beef Replacement Heifers 12-23 Months	Steer Stockers	Heifer Stockers	Feedlot	Total
Alabama	44	966	63	224	4,866	3,713	65,220	1,672	4,692	1,406	1,143	257	84,265
Alaska	2	29	1	5	280	27	472	15	42	15	17	3	909
Arizona	1,223	30,231	1,591	5,656	2,078	1,064	18,486	571	1,594	8,023	1,197	12,054	83,770
Arkansas	37	705	44	156	5,839	4,897	86,018	2,411	6,764	3,094	2,031	531	112,527
California	10,947	255,718	10,337	36,743	7,272	3,788	65,807	1,954	5,454	18,166	5,129	20,614	441,929
Colorado	967	23,480	1,288	4,578	5,714	4,655	80,877	2,856	7,972	25,735	17,780	44,357	220,260
Conn.	119	2,901	137	486	49	27	472	28	78	56	32	9	4,393
Delaware	31	690	32	113	29	13	236	10	27	54	13	7	1,254
Florida	761	19,772	552	1,964	5,839	4,865	85,454	1,742	4,887	844	952	174	127,806
Georgia	518	14,123	474	1,683	3,211	2,663	46,774	1,533	4,301	1,041	1,587	247	78,154
Hawaii	15	297	14	48	416	426	7,394	195	545	303	137	42	9,832
Idaho	3,742	91,837	4,216	14,987	4,155	2,892	50,234	1,804	5,035	9,386	6,497	12,632	207,418
Illinois	580	12,214	670	2,381	2,378	2,020	35,606	1,019	2,862	6,583	3,341	12,157	81,810
Indiana	1,154	25,708	1,030	3,663	1,617	1,096	19,321	679	1,908	2,962	1,547	5,272	65,958
Iowa	1,341	30,612	1,739	6,181	6,659	5,037	88,785	2,512	7,060	35,930	16,707	55,763	258,326
Kansas	936	20,954	1,288	4,578	9,038	8,195	144,448	4,210	11,831	56,227	44,241	108,565	414,511
Kentucky	356	8,838	631	2,244	6,812	5,481	96,277	2,090	5,865	6,047	3,650	845	139,136
Louisiana	75	1,419	58	207	3,017	2,400	42,162	1,185	3,323	703	635	133	55,317
Maine	187	4,443	216	767	146	59	1,038	56	157	113	96	21	7,298
Maryland	293	6,737	417	1,483	390	231	4,058	154	431	395	191	427	15,208
Mass.	72	1,540	101	358	98	35	613	28	78	56	32	9	3,020
Michigan	2,651	64,570	2,190	7,783	1,522	626	11,041	340	954	4,635	1,238	7,126	104,675
Minn.	2,869	61,767	3,800	13,506	3,330	1,931	34,042	1,290	3,626	13,714	5,105	18,097	163,076
Miss.	56	1,257	95	337	3,698	2,550	44,797	1,296	3,636	1,181	984	221	60,109
Missouri	530	9,225	580	2,060	11,416	10,726	189,071	5,025	14,121	12,617	7,270	5,129	267,770
Montana	87	1,912	116	412	10,389	8,594	149,296	6,389	17,831	6,964	8,753	2,185	212,929
Nebraska	374	8,619	322	1,145	10,465	10,021	176,650	5,093	14,312	62,809	42,695	117,788	450,292
Nevada	187	4,331	150	532	1,454	1,272	22,103	616	1,720	1,362	992	133	34,853
N. Hamp.	84	1,999	86	307	49	27	472	14	39	42	32	7	3,158
N. Jersey	41	931	53	189	98	40	708	22	63	59	38	10	2,252
N. Mexico	2,027	50,486	1,496	5,318	3,636	2,689	46,718	1,503	4,196	3,633	3,077	619	125,399
New York	3,867	99,361	5,108	18,157	1,952	591	10,381	629	1,765	1,270	1,592	912	145,586
N. Car.	281	7,503	347	1,234	3,017	1,982	34,821	962	2,698	1,209	793	197	55,046
N. Dakota	100	2,150	116	412	6,184	4,979	87,773	2,797	7,862	6,994	6,652	2,423	128,442
Ohio	1,634	34,910	1,546	5,494	2,854	1,503	26,498	1,019	2,862	6,034	1,856	7,220	93,430

Oklahoma	218	4,923	292	1,037	15,570	11,224	197,165	6,062	17,008	25,315	14,758	14,436	308,008
Oregon	773	17,045	884	3,142	4,155	3,158	54,856	1,579	4,405	4,693	3,932	3,941	102,564
Penn.	3,275	77,384	4,533	16,111	2,440	994	17,459	909	2,549	4,514	1,910	4,416	136,494
R. Island	5	103	7	26	10	8	132	6	16	14	6	2	334
S. Car.	94	2,181	110	393	1,460	911	15,999	460	1,290	225	317	58	23,498
S. Dakota	724	15,937	580	2,060	9,513	8,685	153,097	5,364	15,075	20,296	16,397	18,574	266,302
Tenn.	256	6,121	552	1,964	6,325	4,870	85,548	2,021	5,669	3,797	2,856	679	120,659
Texas	3,056	79,064	3,794	13,486	33,086	23,895	419,740	11,288	31,671	72,851	42,845	115,505	850,281
Utah	574	13,699	748	2,659	2,805	1,955	33,958	1,278	3,566	2,422	2,052	1,017	66,733
Vermont	805	19,182	806	2,864	293	75	1,321	77	216	113	207	31	25,989
Virginia	543	14,030	600	2,132	3,892	3,445	60,514	1,561	4,379	4,641	2,222	969	98,928
Wash.	1,715	41,488	1,632	5,801	1,870	1,301	22,605	872	2,433	5,753	4,001	9,072	98,544
W. Virg.	50	1,015	58	205	1,464	1,113	19,535	531	1,490	1,100	541	190	27,292
Wisconsin	7,984	182,246	9,145	32,507	2,854	1,514	26,682	1,086	3,053	10,971	1,547	12,871	292,460
Wyoming	37	839	39	137	4,155	4,129	71,735	2,781	7,762	4,844	4,684	3,514	104,657

Table A-182: CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation from Other Livestock (metric tons), by State, for 2017

State	Swine	Horses	Sheep	Goats	American Bison	Mules and Asses	Total
Alabama	86	725	99	125	21	120	1,175
Alaska	2	16	99	4	131	1	252
Arizona	240	2,089	1,040	506	6	41	3,921
Arkansas	197	778	99	163	27	87	1,350
California	143	1,879	4,800	746	120	62	7,751
Colorado	1,099	1,830	3,360	103	882	68	7,342
Connecticut	4	420	57	21	10	12	524
Delaware	9	150	99	2	8	1	269
Florida	23	2,186	99	232	32	110	2,681
Georgia	120	1,134	99	297	23	88	1,761
Hawaii	8	66	99	84	8	5	269
Idaho	38	879	2,000	92	292	40	3,341
Illinois	7,969	827	440	147	57	32	9,471
Indiana	6,056	2,045	416	151	108	58	8,835
Iowa	33,375	944	1,400	283	151	44	36,196
Kansas	3,011	1,077	544	176	546	34	5,387
Kentucky	615	1,947	384	150	116	135	3,347
Louisiana	9	1,063	99	80	7	84	1,341
Maine	7	213	57	35	22	4	337
Maryland	39	478	99	23	36	12	688
Massachusetts	11	362	57	45	8	3	486
Michigan	1,725	1,347	680	131	156	40	4,080
Minnesota	12,675	767	1,040	153	254	26	14,916
Mississippi	855	937	99	92	4	96	2,083
Missouri	4,969	1,538	720	554	168	86	8,035
Montana	269	1,631	1,840	42	1,206	49	5,036
Nebraska	5,156	1,135	664	85	1,903	43	8,986
Nevada	1	478	504	154	7	7	1,150
New Hampshire	5	149	57	29	25	1	266
New Jersey	19	453	99	29	16	8	624
New Mexico	2	861	776	131	424	18	2,213
New York	72	1,716	640	165	82	41	2,715
North Carolina	13,650	997	240	172	26	96	15,180
North Dakota	221	824	528	26	786	14	2,399
Ohio	4,181	1,963	936	168	70	72	7,391
Oklahoma	3,218	2,741	384	264	796	137	7,540
Oregon	14	926	1,360	142	115	27	2,583
Pennsylvania	1,800	2,222	744	206	108	94	5,173
Rhode Island	3	24	57	5	-	1	91
South Carolina	278	1,107	99	169	11	63	1,726
South Dakota	2,265	1,217	2,000	112	2,765	14	8,373
Tennessee	353	919	368	262	28	126	2,057
Texas	1,459	6,350	5,680	3,089	360	642	17,581
Utah	979	1,047	2,200	61	93	37	4,417
Vermont	6	181	57	73	9	14	340
Virginia	360	1,500	640	193	85	71	2,849
Washington	38	711	384	106	79	34	1,352
West Virginia	8	274	272	49	4	30	635
Wisconsin	458	1,565	608	331	349	58	3,368
Wyoming	135	1,160	2,880	50	787	29	5,041

^{a,-} Indicates there are no emissions, as there is no significant population of this animal type.

References

- Archibeque, S. (2011) Personal Communication. Shawn Archibeque, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado and staff at ICF International.
- Crutzen, P.J., I. Aselmann, and W. Seiler (1986) Methane Production by Domestic Animals, Wild Ruminants, Other Herbivores, Fauna, and Humans. *Tellus*, 38B:271-284.
- Donovan, K. (1999) Personal Communication. Kacey Donovan, University of California at Davis and staff at ICF International.
- Doren, P.E., J. F. Baker, C. R. Long and T. C. Cartwright (1989) Estimating Parameters of Growth Curves of Bulls, *J Animal Science* 67:1432-1445.
- Enns, M. (2008) Personal Communication. Dr. Mark Enns, Colorado State University and staff at ICF International.
- ERG (2016) Development of Methane Conversion Rate Scaling Factor and Diet-Related Inputs to the Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model for Dairy Cows, Dairy Heifers, and Feedlot Animals. ERG, Lexington, MA. December 2016.
- Galyean and Gleghorn (2001) Summary of the 2000 Texas Tech University Consulting Nutritionist Survey. Texas Tech University. Available online at <http://www.depts.ttu.edu/afs/burnett_center/progress_reports/bc12.pdf>. June 2009.
- Holstein Association (2010) *History of the Holstein Breed* (website). Available online at <http://www.holsteinusa.com/holstein_breed/breedhistory.html>. Accessed September 2010.
- ICF (2006) *Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model: Model Documentation*. Prepared by ICF International for the Environmental Protection Agency. June 2006.
- ICF (2003) *Uncertainty Analysis of 2001 Inventory Estimates of Methane Emissions from Livestock Enteric Fermentation in the U.S.* Memorandum from ICF International to the Environmental Protection Agency. May 2003.
- IPCC (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*. S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom 996 pp.
- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- Johnson, D. (2002) Personal Communication. Don Johnson, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, and ICF International.
- Johnson, D. (1999) Personal Communication. Don Johnson, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, and David Conneely, ICF International.
- Johnson, K. (2010) Personal Communication. Kris Johnson, Washington State University, Pullman, and ICF International.
- Kebreab E., K. A. Johnson, S. L. Archibeque, D. Pape, and T. Wirth (2008) Model for estimating enteric methane emissions from United States dairy and feedlot cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 86: 2738-2748.
- Lippke, H., T. D. Forbes, and W. C. Ellis. (2000) Effect of supplements on growth and forage intake by stocker steers grazing wheat pasture. *J. Anim. Sci.* 78:1625-1635.
- National Bison Association (2011) Handling & Carcass Info (on website). Available online at: <<http://www.bisoncentral.com/about-bison/handling-and-carcass-info>>. Accessed August 16, 2011.
- National Bison Association (1999) Total Bison Population—1999. Report provided during personal email communication with Dave Carter, Executive Director, National Bison Association July 19, 2011.
- NRC (1999) *1996 Beef NRC: Appendix Table 22*. National Research Council.
- NRC (1984) *Nutrient requirements for beef cattle (6th Ed.)*. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
- Pinchak, W.E., D. R. Tolleson, M. McCloy, L. J. Hunt, R. J. Gill, R. J. Ansley, and S. J. Bevers (2004) Morbidity effects on productivity and profitability of stocker cattle grazing in the southern plains. *J. Anim. Sci.* 82:2773-2779.
- Platter, W. J., J. D. Tatum, K. E. Belk, J. A. Scanga, and G. C. Smith (2003) Effects of repetitive use of hormonal implants on beef carcass quality, tenderness, and consumer ratings of beef palatability. *J. Anim. Sci.* 81:984-996.

- 1 Preston, R.L. (2010) What's The Feed Composition Value of That Cattle Feed? Beef Magazine, March 1, 2010. Available
2 at: <<http://beefmagazine.com/nutrition/feed-composition-tables/feed-composition-value-cattle--0301>>.
- 3 Skogerboe, T. L., L. Thompson, J. M. Cunningham, A. C. Brake, V. K. Karle (2000) The effectiveness of a single dose of
4 doramectin pour-on in the control of gastrointestinal nematodes in yearling stocker cattle. Vet. Parasitology 87:173-
5 181.
- 6 Soliva, C.R. (2006) Report to the attention of IPCC about the data set and calculation method used to estimate methane
7 formation from enteric fermentation of agricultural livestock population and manure management in Swiss
8 agriculture. On behalf of the Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), Berne, Switzerland.
- 9 USDA (2018) *Quick Stats: Agricultural Statistics Database*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of
10 Agriculture. Washington, D.C. Available online at <<http://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/>>.
- 11 USDA (2012) *Census of Agriculture: 2012 Census Report*. United States Department of Agriculture. Available online at:
12 <<http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/>>.
- 13 USDA (2007) *Census of Agriculture: 2007 Census Report*. United States Department of Agriculture. Available online at:
14 <<http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/index.asp>>.
- 15 USDA (2002) *Census of Agriculture: 2002 Census Report*. United States Department of Agriculture. Available online at:
16 <<http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2002/index.asp>>.
- 17 USDA (1997) *Census of Agriculture: 1997 Census Report*. United States Department of Agriculture. Available online at:
18 <<http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/1997/index.asp>>. Accessed July 18, 2011.
- 19 USDA (1996) *Beef Cow/Calf Health and Productivity Audit (CHAPA): Forage Analyses from Cow/Calf Herds in 18*
20 *States*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. Available online at
21 <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>. March 1996.
- 22 USDA (1992) *Census of Agriculture: 1992 Census Report*. United States Department of Agriculture. Available online at:
23 <<http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/1992/index.asp>>. Accessed July 18, 2011.
- 24 USDA:APHIS:VS (2010) Beef 2007–08, Part V: *Reference of Beef Cow-calf Management Practices in the United States,*
25 *2007–08*. USDA–APHIS–VS, CEAH. Fort Collins, CO.
- 26 USDA:APHIS:VS (2002) *Reference of 2002 Dairy Management Practices*. USDA–APHIS–VS, CEAH. Fort Collins, CO.
27 Available online at <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.
- 28 USDA:APHIS:VS (1998) *Beef '97, Parts I-IV*. USDA–APHIS–VS, CEAH. Fort Collins, CO. Available online at
29 <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/nahms/beefcowcalf/index.shtml#beef97>.
- 30 USDA:APHIS:VS (1996) *Reference of 1996 Dairy Management Practices*. USDA–APHIS–VS, CEAH. Fort Collins, CO.
31 Available online at <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.
- 32 USDA:APHIS:VS (1994) *Beef Cow/Calf Health and Productivity Audit*. USDA–APHIS–VS, CEAH. Fort Collins, CO.
33 Available online at <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.
- 34 USDA:APHIS:VS (1993) *Beef Cow/Calf Health and Productivity Audit*. USDA–APHIS–VS, CEAH. Fort Collins, CO.
35 August 1993. Available online at <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.
- 36 Vasconcelos and Galyean (2007) Nutritional recommendations of feedlot consulting nutritionists: The 2007 Texas Tech
37 University Study. J. Anim. Sci. 85:2772-2781.

3.11. Methodology for Estimating CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Manure Management⁸⁰

The following steps were used to estimate methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from the management of livestock manure for the years 1990 through 2017.

Step 1: Livestock Population Characterization Data

Annual animal population data for 1990 through 2017 for all livestock types, except American bison, goats, horses, mules and asses were obtained from the USDA NASS. The population data used in the emissions calculations for cattle, swine, and sheep were downloaded from the USDA NASS Quick Stats Database (USDA 2018a). Poultry population data were obtained from USDA NASS reports (USDA 1995a, 1995b, 1998, 1999, 2004a, 2004b, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b, 2014b, 2014c, 2015a, 2015b, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2018b, and 2018c). Goat population data for 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 were obtained from the Census of Agriculture (USDA 2014a), as were horse, mule and ass population data for 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012, and American bison population for 2002, 2007, and 2012. American bison population data for 1990-1999 were obtained from the National Bison Association (1999). Additional data sources used and adjustments to these data sets are described below.

Cattle: For all cattle groups (cows, heifers, steers, bulls, and calves), the USDA data provide cattle inventories from January (for each state) and July (as a U.S. total only) of each year. Cattle inventories change over the course of the year, sometimes significantly, as new calves are born and as cattle are moved into feedlots and subsequently slaughtered; therefore, to develop the best estimate for the annual animal population, the populations and the individual characteristics, such as weight and weight gain, pregnancy, and lactation of each animal type were tracked in the Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model (CEFM—see section 5.1 Enteric Fermentation). For animals that have relatively static populations throughout the year, such as mature cows and bulls, the January 1 values were used. For animals that have fluctuating populations throughout the year, such as calves and growing heifers and steer, the populations are modeled based on a transition matrix that uses annual population data from USDA along with USDA data on animal births, placement into feedlots, and slaughter statistics.

Swine: The USDA provides quarterly data for each swine subcategory: breeding, market under 50 pounds (under 23 kg), market 50 to 119 pounds (23 to 54 kg), market 120 to 179 pounds (54 to 81 kg), and market 180 pounds and over (greater than 82 kg). The average of the quarterly data was used in the emission calculations. For states where only December inventory is reported, the December data were used directly.

Sheep: The USDA provides total state-level data annually for lambs and sheep. Population distribution data for lambs and sheep on feed are not available after 1993 (USDA 1994). The number of lambs and sheep on feed for 1994 through 2015 were calculated using the average of the percent of lambs and sheep on feed from 1990 through 1993. In addition, all of the sheep and lambs “on feed” are not necessarily on “feedlots;” they may be on pasture/crop residue supplemented by feed. Data for those animals on feed that are in feedlots versus pasture/crop residue were provided only for lamb in 1993. To calculate the populations of sheep and lambs in feedlots for all years, it was assumed that the percentage of sheep and lambs on feed that are in feedlots versus pasture/crop residue is the same as that for lambs in 1993 (Anderson 2000).

Goats: Annual goat population data by state were available for 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 (USDA 2014a). The data for 1992 were used for 1990 through 1992. Data for 1993 through 1996, 1998 through 2001, 2003 through 2006, 2008 through 2011, and 2013 through 2017 were interpolated and extrapolated based on the 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census data.

Horses: Annual horse population data by state were available for 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 (USDA 2014a). Data for 1990 through 1991, 1993 through 1996, 1998 through 2001, 2003 through 2006, 2008 through 2011, and 2013 through 2017 were interpolated and extrapolated based on the 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census data.

Mules and Asses: Annual mule and ass (burro and donkey) population data by state were available for 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 (USDA 2014a). Data for 1990 through 1991, 1993 through 1996, 1998 through 2001, 2003

⁸⁰ Note that direct N₂O emissions from dung and urine spread onto fields either directly as daily spread or after it is removed from manure management systems (e.g., lagoon, pit, etc.) and from livestock dung and urine deposited on pasture, range, or paddock lands are accounted for and discussed in the Agricultural Soil Management source category within the Agriculture sector. Indirect N₂O emissions dung and urine spread onto fields after it is removed from manure management systems (e.g., lagoon, pit, etc.) and from livestock dung and urine deposited on pasture, range, or paddock lands are also included in the Agricultural Soil Management source category.

through 2006, 2008 through 2011, and 2013 through 2017 were interpolated and extrapolated based on the 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census data.

American Bison: Annual American bison population data by state were available for 2002, 2007, and 2012 (USDA 2014a). Data for 1990 through 1999 were obtained from the Bison Association (1999). Data for 2000, 2001, 2003 through 2006, and 2008 through 2011 were interpolated based on the Bison Association and 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census data. Populations for 2012 through 2017 are set equal to the 2012 Census data.

Poultry: The USDA provides population data for hens (one year old or older), pullets (hens younger than one year old), other chickens, and production (slaughter) data for broilers and turkeys (USDA 1995a, 1995b, 1998, 1999, 2004a, 2004b, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d, 2009e, 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2011b, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b, 2014b, 2014c, 2015a, 2015b, 2016a, 2016b, 2018b, and 2018c). All poultry population data were adjusted to account for states that report non-disclosed populations to USDA NASS. The combined populations of the states reporting non-disclosed populations are reported as “other” states. State populations for the non-disclosed states were estimated by equally distributing the population attributed to “other” states to each of the non-disclosed states.

Because only production data are available for boilers and turkeys, population data are calculated by dividing the number of animals produced by the number of production cycles per year, or the turnover rate. Based on personal communications with John Lange, an agricultural statistician with USDA NASS, the broiler turnover rate ranges from 3.4 to 5.5 over the course of the inventory (Lange 2000). For turkeys, the turnover rate ranges from 2.4 to 3.0. A summary of the livestock population characterization data used to calculate CH₄ and N₂O emissions is presented in Table A-183.

Step 2: Waste Characteristics Data

Methane and N₂O emissions calculations are based on the following animal characteristics for each relevant livestock population:

- Volatile solids (VS) excretion rate;
- Maximum methane producing capacity (B₀) for U.S. animal waste;
- Nitrogen excretion rate (Nex); and
- Typical animal mass (TAM).

Table A-184 presents a summary of the waste characteristics used in the emissions estimates. Published sources were reviewed for U.S.-specific livestock waste characterization data that would be consistent with the animal population data discussed in Step 1. The USDA’s *Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook* (AWMFH; USDA 1996, 2008) is one of the primary sources of waste characteristics for non-cattle animal groups. Data from the 1996 and 2008 USDA AWMFH were used to estimate VS and Nex for most non-cattle animal groups across the time series of the Inventory, as shown in Table A-185 (ERG 2010b and 2010c). The 1996 AWMFH data were based on measured values from U.S. farms; the 2008 AWMFH data were developed using the calculation method created by the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE), which is based on U.S. animal dietary intake and performance measures. Since the values from each of the two AWMFHs result from different estimation methods and reflect changes in animal genetics and nutrition over time, both data sources were used to create a time series across the Inventory as neither value would be appropriate to use across the entire span of Inventory years. Expert sources agreed interpolating the two data sources across the time series would be appropriate as each methodology reflect the best available for that time period and the more recent data may not appropriately reflect the historic time series (ERG 2010b). Although the AWMFH values are lower than the IPCC values, these values are more appropriate for U.S. systems because they have been calculated using U.S.-specific data. Animal-specific notes about VS and Nex are presented below:

- *Swine:* The VS and Nex data for breeding swine are from a combination of the types of animals that make up this animal group, namely gestating and farrowing swine and boars. It is assumed that a group of breeding swine is typically broken out as 80 percent gestating sows, 15 percent farrowing swine, and 5 percent boars (Safley 2000). Differing trends in VS and Nex values are due to the updated Nex calculation method from 2008 AWMFH. VS calculations did not follow the same procedure and were updated based on a fixed ratio of VS to total solids and past ASABE standards (ERG 2010b).
- *Poultry:* Due to the change in USDA reporting of hens and pullets in 2005, new nitrogen and VS excretion rates were calculated for the combined population of hens and pullets; a weighted average rate was calculated based on hen and pullet population data from 1990 to 2004.
- *Goats, Sheep, Horses, Mules and Asses:* In cases where data were not available in the USDA documents, data from the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, Standard D384.1 (ASAE 1998) or the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used as a supplement.

The method for calculating VS excretion and Nex for cattle (including American bison, beef and dairy cows, bulls, heifers, and steers) is based on the relationship between animal performance characteristics such as diet, lactation, and weight gain and energy utilization. The method used is outlined by the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* Tier II methodology, and is modeled using the CEFM as described in the enteric fermentation portion of the inventory (documented in Moffroid and Pape 2013) in order to take advantage of the detailed diet and animal performance data assembled as part of the Tier II analysis for cattle. For American bison, VS and Nex were assumed to be the same as beef NOF bulls.

The VS content of manure is the fraction of the diet consumed by cattle that is not digested and thus excreted as fecal material; fecal material combined with urinary excretions constitutes manure. The CEFM uses the input of digestible energy (DE) and the energy requirements of cattle to estimate gross energy (GE) intake and enteric CH₄ emissions. GE and DE are used to calculate the indigestible energy per animal as gross energy minus digestible energy plus the amount of gross energy for urinary energy excretion per animal (2 or 4 percent). This value is then converted to VS production per animal using the typical conversion of dietary gross energy to dry organic matter of 18.45 MJ/kg, after subtracting out the ash content of manure. The current equation recommended by the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* is:

$$\text{VS production (kg)} = \left[(\text{GE} - \text{DE}) + (\text{UE} \times \text{GE}) \right] \times \frac{1 - \text{ASH}}{18.45}$$

where,

GE = Gross energy intake (MJ)
DE = Digestible energy (MJ)
(UE × GE) = Urinary energy expressed as fraction of GE, assumed to be 0.04 except for feedlots which are reduced 0.02 as a result of the high grain content of their diet.
ASH = Ash content of manure calculated as a fraction of the dry matter feed intake (assumed to be 0.08).
18.45 = Conversion factor for dietary GE per kg of dry matter (MJ per kg). This value is relatively constant across a wide range of forage and grain-based feeds commonly consumed by livestock.

Total nitrogen ingestion in cattle is determined by dietary protein intake. When feed intake of protein exceeds the nutrient requirements of the animal, the excess nitrogen is excreted, primarily through the urine. To calculate the nitrogen excreted by each animal type, the CEFM utilizes the energy balance calculations recommended by the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for gross energy and the energy required for growth along with inputs of weight gain, milk production, and the percent of crude protein in the diets. The total nitrogen excreted is measured in the CEFM as nitrogen consumed minus nitrogen retained by the animal for growth and in milk. The basic equation for calculating Nex is shown below, followed by the equations for each of the constituent parts, based on the 10th Corrigenda for the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (IPCC 2018).⁸¹

$$\text{Nex}_{(T)} = \text{N}_{\text{intake}} \times (1 - \text{N}_{\text{retention\_fract}(T)})$$

where,

Nex_(T) = Annual N excretion rates (kg N animal⁻¹ yr⁻¹)
N_{intake(T)} = The annual N intake per head of animal of species/category T (kg N animal⁻¹ yr⁻¹)
N_{retention(T)} = Traction of annual N intake that is retained by animal

N intake is estimated as:

$$\text{N}_{\text{intake}(T)} = \frac{\text{GE}}{18.45} \bullet \left(\frac{\text{CP}\%}{100} \right) \left(\frac{100}{6.25} \right)$$

where,

N_{intake(T)} = Daily N consumed per animal of category T (kg N animal⁻¹ day⁻¹)
GE = Gross energy intake of the animal based on digestible energy, milk

⁸¹ Note that although this equation was updated since the previous Inventory submission, the equations are functionally the same and do not impact Inventory emissions estimates. The updated equation clarifies the relationship between intake of N and milk and growth (i.e., the fraction of N retained).

	production, pregnancy, current weight, mature weight, rate of weight gain, and IPCC constants (MJ animal ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)
18.45	= Conversion factor for dietary GE per kg of dry matter (MJ kg ⁻¹)
CP%	= Percent crude protein in diet, input
6.25	= Conversion from kg of dietary protein to kg of dietary N (kg feed protein per kg N)

The portion of consumed N that is retained as product equals the nitrogen in milk plus the nitrogen required for weight gain. The N content of milk produced is calculated using milk production and percent protein, along with conversion factors. The nitrogen retained in body weight gain by stockers, replacements, or feedlot animals is calculated using the net energy for growth (NE_g), weight gain (WG), and other conversion factors and constants. The equation matches the 10th Corrigenda to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and is as follows:

$$N_{retention(T)} = \left[\frac{Milk \times \left(\frac{Milk\ PR\%}{100} \right)}{6.38} \right] + \left[\frac{WG \times \left[268 - \left(\frac{7.03 \times NE_g}{WG} \right) \right]}{1000 \times 6.25} \right]$$

where,

N _{retention(T)}	= Daily N retained per animal of category T (kg N animal ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)
Milk	= Milk production (kg animal ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)
268	= Constant from 2006 IPCC Guidelines
7.03	= Constant from 2006 IPCC Guidelines
NE _g	= Net energy for growth, calculated in livestock characterization, based on current weight, mature weight, rate of weight gain, and IPCC constants, (MJ day ⁻¹)
1,000	= Conversion from grams to kilograms (g kg ⁻¹)
6.25	= Conversion from kg dietary protein to kg dietary N (kg protein per kg N)
Milk PR%	= Percent of protein in milk (%)
6.38	= Conversion from milk protein to milk N (kg protein per kg N)
WG	= Weight gain, as input into the CEFM transition matrix (kg day ⁻¹)

The VS and N equations above were used to calculate VS and Nex rates for each state, animal type (heifers and steer on feed, heifers and steer not on feed, bulls and American bison), and year. Table A-186 presents the state-specific VS and Nex production rates used for cattle in 2017. As shown in Table A-186, the differences in the VS daily excretion and Nex rate trends between dairy cattle animal types is due to milk production. Milk production by cow varies from state to state and is used in calculating net energy for lactating, which is used to calculate VS and Nex for dairy cows. Milk production is zero for dairy heifers (dairy heifers do not produce milk because they have not yet had a calf). Over time, the differences in milk production are also a big driver for the higher variability of VS and Nex rates in dairy cows.

Step 3: Waste Management System Usage Data

Table A-187 and Table A-188 summarize 2017 manure distribution data among waste management systems (WMS) at beef feedlots, dairies, dairy heifer facilities, and swine, layer, broiler, and turkey operations. Manure from the remaining animal types (beef cattle not on feed, American bison, goats, horses, mules and asses and sheep) is managed on pasture, range, or paddocks, on drylot, or with solids storage systems. Note that the Inventory WMS estimates are based on state or regional WMS usage data and not built upon farm-level WMS estimates. Additional information on the development of the manure distribution estimates for each animal type is presented below. Definitions of each WMS type are presented in Table A-189.

Beef Cattle, Dairy Heifers and American Bison: The beef feedlot and dairy heifer WMS data were developed using regional information from EPA's Office of Water's engineering cost analyses conducted to support the development of effluent limitations guidelines for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (EPA 2002b). Based on EPA site visits and state contacts supporting this work and additional personal communication with the national USDA office to estimate the percent of beef steers and heifers in feedlots (Milton 2000), feedlot manure is almost exclusively managed in drylots. Therefore, for these animal groups, the percent of manure deposited in drylots is assumed to be 100 percent. In addition, there is a small amount of manure contained in runoff, which may or may not be collected in runoff ponds. Using EPA and USDA data and expert opinions (documented in ERG 2000a), the runoff from feedlots was calculated by region in *Calculations: Percent Distribution of Manure for Waste Management Systems* and was used to estimate the percentage of manure managed in runoff ponds in addition to drylots; this percentage ranges from 0.4 to 1.3 percent (ERG 2000a). The percentage of manure generating emissions from beef feedlots is therefore greater than 100 percent. The remaining

population categories of beef cattle outside of feedlots are managed through pasture, range, or paddock systems, which are utilized for the majority of the population of beef cattle in the country. American bison WMS data were assumed to be the same as beef cattle NOF.

Dairy Cows: The WMS data for dairy cows were developed using state and regional data from the Census of Agriculture, EPA's Office of Water, USDA, and the expert sources noted below. Farm-size distribution data are reported in the 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2007 and 2012 Census of Agriculture (USDA 2016c). It was assumed that the Census data provided for 1992 were the same as that for 1990 and 1991, and data provided for 2012 were the same as that for 2013 through 2017. Data for 1993 through 1996, 1998 through 2001, and 2003 through 2006, and 2008 through 2011 were interpolated using the 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 data. The percent of waste by system was estimated using the USDA data broken out by geographic region and farm size.

Based on EPA site visits and the expert opinion of state contacts, manure from dairy cows at medium (200 through 700 head) and large (greater than 700 head) operations are managed using either flush systems or scrape/slurry systems. In addition, they may have a solids separator in place prior to their storage component. Estimates of the percent of farms that use each type of system (by geographic region) were developed by EPA's Office of Water and were used to estimate the percent of waste managed in lagoons (flush systems), liquid/slurry systems (scrape systems), and solid storage (separated solids) (EPA 2002b).

Manure management system data for small (fewer than 200 head) dairies were obtained at the regional level from USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)'s National Animal Health Monitoring System (Ott 2000). These data are based on a statistical sample of farms in the 20 U.S. states with the most dairy cows. Small operations are more likely to use liquid/slurry and solid storage management systems than anaerobic lagoon systems. The reported manure management systems were deep pit, liquid/slurry (includes slurry tank, slurry earth-basin, and aerated lagoon), anaerobic lagoon, and solid storage (includes manure pack, outside storage, and inside storage).

Data regarding the use of daily spread and pasture, range, or paddock systems for dairy cattle were obtained from personal communications with personnel from several organizations. These organizations include state NRCS offices, state extension services, state universities, USDA NASS, and other experts (Deal 2000, Johnson 2000, Miller 2000, Stettler 2000, Sweeten 2000, and Wright 2000). Contacts at Cornell University provided survey data on dairy manure management practices in New York (Poe et al. 1999). Census of Agriculture population data for 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 (USDA 2016c) were used in conjunction with the state data obtained from personal communications to determine regional percentages of total dairy cattle and dairy waste that are managed using these systems. These percentages were applied to the total annual dairy cow and heifer state population data for 1990 through 2017, which were obtained from the USDA NASS (USDA 2018a).

Of the dairies using systems other than daily spread and pasture, range, or paddock systems, some dairies reported using more than one type of manure management system. Due to limitations in how USDA APHIS collects the manure management data, the total percent of systems for a region and farm size is greater than 100 percent. However, manure is typically partitioned to use only one manure management system, rather than transferred between several different systems. Emissions estimates are only calculated for the final manure management system used for each portion of manure. To avoid double counting emissions, the reported percentages of systems in use were adjusted to equal a total of 100 percent using the same distribution of systems. For example, if USDA reported that 65 percent of dairies use deep pits to manage manure and 55 percent of dairies use anaerobic lagoons to manage manure, it was assumed that 54 percent (i.e., 65 percent divided by 120 percent) of the manure is managed with deep pits and 46 percent (i.e., 55 percent divided by 120 percent) of the manure is managed with anaerobic lagoons (ERG 2000a).

Finally, the percentage of manure managed with anaerobic digestion (AD) systems with methane capture and combustion was added to the WMS distributions at the state-level. AD system data were obtained from EPA's AgSTAR Program's project database (EPA 2016). This database includes basic information for AD systems in the United States, based on publicly available data and data submitted by farm operators, project developers, financiers, and others involved in the development of farm AD projects.

Swine: The regional distribution of manure managed in each WMS was estimated using data from a 1998 USDA APHIS survey, EPA's Office of Water site visits, and 2009 USDA Economic Research Service (ERS) Agricultural Resource Management Survey (ARMS) data (Bush 1998, ERG 2000a, ERG 2018). The USDA APHIS data are based on a statistical sample of farms in the 16 U.S. states with the most hogs. The ERS ARMS data are based on surveys of nationally representative swine producers. Prior to 2009, operations with less than 200 head were assumed to use pasture, range, or paddock systems and swine operations with greater than 200 head were assigned WMS as obtained from USDA APHIS (Bush 1998). From 2009 to 2017, WMS data were obtained from USDA ERS ARMS (ERG 2018). The percent of waste managed in each system was estimated using the EPA and USDA data broken out by geographic region and farm size. Farm-size distribution data reported in the 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census of Agriculture (USDA 2016c) were used to

determine the percentage of all swine utilizing the various manure management systems. It was assumed that the swine farm size data provided for 1992 were the same as that for 1990 and 1991, and data provided for 2012 were the same as that for 2013 through 2015. Data for 1993 through 1996, 1998 through 2001, 2003 through 2006, and 2008 through 2011 were interpolated using the 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 data.

Some swine operations reported using more than one management system; therefore, the total percent of systems reported by USDA for a region and farm size was greater than 100 percent. Typically, this means that a portion of the manure at a swine operation is handled in one system (e.g., liquid system), and a separate portion of the manure is handled in another system (e.g., dry system). However, it is unlikely that the same manure is moved from one system to another, which could result in increased emissions, so reported systems data were normalized to 100 percent for incorporation into the WMS distribution, using the same method as described above for dairy operations. As with dairy, AD WMS were added to the state-level WMS distribution based on data from EPA's AgSTAR database (EPA 2018).

Sheep: WMS data for sheep were obtained from USDA NASS sheep report for years 1990 through 1993 (USDA 1994). Data for 2001 are obtained from USDA APHIS's national sheep report (USDA, APHIS 2003). The USDA APHIS data are based on a statistical sampled of farms in the 22 U.S. states with the most sheep. The data for years 1994-2000 are calculated assuming a linear progression from 1993 to 2001. Due to lack of additional data, data for years 2002 and beyond are assumed to be the same as 2001. Based on expert opinion, it was assumed that all sheep manure not deposited in feedlots was deposited on pasture, range, or paddock lands (Anderson 2000).

Goats, Horses, and Mules and Asses: WMS data for 1990 to 2017 were obtained from Appendix H of *Global Methane Emissions from Livestock and Poultry Manure* (EPA 1992). This report presents state WMS usage in percentages for the major animal types in the United States, based on information obtained from extension service personnel in each state. It was assumed that all manure not deposited in pasture, range, or paddock lands was managed in dry systems. For mules and asses, the WMS was assumed to be the same as horses.

Poultry—Hens (one year old or older), Pullets (hens less than one year old), and Other Chickens: WMS data for 1992 were obtained from *Global Methane Emissions from Livestock and Poultry Manure* (EPA 1992). These data were also used to represent 1990 and 1991. The percentage of layer operations using a shallow pit flush house with anaerobic lagoon or high-rise house without bedding was obtained for 1999 from a United Egg Producers voluntary survey (UEP 1999). These data were augmented for key poultry states (AL, AR, CA, FL, GA, IA, IN, MN, MO, NC, NE, OH, PA, TX, and WA) with USDA data (USDA, APHIS 2000). It was assumed that the change in system usage between 1990 and 1999 is proportionally distributed among those years of the inventory. It was also assumed that system usage in 2000 through 2017 was equal to that estimated for 1999. Data collected for EPA's Office of Water, including information collected during site visits (EPA 2002b), were used to estimate the distribution of waste by management system and animal type. As with dairy and swine, using information about AD WMS from EPA's AgSTAR database (EPA 2016), AD was added to the WMS distribution for poultry operations.

Poultry—Broilers and Turkeys: The percentage of turkeys and broilers on pasture was obtained from the Office of Air and Radiation's *Global Methane Emissions from Livestock and Poultry Manure* (EPA 1992). It was assumed that one percent of poultry waste is deposited in pastures, ranges, and paddocks (EPA 1992). The remainder of waste is assumed to be deposited in operations with bedding management. As with dairy, swine, and other poultry, AD systems were used to update the WMS distributions based on information from EPA's AgSTAR database (EPA 2016).

Step 4: Emission Factor Calculations

Methane conversion factors (MCFs) and N₂O emission factors (EFs) used in the emission calculations were determined using the methodologies presented below.

Methane Conversion Factors (MCFs)

Climate-based IPCC default MCFs (IPCC 2006) were used for all dry systems; these factors are presented in Table A-190. A U.S.-specific methodology was used to develop MCFs for all lagoon and liquid systems.

For animal waste managed in dry systems, the appropriate IPCC default MCF was applied based on annual average temperature data. The average county and state temperature data were obtained from the National Climate Data Center (NOAA 2016) and each state and year in the inventory was assigned a climate classification of cool, temperate or warm. Although there are some specific locations in the United States that may be included in the warm climate category, no aggregated state-level annual average temperatures are included in this category. In addition, some counties in a particular state may be included in the cool climate category, although the aggregated state-level annual average temperature may be included in the temperate category. Although considering the temperatures at a state level instead of a county level may be

causing some specific locations to be classified into an inappropriate climate category, using the state level annual average temperature provides an estimate that is appropriate for calculating the national average.

For anaerobic lagoons and other liquid systems, a climate-based approach based on the van't Hoff-Arrhenius equation was developed to estimate MCFs that reflects the seasonal changes in temperatures, and also accounts for long-term retention time. This approach is consistent with the latest guidelines from IPCC (2006). The van't Hoff-Arrhenius equation, with a base temperature of 30°C, is shown in the following equation (Safley and Westerman 1990):

$$f = \exp \left[\frac{E(T_2 - T_1)}{RT_1T_2} \right]$$

where,

f	= van't Hoff-Arrhenius f factor, the proportion of VS that are biologically available for conversion to CH ₄ based on the temperature of the system
T_1	= 303.15K
T_2	= Ambient temperature (K) for climate zone (in this case, a weighted value for each state)
E	= Activation energy constant (15,175 cal/mol)
R	= Ideal gas constant (1.987 cal/K mol)

For those animal populations using liquid manure management systems or manure runoff ponds (i.e., dairy cow, dairy heifer, layers, beef in feedlots, and swine) monthly average state temperatures were based on the counties where the specific animal population resides (i.e., the temperatures were weighted based on the percent of animals located in each county). County population data were calculated from state-level population data from NASS and county-state distribution data from the 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census data (USDA 2016c). County population distribution data for 1990 and 1991 were assumed to be the same as 1992; county population distribution data for 1993 through 1996 were interpolated based on 1992 and 1997 data; county population data for 1998 through 2001 were interpolated based on 1997 and 2002 data; county population data for 2003 through 2006 were interpolated based on 2002 and 2007 data; county population data for 2008 through 2015 were assumed to be the same as 2007.

Annual MCFs for liquid systems are calculated as follows for each animal type, state, and year of the inventory:

- The weighted-average temperature for a state is calculated using the county population estimates and average monthly temperature in each county. Monthly temperatures are used to calculate a monthly van't Hoff-Arrhenius f factor, using the equation presented above. A minimum temperature of 5°C is used for uncovered anaerobic lagoons and 7.5°C is used for liquid/slurry and deep pit systems due to the biological activity in the lagoon which keeps the temperature above freezing.
- Monthly production of VS added to the system is estimated based on the animal type, number of animals present, and the volatile solids excretion rate of the animals.
- For lagoon systems, the calculation of methane includes a management and design practices (MDP) factor. This factor, equal to 0.8, was developed based on model comparisons to empirical CH₄ measurement data from anaerobic lagoon systems in the United States (ERG 2001). The MDP factor represents management and design factors which cause a system to operate at a less than optimal level.
- For all systems other than anaerobic lagoons, the amount of VS available for conversion to CH₄ each month is assumed to be equal to the amount of VS produced during the month (from Step 3). For anaerobic lagoons, the amount of VS available also includes VS that may remain in the system from previous months.
- The amount of VS consumed during the month is equal to the amount available for conversion multiplied by the f factor.
- For anaerobic lagoons, the amount of VS carried over from one month to the next is equal to the amount available for conversion minus the amount consumed. Lagoons are also modeled to have a solids clean-out once per year, occurring in the month of October.
- The estimated amount of CH₄ generated during the month is equal to the monthly VS consumed multiplied by the maximum CH₄ potential of the waste (B_0).

The annual MCF is then calculated as:

$$\text{MCF}_{\text{annual}} = \frac{\text{CH}_4 \text{ generated}_{\text{annual}}}{\text{VS produced}_{\text{annual}} \times B_o}$$

where,

MCF_{annual} = Methane conversion factor
 VS produced_{annual} = Volatile solids excreted annually
 B_o = Maximum CH₄ producing potential of the waste

In order to account for the carry-over of VS from one year to the next, it is assumed that a portion of the VS from the previous year are available in the lagoon system in the next year. For example, the VS from October, November, and December of 2005 are available in the lagoon system starting January of 2006 in the MCF calculation for lagoons in 2006. Following this procedure, the resulting MCF for lagoons accounts for temperature variation throughout the year, residual VS in a system (carry-over), and management and design practices that may reduce the VS available for conversion to CH₄. It is assumed that liquid-slurry systems have a retention time less than 30 days, so the liquid-slurry MCF calculation doesn't reflect the VS carry-over.

The liquid system MCFs are presented in Table A-191 by state, WMS, and animal group for 2015.

Nitrous Oxide Emission Factors

Direct N₂O EFs for manure management systems (kg N₂O-N/kg excreted N) were set equal to the most recent default IPCC factors (IPCC 2006), presented in Table A-192.

Indirect N₂O EFs account for two fractions of nitrogen losses: volatilization of ammonia (NH₃) and NO_x (Frac_{gas}) and runoff/leaching (Frac_{runoff/leach}). IPCC default indirect N₂O EFs were used to estimate indirect N₂O emissions. These factors are 0.010 kg N₂O-N/kg N for volatilization and 0.0075 kg N₂O/kg N for runoff/leaching.

Country-specific estimates of N losses were developed for Frac_{gas} and Frac_{runoff/leach} for the United States. The vast majority of volatilization losses are NH₃. Although there are also some small losses of NO_x, no quantified estimates were available for use and those losses are believed to be small (about 1 percent) in comparison to the NH₃ losses. Therefore, Frac_{gas} values were based on WMS-specific volatilization values estimated from U.S. EPA's *National Emission Inventory - Ammonia Emissions from Animal Agriculture Operations* (EPA 2005). To estimate Frac_{runoff/leach}, data from EPA's Office of Water were used that estimate the amount of runoff from beef, dairy, and heifer operations in five geographic regions of the country (EPA 2002b). These estimates were used to develop U.S. runoff factors by animal type, WMS, and region. Nitrogen losses from leaching are believed to be small in comparison to the runoff losses and there are a lack of data to quantify these losses. Therefore, leaching losses were assumed to be zero and Frac_{runoff/leach} was set equal to the runoff loss factor. Nitrogen losses from volatilization and runoff/leaching are presented in Table A-193.

Step 5: CH₄ Emission Calculations

To calculate CH₄ emissions for animals other than cattle, first the amount of VS excreted in manure that is managed in each WMS was estimated:

$$\text{VS excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} = \text{Population}_{\text{State, Animal}} \times \frac{\text{TAM}}{1000} \times \text{VS} \times \text{WMS} \times 365.25$$

where,

VS excreted_{State, Animal, WMS} = Amount of VS excreted in manure managed in each WMS for each animal type (kg/yr)
 Population_{State, Animal} = Annual average state animal population by animal type (head)
 TAM = Typical animal mass (kg)
 VS = Volatile solids production rate (kg VS/1000 kg animal mass/day)
 WMS = Distribution of manure by WMS for each animal type in a state (percent)
 365.25 = Days per year

Using the CEFM VS data for cattle, the amount of VS excreted in manure that is managed in each WMS was estimated using the following equation:

$$\text{VS excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} = \text{Population}_{\text{State, Animal}} \times \text{VS} \times \text{WMS}$$

where,

VS excreted_{State, Animal, WMS} = Amount of VS excreted in manure managed in each WMS for each animal type (kg/yr)
 Population_{State, Animal} = Annual average state animal population by animal type (head)
 VS = Volatile solids production rate (kg VS/animal/year)
 WMS = Distribution of manure by WMS for each animal type in a state (percent)

For all animals, the estimated amount of VS excreted into a WMS was used to calculate CH₄ emissions using the following equation:

$$\text{CH}_4 = \sum_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} (\text{VS excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} \times B_o \times \text{MCF} \times 0.662)$$

where,

CH₄ = CH₄ emissions (kg CH₄/yr)
 VS excreted_{WMS, State} = Amount of VS excreted in manure managed in each WMS (kg/yr)
 B_o = Maximum CH₄ producing capacity (m³ CH₄/kg VS)
 MCF_{animal, state, WMS} = MCF for the animal group, state and WMS (percent)
 0.662 = Density of methane at 25° C (kg CH₄/m³ CH₄)

A calculation was developed to estimate the amount of CH₄ emitted from AD systems utilizing CH₄ capture and combustion technology. First, AD systems were assumed to produce 90 percent of the maximum CH₄ producing capacity (B_o) of the manure. This value is applied for all climate regions and AD system types. However, this is a conservative assumption as the actual amount of CH₄ produced by each AD system is very variable and will change based on operational and climate conditions and an assumption of 90 percent is likely overestimating CH₄ production from some systems and underestimating CH₄ production in other systems. The CH₄ production of AD systems is calculated using the equation below:

$$\text{CH}_4 \text{ Production}_{\text{AD}_{\text{ADSystem}}} = \text{Production}_{\text{AD}_{\text{ADSystem}}} \times \frac{\text{TAM}}{1000} \times \text{VS} \times B_o \times 0.662 \times 365.25 \times 0.90$$

where,

CH₄ Production_{AD_{AD system}} = CH₄ production from a particular AD system, (kg/yr)
 Population_{AD_{state}} = Number of animals on a particular AD system
 VS = Volatile solids production rate (kg VS/1000 kg animal mass-day)
 TAM = Typical Animal Mass (kg/head)
 B_o = Maximum CH₄ producing capacity (CH₄ m³/kg VS)
 0.662 = Density of CH₄ at 25° C (kg CH₄/m³ CH₄)
 365.25 = Days/year
 0.90 = CH₄ production factor for AD systems

The total amount of CH₄ produced by AD is calculated only as a means to estimate the emissions from AD; i.e., only the estimated amount of CH₄ actually entering the atmosphere from AD is reported in the inventory. The emissions to the atmosphere from AD are a result of leakage from the system (e.g., from the cover, piping, tank, etc.) and incomplete combustion and are calculated using the collection efficiency (CE) and destruction efficiency (DE) of the AD system. The three primary types of AD systems in the United States are covered lagoons, complete mix and plug flow systems. The CE of covered lagoon systems was assumed to be 75 percent, and the CE of complete mix and plug flow AD systems was assumed to be 99 percent (EPA 2008). The CH₄ DE from flaring or burning in an engine was assumed to be 98 percent; therefore, the amount of CH₄ that would not be flared or combusted was assumed to be 2 percent (EPA 2008). The amount of CH₄ produced by systems with AD was calculated with the following equation:

$$\text{CH}_4 \text{ Emissions AD} = \sum_{\text{State, Animal, ADSystems}} \left(\left[\text{CH}_4 \text{ Production}_{\text{AD}_{\text{ADsystem}}} \times \text{CE}_{\text{ADsystem}} \times (1 - \text{DE}) \right] + \left[\text{CH}_4 \text{ Production}_{\text{AD}_{\text{ADsystem}}} \times (1 - \text{CE}_{\text{ADsystem}}) \right] \right)$$

where,

CH₄ Emissions AD = CH₄ emissions from AD systems, (kg/yr)

CH₄ Production AD_{AD system} = CH₄ production from a particular AD system, (kg/yr)

CE_{AD system} = Collection efficiency of the AD system, varies by AD system type

DE = Destruction efficiency of the AD system, 0.98 for all systems

Step 6: N₂O Emission Calculations

Total N₂O emissions from manure management systems were calculated by summing direct and indirect N₂O emissions. The first step in estimating direct and indirect N₂O emissions was calculating the amount of N excreted in manure and managed in each WMS. For calves and animals other than cattle the following equation was used:

$$\text{N excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} = \text{Population}_{\text{State, Animal}} \times \text{WMS} \times \frac{\text{TAM}}{1000} \times \text{Nex} \times 365.25$$

where,

N excreted_{State, Animal, WMS} = Amount of N excreted in manure managed in each WMS for each animal type (kg/yr)

Population_{state} = Annual average state animal population by animal type (head)

WMS = Distribution of manure by waste management system for each animal type in a state (percent)

TAM = Typical animal mass (kg)

Nex = Nitrogen excretion rate (kg N/1000 kg animal mass/day)

365.25 = Days per year

Using the CEFM Nex data for cattle other than calves, the amount of N excreted was calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{N excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} = \text{Population}_{\text{State, Animal}} \times \text{WMS} \times \text{Nex}$$

where,

N excreted_{State, Animal, WMS} = Amount of N excreted in manure managed in each WMS for each animal type (kg/yr)

Population_{state} = Annual average state animal population by animal type (head)

WMS = Distribution of manure by waste management system for each animal type in a state (percent)

Nex = Nitrogen excretion rate (kg N/animal/year)

For all animals, direct N₂O emissions were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Direct N}_2\text{O} = \sum_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} \left(\text{N excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} \times \text{EF}_{\text{WMS}} \times \frac{44}{28} \right)$$

where,

Direct N₂O = Direct N₂O emissions (kg N₂O/yr)

N excreted_{State, Animal, WMS} = Amount of N excreted in manure managed in each WMS for each animal type (kg/yr)

EF_{WMS} = Direct N₂O emission factor from IPCC guidelines (kg N₂O-N /kg N)

44/28 = Conversion factor of N₂O-N to N₂O

Indirect N₂O emissions were calculated for all animals with the following equation:

$$\text{Indirect N}_2\text{O} = \sum_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} \left[\text{N excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} \times \frac{\text{Frac}_{\text{gas, WMS}}}{100} \times \text{EF}_{\text{volatilization}} \times \frac{44}{28} \right] + \left[\text{N excreted}_{\text{State, Animal, WMS}} \times \frac{\text{Frac}_{\text{runoff/leach, WMS}}}{100} \times \text{EF}_{\text{runoff/leach}} \times \frac{44}{28} \right]$$

where,

Indirect N ₂ O	= Indirect N ₂ O emissions (kg N ₂ O/yr)
N excreted _{State, Animal, WMS}	= Amount of N excreted in manure managed in each WMS for each animal type (kg/yr)
Frac _{gas, WMS}	= Nitrogen lost through volatilization in each WMS
Frac _{runoff/leach, WMS}	= Nitrogen lost through runoff and leaching in each WMS (data were not available for leaching so the value reflects only runoff)
EF _{volatilization}	= Emission factor for volatilization (0.010 kg N ₂ O-N/kg N)
EF _{runoff/leach}	= Emission factor for runoff/leaching (0.0075 kg N ₂ O-N/kg N)
44/28	= Conversion factor of N ₂ O-N to N ₂ O

Emission estimates of CH₄ and N₂O by animal type are presented for all years of the inventory in Table A-194 and Table A-195 respectively. Emission estimates for 2017 are presented by animal type and state in Table A-196 and Table A-197 respectively.

1 **Table A-183: Livestock Population (1,000 Head)**

Animal Type	1990	1995	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Dairy Cattle	19,512	18,681	17,793	18,078	18,190	18,422	18,560	18,297	18,442	18,587	18,505	18,527	18,803	18,853	18,893
Dairy Cows	10,015	9,482	9,004	9,104	9,145	9,257	9,333	9,087	9,156	9,236	9,221	9,208	9,307	9,310	9,346
Dairy Heifer	4,129	4,108	4,162	4,294	4,343	4,401	4,437	4,545	4,577	4,581	4,525	4,579	4,725	4,785	4,762
Dairy Calves	5,369	5,091	4,628	4,680	4,703	4,765	4,791	4,666	4,709	4,770	4,758	4,740	4,771	4,758	4,785
Swine ^a	53,941	58,899	61,073	61,887	65,417	67,183	65,842	64,723	65,572	66,363	65,437	64,325	68,203	70,128	72,152
Market <50 lb.	18,359	19,656	20,228	20,514	21,812	19,933	19,411	19,067	19,285	19,472	19,002	18,952	19,836	20,572	21,016
Market 50-119 lb.	11,734	12,836	13,519	13,727	14,557	17,163	16,942	16,645	16,904	17,140	16,834	16,576	17,577	18,181	18,728
Market 120-179 lb.	9,440	10,545	11,336	11,443	12,185	12,825	12,517	12,377	12,514	12,714	12,674	12,333	13,233	13,610	13,995
Market >180 lb.	7,510	8,937	9,997	10,113	10,673	11,161	11,067	10,856	11,078	11,199	11,116	10,572	11,580	11,735	12,292
Breeding	6,899	6,926	5,993	6,090	6,190	6,102	5,905	5,778	5,791	5,839	5,812	5,892	5,978	6,030	6,122
Beef Cattle ^b	81,576	90,361	82,193	83,263	82,801	81,532	80,993	80,484	78,937	76,858	76,075	75,245	76,080	79,374	81,560
Feedlot Steers	6,357	7,233	8,116	8,724	8,674	8,474	8,434	8,584	8,771	8,586	8,614	8,695	8,570	9,019	9,572
Feedlot Heifers	3,192	3,831	4,536	4,801	4,730	4,585	4,493	4,620	4,830	4,742	4,653	4,525	4,313	4,431	4,768
NOF Bulls	2,160	2,385	2,214	2,258	2,214	2,207	2,188	2,190	2,165	2,100	2,074	2,038	2,109	2,142	2,244
Beef Calves	16,909	18,177	16,918	16,814	16,644	16,231	16,051	16,067	15,817	15,288	14,859	14,741	15,000	15,563	15,971
NOF Heifers	10,182	11,829	9,550	9,716	9,592	9,356	9,473	9,349	8,874	8,687	8,787	8,787	9,288	9,903	9,835
NOF Steers	10,321	11,716	8,185	8,248	8,302	8,244	8,560	8,234	7,568	7,173	7,457	7,374	7,496	8,150	7,957
NOF Cows	32,455	35,190	32,674	32,703	32,644	32,435	31,794	31,440	30,913	30,282	29,631	29,085	29,302	30,166	31,213
Sheep	11,358	8,989	6,135	6,200	6,120	5,950	5,747	5,620	5,470	5,375	5,360	5,245	5,280	5,300	5,250
Sheep On Feed	1,180	1,771	2,971	3,026	3,000	2,911	2,806	2,778	2,687	2,666	2,655	2,593	2,593	2,624	2,597
Sheep NOF	10,178	7,218	3,164	3,174	3,120	3,039	2,941	2,842	2,783	2,709	2,705	2,652	2,687	2,676	2,653
Goats	2,516	2,357	2,897	3,019	3,141	3,037	2,933	2,829	2,725	2,622	2,518	2,414	2,310	2,206	2,102
Poultry ^c	1,537,074	1,826,977	2,150,410	2,154,236	2,166,936	2,175,990	2,088,828	2,104,335	2,095,951	2,168,697	2,106,502	2,116,333	2,134,445	2,173,216	2,205,915
Hens >1 yr.	273,467	299,071	348,203	349,888	346,613	339,859	341,005	341,884	338,944	346,965	361,403	370,637	351,656	377,299	382,266
Pullets	73,167	81,369	96,809	96,596	103,816	99,458	102,301	105,738	102,233	104,460	106,646	106,490	118,114	112,061	115,411
Chickens	6,545	7,637	8,289	7,938	8,164	7,589	8,487	7,390	6,922	6,827	6,853	6,403	7,211	6,759	6,859
Broilers	1,066,209	1,331,940	1,613,091	1,612,327	1,619,400	1,638,055	1,554,582	1,567,927	1,565,018	1,625,945	1,551,600	1,553,636	1,579,764	1,595,764	1,620,545
Turkeys	117,685	106,960	84,018	87,487	88,943	91,029	82,453	81,396	82,833	84,500	80,000	79,167	77,700	81,333	80,833
Horses	2,212	2,632	3,875	3,952	4,029	3,947	3,866	3,784	3,703	3,621	3,540	3,458	3,377	3,295	3,214
Mules and Asses	63	101	212	248	284	286	287	289	291	293	294	296	298	300	301
American Bison	47	104	212	205	198	191	184	177	169	162	162	162	162	162	162

^a Prior to 2008, the Market <50 lbs category was <60 lbs and the Market 50-119 lbs category was Market 60-119 lbs; USDA updated the categories to be more consistent with international animal categories.

^b NOF - Not on Feed

^c Pullets includes laying pullets, pullets younger than 3 months, and pullets older than 3 months.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Source(s): See Step 1: Livestock Population Characterization Data

1 **Table A-184: Waste Characteristics Data**

Animal Group	Typical Animal Mass, TAM		Total Nitrogen Excreted, Nex ^a		Maximum Methane Generation Potential, B ₀		Volatile Solids Excreted, VS ^a	
	Value (kg)	Source	Value	Source	Value (m ³ CH ₄ /kg VS added)	Source	Value	Source
Dairy Cows	680	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.24	Morris 1976	Table A-186	CEFM
Dairy Heifers	406-408	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.17	Bryant et al. 1976	Table A-186	CEFM
Feedlot Steers	419-457	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.33	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
Feedlot Heifers	384-430	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.33	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
NOF Bulls	831-917	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.17	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
NOF Calves	118	ERG 2003b	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.17	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
NOF Heifers	296-407	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.17	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
NOF Steers	314-335	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.17	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
NOF Cows	554-611	CEFM	Table A-186	CEFM	0.17	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
American Bison	578.5	Meagher 1986	Table A-186	CEFM	0.17	Hashimoto 1981	Table A-186	CEFM
Market Swine <50 lbs.	13	ERG 2010a	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Market Swine <60 lbs.	16	Safley 2000	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Market Swine 50-119 lbs.	39	ERG 2010a	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Market Swine 60-119 lbs.	41	Safley 2000	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Market Swine 120-179 lbs.	68	Safley 2000	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Market Swine >180 lbs.	91	Safley 2000	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Breeding Swine	198	Safley 2000	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.48	Hashimoto 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Feedlot Sheep	25	EPA 1992	Table A-185	ASAE 1998, USDA 2008	0.36	EPA 1992	Table A-185	ASAE 1998, USDA 2008
NOF Sheep	80	EPA 1992	Table A-185	ASAE 1998, USDA 2008	0.19	EPA 1992	Table A-185	ASAE 1998, USDA 2008
Goats	64	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	ASAE 1998	0.17	EPA 1992	Table A-185	ASAE 1998
Horses	450	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	ASAE 1998, USDA 2008	0.33	EPA 1992	Table A-185	ASAE 1998, USDA 2008
Mules and Asses	130	IPCC 2006	Table A-185	IPCC 2006	0.33	EPA 1992	Table A-185	IPCC 2006
Hens >= 1 yr	1.8	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.39	Hill 1982	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Pullets	1.8	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.39	Hill 1982	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Other Chickens	1.8	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.39	Hill 1982	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Broilers	0.9	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.36	Hill 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008
Turkeys	6.8	ASAE 1998	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008	0.36	Hill 1984	Table A-185	USDA 1996, 2008

^a Nex and VS values vary by year; Table A-186 shows state-level values for 2017 only.

2

1 Table A-185: Estimated Volatile Solids (VS) and Total Nitrogen Excreted (Nex) Production Rates by year for Swine, Poultry, Sheep, Goats, Horses, Mules and Asses, and Cattle
2 Calves (kg/day/1000 kg animal mass)

Animal Type	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
VS																				
Swine, Market <50 lbs.	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8
Swine, Market 50-119 lbs.	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Swine, Market 120-179 lbs.	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Swine, Market >180 lbs.	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Swine, Breeding	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
NOF Cattle Calves	6.4	6.4	6.8	6.9	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7
Sheep	9.2	9.2	9.0	8.9	8.8	8.8	8.7	8.6	8.5	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3
Goats	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5
Hens >1yr.	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2
Pullets	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2
Chickens	10.8	10.8	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0
Broilers	15.0	15.0	15.7	15.8	16.0	16.2	16.3	16.5	16.7	16.8	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0
Turkeys	9.7	9.7	9.3	9.2	9.1	9.0	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.6	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5
Horses	10.0	10.0	9.2	8.8	8.4	8.1	7.7	7.3	6.9	6.5	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1
Mules and Asses	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2
Nex																				
Swine, Market <50 lbs.	0.60	0.60	0.71	0.73	0.76	0.79	0.81	0.84	0.87	0.89	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Swine, Market 50-119 lbs.	0.42	0.42	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54
Swine, Market 120-179 lbs.	0.42	0.42	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54
Swine, Market >180 lbs.	0.42	0.42	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54
Swine, Breeding	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
NOF Cattle Calves	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.36	0.38	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.43	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45
Sheep	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45
Goats	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45
Hens >1yr.	0.70	0.70	0.73	0.73	0.74	0.75	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.78	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79

Animal Type	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Pullets	0.70	0.70	0.73	0.73	0.74	0.75	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.78	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79
Chickens	0.83	0.83	0.92	0.94	0.97	0.99	1.01	1.03	1.06	1.08	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
Broilers	1.10	1.10	1.05	1.04	1.03	1.02	1.01	1.00	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
Turkeys	0.74	0.74	0.70	0.69	0.68	0.67	0.66	0.65	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63
Horses	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Mules and Asses	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30

Source: USDA AWMFH (1996, 2008)

1 Table A-186: Estimated Volatile Solids (VS) and Total Nitrogen Excreted (Nex) Production Rates by State for Cattle (other than Calves) and American Bison^a for 2017
2 (kg/animal/year)

State	Volatile Solids									Nitrogen Excreted								
	Dairy Cow	Dairy Heifers	Beef NOF Cow	Beef NOF Heifers	Beef NOF Steer	Beef OF Heifers	Beef OF Steer	Beef NOF Bull	American Bison	Dairy Cow	Dairy Heifers	Beef NOF Cow	Beef NOF Heifers	Beef NOF Steer	Beef OF Heifers	Beef OF Steer	Beef NOF Bull	American Bison
Alabama	2,262	1,252	1,664	1,101	975	691	669	1,721	1,721	136	69	73	51	42	56	57	83	83
Alaska	1,821	1,252	1,891	1,254	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	115	69	59	41	33	56	57	69	69
Arizona	2,943	1,252	1,891	1,239	1,120	691	670	1,956	1,956	163	69	59	40	33	56	57	69	69
Arkansas	2,087	1,252	1,664	1,098	975	691	670	1,721	1,721	126	69	73	50	42	56	57	83	83
California	2,780	1,252	1,891	1,232	1,120	691	670	1,956	1,956	155	69	59	40	33	56	57	69	69
Colorado	3,055	1,252	1,891	1,207	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	168	69	59	38	33	56	57	69	69
Connecticut	2,751	1,252	1,674	1,099	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	155	69	74	51	42	56	57	84	84
Delaware	2,486	1,252	1,674	1,096	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	143	69	74	51	42	56	57	84	84
Florida	2,657	1,252	1,664	1,104	975	691	668	1,721	1,721	153	69	73	51	42	56	57	83	83
Georgia	2,790	1,252	1,664	1,094	975	691	668	1,721	1,721	158	69	73	50	42	55	57	83	83
Hawaii	2,363	1,252	1,891	1,263	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	138	69	59	41	33	56	57	69	69
Idaho	2,920	1,252	1,891	1,223	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	162	69	59	39	33	56	57	69	69
Illinois	2,649	1,252	1,589	1,015	927	691	669	1,643	1,643	150	69	75	50	43	56	57	85	85
Indiana	2,803	1,252	1,589	1,024	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	157	69	75	50	43	56	57	85	85
Iowa	2,872	1,252	1,589	997	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	160	69	75	48	43	56	57	85	85
Kansas	2,817	1,252	1,589	988	927	691	669	1,643	1,643	158	69	75	48	43	56	57	85	85
Kentucky	2,542	1,252	1,664	1,083	975	691	669	1,721	1,721	148	69	73	49	42	56	57	83	83
Louisiana	2,100	1,252	1,664	1,104	975	691	669	1,721	1,721	127	69	73	51	42	56	57	83	83
Maine	2,668	1,252	1,674	1,090	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	151	69	74	50	42	56	57	84	84
Maryland	2,582	1,252	1,674	1,097	981	691	670	1,731	1,731	147	69	74	51	42	56	57	84	84
Massachusetts	2,413	1,252	1,674	1,099	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	140	69	74	51	42	56	57	84	84
Michigan	3,064	1,252	1,589	1,012	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	168	69	75	49	43	56	57	85	85
Minnesota	2,708	1,252	1,589	1,010	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	153	69	75	49	43	56	57	85	85
Mississippi	2,291	1,252	1,664	1,099	975	691	669	1,721	1,721	137	69	73	50	42	56	57	83	83
Missouri	2,189	1,252	1,589	1,034	927	691	669	1,643	1,643	131	69	75	51	43	56	57	85	85
Montana	2,754	1,252	1,891	1,250	1,120	691	670	1,956	1,956	155	69	59	41	33	56	57	69	69
Nebraska	2,897	1,252	1,589	992	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	161	69	75	48	43	56	57	85	85
Nevada	2,754	1,252	1,891	1,246	1,120	691	668	1,956	1,956	155	69	59	40	33	55	56	69	69
New Hampshire	2,668	1,252	1,674	1,083	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	151	69	74	50	42	56	57	84	84
New Jersey	2,581	1,252	1,674	1,090	981	691	668	1,731	1,731	147	69	74	50	42	56	57	84	84
New Mexico	2,964	1,252	1,891	1,239	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	164	69	59	40	33	56	57	69	69
New York	2,887	1,252	1,674	1,080	981	691	668	1,731	1,731	161	69	74	50	42	56	57	84	84
North Carolina	2,734	1,252	1,664	1,098	975	691	668	1,721	1,721	156	69	73	50	42	56	57	83	83
North Dakota	2,710	1,252	1,589	1,023	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	153	69	75	50	43	56	57	85	85
Ohio	2,687	1,252	1,589	1,029	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	152	69	75	51	43	56	57	85	85
Oklahoma	2,498	1,252	1,664	1,075	975	691	669	1,721	1,721	144	69	73	49	42	56	57	83	83
Oregon	2,623	1,252	1,891	1,234	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	149	69	59	40	33	56	57	69	69
Pennsylvania	2,656	1,252	1,674	1,085	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	151	69	74	50	42	56	57	84	84
Rhode Island	2,313	1,252	1,674	1,099	981	691	669	1,731	1,731	136	69	74	51	42	56	57	84	84
South Carolina	2,384	1,252	1,664	1,101	975	691	671	1,721	1,721	141	69	73	51	42	56	58	83	83
South Dakota	2,771	1,252	1,589	1,016	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	156	69	75	50	43	56	57	85	85

	Volatile Solids									Nitrogen Excreted								
State	Dairy	Dairy	Beef	Beef	Beef	Beef	Beef	Beef	American	Dairy	Dairy	Beef	Beef	Beef	Beef	Beef	Beef	American
	Cow	Heifers	NOF Cow	NOF Heifers	NOF Steer	OF Heifers	OF Steer	NOF Bull	Bison	Cow	Heifers	NOF Cow	NOF Heifers	NOF Steer	OF Heifers	OF Steer	NOF Bull	Bison
Tennessee	2,448	1,252	1,664	1,088	975	691	669	1,721	1,721	144	69	73	50	42	56	57	83	83
Texas	2,866	1,252	1,664	1,063	975	691	670	1,721	1,721	160	69	73	48	42	56	57	83	83
Utah	2,841	1,252	1,891	1,246	1,120	692	671	1,956	1,956	159	69	59	40	33	56	58	69	69
Vermont	2,679	1,252	1,674	1,079	981	691	668	1,731	1,731	152	69	74	50	42	56	57	84	84
Virginia	2,644	1,252	1,664	1,088	975	691	670	1,721	1,721	152	69	73	50	42	56	57	83	83
Washington	2,878	1,252	1,891	1,216	1,120	691	670	1,956	1,956	160	69	59	39	33	56	57	69	69
West Virginia	2,285	1,252	1,674	1,101	981	691	670	1,731	1,731	135	69	74	51	42	56	57	84	84
Wisconsin	2,872	1,252	1,589	1,035	927	691	670	1,643	1,643	160	69	75	51	43	56	57	85	85
Wyoming	2,820	1,252	1,891	1,244	1,120	691	669	1,956	1,956	158	69	59	40	33	56	57	69	69

1 ^a Beef NOF Bull values were used for American bison Nex and VS.

2 Source: CEFM.

3

4 **Table A-187: 2017 Manure Distribution Among Waste Management Systems by Operation (Percent)**

State	Beef Feedlots		Beef Not on Feed Operations	Dairy Cow Farms ^a						Dairy Heifer Facilities			
	Dry Lot ^b	Liquid/Slurry ^b		Pasture, Range, Paddock	Pasture, Range, Daily Spread	Solid Storage	Liquid/Slurry	Anaerobic Lagoon	Deep Pit	Daily Spread ^b	Dry Lot ^b	Liquid/Slurry ^b	Pasture, Range, Paddock ^b
Alabama	100	1	100	51	16	9	9	14	0	17	38	0	45
Alaska	100	1	100	4	7	34	19	25	10	6	90	1	4
Arizona	100	0	100	0	10	9	19	61	0	10	90	0	0
Arkansas	100	1	100	63	14	8	6	8	0	15	28	0	57
California	100	1	100	0	10	9	20	60	0	11	88	1	1
Colorado	100	0	100	0	1	11	22	66	0	1	98	0	1
Connecticut	100	1	100	6	43	15	22	13	2	43	51	0	6
Delaware	100	1	100	6	44	18	19	11	2	44	50	0	6
Florida	100	1	100	12	22	7	15	43	0	22	61	1	17
Georgia	100	1	100	28	20	10	13	29	0	18	42	0	40
Hawaii	100	1	100	1	0	11	21	67	0	0	99	1	1
Idaho	100	0	100	0	0	11	22	66	0	1	99	0	0
Illinois	100	1	100	3	6	35	33	19	4	8	87	0	5
Indiana	100	1	100	6	10	26	30	26	2	13	79	0	8
Iowa	100	1	100	3	5	30	34	25	3	10	83	0	6
Kansas	100	1	100	2	3	15	38	40	1	5	92	0	3
Kentucky	100	1	100	57	15	15	8	4	1	14	24	0	61
Louisiana	100	1	100	51	16	9	9	14	0	14	26	0	60
Maine	100	1	100	6	44	18	19	12	2	45	48	0	7
Maryland	100	1	100	6	44	20	17	10	3	44	49	0	7
Massachusetts	100	1	100	7	45	22	17	7	2	45	47	0	7
Michigan	100	1	100	2	3	20	39	33	2	6	91	0	3

	Beef Feedlots		Beef Not on Feed Operations	Dairy Cow Farms ^a						Dairy Heifer Facilities			
	Liquid/ Dry Lot ^b Slurry ^b		Pasture, Range, Paddock	Pasture, Range, Paddock	Daily Spread	Solid Storage	Liquid/ Slurry	Anaerobic Lagoon	Deep Pit	Daily Spread ^b	Dry Lot ^b	Liquid/ Slurry ^b	Pasture, Range, Paddock ^b
State													
Minnesota	100	1	100	4	7	35	30	20	4	10	84	0	6
Mississippi	100	1	100	55	15	10	8	11	1	15	28	0	57
Missouri	100	1	100	7	12	39	24	14	4	14	77	0	8
Montana	100	0	100	3	4	19	27	43	4	4	93	0	3
Nebraska	100	1	100	3	5	21	36	33	2	6	90	0	4
Nevada	100	0	100	0	0	10	23	66	0	0	99	0	0
New Hampshire	100	1	100	6	44	18	19	10	2	44	49	0	7
New Jersey	100	1	100	8	46	25	13	6	3	45	47	0	8
New Mexico	100	0	100	0	10	9	19	61	0	10	90	0	0
New York	100	1	100	6	44	16	18	14	2	45	48	0	7
North Carolina	100	1	100	41	18	10	17	13	1	15	31	0	54
North Dakota	100	1	100	5	9	27	31	25	2	11	83	0	6
Ohio	100	1	100	7	11	33	27	19	3	14	78	0	8
Oklahoma	100	0	100	0	8	17	22	50	3	6	94	0	0
Oregon	100	1	100	12	0	10	22	54	1	0	80	1	20
Pennsylvania	100	1	100	8	46	24	13	7	2	47	44	0	9
Rhode Island	100	1	100	7	45	24	15	6	3	47	44	0	9
South Carolina	100	1	100	44	17	7	12	20	0	15	31	0	54
South Dakota	100	1	100	2	4	17	39	38	1	8	87	0	5
Tennessee	100	1	100	55	15	12	10	5	2	15	26	0	59
Texas	100	0	100	0	9	11	21	59	1	8	92	0	0
Utah	100	0	100	1	1	13	24	60	1	1	98	0	1
Vermont	100	1	100	5	43	15	20	15	2	44	49	0	7
Virginia	100	1	100	52	16	12	12	7	2	15	28	0	57
Washington	100	1	100	8	0	10	22	59	1	0	83	1	17
West Virginia	100	1	100	8	46	24	14	5	3	45	48	0	7
Wisconsin	100	1	100	4	6	32	32	22	3	12	82	0	7
Wyoming	100	0	100	4	7	19	21	44	4	12	81	0	7

^a In the methane inventory for manure management, the percent of dairy cows and swine with AD systems is estimated using data from EPA's AgSTAR Program.

^b Because manure from beef feedlots and dairy heifers may be managed for long periods of time in multiple systems (i.e., both drylot and runoff collection pond), the percent of manure that generates emissions is greater than 100 percent.

Source(s): See Step 3: Waste Management System Usage Data

1 **Table A-188: 2017 Manure Distribution Among Waste Management Systems by Operation (Percent) Continued**

State	Swine Operations ^a						Layer Operations		Broiler and Turkey Operations	
	Pasture, Range, Paddock	Solid Storage	Liquid/ Slurry	Anaerobic Lagoon	Deep Pit	Deep Pit (<1 month)	Anaerobic Lagoon	Poultry without Litter	Pasture, Range, Paddock	Poultry with Litter
Alabama	5	0	31	34	13	17	42	58	1	99
Alaska	64	0	2	2	28	4	25	75	1	99
Arizona	5	0	31	34	13	17	60	40	1	99
Arkansas	6	0	61	26	4	3	0	100	1	99
California	15	0	28	30	12	14	12	88	1	99
Colorado	2	0	53	0	23	22	60	40	1	99
Connecticut	73	0	2	1	21	4	5	95	1	99
Delaware	25	0	12	3	54	7	5	95	1	99
Florida	52	0	20	14	9	5	42	58	1	99
Georgia	8	0	60	30	2	0	42	58	1	99
Hawaii	38	0	23	19	12	8	25	75	1	99
Idaho	10	0	18	3	60	8	60	40	1	99
Illinois	2	0	15	7	71	5	2	98	1	99
Indiana	1	0	3	12	77	7	0	100	1	99
Iowa	1	0	10	4	80	5	0	100	1	99
Kansas	1	0	13	35	21	30	2	98	1	99
Kentucky	9	0	19	20	31	20	5	95	1	99
Louisiana	61	0	18	11	7	3	60	40	1	99
Maine	69	0	2	1	24	4	5	95	1	99
Maryland	26	0	11	3	53	7	5	95	1	99
Massachusetts	64	0	2	2	28	4	5	95	1	99
Michigan	5	0	11	6	69	9	2	98	1	99
Minnesota	2	0	3	3	88	5	0	100	1	99
Mississippi	2	0	31	36	13	18	60	40	1	99
Missouri	2	0	16	33	33	15	0	100	1	99
Montana	2	0	21	2	65	9	60	40	1	99
Nebraska	3	0	10	21	48	18	2	98	1	99
Nevada	67	0	17	9	6	2	0	100	1	99
New Hampshire	82	0	1	0	13	3	5	95	1	99
New Jersey	65	0	2	2	27	4	5	95	1	99
New Mexico	53	0	20	14	9	5	60	40	1	99
New York	31	0	12	2	48	7	5	95	1	99
North Carolina	1	0	32	49	1	16	42	58	1	99
North Dakota	3	0	21	2	64	9	2	98	1	99
Ohio	1	0	10	8	67	13	0	100	1	99
Oklahoma	1	0	11	53	3	32	60	40	1	99
Oregon	55	0	19	13	8	4	25	75	1	99
Pennsylvania	1	0	9	5	76	9	0	100	1	99

	Swine Operations ^a						Layer Operations		Broiler and Turkey Operations	
State	Pasture, Range, Paddock	Solid Storage	Liquid/ Slurry	Anaerobic Lagoon	Deep Pit	Deep Pit (<1 month)	Anaerobic Lagoon	Poultry without Litter	Pasture, Range, Paddock	Poultry with Litter
Rhode Island	70	0	2	1	23	4	5	95	1	99
South Carolina	5	0	31	34	13	17	60	40	1	99
South Dakota	1	0	17	11	57	13	2	98	1	99
Tennessee	9	0	30	32	13	16	5	95	1	99
Texas	5	0	31	34	13	17	12	88	1	99
Utah	1	0	22	2	66	9	60	40	1	99
Vermont	72	0	2	1	22	4	5	95	1	99
Virginia	7	0	14	29	16	34	5	95	1	99
Washington	36	0	9	3	46	6	12	88	1	99
West Virginia	79	0	1	0	16	4	5	95	1	99
Wisconsin	18	0	20	1	55	5	2	98	1	99
Wyoming	1	0	22	2	65	9	60	40	1	99

1 ^a In the methane inventory for manure management, the percent of dairy cows and swine with AD systems is estimated using data from EPA's AgSTAR Program.

2 ^b Because manure from beef feedlots and dairy heifers may be managed for long periods of time in multiple systems (i.e., both drylot and runoff collection pond), the percent of manure that generates emissions is greater than 100 percent.

4 Source(s): See Step 3: Waste Management System Usage Data

1 **Table A-189: Manure Management System Descriptions**

Manure Management System	Description ^a
Pasture, Range, Paddock	The manure from pasture and range grazing animals is allowed to lie as is and is not managed. Methane emissions are accounted for under Manure Management, but the N ₂ O emissions from manure deposited on PRP are included under the Agricultural Soil Management category.
Daily Spread	Manure is routinely removed from a confinement facility and is applied to cropland or pasture within 24 hours of excretion. Methane and indirect N ₂ O emissions are accounted for under Manure Management. Direct N ₂ O emissions from land application are covered under the Agricultural Soil Management category.
Solid Storage	The storage of manure, typically for a period of several months, in unconfined piles or stacks. Manure is able to be stacked due to the presence of a sufficient amount of bedding material or loss of moisture by evaporation.
Dry Lot	A paved or unpaved open confinement area without any significant vegetative cover where accumulating manure may be removed periodically. Dry lots are most typically found in dry climates but also are used in humid climates.
Liquid/ Slurry	Manure is stored as excreted or with some minimal addition of water to facilitate handling and is stored in either tanks or earthen ponds, usually for periods less than one year.
Anaerobic Lagoon	Uncovered anaerobic lagoons are designed and operated to combine waste stabilization and storage. Lagoon supernatant is usually used to remove manure from the associated confinement facilities to the lagoon. Anaerobic lagoons are designed with varying lengths of storage (up to a year or greater), depending on the climate region, the VS loading rate, and other operational factors. Anaerobic lagoons accumulate sludge over time, diminishing treatment capacity. Lagoons must be cleaned out once every 5 to 15 years, and the sludge is typically applied to agricultural lands. The water from the lagoon may be recycled as flush water or used to irrigate and fertilize fields. Lagoons are sometimes used in combination with a solids separator, typically for dairy waste. Solids separators help control the buildup of nondegradable material such as straw or other bedding materials.
Anaerobic Digester	Animal excreta with or without straw are collected and anaerobically digested in a large containment vessel (complete mix or plug flow digester) or covered lagoon. Digesters are designed and operated for waste stabilization by the microbial reduction of complex organic compounds to CO ₂ and CH ₄ , which is captured and flared or used as a fuel.
Deep Pit	Collection and storage of manure usually with little or no added water typically below a slatted floor in an enclosed animal confinement facility. Typical storage periods range from 5 to 12 months, after which manure is removed from the pit and transferred to a treatment system or applied to land.
Poultry with Litter	Enclosed poultry houses use bedding derived from wood shavings, rice hulls, chopped straw, peanut hulls, or other products, depending on availability. The bedding absorbs moisture and dilutes the manure produced by the birds. Litter is typically cleaned out completely once a year. These manure systems are typically used for all poultry breeder flocks and for the production of meat type chickens (broilers) and other fowl.
Poultry without Litter	In high-rise cages or scrape-out/belt systems, manure is excreted onto the floor below with no bedding to absorb moisture. The ventilation system dries the manure as it is stored. When designed and operated properly, this high-rise system is a form of passive windrow composting.

^a Manure management system descriptions and the classification of manure as managed or unmanaged are based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (Volume 4: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use, Chapter 10: Emissions from Livestock and Manure Management, Tables 10.18 and 10.21) and the Development Document for the Final Revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulation and the Effluent Guidelines for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (EPA-821-R-03-001, December 2002).

2 **Table A-190: Methane Conversion Factors (percent) for Dry Systems**

Waste Management System	Cool Climate MCF	Temperate Climate MCF	Warm Climate MCF
Aerobic Treatment	0	0	0
Anaerobic Digester	0	0	0
Cattle Deep Litter (<1 month)	3	3	30
Cattle Deep Litter (>1 month)	21	44	76
Composting - In Vessel	0.5	0.5	0.5
Composting - Static Pile	0.5	0.5	0.5
Composting-Extensive/ Passive	0.5	1	1.5
Composting-Intensive	0.5	1	1.5
Daily Spread	0.1	0.5	1
Dry Lot	1	1.5	5
Fuel	10	10	10
Pasture	1	1.5	2
Poultry with bedding	1.5	1.5	1.5

Waste Management System	Cool Climate MCF	Temperate Climate MCF	Warm Climate MCF
Poultry without bedding	1.5	1.5	1.5
Solid Storage	2	4	5

Source: IPCC (2006)

Table A-191: Methane Conversion Factors by State for Liquid Systems for 2017 (Percent)

State	Dairy		Swine		Beef	Poultry
	Anaerobic Lagoon	Liquid/Slurry and Deep Pit	Anaerobic Lagoon	Liquid/Slurry and Pit Storage	Liquid/Slurry	Anaerobic Lagoon
Alabama	74	40	74	39	42	74
Alaska	50	15	50	15	15	50
Arizona	80	61	79	53	52	76
Arkansas	74	36	75	39	37	74
California	75	34	74	33	44	75
Colorado	64	21	67	23	23	63
Connecticut	69	26	70	26	26	69
Delaware	74	33	74	33	32	74
Florida	77	57	77	57	52	77
Georgia	75	43	75	41	41	75
Hawaii	77	59	77	59	59	77
Idaho	68	24	67	23	22	65
Illinois	72	30	72	30	29	71
Indiana	70	27	70	28	28	70
Iowa	69	26	70	26	26	69
Kansas	73	32	73	32	32	73
Kentucky	72	32	72	32	32	73
Louisiana	76	48	76	48	49	76
Maine	64	21	65	21	21	65
Maryland	72	31	73	32	31	74
Massachusetts	67	24	68	25	25	69
Michigan	67	24	67	24	25	66
Minnesota	67	23	68	24	24	66
Mississippi	75	43	75	42	44	76
Missouri	73	32	73	32	32	73
Montana	61	20	64	21	21	63
Nebraska	71	28	71	28	27	71
Nevada	71	26	72	29	26	71
New Hampshire	65	22	65	22	21	65
New Jersey	72	29	72	29	29	72
New Mexico	73	32	71	28	31	70
New York	66	23	67	24	23	67
North Carolina	73	34	76	40	30	74
North Dakota	66	22	65	22	22	65
Ohio	69	27	70	27	27	70
Oklahoma	75	39	74	36	36	75
Oregon	66	22	65	22	23	65
Pennsylvania	70	27	70	27	28	69
Rhode Island	69	26	69	26	26	69
South Carolina	76	42	76	42	41	76
South Dakota	68	24	68	25	25	68
Tennessee	73	33	73	34	34	73
Texas	75	41	76	46	39	76
Utah	66	22	67	24	24	66
Vermont	63	21	63	21	21	63
Virginia	71	29	73	33	30	74
Washington	65	22	65	22	23	66
West Virginia	69	27	69	27	27	70
Wisconsin	66	23	67	24	23	66
Wyoming	61	20	64	21	21	62

Note: MCFs developed using Tier 2 methods described in 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Section 10.4.2.

Table A-192: Direct Nitrous Oxide Emission Factors (kg N₂O-N/kg N excreted)

Waste Management System	Direct N ₂ O Emission Factor
Aerobic Treatment (forced aeration)	0.005
Aerobic Treatment (natural aeration)	0.01
Anaerobic Digester	0
Anaerobic Lagoon	0
Cattle Deep Bed (active mix)	0.07
Cattle Deep Bed (no mix)	0.01
Composting_in vessel	0.006
Composting_intensive	0.1
Composting_passive	0.01
Composting_static	0.006
Daily Spread	0
Pit Storage	0.002
Dry Lot	0.02
Fuel	0
Liquid/Slurry	0.005
Pasture	0
Poultry with bedding	0.001
Poultry without bedding	0.001
Solid Storage	0.005

Source: 2006 IPCC Guidelines

Table A-193: Indirect Nitrous Oxide Loss Factors (Percent)

Animal Type	Waste Management System	Volatilization Nitrogen Loss	Runoff/Leaching Nitrogen Loss ^a				
			Central	Pacific	Mid-Atlantic	Midwest	South
Beef Cattle	Dry Lot	23	1.1	3.9	3.6	1.9	4.3
Beef Cattle	Liquid/Slurry	26	0	0	0	0	0
Beef Cattle	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dairy Cattle	Anaerobic Lagoon	43	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.9
Dairy Cattle	Daily Spread	10	0	0	0	0	0
Dairy Cattle	Deep Pit	24	0	0	0	0	0
Dairy Cattle	Dry Lot	15	0.6	2	1.8	0.9	2.2
Dairy Cattle	Liquid/Slurry	26	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.9
Dairy Cattle	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dairy Cattle	Solid Storage	27	0.2	0	0	0	0
American Bison	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goats	Dry Lot	23	1.1	3.9	3.6	1.9	4.3
Goats	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Horses	Dry Lot	23	0	0	0	0	0
Horses	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mules and Asses	Dry Lot	23	0	0	0	0	0
Mules and Asses	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poultry	Anaerobic Lagoon	54	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.9
Poultry	Liquid/Slurry	26	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.9
Poultry	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poultry	Poultry with bedding	26	0	0	0	0	0
Poultry	Poultry without bedding	34	0	0	0	0	0
Poultry	Solid Storage	8	0	0	0	0	0
Sheep	Dry Lot	23	1.1	3.9	3.6	1.9	4.3
Sheep	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swine	Anaerobic Lagoon	58	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.9
Swine	Deep Pit	34	0	0	0	0	0
Swine	Liquid/Slurry	26	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.9
Swine	Pasture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swine	Solid Storage	45	0	0	0	0	0

^a Data for nitrogen losses due to leaching were not available, so the values represent only nitrogen losses due to runoff. Source: EPA (2002b, 2005).

1 **Table A-194: Total Methane Emissions from Livestock Manure Management (kt)^a**

Animal Type	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Dairy Cattle	590	685	889	951	985	1,036	988	1,057	1,091	1,212	1,242	1,242	1,256	1,297	1,372	1,338	1,360	1,390	1,374	1,381
Dairy Cows	581	676	880	942	977	1,027	980	1,049	1,082	1,202	1,232	1,233	1,246	1,287	1,362	1,327	1,349	1,379	1,364	1,370
Dairy Heifer	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	9	9	9
Dairy Calves	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Swine	622	763	790	797	810	781	770	812	789	851	786	740	797	791	783	721	688	770	807	802
Market Swine	483	607	642	648	662	638	630	665	643	698	645	608	657	653	647	594	561	635	668	666
Market <50 lbs.	102	121	125	126	128	124	123	128	125	136	94	88	95	94	92	84	81	90	95	94
Market 50-119 lbs.	101	123	128	128	131	126	125	131	127	138	143	134	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Market 120-179 lbs.	136	170	178	178	182	177	174	184	177	193	185	173	188	185	184	171	162	184	194	192
Market >180 lbs.	144	193	212	216	220	211	209	222	214	232	223	214	229	231	228	210	193	222	230	233
Breeding Swine	139	155	155	158	158	154	151	161	160	168	158	149	156	155	159	151	151	160	139	136
Beef Cattle	126	139	131	134	131	131	129	133	137	134	130	130	132	131	128	121	120	126	131	135
Feedlot Steers	14	14	15	15	15	16	15	15	16	16	16	16	16	17	16	16	16	16	17	18
Feedlot Heifers	7	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
NOF Bulls	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Beef Calves	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	7	7	7
NOF Heifers	12	15	13	13	13	13	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	12	12	12	13	14	14
NOF Steers	12	14	11	11	11	10	10	10	11	10	10	11	10	10	9	9	9	9	10	10
NOF Cows	69	76	71	73	71	71	71	73	75	73	70	70	71	71	69	65	63	67	69	71
Sheep	7	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Goats	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Poultry	131	128	127	131	129	130	129	129	131	134	129	128	129	127	128	129	132	136	136	137
Hens >1 yr.	73	69	66	70	67	68	66	66	66	67	64	64	64	64	63	65	68	69	69	69
Total Pullets	25	22	22	22	22	22	23	22	23	25	23	23	24	23	23	24	24	27	26	26
Chickens	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Broilers	19	23	28	28	29	29	30	31	32	32	33	31	31	31	32	31	31	32	32	32
Turkeys	10	9	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Horses	9	11	13	13	13	13	12	12	12	11	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	9	9	8
Mules and Asses	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
American Bison	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

2 + Does not exceed 0.5 kt.

3 ^a Accounts for CH₄ reductions due to capture and destruction of CH₄ at facilities using anaerobic digesters.

4
5

1 **Table A-195: Total (Direct and Indirect) Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Livestock Manure Management (kt)**

Animal Type	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Dairy Cattle	17.7	18.2	18.4	18.7	18.9	19.1	18.2	18.7	19.3	19.3	19.0	19.2	19.3	19.5	19.8	19.7	19.8	20.3	20.5	20.6
Dairy Cows	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	11.0	11.1	10.6	10.8	11.1	11.1	10.9	11.1	11.0	11.1	11.3	11.3	11.4	11.6	11.7	11.8
Dairy Heifer	7.1	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.9	8.0	7.6	7.8	8.2	8.2	8.0	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.3	8.4	8.7	8.8	8.8
Dairy Calves	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Swine	4.0	4.5	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.5	5.6	6.0	6.1	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.0	6.0	5.8	6.2	6.3	6.5
Market Swine	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.8	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.4	5.5	5.7
Market <50 lbs.	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
Market 50-119 lbs.	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.3
Market 120-179 lbs.	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7
Market >180 lbs.	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0
Breeding Swine	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Beef Cattle	19.8	21.8	25.0	24.1	24.8	25.0	23.6	24.0	25.7	25.6	25.1	25.1	25.3	25.9	25.8	26.0	26.0	25.8	27.2	28.7
Feedlot Steers	13.4	14.4	16.1	15.4	16.0	16.3	15.3	15.5	16.7	16.7	16.5	16.5	16.6	16.9	16.7	17.0	17.3	17.3	18.4	19.3
Feedlot Heifers	6.4	7.4	8.9	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.4	8.5	9.0	8.9	8.7	8.6	8.7	9.1	9.0	9.0	8.8	8.5	8.8	9.4
Sheep	0.4	0.7	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Goats	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Poultry	4.7	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.4	5.4
Hens >1 yr.	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4
Total Pullets	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Chickens	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Broilers	2.2	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9
Turkeys	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Horses	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Mules and Asses	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
American Bison	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

2 + Does not exceed 0.05 kt.

3 NA (Not Applicable)

4 Note: American bison are maintained entirely on pasture, range, and paddock. Emissions from manure deposited on pasture are included in the Agricultural Soils Management sector.

Table A-196: Methane Emissions by State from Livestock Manure Management for 2017 (kt)^a

State	Beef on Feedlots	Beef Not on Feed ^b	Dairy Cow	Dairy Heifer	Swine— Market	Swine— Breeding	Layer	Broiler	Turkey	Sheep	Goats	Horses	Mules and Asses	American Bison	Total
Alabama	0.0179	2.5462	0.3878	0.0107	0.7420	0.3177	8.9600	3.9787	0.0209	0.0087	0.0094	0.1324	0.0135	0.0007	17.1466
Alaska	0.0001	0.0187	0.0152	0.0002	0.0025	0.0013	0.3804	+	0.0208	0.0058	0.0002	0.0020	+	0.0035	0.4507
Arizona	0.7026	1.1079	51.0455	0.2780	2.6739	0.6073	1.2975	+	0.0209	0.0916	0.0379	0.3813	0.0046	0.0002	58.2491
Arkansas	0.0360	3.4123	0.1955	0.0079	0.6370	1.3345	0.6025	3.8465	0.6627	0.0087	0.0122	0.1420	0.0097	0.0010	10.9085
California	1.4542	3.9450	389.2424	1.9692	1.2504	0.0996	3.1799	0.2081	0.2876	0.4229	0.0560	0.3430	0.0070	0.0048	402.4701
Colorado	1.6542	3.1171	35.5315	0.1502	3.6578	2.2344	3.8637	+	0.0208	0.1973	0.0051	0.2227	0.0051	0.0236	50.6836
Connecticut	0.0004	0.0187	1.2303	0.0162	0.0047	0.0031	0.1367	+	0.0208	0.0034	0.0011	0.0511	0.0009	0.0002	1.4874
Delaware	0.0003	0.0087	0.3128	0.0039	0.0232	0.0331	0.1432	0.9405	0.0208	0.0058	0.0001	0.0183	0.0001	0.0002	1.5111
Florida	0.0129	3.2601	20.5248	0.1025	0.1077	0.0579	5.4005	0.2368	0.0209	0.0087	0.0174	0.3990	0.0124	0.0011	30.1627
Georgia	0.0172	1.8989	10.2264	0.0816	0.7247	0.6570	16.3483	4.9522	0.0209	0.0087	0.0223	0.2070	0.0099	0.0008	35.1760
Hawaii	0.0032	0.3058	0.5833	0.0029	0.0468	0.0255	0.5707	+	0.0209	0.0087	0.0063	0.0121	0.0005	0.0003	1.5872
Idaho	0.4695	1.8221	125.2135	0.4690	0.1249	0.0512	1.1133	+	0.0208	0.1175	0.0046	0.1070	0.0030	0.0078	129.5242
Illinois	0.4858	1.0849	9.3214	0.0843	46.1491	10.9141	0.2725	0.2074	0.0208	0.0258	0.0074	0.1006	0.0024	0.0013	68.6779
Indiana	0.2100	0.6135	15.6905	0.1283	40.1292	5.4686	1.0875	0.2074	0.4985	0.0244	0.0075	0.2488	0.0044	0.0024	64.3212
Iowa	2.2007	3.2295	27.2519	0.2150	185.2806	17.5395	1.7525	0.2074	0.2991	0.0822	0.0141	0.1148	0.0033	0.0034	238.1941
Kansas	4.4159	5.4637	28.4672	0.1639	28.9142	4.7288	0.0822	+	0.0208	0.0320	0.0088	0.1311	0.0025	0.0123	72.4434
Kentucky	0.0379	2.5925	1.5162	0.0709	4.5967	1.0594	0.7045	1.0708	0.0208	0.0226	0.0075	0.2369	0.0101	0.0027	11.9496
Louisiana	0.0097	1.6467	0.6729	0.0112	0.0313	0.0287	2.2192	0.2081	0.0209	0.0087	0.0060	0.1940	0.0094	0.0002	5.0671
Maine	0.0009	0.0395	1.4364	0.0248	0.0087	0.0050	0.1314	+	0.0208	0.0034	0.0017	0.0259	0.0003	0.0005	1.6992
Maryland	0.0191	0.1282	2.6174	0.0509	0.1676	0.0801	0.3699	1.1103	0.0208	0.0058	0.0011	0.0582	0.0009	0.0009	4.6313
Massachusetts	0.0004	0.0213	0.2248	0.0118	0.0179	0.0096	0.0125	+	0.0208	0.0034	0.0022	0.0440	0.0003	0.0002	0.3693
Michigan	0.2787	0.4807	64.9895	0.2689	8.7549	1.8467	0.8810	0.2074	0.1271	0.0399	0.0066	0.1640	0.0030	0.0035	78.0520
Minnesota	0.7048	1.3234	36.9392	0.4647	57.3858	8.6948	0.3665	0.2161	1.0469	0.0611	0.0077	0.0934	0.0020	0.0057	107.3119
Mississippi	0.0156	1.7885	0.3141	0.0164	8.0540	1.6875	7.6885	2.6918	0.0209	0.0087	0.0069	0.1711	0.0108	0.0001	22.4749
Missouri	0.2083	5.0261	6.0337	0.0737	33.3144	12.0810	0.3785	1.0538	0.4686	0.0423	0.0277	0.1871	0.0065	0.0038	58.9056
Montana	0.0808	4.4775	1.8224	0.0135	0.9961	0.3413	0.8383	+	0.0208	0.1081	0.0021	0.1984	0.0036	0.0323	8.9354
Nebraska	4.6710	6.3220	9.5106	0.0402	33.4254	9.4033	0.4753	0.2074	0.0208	0.0390	0.0043	0.1381	0.0032	0.0428	64.3035
Nevada	0.0050	0.6417	6.9494	0.0167	0.0019	0.0009	0.0420	+	0.0208	0.0296	0.0077	0.0581	0.0005	0.0002	7.7746
New Hampshire	0.0003	0.0163	0.6559	0.0099	0.0045	0.0021	0.1309	+	0.0208	0.0034	0.0015	0.0182	+	0.0006	0.8644
New Jersey	0.0004	0.0222	0.2556	0.0064	0.0480	0.0107	0.1402	+	0.0208	0.0058	0.0015	0.0551	0.0006	0.0004	0.5678
New Mexico	0.0237	1.4688	77.8802	0.1700	0.0070	0.0063	1.1890	+	0.0208	0.0456	0.0066	0.1048	0.0014	0.0113	80.9355
New York	0.0384	0.4856	33.8822	0.5916	0.2626	0.0657	0.5435	0.2074	0.0208	0.0376	0.0082	0.2088	0.0030	0.0019	36.3574
North Carolina	0.0088	0.9439	3.2569	0.0551	103.8573	23.9249	12.9241	3.0176	0.8128	0.0211	0.0129	0.1819	0.0108	0.0006	149.0286
North Dakota	0.0937	2.4602	1.6868	0.0141	0.6432	0.4938	0.0777	+	0.0208	0.0310	0.0013	0.1003	0.0011	0.0177	5.6417
Ohio	0.2864	0.8930	22.3058	0.1920	25.2796	3.5744	1.0146	0.3595	0.1670	0.0550	0.0084	0.2389	0.0054	0.0016	54.3814
Oklahoma	0.8101	8.7556	6.6841	0.0456	27.0423	16.0319	3.2365	0.7428	0.0209	0.0338	0.0198	0.5003	0.0154	0.0281	63.9674
Oregon	0.1740	1.6737	12.6755	0.1121	0.0411	0.0153	0.8683	0.2074	0.0208	0.0799	0.0071	0.1127	0.0020	0.0031	15.9930
Pennsylvania	0.1922	0.7207	18.3573	0.5391	9.9117	1.8822	0.8716	0.6704	0.1869	0.0437	0.0103	0.2704	0.0070	0.0025	33.6661
Rhode Island	0.0001	0.0040	0.0271	0.0009	0.0046	0.0017	0.1371	+	0.0208	0.0034	0.0003	0.0030	0.0001	+	0.2030
South Carolina	0.0040	0.6394	1.2149	0.0190	3.1393	0.3078	4.4366	0.8830	0.0209	0.0087	0.0127	0.2021	0.0070	0.0004	10.8957
South Dakota	0.7278	4.5556	17.9989	0.0713	11.4698	3.7951	0.1787	+	0.1022	0.1175	0.0056	0.1481	0.0011	0.0622	39.2339

State	Beef on Feedlots	Beef Not on Feed ^b	Dairy Cow	Dairy Heifer	Swine—Market	Swine—Breeding	Layer	Broiler	Turkey	Sheep	Goats	Horses	Mules and Asses	American Bison	Total
Tennessee	0.0426	3.4226	1.4761	0.0870	3.0940	0.6337	0.2500	0.6229	0.0209	0.0324	0.0197	0.1678	0.0142	0.0010	9.8850
Texas	6.5258	19.4454	118.9585	0.5954	13.9005	3.9219	5.2633	2.3653	0.0209	0.5004	0.2316	1.1591	0.0723	0.0127	172.9733
Utah	0.0379	1.0495	18.7950	0.0828	4.1977	1.2015	4.3138	+	0.1296	0.1292	0.0030	0.1274	0.0028	0.0025	30.0728
Vermont	0.0013	0.0712	6.4058	0.0920	0.0061	0.0044	0.0141	+	0.0208	0.0034	0.0036	0.0220	0.0011	0.0002	6.6459
Virginia	0.0430	1.6639	3.2487	0.0660	3.4687	0.1293	0.3263	1.0042	0.4187	0.0376	0.0096	0.1825	0.0053	0.0020	10.6059
Washington	0.4017	0.8782	52.2939	0.2060	0.0870	0.0386	1.3589	0.2074	0.0208	0.0226	0.0053	0.0865	0.0026	0.0021	55.6115
West Virginia	0.0083	0.5298	0.2588	0.0069	0.0108	0.0042	0.1751	0.3117	0.0922	0.0160	0.0024	0.0333	0.0023	0.0001	1.4518
Wisconsin	0.5010	1.1819	122.2982	1.1158	1.6887	0.5708	0.4112	0.1948	0.0208	0.0357	0.0166	0.1904	0.0043	0.0078	128.2379
Wyoming	0.1302	2.1514	0.8680	0.0045	0.1786	0.3340	1.0520	+	0.0208	0.1692	0.0025	0.1412	0.0022	0.0211	5.0756

+ Does not exceed 0.00005 kt.

^a Accounts for CH₄ reductions due to capture and destruction of CH₄ at facilities using anaerobic digesters.

^b Beef Not on Feed includes calves.

Table A-197: Total (Direct and Indirect) Nitrous Oxide Emissions by State from Livestock Manure Management for 2017 (kt)

	Beef Feedlot-Heifer	Beef Feedlot-Steers	Dairy Cow	Dairy Heifer	Swine-Market	Swine-Breeding	Layer	Broiler	Turkey	Sheep	Goats	Horses	Mules and Asses	American Bison	Total
Alabama	0.0039	0.0081	0.0033	0.0037	0.0045	0.0014	0.0653	0.3520	0.0024	0.0047	0.0007	0.0045	0.0005	NA	0.4550
Alaska	+	0.0001	0.0003	0.0002	+	+	0.0062	+	0.0024	0.0015	+	0.0001	+	NA	0.0109
Arizona	0.1818	0.3733	0.2479	0.2478	0.0133	0.0023	0.0066	+	0.0024	0.0143	0.0030	0.0131	0.0002	NA	1.1061
Arkansas	0.0081	0.0167	0.0020	0.0020	0.0048	0.0073	0.0848	0.3403	0.0768	0.0041	0.0010	0.0049	0.0003	NA	0.5530
California	0.3148	0.6467	2.1239	1.5891	0.0082	0.0005	0.0657	0.0184	0.0333	0.0747	0.0045	0.0118	0.0002	NA	4.8919
Colorado	0.6686	1.3723	0.2200	0.2298	0.0521	0.0230	0.0238	+	0.0024	0.0463	0.0006	0.0115	0.0003	NA	2.6507
Connecticut	0.0001	0.0003	0.0179	0.0119	+	+	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0027	0.0001	0.0026	+	NA	0.0440
Delaware	0.0001	0.0002	0.0043	0.0027	0.0002	0.0002	0.0059	0.0835	0.0024	0.0047	+	0.0009	+	NA	0.1052
Florida	0.0026	0.0054	0.1113	0.0513	0.0005	0.0002	0.0373	0.0210	0.0024	0.0047	0.0014	0.0137	0.0004	NA	0.2523
Georgia	0.0038	0.0077	0.0667	0.0303	0.0049	0.0033	0.1179	0.4381	0.0024	0.0047	0.0018	0.0071	0.0004	NA	0.6891
Hawaii	0.0006	0.0013	0.0028	0.0023	0.0002	0.0001	0.0062	+	0.0024	0.0015	0.0005	0.0004	+	NA	0.0185
Idaho	0.1903	0.3905	0.8272	0.7176	0.0015	0.0005	0.0066	+	0.0024	0.0276	0.0005	0.0055	0.0002	NA	2.1704
Illinois	0.1838	0.3770	0.1373	0.1065	0.4055	0.0697	0.0197	0.0184	0.0024	0.0180	0.0009	0.0052	0.0001	NA	1.3446
Indiana	0.0798	0.1639	0.2546	0.1486	0.3367	0.0334	0.1510	0.0184	0.0580	0.0171	0.0009	0.0128	0.0002	NA	1.2755
Iowa	0.8441	1.7343	0.3336	0.2650	1.8525	0.1282	0.2434	0.0184	0.0348	0.0574	0.0017	0.0059	0.0002	NA	5.5194
Kansas	1.6419	3.3702	0.2197	0.2157	0.1801	0.0217	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0223	0.0010	0.0068	0.0001	NA	5.6880
Kentucky	0.0129	0.0264	0.0278	0.0236	0.0331	0.0056	0.0295	0.0951	0.0024	0.0183	0.0009	0.0122	0.0005	NA	0.2884
Louisiana	0.0020	0.0042	0.0053	0.0025	0.0002	0.0001	0.0115	0.0184	0.0024	0.0041	0.0005	0.0067	0.0003	NA	0.0582
Maine	0.0003	0.0006	0.0272	0.0177	0.0001	+	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0027	0.0002	0.0013	+	NA	0.0586
Maryland	0.0065	0.0134	0.0424	0.0348	0.0014	0.0005	0.0153	0.0986	0.0024	0.0047	0.0001	0.0030	+	NA	0.2231
Massachusetts	0.0001	0.0003	0.0097	0.0082	0.0002	0.0001	0.0005	+	0.0024	0.0027	0.0003	0.0023	+	NA	0.0267
Michigan	0.1080	0.2221	0.6882	0.3619	0.0917	0.0143	0.0661	0.0184	0.0148	0.0279	0.0008	0.0085	0.0002	NA	1.6227
Minnesota	0.2740	0.5631	0.6707	0.5836	0.6223	0.0697	0.0509	0.0192	0.1217	0.0426	0.0009	0.0048	0.0001	NA	3.0236
Mississippi	0.0034	0.0069	0.0040	0.0041	0.0471	0.0073	0.0407	0.2381	0.0024	0.0047	0.0006	0.0059	0.0004	NA	0.3655
Missouri	0.0775	0.1590	0.1002	0.0820	0.2230	0.0593	0.0527	0.0935	0.0545	0.0295	0.0033	0.0096	0.0003	NA	0.9446

Montana	0.0330	0.0678	0.0191	0.0196	0.0132	0.0033	0.0052	+	0.0024	0.0254	0.0002	0.0102	0.0002	NA	0.1996
Nebraska	1.7822	3.6604	0.0909	0.0530	0.2571	0.0532	0.0345	0.0184	0.0024	0.0272	0.0005	0.0071	0.0002	NA	5.9872
Nevada	0.0020	0.0041	0.0395	0.0256	+	+	0.0058	+	0.0024	0.0069	0.0009	0.0030	+	NA	0.0903
New Hampshire	0.0001	0.0002	0.0123	0.0072	+	+	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0027	0.0002	0.0009	+	NA	0.0321
New Jersey	0.0001	0.0003	0.0056	0.0043	0.0004	0.0001	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0047	0.0002	0.0028	+	NA	0.0269
New Mexico	0.0093	0.0191	0.4136	0.2329	0.0001	+	0.0066	+	0.0024	0.0107	0.0008	0.0054	0.0001	NA	0.7010
New York	0.0139	0.0284	0.5887	0.4192	0.0030	0.0006	0.0240	0.0184	0.0024	0.0305	0.0010	0.0108	0.0002	NA	1.1409
North Carolina	0.0030	0.0061	0.0318	0.0162	0.7594	0.1290	0.0937	0.2670	0.0942	0.0114	0.0010	0.0062	0.0004	NA	1.4194
North Dakota	0.0367	0.0754	0.0222	0.0175	0.0082	0.0046	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0217	0.0002	0.0052	0.0001	NA	0.1998
Ohio	0.1093	0.2246	0.3553	0.2220	0.2310	0.0240	0.1424	0.0319	0.0194	0.0443	0.0010	0.0123	0.0003	NA	1.4179
Oklahoma	0.2174	0.4460	0.0423	0.0439	0.1416	0.0607	0.0171	0.0657	0.0024	0.0157	0.0016	0.0172	0.0005	NA	1.0722
Oregon	0.0601	0.1232	0.1432	0.1222	0.0004	0.0001	0.0110	0.0184	0.0024	0.0212	0.0008	0.0058	0.0001	NA	0.5090
Pennsylvania	0.0672	0.1378	0.4562	0.3441	0.0962	0.0136	0.1212	0.0595	0.0217	0.0354	0.0012	0.0139	0.0004	NA	1.3685
Rhode Island	+	0.0001	0.0007	0.0005	+	+	0.0059	+	0.0024	0.0027	+	0.0002	+	NA	0.0125
South Carolina	0.0009	0.0018	0.0082	0.0052	0.0190	0.0014	0.0232	0.0781	0.0024	0.0047	0.0010	0.0069	0.0002	NA	0.1532
South Dakota	0.2814	0.5786	0.1688	0.0924	0.1124	0.0274	0.0132	+	0.0119	0.0820	0.0007	0.0076	0.0001	NA	1.3764
Tennessee	0.0103	0.0212	0.0201	0.0222	0.0201	0.0030	0.0106	0.0551	0.0024	0.0175	0.0016	0.0058	0.0005	NA	0.1905
Texas	1.7416	3.5762	0.6222	0.5616	0.0859	0.0178	0.1079	0.2093	0.0024	0.0783	0.0183	0.0398	0.0026	NA	7.0639
Utah	0.0154	0.0317	0.1255	0.1258	0.0500	0.0106	0.0253	+	0.0151	0.0303	0.0004	0.0066	0.0001	NA	0.4368
Vermont	0.0005	0.0009	0.1178	0.0672	0.0001	+	0.0006	+	0.0024	0.0027	0.0004	0.0011	0.0001	NA	0.1939
Virginia	0.0148	0.0304	0.0484	0.0254	0.0223	0.0006	0.0136	0.0891	0.0487	0.0305	0.0012	0.0094	0.0003	NA	0.3348
Washington	0.1385	0.2845	0.3535	0.2357	0.0010	0.0003	0.0314	0.0184	0.0024	0.0060	0.0006	0.0045	0.0001	NA	1.0770
West Virginia	0.0029	0.0059	0.0063	0.0047	0.0001	+	0.0076	0.0277	0.0107	0.0130	0.0003	0.0017	0.0001	NA	0.0810
Wisconsin	0.1947	0.4000	1.9614	1.3663	0.0202	0.0050	0.0307	0.0173	0.0024	0.0249	0.0020	0.0098	0.0002	NA	4.0351
Wyoming	0.0529	0.1086	0.0078	0.0057	0.0030	0.0043	0.0066	+	0.0024	0.0397	0.0003	0.0073	0.0001	NA	0.2389

+ Does not exceed 0.00005 kt.

NA (Not Applicable)

Note: American bison are maintained entirely on pasture, range, and paddock. Emissions from manure deposited on pasture are included in the Agricultural Soils Management sector.

References

- Anderson, S. (2000) Personal Communication. Steve Anderson, Agricultural Statistician, National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. Washington, D.C. May 31, 2000.
- ASAE (1998) *ASAE Standards 1998, 45th Edition*. American Society of Agricultural Engineers. St. Joseph, MI. Bryant, M.P., V.H. Varel, R.A. Frobish, and H.R. Isaacson (1976) In H.G. Schlegel (ed.); *Seminar on Microbial Energy Conversion*. E. Goltz KG. Göttingen, Germany.
- Bush, E. (1998) Personal communication with Eric Bush, Centers for Epidemiology and Animal Health, U.S. Department of Agriculture regarding *National Animal Health Monitoring System's (NAHMS) Swine '95 Study*.
- Deal, P. (2000) Personal Communication. Peter B. Deal, Rangeland Management Specialist, Florida Natural Resource Conservation Service and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. June 21, 2000.
- EPA (2018) AgSTAR Anaerobic Digester Database. Available online at: < <https://www.epa.gov/agstar/livestock-anaerobic-digester-database>>, accessed July 2018.
- EPA (2016) AgSTAR Anaerobic Digester Database. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/agstar/projects/index.html#database>>, accessed July 2016.
- EPA (2008) *Climate Leaders Greenhouse Gas Inventory Protocol Offset Project Methodology for Project Type Managing Manure with Biogas Recovery Systems*. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/climateleaders/documents/resources/ClimateLeaders_DraftManureOffsetProtocol.pdf>.
- EPA (2006) *AgSTAR Digest*. Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Winter 2006. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/agstar/pdf/2006digest.pdf>>. Retrieved July 2006.
- EPA (2005) *National Emission Inventory—Ammonia Emissions from Animal Agricultural Operations, Revised Draft Report*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. April 22, 2005. Available online at: <ftp://ftp.epa.gov/EmisInventory/2002finalnei/documentation/nonpoint/nh3inventory_draft_042205.pdf>. Retrieved August 2007.
- EPA (2003) *AgSTAR Digest*. Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Winter 2003. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/agstar/pdf/2003digest.pdf>>. Retrieved July 2006.
- EPA (2002a) *Development Document for the Final Revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Regulation and the Effluent Guidelines for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOS)*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA-821-R-03-001. December 2002.
- EPA (2002b) *Cost Methodology for the Final Revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulation and the Effluent Guidelines for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA-821-R-03-004. December 2002.
- EPA (2000) *AgSTAR Digest*. Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. Spring 2000. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/agstar/news-events/digest/2000digest.pdf>>.
- EPA (1992) *Global Methane Emissions from Livestock and Poultry Manure*, Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. February 1992.
- ERG (2018) Incorporation of USDA 2009 ARMS Swine Data into the Manure Management Greenhouse Gas Inventory. Memorandum to USDA OCE and EPA from ERG, October 2018.
- ERG (2010a) “Typical Animal Mass Values for Inventory Swine Categories.” Memorandum to EPA from ERG. July 19, 2010.
- ERG (2010b) Telecon with William Boyd of USDA NRCS and Cortney Itle of ERG Concerning Updated VS and Nex Rates. August 8, 2010.
- ERG (2010c) “Updating Current Inventory Manure Characteristics new USDA Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook Values.” Memorandum to EPA from ERG. August 13, 2010.
- ERG (2008) “Methodology for Improving Methane Emissions Estimates and Emission Reductions from Anaerobic Digestion System for the 1990-2007 Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Manure Management.” Memorandum to EPA from ERG. August 18, 2008.

ERG (2003a) "Methodology for Estimating Uncertainty for Manure Management Greenhouse Gas Inventory." Contract No. GS-10F-0036, Task Order 005. Memorandum to EPA from ERG, Lexington, MA. September 26, 2003.

ERG (2003b) "Changes to Beef Calves and Beef Cows Typical Animal Mass in the Manure Management Greenhouse Gas Inventory." Memorandum to EPA from ERG, October 7, 2003.

ERG (2001) Summary of development of MDP Factor for methane conversion factor calculations. ERG, Lexington, MA. September 2001.

ERG (2000a) *Calculations: Percent Distribution of Manure for Waste Management Systems*. ERG, Lexington, MA. August 2000.

ERG (2000b) *Discussion of Methodology for Estimating Animal Waste Characteristics* (Summary of B₀ Literature Review). ERG, Lexington, MA. June 2000.

Garrett, W.N. and D.E. Johnson (1983) "Nutritional energetics of ruminants." *Journal of Animal Science*, 57(suppl.2):478-497.

Groffman, P.M., R. Brumme, K. Butterbach-Bahl, K.E. Dobbie, A.R. Mosier, D. Ojima, H. Papen, W.J. Parton, K.A. Smith, and C. Wagner-Riddle (2000) "Evaluating annual nitrous oxide fluxes at the ecosystem scale." *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 14(4):1061-1070.

Hashimoto, A.G. (1984) "Methane from Swine Manure: Effect of Temperature and Influent Substrate Composition on Kinetic Parameter (k)." *Agricultural Wastes*, 9:299-308.

Hashimoto, A.G., V.H. Varel, and Y.R. Chen (1981) "Ultimate Methane Yield from Beef Cattle Manure; Effect of Temperature, Ration Constituents, Antibiotics and Manure Age." *Agricultural Wastes*, 3:241-256.

Hill, D.T. (1984) "Methane Productivity of the Major Animal Types." *Transactions of the ASAE*, 27(2):530-540.

Hill, D.T. (1982) "Design of Digestion Systems for Maximum Methane Production." *Transactions of the ASAE*, 25(1):226-230.

IPCC (2018) *10th Corrigenda for the 2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Available online at: <https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/corrigenda10.html>.

IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.

Johnson, D. (2000) Personal Communication. Dan Johnson, State Water Management Engineer, California Natural Resource Conservation Service and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. June 23, 2000.

Lange, J. (2000) Personal Communication. John Lange, Agricultural Statistician, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agriculture Statistics Service and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. Washington, D.C. May 8, 2000.

Meagher, M. (1986). *Bison*. Mammalian Species. 266: 1-8.

Miller, P. (2000) Personal Communication. Paul Miller, Iowa Natural Resource Conservation Service and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. June 12, 2000.

Milton, B. (2000) Personal Communication. Bob Milton, Chief of Livestock Branch, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agriculture Statistics Service and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. May 1, 2000.

Moffroid, K. and D. Pape. (2014) *1990-2013 Volatile Solids and Nitrogen Excretion Rates*. Dataset to EPA from ICF International. August 2014.

Morris, G.R. (1976) *Anaerobic Fermentation of Animal Wastes: A Kinetic and Empirical Design Fermentation*. M.S. Thesis. Cornell University.

National Bison Association (1999) Total Bison Population—1999. Report provided during personal email communication with Dave Carter, Executive Director, National Bison Association July 19, 2011.

NOAA (2016) *National Climate Data Center (NCDC)*. Available online at: <ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cirs/climdiv/> (for all states except Alaska and Hawaii) and <ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/gsod/2008/> (for Alaska and Hawaii). July 2016.

- 1 Ott, S.L. (2000) *Dairy '96 Study*. Stephen L. Ott, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of
2 Agriculture. June 19, 2000.
- 3 Poe, G., N. Bills, B. Bellows, P. Crosscombe, R. Koelsch, M. Kreher, and P. Wright (1999) *Staff Paper Documenting the*
4 *Status of Dairy Manure Management in New York: Current Practices and Willingness to Participate in Voluntary*
5 *Programs*. Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics; Cornell University, Ithaca, New York,
6 September.
- 7 Safley, L.M., Jr. (2000) Personal Communication. Deb Bartram, ERG and L.M. Safley, President, Agri-Waste
8 Technology. June and October 2000.
- 9 Safley, L.M., Jr. and P.W. Westerman (1990) "Psychrophilic anaerobic digestion of animal manure: proposed design
10 methodology." *Biological Wastes*, 34:133-148.
- 11 Stettler, D. (2000) Personal Communication. Don Stettler, Environmental Engineer, National Climate Center, Oregon
12 Natural Resource Conservation Service and Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG. June 27, 2000.
- 13 Sweeten, J. (2000) Personal Communication. John Sweeten, Texas A&M University and Indra Mitra, ERG. June 2000.
- 14 UEP (1999) *Voluntary Survey Results—Estimated Percentage Participation/Activity*. Caged Layer Environmental
15 Management Practices, Industry data submissions for EPA profile development, United Egg Producers and National
16 Chicken Council. Received from John Thorne, Capitolink. June 2000.
- 17 USDA (2018a) *Quick Stats: Agricultural Statistics Database*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of
18 Agriculture. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/>>.
- 19 USDA (2018b) *Chicken and Eggs 2017 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of
20 Agriculture. Washington, D.C. February 2018. Available online at:
21 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 22 USDA (2018c) *Poultry - Production and Value 2017 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
23 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2018. Available online at:
24 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 25 USDA (2016a) *Chicken and Eggs 2015 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
26 Washington, D.C. July 2016. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 27 USDA (2016b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2015 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
28 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. July 2016. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 29 USDA (2016c) *1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census of Agriculture*. National Agriculture Statistics Service,
30 U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/>>. July
31 2016.
- 32 USDA (2015a) *Chicken and Eggs 2014 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
33 Washington, D.C. February 2015. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 34 USDA (2015b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2014 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
35 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2015. Available online at:
36 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 37 USDA (2014a) *1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012 Census of Agriculture*. National Agriculture Statistics Service,
38 U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/>>. May
39 2014.
- 40 USDA (2014b) *Chicken and Eggs 2013 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of
41 Agriculture. Washington, D.C. February 2014. Available online at:
42 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 43 USDA (2014c) *Poultry - Production and Value 2013 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
44 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2014. Available online at:
45 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 46 USDA (2013a) *Chicken and Eggs 2012 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
47 Washington, D.C. February 2013. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.

- 1 USDA (2013b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2012 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
2 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2013. Available online at:
3 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 4 USDA (2012a) *Chicken and Eggs 2011 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
5 Washington, D.C. February 2012. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 6 USDA (2012b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2011 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
7 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2012. Available online at:
8 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 9 USDA (2011a) *Chicken and Eggs 2010 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
10 Washington, D.C. February 2011. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 11 USDA (2011b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2010 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
12 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2011. Available online at:
13 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 14 USDA (2010a) *Chicken and Eggs 2009 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
15 Washington, D.C. February 2010. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 16 USDA (2010b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2009 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
17 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2010. Available online at:
18 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 19 USDA (2009a) *Chicken and Eggs 2008 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
20 Washington, D.C. February 2009. Available online at: <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 21 USDA (2009b) *Poultry - Production and Value 2008 Summary*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
22 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2009. Available online at:
23 <<http://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/index.asp>>.
- 24 USDA (2009c) *Chicken and Eggs – Final Estimates 2003-2007*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
25 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. March 2009. Available online at:
26 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/nass/SB980/sb1024.pdf>>.
- 27 USDA (2009d) *Poultry Production and Value—Final Estimates 2003-2007*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S.
28 Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. May 2009. Available online at:
29 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/nass/SB994/sb1028.pdf>>.
- 30 USDA (2008) *Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook, National Engineering Handbook (NEH)*, Part 651.
31 Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- 32 USDA (2004a) *Chicken and Eggs—Final Estimates 1998-2003*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
33 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2004. Available online at:
34 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.
- 35 USDA (2004b) *Poultry Production and Value—Final Estimates 1998-2002*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S.
36 Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. April 2004. Available online at:
37 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.
- 38 USDA (1999) *Poultry Production and Value—Final Estimates 1994-97*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S.
39 Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. March 1999. Available online at:
40 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.
- 41 USDA (1998) *Chicken and Eggs—Final Estimates 1994-97*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of
42 Agriculture. Washington, D.C. December 1998. Available online at:
43 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.
- 44 USDA (1996) *Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook, National Engineering Handbook (NEH)*, Part 651.
45 Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. July 1996.
- 46 USDA (1995a) *Poultry Production and Value—Final Estimates 1988-1993*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S.
47 Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. March 1995. Available online at:
48 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.

- 1 USDA (1995b) *Chicken and Eggs—Final Estimates 1988-1993*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department
2 of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. December 1995. Available online at:
3 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.
- 4 USDA (1994) *Sheep and Goats—Final Estimates 1989-1993*. National Agriculture Statistics Service, U.S. Department of
5 Agriculture. Washington, D.C. January 31, 1994. Available online at:
6 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/general/sb/>>.
- 7 USDA, APHIS (2003) *Sheep 2001, Part I: Reference of Sheep Management in the United States, 2001 and Part*
8 *IV: Baseline Reference of 2001 Sheep Feedlot Health and Management*. USDA-APHIS-VS. Fort Collins, CO.
9 #N356.0702. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/nahms/sheep/index.shtml#sheep2001>.
- 10 USDA, APHIS (2000) *Layers '99—Part II: References of 1999 Table Egg Layer Management in the U.S.* USDA-APHIS-
11 VS. Fort Collins, CO.
12 <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/nahms/poultry/downloads/layers99/Layers99_dr_PartII.pdf>.
- 13 USDA, APHIS (1996) *Swine '95: Grower/Finisher Part II: Reference of 1995 U.S. Grower/Finisher Health &*
14 *Management Practices*. USDA-APHIS-VS. Fort Collins, CO.
15 <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/nahms/swine/downloads/swine95/Swine95_dr_PartII.pdf>.
- 16 Wright, P. (2000) Personal Communication. Lee-Ann Tracy, ERG and Peter Wright, Cornell University, College of
17 Agriculture and Life Sciences. June 23, 2000.

3.12. Methodology for Estimating N₂O Emissions, CH₄ Emissions and Soil Organic C Stock Changes from Agricultural Lands (Cropland and Grassland) – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

This annex provides a detailed description of Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods that are used to estimate soil organic C stock changes for *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland* and *Land Converted to Grassland*; direct N₂O emissions from cropland and grassland soils; indirect N₂O emissions from volatilization, leaching, and runoff from croplands and grasslands; and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation. Splicing methods are used to fill gaps at the end of the time series for these emission sources, which are not described in this annex. The splicing methods are applied for two reasons. First, the Inventory is currently compiled every two years for many categories in the AFOLU sector in order to conserve resources that are needed to implement improvements. Second, even in years that the Inventory is compiled fully with the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods, there are typically gaps in the activity data at the end of the time series, which means that these methods cannot be applied. The splicing methods are described in the main chapters, particularly Box 6-4 in the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section and Box 5-3 in the Agricultural Soil Management section.

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is produced in soils through the microbial processes of nitrification and denitrification.⁸² Management influences these processes by modifying the availability of mineral nitrogen (N), which is a key control on the N₂O emissions rates (Mosier et al. 1998). Emissions can occur directly in the soil where the N is made available or can be transported to another location following volatilization, leaching, or runoff, and then converted into N₂O. Management practices influence soil organic C stocks in agricultural soils by modifying the natural processes of photosynthesis (i.e., crop and forage production) and microbial decomposition. CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation occur under flooded conditions through the process of methanogenesis. This sub-annex describes the methodologies used to calculate N₂O emissions from agricultural soil management and annual carbon (C) stock changes from mineral and organic soils classified as *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, and *Land Converted to Grassland*⁸³, and CH₄ emissions from *Rice Cultivation*. This annex provides the underlying methodologies for these three emission sources because there is considerable overlap in the methods with the majority of emissions estimated using the DayCent biogeochemical⁸⁴ simulation model.

A combination of Tier 1, 2 and 3 approaches are used to estimate direct and indirect N₂O emissions and C stock changes in agricultural soils. More specifically, the methodologies used to estimate soil N₂O emissions include:

- 1) A Tier 3 method using the DayCent biogeochemical simulation model to estimate direct emissions from mineral soils that have less than 35 percent coarse fragments by volume and are used to produce alfalfa hay, barley, corn, cotton, dry beans, grass hay, grass-clover hay, oats, onions, peanuts, potatoes, rice, sorghum, soybeans, sugar beets, sunflowers, tomatoes, and wheat, as well as non-federal grasslands and land use change between grassland and cropland (with the crops listed above and less than 35 percent coarse fragments);
- 2) A combination of the Tier 3 and 1 methods to estimate indirect N₂O emissions associated with management of cropland and grassland simulated with DayCent in Item 1;
- 3) A Tier 1 method to estimate direct and indirect N₂O emissions from mineral soils that are not simulated with DayCent, including very gravelly, cobbly, or shaley soils (greater than 35 percent coarse fragments by volume); mineral soils with less than 35 percent coarse fragments that are used to produce crops that are not simulated by DayCent; and crops that are rotated with the crops that are not simulated with DayCent Pasture/Range/Paddock (PRP) manure N deposited on federal grasslands; and
- 4) A Tier 1 method to estimate direct N₂O emissions due to partial or complete drainage of organic soils in croplands and grasslands.

⁸² Nitrification and denitrification are driven by the activity of microorganisms in soils. Nitrification is the aerobic microbial oxidation of ammonium (NH₄⁺) to nitrate (NO₃⁻), and denitrification is the anaerobic microbial reduction of nitrate to N₂. Nitrous oxide is a gaseous intermediate product in the reaction sequence of denitrification, which leaks from microbial cells into the soil and then into the atmosphere. Nitrous oxide is also produced during nitrification, although by a less well-understood mechanism (Nevison 2000).

⁸³ Soil C stock change methods for forestland are described in the *Forestland Remaining Forestland* section.

⁸⁴ Biogeochemical cycles are the flow of chemical elements and compounds between living organisms and the physical environment.

The methodologies used to estimate soil CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation include:

- 1) A Tier 3 method using the DayCent biogeochemical simulation model to estimate CH₄ emissions from mineral soils that have less than 35 percent coarse fragments by volume and rice grown continuously or in rotation with a crop listed in (1) for soil N₂O emissions; and
- 2) A Tier 1 method to estimate CH₄ emissions from all other soils used to produce rice that are not estimated with the Tier 3 method, including rice grown on organic soils (i.e., *Histosols*), mineral soils with very gravelly, cobbly, or shaley soils (greater than 35 percent coarse fragments by volume), and rice grown in rotation with crops that are not simulated by DayCent.

The methodologies used to estimate soil organic C stock changes include:

- 1) A Tier 3 method using the DayCent biogeochemical simulation model to estimate soil organic C stock changes in mineral soils as described in Item 1 for N₂O emissions;
- 2) Tier 2 methods with country-specific stock change factors for estimating mineral soil organic C stock changes for mineral soils that are very gravelly, cobbly, or shaley (greater than 35 percent coarse fragments by volume), are used to produce crops or have land use changes to cropland and grassland (other than the conversions between cropland and grassland that are included in Item 1) that are not simulated with DayCent;
- 3) Tier 2 methods with country-specific stock change factors for estimating mineral soil organic C stock changes on federal lands;
- 4) Tier 2 methods with country-specific emission factors for estimating losses of C from organic soils that are partly or completely drained for agricultural production; and
- 5) Tier 2 methods for estimating additional changes in mineral soil C stocks due to biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) additions to soils.

As described above, the Inventory uses a Tier 3 approach to estimate direct soil N₂O emissions, CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation, and C stock changes for the majority of agricultural lands. This approach has the following advantages over the IPCC Tier 1 or 2 approaches:

- 1) It utilizes actual weather data at sub-county scales enabling quantification of inter-annual variability in N₂O emissions and C stock changes at finer spatial scales, as opposed to a single emission factor for the entire country for soil N₂O or broad climate region classification for soil C stock changes;
- 2) The model uses a more detailed characterization of spatially-mapped soil properties that influence soil C and N dynamics, as opposed to the broad soil taxonomic classifications of the IPCC methodology;
- 3) The simulation approach provides a more detailed representation of management influences and their interactions than are represented by a discrete factor-based approach in the Tier 1 and 2 methods; and
- 4) Soil N₂O and CH₄ emissions, and C stock changes are estimated on a more continuous, daily basis as a function of the interaction of climate, soil, and land management, compared with the linear rate changes that are estimated with the Tier 1 and 2 methods.

The DayCent process-based simulation model (daily time-step version of the Century model) has been selected for the Tier 3 approach based on the following criteria:

- 1) The model has been developed in the United States and extensively tested for U.S. conditions (e.g., Parton et al. 1987, 1993). In addition, the model has been widely used by researchers and agencies in many other parts of the world for simulating soil C dynamics at local, regional and national scales (e.g., Brazil, Canada, India, Jordan, Kenya, Mexico), soil N₂O emissions (e.g., Canada, China, Ireland, New Zealand) (Abdalla et al. 2010; Li et al. 2005; Smith et al. 2008; Stehfest and Muller 2004; Cheng et al. 2014), and CH₄ emissions (Cheng et al. 2013).
- 2) The model is capable of simulating cropland, grassland, forest, and savanna ecosystems, and land-use transitions between these different land uses. It is, thus, well suited to model land-use change effects.
- 3) The model is designed to simulate management practices that influence soil C dynamics, CH₄ emissions and direct N₂O emissions, with the exception of cultivated organic soils; cobbly, gravelly, or shaley soils; and crops that have not been parameterized for DayCent simulations (e.g., some vegetables, tobacco, perennial/horticultural crops, and crops that are rotated with these crops). For these latter cases, an IPCC Tier 2 method has been used for soil C stock changes and IPCC Tier 1 method for CH₄ and N₂O emissions. The model can also be used estimate the amount of N leaching and runoff, as well as volatilization of N, which is subject to indirect N₂O emissions.
- 4) Much of the data needed for the model is available from existing national databases. The exceptions are management of federal grasslands and biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) amendments to soils, which are not known

at a sufficient resolution to use the Tier 3 model. Soil N₂O emissions and C stock changes associated with these practices are addressed with a Tier 1 and 2 method, respectively.

Overall, the Tier 3 approach is used to estimate approximately about 91 percent of direct soil N₂O emissions 94 percent of the rice cultivation, and 88 percent of the land area associated with estimation of soil organic C stock changes under agricultural management in the United States.

Tier 3 Method Description and Model Evaluation

The DayCent biogeochemical model (Parton et al. 1998; Del Grosso et al. 2001, 2011) simulates biogeochemical C and N fluxes between the atmosphere, vegetation, and soil. The model provides a more complete estimation of soil C stock changes, CH₄ and N₂O emissions than IPCC Tier 1 or 2 methods by accounting for a broader suite of environmental drivers that influence emissions and stock changes. These drivers include soil characteristics, weather patterns, crop and forage characteristics, and management practices. The DayCent model utilizes the soil C modeling framework developed in the Century model (Parton et al. 1987, 1988, 1994; Metherell et al. 1993), but has been refined to simulate dynamics at a daily time-step. Carbon and N dynamics are linked in plant-soil systems through biogeochemical processes of microbial decomposition and plant production (McGill and Cole 1981). Coupling the three source categories (i.e., agricultural soil C, rice CH₄ and soil N₂O) in a single inventory analysis ensures that there is a consistent treatment of the processes and interactions between C and N cycling in soils. For example, plant growth is controlled by nutrient availability, water, and temperature stress. Plant growth, along with residue management, determines C inputs to soils and influences C stock changes. Removal of soil mineral N by plants influences the amount of N that can be converted into N₂O. Nutrient supply is a function of external nutrient additions as well as litter and soil organic matter (SOM) decomposition rates, and increasing decomposition can lead to a reduction in soil organic C stocks due to microbial respiration, and greater N₂O emissions by enhancing mineral N availability in soils.

Key processes simulated by DayCent include (1) plant growth; (2) organic matter formation and decomposition; (3) soil water and temperature regimes by layer; (4) nitrification and denitrification processes; and (5) methanogenesis (Figure A-7). Each of these submodels will be described separately below.

- 1) The plant-growth submodel simulates C assimilation through photosynthesis; N uptake; dry matter production; partitioning of C within the crop or forage; senescence; and mortality. The primary function of the growth submodel is to estimate the amount, type, and timing of organic matter inputs to soil, and to represent the influence of the plant on soil water, temperature, and N balance. Yield and removal of harvested biomass are also simulated. Separate submodels are designed to simulate herbaceous plants (i.e., agricultural crops and grasses) and woody vegetation (i.e., trees and scrub). Maximum daily net primary production (NPP) is estimated using the NASA-CASA production algorithm (Potter et al. 1993, 2007) and MODIS Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI) products, MOD13Q1 and MYD13Q1, or an approximation of EVI data derived from the MODIS products (Gurung et al. 2009). The NASA-CASA production algorithm is only used for the following major crops: corn, soybeans, sorghum, cotton and wheat.⁸⁵ Other regions and crops are simulated with a single value for the maximum daily NPP, instead of the more dynamic NASA-CASA algorithm. The maximum daily NPP rate is modified by air temperature and available water to capture temperature and moisture stress. If the NASA-CASA algorithm is not used in the simulation, then production is further subject to nutrient limitations (i.e., nitrogen). Model evaluation has shown that the NASA-CASA algorithm improves the precision of NPP estimates by using the EVI products to inform the production model. The r² is 83 percent for the NASA-CASA algorithm and 64 percent for the single parameter value approach. See Figure A-8.
- 2) Dynamics of soil organic C and N (Figure A-7) are simulated for the surface and belowground litter pools and soil organic matter in the top 20 cm of the soil profile; mineral N dynamics are simulated through the whole soil profile. Organic C and N stocks are represented by two plant litter pools (metabolic and structural) and three soil organic matter (SOM) pools (active, slow, and passive). The metabolic litter pool represents the easily decomposable constituents of plant residues, while the structural litter pool is composed of more recalcitrant, ligno-cellulose plant materials. The three SOM pools represent a gradient in decomposability, from active SOM (representing microbial biomass and associated metabolites) having a rapid turnover (months to years), to passive SOM (representing highly processed, humified, condensed decomposition products), which is highly recalcitrant,

⁸⁵ It is a planned improvement to estimate NPP for additional crops and grass forage with the NASA-CASA method in the future.

with mean residence times on the order of several hundred years. The slow pool represents decomposition products of intermediate stability, having a mean residence time on the order of decades and is the fraction that tends to change the most in response to changes in land use and management. Soil texture influences turnover rates of the slow and passive pools. The clay and silt-sized mineral fraction of the soil provides physical protection from microbial decomposition, leading to enhanced SOM stabilization in finely textured soils. Soil temperature and moisture, tillage disturbance, aeration, and other factors influence decomposition and loss of C from the soil organic matter pools.

- 3) The soil-water submodel simulates water flows and changes in soil water availability, which influences both plant growth and decomposition/nutrient cycling processes. The moisture content of soils are simulated through a multi-layer profile based on precipitation, snow accumulation and melting, interception, soil and canopy evaporation, transpiration, soil water movement, runoff, and drainage.

Figure A-7: DayCent Model Flow Diagram





Figure A-8: Modeled versus measured net primary production (g C m^{-2})



Part a) presents results of the NASA-CASA algorithm ($r^2 = 83\%$) and part b) presents the results of a single parameter value for maximum net primary production ($r^2 = 64\%$).

- 4) Soil mineral N dynamics are modeled based on N inputs from fertilizer inputs (synthetic and organic), residue N inputs, soil organic matter mineralization in addition to symbiotic and asymbiotic N fixation. Mineral N is available for plant and microbial uptake, and is largely controlled by the specified stoichiometric limits for these organisms (i.e., C:N ratios). Mineral and organic N losses are simulated with leaching and runoff, and nitrogen can be volatilized and lost from the soil through ammonia volatilization, nitrification and denitrification. N_2O emissions occur through nitrification and denitrification. Denitrification is a function of soil NO_3^- concentration, water filled pore space (WFPS), heterotrophic (i.e., microbial) respiration, and texture. Nitrification is controlled by soil ammonium (NH_4^+) concentration, water filled pore space, temperature, and pH (See Box 2 for more information).
- 5) Methanogenesis is modeled under anaerobic conditions and is controlled by carbon substrate availability, temperature, and redox potential (Cheng et al. 2013). Carbon substrate supply is determined by decomposition of residues and soil organic matter, in addition to root exudation. The transport of CH_4 to the atmosphere occurs through the rice plant and via ebullition (i.e., bubbles). CH_4 can be oxidized (methanotrophy) as it moves through a flooded soil and the oxidation rates are higher as the plants mature and in soils with more clay (Sass et al. 1994).

The model allows for a variety of management options to be simulated, including different crop types, crop sequences (e.g., rotation), tillage practices, fertilization, organic matter addition (e.g., manure amendments), harvest events (with variable residue removal), drainage, flooding, irrigation, burning, and grazing intensity. An input “schedule” file is used to simulate the timing of management activities and temporal trends; schedules can be organized into discrete time blocks to define a repeated sequence of events (e.g., a crop rotation or a frequency of disturbance such as a burning cycle for perennial grassland). Management options can be specified for any day of a year within a scheduling block, where management codes point to operation-specific parameter files (referred to as *.100 files), which contain the information used to simulate management effects. User-specified management activities can be defined by adding to or editing the contents of the *.100 files. Additional details of the model formulation are given in Parton et al. (1987, 1988, 1994, 1998), Del Grosso et al. (2001, 2011), Cheng et al. (2013) and Metherell et al. (1993), and archived copies of the model source code are available.

Box 2. DayCent Model Simulation of Nitrification and Denitrification

The DayCent model simulates the two biogeochemical processes, nitrification and denitrification, that result in N₂O emissions from soils (Del Grosso et al. 2000, Parton et al. 2001). Nitrification is calculated for the top 15 cm of soil (where nitrification mostly occurs) while denitrification is calculated for the entire soil profile (accounting for denitrification near the surface and subsurface as nitrate leaches through the profile). The equations and key parameters controlling N₂O emissions from nitrification and denitrification are described below.

Nitrification is controlled by soil ammonium (NH₄⁺) concentration, temperature (t), Water Filled Pore Space (WFPS) and pH according to the following equation:

$$\text{Nit} = \text{NH}_{4+} \times K_{\max} \times F(t) \times F(\text{WFPS}) \times F(\text{pH})$$

where,

Nit	=	the soil nitrification rate (g N/m ² /day)
NH ₄₊	=	the model-derived soil ammonium concentration (g N/m ²)
K _{max}	=	the maximum fraction of NH ₄ ⁺ nitrified (K _{max} = 0.10/day)
F(t)	=	the effect of soil temperature on nitrification (Figure A-9a)
F(WFPS)	=	the effect of soil water content and soil texture on nitrification (Figure A-9b)
F(pH)	=	the effect of soil pH on nitrification (Figure A-9c)

The current parameterization used in the model assumes that 1.2 percent of nitrified N is converted to N₂O.

The model assumes that denitrification rates are controlled by the availability of soil NO₃⁻ (electron acceptor), labile C compounds (electron donor) and oxygen (competing electron acceptor). Heterotrophic soil respiration is used as a proxy for labile C availability, while oxygen availability is a function of soil physical properties that influence gas diffusivity, soil WFPS, and oxygen demand. The model selects the minimum of the NO₃⁻ and CO₂ functions to establish a maximum potential denitrification rate. These rates vary for particular levels of electron acceptor and C substrate, and account for limitations of oxygen availability to estimate daily denitrification rates according to the following equation:

$$\text{Den} = \min[F(\text{CO}_2), F(\text{NO}_3)] \times F(\text{WFPS})$$

where,

Den	=	the soil denitrification rate (μg N/g soil/day)
F(NO ₃)	=	a function relating N gas flux to nitrate levels (Figure A-10a)
F(CO ₂)	=	a function relating N gas flux to soil respiration (Figure A-10b)
F(WFPS)	=	a dimensionless multiplier (Figure A-10c)

The x inflection point of F(WFPS) is a function of respiration and soil gas diffusivity at field capacity (D_{FC}):

$$x \text{ inflection} = 0.90 - M(\text{CO}_2)$$

where,

M	=	a multiplier that is a function of D _{FC} . In technical terms, the inflection point is the domain where either F(WFPS) is not differentiable or its derivative is 0. In this case, the inflection point can be interpreted as the WFPS value at which denitrification reaches half of its maximum rate.

Respiration has a much stronger effect on the water curve in clay soils with low D_{FC} than in loam or sandy soils with high D_{FC} (Figure A-9b). The model assumes that microsites in fine-textured soils can become anaerobic at relatively low water contents when oxygen demand is high. After calculating total N gas flux, the ratio of N₂/N₂O is estimated so that total N gas emissions can be partitioned between N₂O and N₂:

$$R_{\text{N}_2/\text{N}_2\text{O}} = F_r(\text{NO}_3/\text{CO}_2) \times F_r(\text{WFPS}).$$

where,

R_{N_2/N_2O} = the ratio of N_2/N_2O
 $F_r(NO_3/CO_2)$ = a function estimating the impact of the availability of electron donor relative to substrate
 $F_r(WFPS)$ = a multiplier to account for the effect of soil water on $N_2:N_2O$.

For $F_r(NO_3/CO_2)$, as the ratio of electron donor to substrate increases, a higher portion of N gas is assumed to be in the form of N_2O . For $F_r(WFPS)$, as WFPS increases, a higher portion of N gas is assumed to be in the form of N_2 .

Figure A-9: Effect of Soil Temperature (a), Water-Filled Pore Space (b), and pH (c) on Nitrification Rates





Figure A-10: Effect of Soil Nitrite Concentration (a), Heterotrophic Respiration Rates (b), and Water-Filled Pore Space (c) on Denitrification Rates



Comparison of model results and plot level data show that DayCent reliably simulates soil organic matter levels (Ogle et al. 2007). The model was tested and shown to capture the general trends in C storage across 908 treatment observations from 92 experimental sites (Figure A-11). Some bias and imprecision occur in predictions of soil organic C, which is reflected in the uncertainty associated with DayCent model results. Regardless, the Tier 3 approach has considerably less uncertainty than Tier 1 and 2 methods (Del Grosso et al. 2010; Figure A-12).

Figure A-11: Comparisons of Results from DayCent Model and Measurements of Soil Organic C Stocks






Figure A-12: Comparison of Estimated Soil Organic C Stock Changes and Uncertainties using Tier 1 (IPCC 2006), Tier 2 (Ogle et al. 2003, 2006) and Tier 3 Methods




Similarly, DayCent model results have been compared to trace gas N₂O fluxes for a number of native and managed systems (Del Grosso et al. 2001, 2005, 2010) (Figure A-13). In general, the model simulates accurate emissions, but some bias and imprecision does occur in predictions, which is reflected in the uncertainty associated with DayCent model results. Comparisons with measured data showed that DayCent estimated N₂O emissions more accurately and precisely than the IPCC Tier 1 methodology (IPCC 2006) (See Agricultural Soil Management, QA/QC and Verification Section). The linear regression of simulated vs. measured emissions for DayCent had higher r² values and a fitted line closer to a perfect 1:1 relationship between measured and modeled N₂O emissions compared to the IPCC Tier 1 approach (Del Grosso et al. 2005, 2008). This is not surprising, since DayCent includes site-specific factors (climate, soil properties, and previous management) that influence N₂O emissions. Furthermore, DayCent also simulated NO₃- leaching (root mean square error = 20 percent) more accurately than IPCC Tier 1 methodology (root mean square error = 69 percent) (Del Grosso et al. 2005). Volatilization of N gases that contribute to indirect soil N₂O emissions is the only component that has not been thoroughly tested, which is due to a lack of measurement data. Overall, the Tier 3 approach has reduced uncertainties in the agricultural soil C stock changes and N₂O emissions compared to using lower Tier methods.

Figure A-13: Comparisons of Results from DayCent Model and Measurements of Soil Nitrous Oxide Emissions



DayCent predictions of soil CH₄ emissions have also been compared to experimental measurements from sites in California, Texas, Arkansas and Louisiana (Figure A-14). There are 10 experiments and 126 treatment observations. In general, the model estimates CH₄ emissions in most states with no apparent bias, but there is a lack of precision, which is addressed in the uncertainty analysis. The exception is California where the model tends to over-estimate low emission rates, and this additional uncertainty is captured in the error propagation associated with the inventory analysis for California.

Figure A-14: Comparisons of Results from DayCent Model and Measurements of Soil Methane Emissions



Inventory Compilation Steps

There are five steps involved in estimating soil organic C stock changes for *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland* and *Land Converted to Grassland*; direct N₂O emissions from cropland and grassland soils; indirect N₂O emissions from volatilization, leaching, and runoff from croplands and grasslands; and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation. First, the activity data are derived from a combination of land-use, livestock, crop, and grassland management surveys, as well as expert knowledge. In the second, third, and fourth steps, soil organic C stock changes, direct and indirect N₂O emissions, and CH₄ emissions are estimated using DayCent and/or the Tier 1 and 2 methods. In the fifth step, total emissions are computed by summing all components separately for soil organic C stock changes, N₂O emissions and CH₄ emissions. The remainder of this annex describes the methods underlying each step.

Step 1: Derive Activity Data

This step describes how the activity data are derived to estimate soil organic C stock changes, direct and indirect N₂O emissions, and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation. The activity data requirements include: (1) land base and history data, (2) crop-specific mineral N fertilizer rates,⁸⁶ (3) crop-specific manure amendment N rates and timing, (4) other N inputs, (5) tillage practices, (6) irrigation data, (7) Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI), (8) daily weather data, and (9) edaphic characteristics.⁸⁷

Step 1a: Activity Data for the Agricultural Land Base and Histories

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's 2012 National Resources Inventory (NRI) (USDA-NRCS 2015) provides the basis for identifying the U.S. agricultural land base on non-federal lands, and classifying parcels into *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, and *Land Converted to Grassland*. In 1998, the NRI program began collecting annual data, and data are currently available through 2012 (USDA-NRCS 2015). The time series will be extended as new data are released by the USDA NRI program. Note that the Inventory does not include estimates of N₂O emissions for federal grasslands (with the exception of soil N₂O from PRP manure N, i.e., manure deposited directly onto pasture, range or paddock by grazing livestock) and a minor amount of croplands on federal lands.

The NRI has a stratified multi-stage sampling design, where primary sample units are stratified on the basis of county and township boundaries defined by the U.S. Public Land Survey (Nusser and Goebel 1997). Within a primary sample unit, typically a 160-acre (64.75 ha) square quarter-section, three sample points are selected according to a restricted randomization procedure. Each point in the survey is assigned an area weight (expansion factor) based on other known areas and land-use information (Nusser and Goebel 1997). In principle, the expansion factors represent the amount of area with the land use and land use change history that is the same as the point location. It is important to note that the NRI uses a

⁸⁶ No data are currently available at the national scale to distinguish the type of fertilizer applied or timing of applications rates. It is a planned improvement to address variation in these practices in future inventories, such as application of enhanced efficiency fertilizers.

⁸⁷ Edaphic characteristics include such factors as soil texture and pH.

sampling approach, and therefore there is some uncertainty associated with scaling the point data to a region or the country using the expansion factors. In general, those uncertainties decline at larger scales, such as states compared to smaller county units, because of a larger sample size. An extensive amount of soils, land-use, and land management data have been collected through the survey (Nusser et al. 1998).⁸⁸ Primary sources for data include aerial photography and remote sensing imagery as well as field visits and county office records.

The annual NRI data product provides crop data for most years between 1979 and 2012, with the exception of 1983, 1988, and 1993. These years are gap-filled using an automated set of rules so that cropping sequences are filled with the most likely crop type given the historical cropping pattern at each NRI point location. Grassland data are reported on 5-year increments prior to 1998, but it is assumed that the land use is also grassland between the years of data collection (see Easter et al. 2008 for more information).

NRI points are included in the land base for the agricultural soil C and N₂O emissions inventories if they are identified as cropland or grassland⁸⁹ between 1990 and 2012 (Table A-198).⁹⁰ NRI does not provide land use data on federal lands, therefore land use on federal lands are derived from the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (Fry et al. 2011; Homer et al. 2007; Homer et al. 2015). Federal NRI points are classified as cropland or grassland according to the NLCD and included in the agricultural land base. The NRI data are reconciled with the Forest Inventory and Analysis Dataset, and in this process, the time series for *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, *Land Converted to Grassland*, *Wetland Remaining Wetland* and *Land Converted to Wetlands* are modified to account for differences in forest land area between the two national surveys (See Section 6.1 for more information on the U.S. land representation). Overall, 674,613 NRI survey points are included in the inventory (USDA-NRCS 2015).

For each year, land parcels are subdivided into *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, and *Land Converted to Grassland*. Land parcels under cropping management in a specific year are classified as *Cropland Remaining Cropland* if the parcel has been used as cropland for at least 20 years.⁹¹ Similarly land parcels under grassland management in a specific year of the inventory are classified as *Grassland Remaining Grassland* if they have been designated as grassland for at least 20 years. Otherwise, land parcels are classified as *Land Converted to Cropland* or *Land Converted to Grassland* based on the most recent use in the inventory time period. Lands are retained in the land-use change categories (i.e., *Land Converted to Cropland* and *Land Converted to Grassland*) for 20 years as recommended by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Lands converted into Cropland and Grassland are further subdivided into the specific land use conversions (e.g., *Forest Land Converted to Cropland*).

Table A-198: Total Land Areas for the Agricultural Soil C and N₂O Inventory, Subdivided by Land Use Categories (Million Hectares)

	Land Areas (million ha)												
Category	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Mineral Soils	421.74	421.03	420.41	419.74	419.11	418.34	417.45	416.61	415.72	414.93	414.32	413.79	413.29
Croplands	172.92	172.82	172.61	172.13	171.76	171.34	171.02	170.59	168.14	167.71	167.42	166.85	166.54
Cropland Remaining Cropland	160.44	159.99	159.52	157.78	156.20	155.62	155.01	154.46	150.61	149.80	149.71	149.34	149.15
Grassland Converted to Cropland	11.79	12.13	12.39	13.62	14.77	14.95	15.22	15.36	16.75	17.13	16.92	16.75	16.66
Forest Converted to Cropland	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.22	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.14	0.13
Other Lands Converted to Cropland	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.32	0.31	0.29
Settlements Converted to Croplands	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11
Wetlands Converted to Croplands	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Grasslands	248.82	248.21	247.80	247.61	247.35	247.00	246.44	246.02	247.58	247.22	246.90	246.94	246.75
Grasslands Remaining Grasslands	238.89	238.06	237.34	235.76	234.27	233.70	232.99	232.40	230.08	229.24	228.31	227.57	226.99
Croplands Converted to Grasslands	8.65	8.77	8.95	10.24	11.38	11.58	11.69	11.84	15.43	15.83	16.29	16.98	17.32
Forest Converted to Grasslands	0.57	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.80	0.80	0.81	0.80	0.81
Other Lands Converted to Grasslands	0.41	0.43	0.47	0.54	0.63	0.66	0.67	0.71	0.77	0.82	0.95	1.03	1.05
Settlements Converted to Grasslands	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.13
Wetlands Converted to Grasslands	0.24	0.30	0.37	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.39	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.45
Organic Soils	1.43	1.42	1.41	1.42	1.43	1.43	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.33	1.32	1.41	1.42
Croplands	0.73	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.64	0.63	0.74	0.74
Cropland Remaining Cropland	0.66	0.64	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.62	0.54	0.54	0.62	0.63

⁸⁸ In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. More recent data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series of activity data.

⁸⁹ Includes only non-federal lands because federal lands are not classified into land uses as part of the NRI survey (i.e., they are only designated as federal lands).

⁹⁰ Land use for 2013 to 2016 is not compiled, but will be updated with newer NRI (i.e., USDA-NRCS 2015).

⁹¹ NRI points are classified according to land-use history records starting in 1979 when the NRI survey began, and consequently the classifications are based on less than 20 years from 1990 to 1998.

Grassland Converted to Cropland	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.09
Forest Converted to Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Lands Converted to Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Settlements Converted to Croplands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wetlands Converted to Croplands	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Grasslands	0.70	0.70	0.69	0.70	0.71	0.70	0.69	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.69	0.68	0.68
Grasslands Remaining Grasslands	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.62	0.62	0.61	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.55	0.55
Croplands Converted to Grasslands	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.10
Forest Converted to Grasslands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
Other Lands Converted to Grasslands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Settlements Converted to Grasslands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wetlands Converted to Grasslands	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02
Total	423.18	422.45	421.82	421.16	420.54	419.77	418.88	418.02	417.15	416.26	415.64	415.20	414.71

Note: In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. Additional data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series for the land use data.

Category	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Mineral Soils	412.44	411.78	410.79	410.09	409.44	408.83	408.29	407.70	407.18	406.59
Croplands	165.89	164.76	164.42	164.02	163.70	163.22	162.81	162.37	162.08	161.86
Cropland Remaining Cropland	149.81	149.73	149.40	149.09	149.32	149.46	149.68	149.28	148.86	148.59
Grassland Converted to Cropland	15.42	14.42	14.43	14.33	13.82	13.25	12.66	12.63	12.75	12.80
Forest Converted to Cropland	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
Other Lands Converted to Cropland	0.27	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.21
Settlements Converted to Croplands	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09
Wetlands Converted to Croplands	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12
Grasslands	246.55	247.01	246.37	246.08	245.74	245.61	245.48	245.33	245.10	244.74
Grasslands Remaining Grasslands	227.28	227.37	226.83	226.48	226.44	226.74	226.93	226.62	226.26	226.03
Croplands Converted to Grasslands	16.89	17.31	17.14	17.21	16.92	16.61	16.36	16.57	16.76	16.72
Forest Converted to Grasslands	0.77	0.73	0.76	0.72	0.68	0.63	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.57
Other Lands Converted to Grasslands	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.09	1.12	1.14	1.13	1.14	1.14	1.12
Settlements Converted to Grasslands	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.13
Wetlands Converted to Grasslands	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.37	0.31	0.27	0.23	0.17
Organic Soils	1.41	1.41	1.40	1.38	1.37	1.36	1.37	1.36	1.33	1.33
Croplands	0.74	0.74	0.73	0.73	0.72	0.71	0.72	0.71	0.68	0.69
Cropland Remaining Cropland	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.63	0.64	0.64	0.61	0.61
Grassland Converted to Cropland	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07
Forest Converted to Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Lands Converted to Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Settlements Converted to Croplands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wetlands Converted to Croplands	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Grasslands	0.66	0.67	0.67	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.64
Grasslands Remaining Grasslands	0.54	0.54	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.49
Croplands Converted to Grasslands	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Forest Converted to Grasslands	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Other Lands Converted to Grasslands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Settlements Converted to Grasslands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wetlands Converted to Grasslands	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Total	413.85	413.18	412.19	411.48	410.81	410.19	409.66	409.06	408.51	407.92

Notes: The area estimates are not consistent with the land area values shown in the Representation of the U.S. Land Base section because the current Inventory does not estimate emissions and removals for all managed lands. Specifically, grassland and cropland in Alaska are not included in the current Inventory. Note: In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. Additional data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series for the land use data.

The Tier 3 method using the DayCent model is applied to estimate soil C stock changes, CH₄ and N₂O emissions for most of the NRI points that occur on mineral soils. The actual crop and grassland histories are simulated with the DayCent model when applying the Tier 3 methods. Parcels of land that are not simulated with DayCent are allocated to the Tier 2 approach for estimating soil organic C stock change, and a Tier 1 method (IPCC 2006) to estimate soil N₂O emissions⁹² and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation (Table A-199).

The land base for the Tier 1 and 2 methods includes (1) land parcels occurring on organic soils; (2) land parcels that include non-agricultural uses such as forest and federal lands in one or more years of the inventory; (3) land parcels on mineral soils that are very gravelly, cobbly, or shaley (i.e., classified as soils that have greater than 35 percent of soil volume comprised

⁹² The Tier 1 method for soil N₂O does not require land area data with the exception of emissions from drainage and cultivation of organic soils, so in practice the Tier 1 method is only dependent on the amount of N input to mineral soils and not the actual land area.

of gravel, cobbles, or shale); or (4) land parcels that are used to produce some of the vegetable crops, perennial/horticultural crops, and tobacco, which are either grown continuously or in rotation with other crops. DayCent has not been fully tested or developed to simulate biogeochemical processes in soils used to produce some annual (e.g., tobacco), horticultural (e.g., flowers), or perennial (e.g., vineyards, orchards) crops and agricultural use of organic soils. In addition, DayCent has not been adequately tested for soils with a high gravel, cobble, or shale content.

Table A-199: Total Land Area Estimated with Tier 2 and 3 Inventory Approaches (Million Hectares)

Year	Land Areas (million ha)			
	Tier 1/2	Mineral Tier 3	Total	Organic Tier 1/2
1990	106.49	315.25	421.74	1.43
1991	105.49	315.54	421.03	1.42
1992	104.55	315.86	420.41	1.41
1993	103.40	316.34	419.74	1.42
1994	102.30	316.81	419.11	1.43
1995	101.02	317.33	418.34	1.43
1996	99.68	317.78	417.45	1.42
1997	98.34	318.26	416.61	1.42
1998	96.96	318.77	415.72	1.42
1999	95.63	319.30	414.93	1.33
2000	94.65	319.66	414.32	1.32
2001	93.80	320.00	413.79	1.41
2002	92.97	320.32	413.29	1.42
2003	92.14	320.30	412.44	1.41
2004	91.47	320.31	411.78	1.41
2005	90.53	320.27	410.79	1.40
2006	89.87	320.23	410.09	1.38
2007	89.24	320.20	409.44	1.37
2008	88.83	320.00	408.83	1.36
2009	88.45	319.84	408.29	1.37
2010	88.05	319.65	407.70	1.36
2011	87.60	319.57	407.18	1.33
2012	87.26	319.34	406.59	1.33

Note: In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. Additional data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series of the land use data.

NRI points on mineral soils are classified into specific crop categories, continuous pasture/rangeland, and other non-agricultural uses for the soil C Tier 2 inventory analysis (Table A-200). NRI points are assigned to IPCC input categories (low, medium, high, and high with organic amendments) according to the classification provided in IPCC (2006). For croplands on federal lands, information on specific cropping systems is not available, so all croplands are assumed to be medium input. In addition, NRI differentiates between improved and unimproved grassland, where improvements include irrigation and interseeding of legumes. Grasslands on federal lands (as identified with the NLCD) are classified according to rangeland condition (nominal, moderately degraded and severely degraded) in areas where information is available. For lands managed for livestock grazing by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), IPCC rangeland condition classes are interpreted at the state-level from the Rangeland Inventory, *Monitoring and Evaluation Report* (BLM 2014). In order to estimate uncertainties, probability distribution functions (PDFs) for the NRI land-use data are constructed as multivariate normal based on the total area estimates for each land-use/management category and associated covariance matrix. Through this approach, dependencies in land use are taken into account resulting from the likelihood that current use is correlated with past use. These dependencies occur because as some land use/management categories increase in area, the area of other land use/management categories will decline. The covariance matrix addresses these relationships.

Table A-200: Total Land Areas by Land-Use and Management System for the Tier 2 Mineral Soil Organic C Approach (Million Hectares)

Land-Use/Management System	Land Areas (million hectares)												
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Cropland Systems	22.42	22.14	21.80	21.33	20.90	20.48	20.07	19.62	18.83	18.33	17.93	17.67	17.43
Conservation Reserve Program	1.98	2.25	2.30	2.16	1.97	1.90	1.77	1.73	1.32	1.25	1.14	1.12	1.07
High Input Cropping Systems, Full Tillage	1.42	1.24	1.12	0.98	0.91	0.88	0.91	0.59	0.57	0.63	0.69	0.66	0.60
High Input Cropping Systems, Reduced Tillage	1.00	1.08	1.15	1.18	1.24	1.27	1.27	1.38	1.32	1.22	1.12	1.09	1.01
High Input Cropping Systems, No Tillage	0.10	0.11	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.18
High Input Cropping Systems with Manure, Full Tillage	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05

High Input Cropping Systems with Manure, Reduced Tillage	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07
High Input Cropping Systems with Manure, No Tillage	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Medium Input Cropping Systems, Full Tillage	5.31	4.95	4.34	3.80	3.47	3.47	3.35	1.80	1.76	1.89	2.01	2.09	2.15
Medium Input Cropping Systems, Reduced Tillage	4.32	4.38	4.85	5.10	5.19	4.83	4.80	5.87	5.59	5.29	4.97	4.79	4.64
Medium Input Cropping Systems, No Tillage	0.34	0.37	0.23	0.31	0.36	0.43	0.42	0.74	0.74	0.76	0.79	0.79	0.79
Low Input Cropping Systems, Full Tillage	2.91	2.84	2.76	2.68	2.60	2.63	2.64	2.49	2.35	2.20	2.18	2.08	1.99
Low Input Cropping Systems, Reduced Tillage	0.07	0.05	0.18	0.19	0.25	0.27	0.26	0.32	0.37	0.37	0.38	0.39	0.40
Low Input Cropping Systems, No Tillage	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.13
Hay with Legumes or Irrigation	1.23	1.18	1.09	1.16	1.12	1.07	0.95	0.88	0.94	0.88	0.76	0.73	0.82
Hay with Legumes or Irrigation and Manure	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05
Hay, Unimproved	0.71	0.72	0.76	0.70	0.67	0.62	0.62	0.67	0.62	0.56	0.53	0.49	0.53
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation in Rotation	2.42	2.41	2.41	2.43	2.45	2.43	2.41	2.38	2.48	2.51	2.55	2.61	2.60
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation and Manure, in Rotation	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
Rice	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.14	0.19	0.18	0.18
Grassland Systems	84.07	83.35	82.75	82.07	81.40	80.54	79.60	78.73	78.13	77.30	76.72	76.13	75.54
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation	5.59	5.39	5.11	5.03	5.01	4.82	4.46	3.98	4.00	3.88	3.64	3.52	3.40
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation and Manure	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.09
Rangelands and Unimproved Pasture	47.71	47.17	47.00	46.75	46.26	45.56	44.53	44.27	43.47	42.77	43.10	42.64	43.43
Rangelands and Unimproved Pasture, Moderately Degraded	22.07	22.19	22.26	22.10	22.09	22.16	22.49	22.36	23.01	22.95	22.29	22.34	21.31
Rangelands and Unimproved Pasture, Severely Degraded	8.52	8.43	8.23	8.04	7.89	7.85	7.99	8.00	7.54	7.59	7.60	7.54	7.31
Total	106.49	105.49	104.55	103.40	102.30	101.02	99.68	98.34	96.96	95.63	94.65	93.80	92.97

1

Land-Use/Management System	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Cropland Systems	17.13	16.76	16.57	16.40	16.22	16.13	16.00	15.90	15.78	15.73
Conservation Reserve Program	0.92	0.68	0.76	0.75	0.73	0.69	0.68	0.66	0.61	0.55
High Input Cropping Systems, Full Tillage	0.60	0.59	0.57	0.55	0.53	0.54	0.55	0.53	0.53	0.51
High Input Cropping Systems, Reduced Tillage	1.00	0.96	0.93	0.91	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.88	0.88	0.86
High Input Cropping Systems, No Tillage	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.18
High Input Cropping Systems with Manure, Full Tillage	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
High Input Cropping Systems with Manure, Reduced Tillage	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06
High Input Cropping Systems with Manure, No Tillage	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Medium Input Cropping Systems, Full Tillage	2.08	2.03	2.00	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.97	1.97	1.97
Medium Input Cropping Systems, Reduced Tillage	4.55	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.38	4.38	4.39
Medium Input Cropping Systems, No Tillage	0.88	0.98	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
Low Input Cropping Systems, Full Tillage	1.90	1.77	1.74	1.74	1.69	1.66	1.56	1.55	1.51	1.55
Low Input Cropping Systems, Reduced Tillage	0.42	0.45	0.44	0.43	0.42	0.41	0.38	0.38	0.37	0.39
Low Input Cropping Systems, No Tillage	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22
Hay with Legumes or Irrigation	0.77	0.77	0.75	0.73	0.73	0.72	0.68	0.70	0.66	0.66
Hay with Legumes or Irrigation and Manure	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Hay, Unimproved	0.53	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.46

Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation in Rotation	2.58	2.57	2.56	2.56	2.52	2.51	2.57	2.56	2.58	2.57
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation and Manure, in Rotation	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
Rice	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.13
Grassland Systems	75.01	74.71	73.96	73.47	73.02	72.70	72.45	72.16	71.82	71.53
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation	3.28	3.25	3.17	3.09	2.98	2.90	2.90	2.81	2.76	2.73
Pasture with Legumes or Irrigation and Manure	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06
Rangelands and Unimproved Pasture	43.43	42.65	42.19	41.96	41.66	41.52	41.32	41.29	41.07	40.87
Rangelands and Unimproved Pasture, Moderately Degraded	20.86	20.84	20.76	20.64	20.69	20.63	20.62	20.52	20.48	20.43
Rangelands and Unimproved Pasture, Severely Degraded	7.36	7.89	7.77	7.70	7.62	7.58	7.54	7.47	7.45	7.43
Total	92.14	91.47	90.53	89.87	89.24	88.83	88.45	88.05	87.60	87.26

Note: In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. Additional data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series for the land use and management data.

Organic soils are categorized into land-use systems based on drainage (IPCC 2006). Undrained soils are treated as having no loss of organic C or soil N₂O emissions. Drained soils are subdivided into those used for cultivated cropland, which are assumed to have high drainage and relatively large losses of C, and those used for managed pasture, which are assumed to have less drainage with smaller losses of C. N₂O emissions are assumed to be similar for both drained croplands and grasslands. Overall, the area of organic soils drained for cropland and grassland has remained relatively stable since 1990 (see Table A-201).

Table A-201: Total Land Areas for Drained Organic Soils by Land Management Category and Climate Region (Million Hectares)

IPCC Land-Use Category for Organic Soils	Land Areas (million ha)													
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Cold Temperate														
Cultivated Cropland (high drainage)	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.43	0.42	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41
Managed Pasture (low drainage)	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.46
Undrained	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
Total	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.90
Warm Temperate														
Cultivated Cropland (high drainage)	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10
Managed Pasture (low drainage)	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11
Undrained	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Total	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.21
Sub-Tropical														
Cultivated Cropland (high drainage)	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.13	0.13	0.24	0.24	0.23
Managed Pasture (low drainage)	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.10
Undrained	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.33

IPCC Land-Use Category for Organic Soils	Land Areas (million ha)								
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Cold Temperate									
Cultivated Cropland (high drainage)	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.41	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41
Managed Pasture (low drainage)	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.45	0.44
Undrained	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02
Total	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.87
Warm Temperate									
Cultivated Cropland (high drainage)	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Managed Pasture (low drainage)	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09

Undrained	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.21	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19
Sub-Tropical									
Cultivated Cropland (high drainage)	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.18	0.18
Managed Pasture (low drainage)	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Undrained	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.03
Total	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32

Note: In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. Additional data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series for the land use and management data.

The harvested area for rice cultivation is estimated from the NRI points based on survey locations classified as flooded rice (Table A-202). Ratoon crops occur in the Southeast with a second season of rice during the year. Ratoon cropping also occurs in Louisiana (LSU 2015 for years 2000 through 2013, 2015) and Texas (TAMU 2015 for years 1993 through 2014), averaging 32 percent and 48 percent of rice acres planted, respectively. Florida also has a large fraction of area with a ratoon crops (45 percent), but ratoon cropping is uncommon in Arkansas occurring on relatively small fraction of fields estimated at about 1 percent. No data are available on ratoon crops in Missouri or Mississippi, and so the amount of ratooning is assumed similar to Arkansas. Ratoon rice crops are not grown in California.

Table A-202: Total Rice Harvested Area Estimated with Tier 1 and 3 Inventory Approaches (Million Hectares)

Year	Land Areas (Million Hectares)		
	Tier 1	Tier 3	Total
1990	0.16	1.54	1.70
1991	0.16	1.60	1.76
1992	0.17	1.67	1.84
1993	0.17	1.63	1.80
1994	0.17	1.53	1.70
1995	0.15	1.56	1.71
1996	0.15	1.56	1.72
1997	0.15	1.52	1.67
1998	0.17	1.43	1.60
1999	0.31	1.49	1.80
2000	0.33	1.51	1.84
2001	0.18	1.44	1.62
2002	0.18	1.60	1.79
2003	0.15	1.47	1.62
2004	0.17	1.53	1.69
2005	0.18	1.65	1.83
2006	0.14	1.33	1.48
2007	0.12	1.45	1.57
2008	0.14	1.27	1.41
2009	0.14	1.57	1.71
2010	0.15	1.61	1.76
2011	0.13	1.32	1.45
2012	0.11	1.18	1.29

Note: In the current Inventory, NRI data only provide land use and management statistics through 2012. Additional data will be incorporated in the future to extend the time series of the land use and management data.

Step 1b: Obtain Management Activity Data for the Tier 3 Method to estimate Soil C Stock Changes, CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Mineral Soils

Synthetic N Fertilizer Application: Data on N fertilizer rates are based primarily on the USDA–Economic Research Service Cropping Practices Survey through 1995 (USDA-ERS 1997), which became the Agricultural Resource Management Surveys (ARMS) in 1996 (USDA-ERS 2015).⁹³ In these surveys, data on inorganic N fertilization rates are collected for crops simulated by DayCent (barley, corn, cotton, dry beans, hay, oats, onions, peanuts, potatoes, rice, sorghum, soybeans, sugar beets, sunflowers, tomatoes, and wheat) in the high production states and for a subset of low production states. These data are used to build a time series of fertilizer application rates for specific crops and states for two periods, 1990 through

⁹³ Available online: <<http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/arms-farm-financial-and-crop-production-practices/arms-data.aspx>>.

1999 and 2000 through 2012. If only a single survey is available for a crop, as is the case with sorghum, the rates for the one survey are used for both time periods.

Mean fertilizer rates and standard deviations for irrigated and rainfed crops are produced for each state. If a state is not surveyed for a particular crop or if there are not enough data to produce a state-level estimate, then data are aggregated to USDA Farm Production Regions in order to estimate a mean and standard deviation for fertilization rates (Farm Production Regions are groups of states in the United States with similar agricultural commodities). If Farm Production Region data are not available, crop data are aggregated to the entire United States (all major states surveyed) to estimate a mean and standard deviation. Standard deviations for fertilizer rates are used to construct PDFs with log-normal densities in order to address uncertainties in application rates (see Step 2a for discussion of uncertainty methods). The survey summaries also present estimates for fraction of crop acres receiving fertilizer, and these fractions are used to determine if a crop is receiving fertilizer. Alfalfa hay and grass-clover hay are assumed to not be fertilized, but grass hay is fertilized according to rates from published farm enterprise budgets (NRIAI 2003). Total fertilizer application data are found in Table A-203.

Simulations are conducted for the period prior to 1990 in order to initialize the DayCent model (see Step 2a), and crop-specific regional fertilizer rates prior to 1990 are based largely on extrapolation/interpolation of fertilizer rates from the years with available data. For crops in some states, little or no data are available, and, therefore, a geographic regional mean is used to simulate N fertilization rates (e.g., no data are available for the State of Alabama during the 1970s and 1980s for corn fertilization rates; therefore, mean values from the southeastern United States are used to simulate fertilization to corn fields in this state).

*Managed Livestock Manure Amendments:*⁹⁴ County-level manure addition estimates have been derived from manure N addition rates developed by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (Edmonds et al. 2003). Working with the farm-level crop and animal data from the 1997 Census of Agriculture, USDA-NRCS has coupled estimates of manure N produced with estimates of manure N recoverability by animal waste management system to produce county-level rates of manure N application to cropland and pasture. Edmonds et al. (2003) defined a hierarchy that included 24 crops, permanent pasture, and cropland used as pasture. They estimated the area amended with manure and application rates in 1997 for both manure-producing farms and manure-receiving farms within a county and for two scenarios—before implementation of Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans (baseline) and after implementation (Edmonds et al. 2003). The goal of nutrient management plans is to apply manure nutrients at a rate meeting plant demand, thus limiting leaching losses of nutrients to groundwater and waterways.

For DayCent simulations, the rates for manure-producing farms and manure-receiving farms have been area-weighted and combined to produce a single county-level estimate for the amount of land amended with manure and the manure N application rate for each crop in each county. The estimates are based on the assumption that Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans have not been fully implemented. This is a conservative assumption because it allows for higher leaching rates due to some over-application of manure to soils. In order to address uncertainty in these data, uniform probability distributions are constructed based on the proportion of land receiving manure versus the amount not receiving manure for each crop type and pasture. For example, if 20 percent of land producing corn in a county is amended with manure, randomly drawing a value equal to or greater than 0 and less than 20 would lead to a simulation with a manure amendment, while drawing a value greater than or equal to 20 and less than 100 would lead to no amendment in the simulation (see Step 2a for further discussion of uncertainty methods).

Edmonds et al. (2003) only provides manure application rate data for 1997, but the amount of managed manure available for soil application changes annually, so the area amended with manure is adjusted relative to 1997 to account for all the manure available for application in other years. Specifically, the manure N available for application in other years is divided by the manure N available in 1997. If the ratio is greater than 1, there is more manure N available in that county relative to the amount in 1997, and so it is assumed a larger area is amended with manure. In contrast, ratios less than one imply less area is amended with manure because there is a lower amount available in the year compared to 1997. The amendment area in each county for 1997 is multiplied by the ratio to reflect the impact of manure N availability on the area amended. The amount of managed manure N available for application to soils is calculated by determining the populations of livestock on feedlots or otherwise housed, requiring collection and management of the manure. The methods are described in the Manure Management section (Section 5.2) and annex (Annex 3.10). The total managed manure N applied to soils is found in Table A-204.

To estimate C inputs (associated with manure N application rates derived from Edmonds et al. (2003), carbon-nitrogen (C:N) ratios for livestock-specific manure types are adapted from the Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook (USDA

⁹⁴ For the Inventory, total livestock manure is divided into two general categories: (1) managed manure, and (2) unmanaged manure. Managed manure includes manure stored in management systems such as drylots, pits and lagoons, as well as manure applied to soils through daily spread manure operations. Unmanaged manure encompasses all manure deposited on soils by animals on PRP.

1996), On-Farm Composting Handbook (NRAES 1992), and recoverability factors provided by Edmonds et al (2003). The C:N ratios are applied to county-level estimates of manure N excreted by animal type and management system to produce a weighted county average C:N ratio for manure amendments. The average C:N ratio is used to determine the associated C input for crop amendments derived from Edmonds et al. (2003).

To account for the common practice of reducing inorganic N fertilizer inputs when manure is added to a cropland soil, crop-specific reduction factors are derived from mineral fertilization data for land amended with manure versus land not amended with manure in the ERS 1995 Cropping Practices Survey (USDA-ERS 1997). Mineral N fertilization rates are reduced for crops receiving manure N based on a fraction of the amount of manure N applied, depending on the crop and whether it is irrigated or rainfed. The reduction factors are randomly selected from PDFs with normal densities in order to address uncertainties in the dependence between manure amendments and mineral fertilizer application.

PRP Manure N: Another key source of N for grasslands is PRP manure N deposition (i.e., manure deposited by grazing livestock on pasture, range or paddock). The total amount of PRP manure N is estimated using methods described in the Manure Management section (Section 5.2) and annex (Annex 3.10). Nitrogen from PRP animal waste deposited on non-federal grasslands in a county is generated by multiplying the total PRP N (based on animal type and population data in a county) by the fraction of non-federal grassland area in the county. PRP manure N input rates for the Tier 3 DayCent simulations are estimated by dividing the total PRP manure N amount by the land area associated with non-federal grasslands in the county from the NRI survey data. The total PRP manure N added to soils is found in Table A-204.

Residue N Inputs: Crop residue N, fixation by legumes, and N residue inputs from senesced grass litter are included as sources of N to the soil, and are estimated in the DayCent simulations as a function of vegetation type, weather, and soil properties. That is, while the model accounts for the contribution of N from crop residues to the soil profile and subsequent N₂O emissions, this source of mineral soil N is not “activity data” as it is not a model input. The simulated total N inputs of above- and below-ground residue N and fixed N, which are not harvested or burned (the DayCent simulations assumed that 3 percent of non-harvested above ground residues for crops are burned),⁹⁵ are provided in Table A-205.

Other N Inputs: Other N inputs are estimated within the DayCent simulation, and thus input data are not required, including mineralization from decomposition of soil organic matter and asymbiotic fixation of N from the atmosphere. Mineralization of soil organic matter will also include the effect of land use change on this process as recommended by the IPCC (2006). The influence of additional inputs of N are estimated in the simulations so that there is full accounting of all emissions from managed lands, as recommended by the IPCC (2006). The simulated N input from residues, soil organic matter mineralization and asymbiotic N fixation are provided in Table A-205.

Tillage Practices: Tillage practices are grouped into 3 categories: full, reduced, and no-tillage. Full tillage is defined as multiple tillage operations every year, including significant soil inversion (e.g., plowing, deep disking) and low surface residue coverage. This definition corresponds to the intensive tillage and “reduced” tillage systems as defined by CTIC (2004). No-till is defined as not disturbing the soil except through the use of fertilizer and seed drills and where no-till is applied to all crops in the rotation. Reduced tillage made up the remainder of the cultivated area, including mulch tillage and ridge tillage as defined by CTIC and intermittent no-till. The specific tillage implements and applications used for different crops, rotations, and regions to represent the three tillage classes are derived from the 1995 Cropping Practices Survey by the Economic Research Service (USDA-ERS 1997).

Tillage practices are estimated for each cropping system based on data from the Conservation Technology Information Center⁹⁶ (CTIC 2004). CTIC compiles data on cropland area under five tillage classes by major crop species and year for each county. Because the surveys involve county-level aggregate area, they do not fully characterize tillage practices as they are applied within a management sequence (e.g., crop rotation). This is particularly true for area estimates of cropland under no-till. These estimates include a relatively high proportion of “intermittent” no-till, where no-till in one year may be followed by tillage in a subsequent year. For example, a common practice in maize-soybean rotations is to use tillage in the maize crop while no-till is used for soybean, such that no-till practices are not continuous in time. Estimates of the area under continuous no-till are provided by experts at CTIC to account for intermittent tillage activity and its impact on soil C (Towery 2001).

Tillage data are further processed to construct PDFs. Transitions between tillage systems are based on observed county-level changes in the frequency distribution of the area under full, reduced, and no-till from the 1980s through 2004. Generally, the fraction of full tillage decreased during this time span, with concomitant increases in reduced till and no-till management.

⁹⁵ Another improvement is to reconcile the amount of crop residues burned with the Field Burning of Agricultural Residues source category (Section 5.5).

⁹⁶ National scale tillage data are no longer collected by CTIC, and a new data source will be needed, which is a planned improvement.

Transitions that are modeled and applied to NRI points occurring within a county are full tillage to reduced and no-till, and reduced tillage to no-till. The remaining amount of cropland is assumed to have no change in tillage (e.g., full tillage remained in full tillage). Transition matrices are constructed from CTIC data to represent tillage changes for three time periods, 1980 through 1989, 1990 through 1999, 2000 through 2012. Areas in each of the three tillage classes—full till (FT), reduced till (RT), no-till (NT)—in 1989 (the first year the CTIC data are available) are used for the first time period, data from 1997 are used for the second time period, and data from 2004 are used for the last time period. Percentage areas of cropland in each county are calculated for each possible transition (e.g., FT→FT, FT→RT, FT→NT, RT→RT, RT→NT) to obtain a probability for each tillage transition at an NRI point. It is assumed that there are no transitions for NT→FT or NT→NT after accounting for NT systems that have intermittent tillage. Uniform probability distributions are established for each tillage scenario in the county. For example, a particular crop rotation had 80 percent chance of remaining in full tillage over the two decades, a 15 percent chance of a transition from full to reduced tillage and a 5 percent chance of a transition from full to no-till. The uniform distribution is subdivided into three segments with random draws in the Monte Carlo simulation (discussed in Step 2b) leading to full tillage over the entire time period if the value is greater than or equal to 0 and less than 80, a transition from full to reduced till if the random draw is equal to or greater than 80 and less than 95, or a transition from full to no-till if the draw is greater than or equal to 95. See step 2b for additional discussion of the uncertainty analysis.

Irrigation: NRI (USDA-NRCS 2015) differentiates between irrigated and non-irrigated land, but does not provide more detailed information on the type and intensity of irrigation. Hence, irrigation is modeled by assuming that applied water to field capacity with intervals between irrigation events where the soils drain to about 60 percent of field capacity.

Daily Weather Data: Daily maximum/minimum temperature and precipitation data are based on gridded weather data from the PRISM Climate Group (2015). It is necessary to use computer-generated weather data because weather station data do not exist near all NRI points. The PRISM product uses this information with interpolation algorithms to derive weather patterns for areas between these stations (Daly et al. 1998). PRISM weather data are available for the United States from 1981 through 2012 at a 4 km resolution. Each NRI point is assigned the PRISM weather data for the grid cell containing the point.

Enhanced Vegetation Index: The Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI) from the MODIS vegetation products, (MOD13Q1 and MYD13Q1) is an input to DayCent for estimating net primary production using the NASA-CASA production algorithm (Potter et al. 1993, 2007). MODIS imagery is collected on a nominal 8 day-time frequency when combining the two products. A best approximation of the daily time series of EVI data is derived using a smoothing process based on the Savitzky-Golay Filter (Savitzky and Golay 1964) after pre-screening for outliers and for cloud-free, high quality data as identified in the MODIS data product quality layer. The NASA-CASA production algorithm is only used for the following crops: corn, soybeans, sorghum, cotton, wheat and other close-grown crops such as barley and oats.⁹⁷

The MODIS EVI products have a 250 m spatial resolution, and some pixels in images have mixed land uses and crop types at this resolution, which is problematic for estimating NPP associated with a specific crop at a NRI point. Therefore, a threshold of 90 percent purity in an individual pixel is the cutoff for estimating NPP using the EVI data derived from the imagery (i.e., pixels with less than 90 percent purity for a crop are assumed to generate bias in the resulting NPP estimates). The USDA-NASS Crop Data Layer (CDL) (Johnson and Mueller 2010) is used to determine the purity levels of the EVI data. CDL data have a 30 to 58 m spatial resolution, depending on the year. The level of purity for individual pixels in the MODIS EVI products is determined by aggregating the crop cover data in CDL to the 250m resolution of the EVI data. In this step, the percent cover of individual crops is determined for the 250m EVI pixels. Pixels that did not meet a 90 percent purity level for any crop are eliminated from the dataset. CDL does not provide full coverage for crop maps across the conterminous United States until 2009 so it is not possible to evaluate purity for the entire cropland area prior to 2009. The nearest pixel with at least 90 percent purity for a crop is assigned to the NRI point based on a 10 km buffer surrounding the survey location. EVI data are not assigned to a point if there are no pixels with at least 90 percent purity within the 10 km buffer. In these cases, production is simulated with a single value for the maximum daily NPP, which is reduced if there is water, temperature or nutrient stress affecting the plants growth.

Water Management for Rice Cultivation: Rice crop production in the United States is mostly managed with continuous flooding, but does include a minor amount of land with mid-season drainage or alternate wet-dry periods (Hardke 2015; UCCE 2015; Hollier 1999; Way et al. 2014). However, continuous flooding is applied to all rice cultivation areas in the inventory because water management data are not available. Winter flooding is another key practice associated with water management in rice fields. Winter flooding occurs on 34 percent of rice fields in California (Miller et al. 2010; Fleskes et al. 2005), and approximately 21 percent of the fields in Arkansas (Wilson and Branson 2005 and 2006; Wilson and Runsick 2007 and 2008; Wilson et al. 2009 and 2010; Hardke and Wilson 2013 and 2014; Hardke 2015). No data are available on

⁹⁷ Additional crops and grassland will be used with the NASA-CASA method in the future, as a planned improvement.

winter flooding for Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Missouri, or Mississippi. For these states, the average amount of flooding is assumed to be similar to Arkansas. In addition, the amount of winter flooding is assumed to be relatively constant over the Inventory time period.

Organic Amendments for Rice Cultivation: Rice straw is not typically harvested from fields in the United States. The C input from rice straw is simulated directly within the DayCent model for the Tier 3 method. For the Tier 1 method, residues are assumed to be left on the field for more than 30 days prior to cultivation and flooding for the next crop, with the exception of ratoon crops, which are assumed to have residues on the field for less than 30 days prior to the second crop in the season. To estimate the amount of rice straw, crop yield data (except rice in Florida) are compiled from USDA NASS QuickStats (USDA 2015). Rice yield data are not collected by USDA for the state of Florida, and so are derived based on NRI crop areas and average primary and ratoon rice yields from Deren (2002). Relative proportions of ratoon crops are derived from information in several publications (Schueneman 1997, 1999, 2000, 2001; Deren 2002; Kirstein 2003, 2004, 2006; Cantens 2004, 2005; Gonzalez 2007 through 2014). The yields are multiplied by residue:crop product ratios from Strehler and Stützel (1987), to estimate rice straw input amounts for the Tier 1 method.

Soil Properties: Soil texture and natural drainage capacity (i.e., hydric vs. non-hydric soil characterization) are the main soil variables used as input to the DayCent model. Texture is one of the main controls on soil C turnover and stabilization in the DayCent model, which uses particle size fractions of sand (50-2,000 μm), silt (2-50 μm), and clay (<2 μm) as inputs. Hydric condition are poorly-drained, and hence prone to have a high water table for part of the year in their native (pre-cultivation) condition. Non-hydric soils are moderately to well-drained.⁹⁸ Poorly drained soils can be subject to anaerobic (lack of oxygen) conditions if water inputs (precipitation and irrigation) exceed water losses from drainage and evapotranspiration. Depending on moisture conditions, hydric soils can range from being fully aerobic to completely anaerobic, varying over the year. Decomposition rates are modified according to a linear function that varies from 0.3 under completely anaerobic conditions to 1.0 under fully aerobic conditions (default parameters in DayCent).⁹⁹ Other soil characteristics needed in the simulation, such as field capacity and wilting-point water contents, are estimated from soil texture data using a standardized hydraulic properties calculator (Saxton et al. 1986). Soil input data are derived from Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO) (Soil Survey Staff 2015). The data are based on field measurements collected as part of soil survey and mapping. Each NRI point is assigned the dominant soil component in the polygon containing the point from the SSURGO data product.

Step 1c: Obtain Additional Management Activity Data for the Tier 1 Method to estimate Soil N₂O Emissions from Mineral Soils

Synthetic N Fertilizer: A process-of-elimination approach is used to estimate synthetic N fertilizer additions to crops in the Tier 1 method. The total amount of fertilizer used on-farms has been estimated by the USGS from 1990 through 2001 on a county scale from fertilizer sales data (Ruddy et al. 2006). For 2002 through 2012, county-level fertilizer used on-farms is adjusted based on annual fluctuations in total U.S. fertilizer sales (AAPFCO 1995 through 2007; AAPFCO 2008 through 2012). The fertilizer consumption data are recorded in “fertilizer year” totals, (i.e., July to June), but are converted to calendar year totals. This is done by assuming that approximately 35 percent of fertilizer usage occurred from July to December and 65 percent from January to June (TVA 1992b). Fertilizer application data are available for crops and grasslands simulated by DayCent (discussed in Step 1a section for Tier 3). Thus, the amount of N applied to crops in the Tier 1 method (i.e., not simulated by DayCent) is assumed to be the remainder of the fertilizer used on farms after subtracting the amount applied to crops and non-federal grasslands simulated by DayCent. The differences are aggregated to the state level, and PDFs are derived based on uncertainties in the amount of N applied to crops and non-federal grasslands for the Tier 3 method. Total fertilizer application to crops in the Tier 1 method is found in Table A-206.

Managed Livestock Manure and Other Organic Amendments: Manure N that is not applied to crops and grassland simulated by DayCent is assumed to be applied to other crops that are included in the Tier 1 method. Estimates of total national annual N additions from other commercial organic fertilizers are derived from organic fertilizer statistics (TVA 1991 through 1994; AAPFCO 1995 through 2016). Commercial organic fertilizers include dried blood, tankage, compost, and other; dried manure and biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) that are used as commercial fertilizer are subtracted from totals to avoid double counting. The dried manure N is counted with the non-commercial manure applications, and biosolids is assumed to be applied only to grasslands. The organic fertilizer data, which are recorded in mass units of fertilizer, had to be converted to mass units of N by multiplying the consumption values by the average organic fertilizer N content of 0.5 percent (AAPFCO 2000). Similar to the data for synthetic fertilizers described above, the organic fertilizer consumption data are recorded in “fertilizer year” totals, (i.e., July to June), but are converted to calendar year totals. This is done by assuming that approximately 35 percent of fertilizer usage occurred from July to December and 65 percent from January to June (TVA

⁹⁸ Artificial drainage (e.g., ditch- or tile-drainage) is simulated as a management variable.

⁹⁹ Hydric soils are primarily subject to anaerobic conditions outside the plant growing season, such as late winter or early spring prior to planting. Soils that are flooded during much of the year are typically classified as organic soils (e.g., peat), which are not simulated with the DayCent model.

1992b). PDFs are derived for the organic fertilizer applications assuming a default ± 50 percent uncertainty. Annual consumption of other organic fertilizers is presented in Table A-207. The fate of manure N is summarized in Table A-204.

PRP Manure N: Soil N_2O emissions from PRP manure N deposited on federal grasslands are estimated with a Tier 1 method. PRP manure N data are derived using methods described in the Manure Management section (Section 5.2) and Annex 3.10. PRP N deposited on federal grasslands is calculated using a process of elimination approach. The amount of PRP N generated by DayCent model simulations of non-federal grasslands was subtracted from total PRP N and this difference was assumed to be applied to federal grasslands. The total PRP manure N added to soils is found in Table A-204.

Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge) Amendments: Biosolids is generated from the treatment of raw sewage in public or private wastewater treatment works and is typically used as a soil amendment, or is sent to waste disposal facilities, such as landfills. In this Inventory, all biosolids that are amended to agricultural soils are assumed to be applied to grasslands. Estimates of the amounts of biosolids N applied to agricultural lands are derived from national data on biosolids generation, disposition, and N content. Total biosolids generation data for 1990 through 2004, in dry mass units, are obtained from AAPFCO (1995 through 2004). Values for 2005 through 2016 were not available so a “least squares line” statistical extrapolation using the previous 16 years of data was used to arrive at an approximate value. The total sludge generation estimates are then converted to units of N by applying an average N content of 69 percent (AAPFCO 2000), and disaggregated into use and disposal practices using historical data in EPA (1993) and NEBRA (2007). The use and disposal practices are agricultural land application, other land application, surface disposal, incineration, landfiling, ocean dumping (ended in 1992), and other disposal methods. The resulting estimates of biosolids N applied to agricultural land are used to estimate N_2O emissions from agricultural soil management; the estimates of biosolids N applied to other land and surface-disposed are used in estimating N_2O fluxes from soils in *Settlements Remaining Settlements* (see Section 6.9 of the Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter). Biosolids disposal data are provided in Table A-208.

Residue N Inputs: Soil N_2O emissions for residue N inputs from croplands that are not simulated by DayCent are estimated with a Tier 1 method. Annual crop production statistics for all major commodity and specialty crops are taken from U.S. Department of Agriculture crop production reports (USDA-NASS 2015). Total production for each crop is converted to tons of dry matter product using the residue dry matter fractions shown in Table A-209. Dry matter yield is then converted to tonnes of above- and below-ground biomass N. Above-ground biomass is calculated by using linear equations to estimate above-ground biomass given dry matter crop yields, and below-ground biomass is calculated by multiplying above-ground biomass by the below-to-above-ground biomass ratio. N inputs are estimated by multiplying above- and below-ground biomass by respective N concentrations and by the portion of cropland that was not simulated by DayCent. All ratios and equations used to calculate residue N inputs are from IPCC (2006) and Williams (2006). PDFs are derived assuming a ± 50 percent uncertainty in the yield estimates (USDA-NASS does not provide uncertainty), along with uncertainties provided by the IPCC (2006) for dry matter fractions, above-ground residue, ratio of below-ground to above-ground biomass, and residue N fractions. The resulting annual residue N inputs are presented in Table A-210.

Step 1d: Obtain Additional Management Activity Data for the Tier 2 Method to estimate Soil C Stock Changes in Mineral Soils

Tillage Practices: For the Tier 2 method that is used to estimate soil organic C stock changes, PDFs are constructed for the CTIC tillage data (CTIC 2004) as bivariate normal on a log-ratio scale to reflect negative dependence among tillage classes. This structure ensured that simulated tillage percentages are non-negative and summed to 100 percent. CTIC data do not differentiate between continuous and intermittent use of no-tillage, which is important for estimating SOC storage. Thus, regionally based estimates for continuous no-tillage (defined as 5 or more years of continuous use) are modified based on consultation with CTIC experts, as discussed in Step 1a (downward adjustment of total no-tillage area based on the amount of no-tillage that is rotated with more intensive tillage practices) (Towery 2001).

Managed Livestock Manure Amendments: USDA provides information on the amount of land amended with manure for 1997 based on manure production data and field-scale surveys detailing application rates that had been collected in the *Census of Agriculture* (Edmonds et al. 2003). Similar to the DayCent model discussion in Step 1b, the amount of land receiving manure is based on the estimates provided by Edmonds et al. (2003), as a proportion of crop and grassland amended with manure within individual climate regions. The resulting proportions are used to re-classify a portion of crop and grassland into a new management category. Specifically, a portion of medium input cropping systems is re-classified as high input, and a portion of the high input systems is re-classified as high input with amendment. In grassland systems, the estimated proportions for land amended with manure are used to re-classify a portion of nominally-managed grassland as improved, and a portion of improved grassland as improved with high input. These classification approaches are consistent with the IPCC inventory methodology (IPCC 2006). Uncertainties in the amount of land amended with manure are based on the sample variance at the climate region scale, assuming normal density PDFs (i.e., variance of the climate region estimates, which are derived from county-scale proportions).

1 *Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge) Amendments:* Biosolids are generated from the treatment of raw sewage in public or private
2 wastewater treatment facilities and are typically used as a soil amendment or is sent for waste disposal to landfills. In this
3 Inventory, all biosolids that are amended to agricultural soils are assumed to be applied to grasslands. See section on
4 biosolids in Step 1c for more information about the methods used to derive biosolids N estimates. The total amount of
5 biosolids N is given in Table A-208. Biosolids N is assumed to be applied at the assimilative capacity provided in Kellogg
6 et al. (2000), which is the amount of nutrients taken up by a crop and removed at harvest, representing the recommended
7 application rate for manure amendments. This capacity varies from year to year, because it is based on specific crop yields
8 during the respective year (Kellogg et al. 2000). Total biosolids N available for application is divided by the assimilative
9 capacity to estimate the total land area over which biosolids had been applied. The resulting estimates are used for the
10 estimation of soil C stock change.

11 *Wetland Reserve:* Wetlands enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program have been restored in the Northern Prairie Pothole
12 Region through the Partners for Wildlife Program funded by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS 2010). The area
13 of restored wetlands is estimated from contract agreements (Euliss and Gleason 2002). While the contracts provide
14 reasonable estimates of the amount of land restored in the region, they do not provide the information necessary to estimate
15 uncertainty. Consequently, a ± 50 percent range is used to construct the PDFs for the uncertainty analysis.

Table A-203: Synthetic Fertilizer N Added to Tier 3 Crops (kt N)

	1990	1991	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Fertilizer N	9,681	9,571	9,750	9,742	9,620	9,343	9,697	9,532	9,546	9,570	9,565	9,689	9,465	10,263	9,850	9,755	9,912	9,935	10,101

Note: The latter part of the time series in this Inventory is estimated with data splicing methods. Additional activity data will be collected and the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-204: Fate of Livestock Manure Nitrogen (kt N)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Managed Manure N Applied to Tier 3 Cropland and Non-federal Grasslands ^{a, b}	819	812	834	857	789	739	773	784	794	965	977	953	972	956	917	929	917	979	937	988	1,015	1,015	1,026
Managed Manure N Applied to Tier 1 Cropland ^c	1,311	1,350	1,341	1,288	1,402	1,484	1,446	1,467	1,429	1,302	1,330	1,335	1,358	1,382	1,327	1,359	1,449	1,420	1,421	1,338	1,298	1,319	1,320
Managed Manure N Applied to Grasslands	404	400	396	411	435	428	424	423	482	463	467	478	480	484	506	502	502	497	497	497	494	490	482
Pasture, Range, & Paddock Manure N	4,097	4,104	4,265	4,354	4,427	4,529	4,493	4,382	4,327	4,255	4,150	4,137	4,134	4,132	4,081	4,124	4,168	4,051	4,036	4,025	3,998	3,924	3,862
Total	6,631	6,666	6,836	6,911	7,054	7,180	7,136	7,055	7,032	6,985	6,924	6,903	6,943	6,954	6,830	6,914	7,036	6,946	6,891	6,849	6,806	6,748	6,690

^a Accounts for N volatilized and leached/runoff during treatment, storage and transport before soil application.

^b Includes managed manure and daily spread manure amendments

^c Totals may not sum exactly due to rounding.

Note: The latter part of the time series in this Inventory is estimated with data splicing methods. Additional activity data will be collected and the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-205: Crop Residue N and Other N Inputs to Tier 3 Crops as Simulated by DayCent (kt N)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Residue N ^a	3,880	4,105	3,722	4,051	3,741	4,183	3,934	3,967	3,891	4,604	4,222	4,199	4,204	4,303	3,954	4,218	4,082	4,171	3,969	4,072	4,484	4,426	4,369
Mineralization & Asymbiotic Fixation	11,962	11,401	11,469	12,313	11,470	12,122	11,767	11,892	13,247	11,891	12,151	12,752	12,151	12,834	13,909	12,738	12,627	13,111	13,175	13,789	14,334	12,752	11,646

^a Residue N inputs include unharvested fixed N from legumes as well as crop residue N.

Note: The latter part of the time series in this Inventory is estimated with data splicing methods. Additional activity data will be collected and the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-206: Synthetic Fertilizer N Added to Tier 1 Crops (kt N)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Fertilizer N	1,291	1,308	1,232	1,137	2,007	1,496	1,865	1,699	1,807	2,042	1,734	1,271	1,438	1,716	1,872	1,489	1,755	1,584	1,453	1,212	1,433	1,815	2,017

Note: The latter part of the time series in this Inventory is estimated with data splicing methods. Additional activity data will be collected and the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-207: Other Organic Commercial Fertilizer Consumption on Agricultural Lands (kt N)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Other Commercial Organic Fertilizer N ^a	4	8	6	5	8	10	13	14	12	11	9	7	8	8	9	10	12	15	12	10	10	12	13

^a Includes dried blood, tankage, compost, other. Excludes dried manure and biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) used as commercial fertilizer to avoid double counting.

Note: The latter part of the time series in this Inventory is estimated with data splicing methods. Additional activity data will be collected and the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-208: Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge) Nitrogen by Disposal Practice (kt N)

Disposal Practice	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Applied to Agricultural Soils	52	55	58	62	65	68	72	75	78	81	84	86	89	91	94	98	101	104	107	110	113	116	119	122	124	127	130
Other Land Application	25	26	26	27	27	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	31	31	32	32	32	32	33	33	33	33	33	34
Surface Disposal	20	19	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	10	9	8	6	5	5	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1
Total	97	100	104	107	109	111	116	118	121	122	124	125	127	128	130	134	137	140	142	145	148	151	153	156	159	162	165

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-209: Key Assumptions for Crop Production in the Tier 1 Method

Crop	Dry Matter Fraction of Harvested Product	Above-ground Residue		Ratio of Below-ground Residue to Above-ground Biomass	Residue N Fraction	
		Slope	Intercept		Above-ground	Below-ground
Alfalfa	0.9	0.29	0	0.4	0.027	0.019
Asparagus	0.07	0.5	0	0.2	0.006	0.009
Barley	0.89	0.98	0.59	0.22	0.007	0.014
Beans and Lentils	0.9	0.36	0.68	0.19	0.01	0.01
Broccoli	0.09	0.1	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Cabbage	0.08	0.1	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Carrots	0.13	0.46	0.02	0.15	0.019	0.014
Cauliflower	0.08	0.1	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Celery	0.05	0.23	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Corn	0.87	1.03	0.61	0.22	0.006	0.007
Corn for silage	0.3	0.3	0	0.22	0.006	0.007
Cotton	0.93	1.49	4.41	0.13	0.012	0.007
Cucumbers	0.04	1.77	0	0.03	0.006	0.009
Flaxseed	0.88	1.09	0.88	0.22	0.006	0.009
Garlic	0.11	0.23	0	0.15	0.019	0.014
Greens	0.08	0.1	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Hay Grass	0.9	0.18	0	0.54	0.015	0.012
Hay legume	0.9	0.235	0	0.47	0.021	0.0155
Lettuce Head	0.04	0.1	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Lettuce Leaf	0.04	0.1	0	0.11	0.006	0.009
Melons Cantaloup	0.06	1.77	0	0.04	0.006	0.009
Melons Honeydew	0.06	1.77	0	0.04	0.006	0.009
Melons Watermelon	0.085	1.77	0	0.04	0.006	0.009
Millet	0.88	1.09	0.88	0.22	0.006	0.009
Oats	0.89	0.91	0.89	0.25	0.007	0.008
Onions	0.12	0.23	0	0.14	0.019	0.014
Other Vegetables	0.05	0.59	0.57	0.19	0.006	0.009
Peanuts	0.94	1.07	1.54	0.2	0.016	0.014
Peas	0.91	1.13	0.85	0.05	0.011	0.008
Peppers	0.08	1.4	0	0.14	0.006	0.009
Potatoes	0.22	0.1	1.06	0.2	0.019	0.014
Pumpkins	0.1	1.77	0	0.04	0.006	0.009
Radishes	0.05	1.21	0.46	0.15	0.019	0.014
Rice	0.89	0.95	2.46	0.16	0.007	0.009
Sorghum Grain	0.89	0.88	1.33	0.22	0.007	0.006
Sorghum for silage	0.3	0.3	0	0.22	0.007	0.006
Soybeans	0.91	0.93	1.35	0.19	0.008	0.008
Squash	0.05	1.57	0	0.04	0.006	0.009
Sugar beets	0.22	0.1	1.06	0.2	0.019	0.014
Sugarcane	0.25	0.41	0	0.16	0.007	0.005
Sunflower	0.88	1.09	0.88	0.22	0.006	0.009
Sweet Potatoes	0.35	0.27	1.74	0.15	0.019	0.014
Tobacco	0.87	0.3	0	0.4	0.008	0.018
Tomatoes	0.05	0.59	0.57	0.19	0.006	0.009
Wheat	0.89	1.51	0.52	0.24	0.006	0.009

Table A-210: Nitrogen in Crop Residues Retained on Soils Producing Crops Not Simulated by DayCent (kt N)

Crop Type	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Alfalfa	83,273	71,670	62,572	68,216	72,375	72,238	62,135	58,522	72,454	67,821	62,386
Asparagus	7	15	5	5	7	6	5	16	13	8	11
Barley	7,202	6,493	8,095	6,897	5,438	7,046	4,574	5,699	4,060	3,817	3,745
Beans and Lentils	1,988	2,087	1,905	1,941	2,086	2,157	2,217	2,169	2,383	2,083	1,795
Broccoli	6	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	1	1	36
Cabbage	76	89	73	71	48	59	77	91	70	72	28
Carrots	1,653	1,406	1,354	1,505	1,734	1,767	1,610	1,859	1,322	1,853	1,376
Cauliflower	6	1	0	1	2	3	3	3	1	4	9

Celery	164	164	160	171	172	175	169	167	152	150	208
Corn	157,085	140,273	163,074	116,107	152,485	120,853	132,009	129,618	128,842	119,312	117,803
Corn for silage	6,044	6,040	6,065	5,686	5,680	5,169	5,207	5,810	5,152	5,366	5,241
Cotton	44,527	44,892	42,250	45,751	48,029	54,878	55,629	52,605	40,598	44,643	38,834
Cucumbers	108	107	77	132	90	104	89	82	96	41	17
Flaxseed	9,109	10,390	11,706	8,780	10,272	9,141	9,346	9,263	10,024	8,286	8,895
Garlic	260	367	310	265	249	226	259	191	493	617	475
Greens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Hay Grass	47,058	46,868	47,621	46,389	49,742	47,119	42,954	42,977	41,591	39,399	37,948
Hay legume	49,609	46,763	45,714	47,095	47,296	45,540	39,727	39,074	39,119	35,655	32,621
Lettuce Head	26	26	36	37	34	30	22	17	11	12	11
Lettuce Leaf	25	32	26	22	22	20	17	26	26	33	21
Melons											
Cantaloup	498	427	436	397	422	518	472	391	346	461	333
Melons											
Honeydew	293	273	278	287	275	204	254	166	170	263	181
Melons											
Watermelon	2,100	2,026	1,976	2,082	2,126	2,009	2,093	2,050	2,195	2,492	2,768
Millet	159,271	166,193	168,344	160,264	157,997	157,691	154,741	155,367	145,258	144,807	101,557
Oats	3,804	2,827	2,522	2,831	2,690	2,431	1,911	2,352	1,933	1,183	2,022
Onions	607	708	615	739	661	735	821	650	661	926	608
Other											
Vegetables	3,450	3,231	3,284	3,181	2,805	2,637	3,038	2,603	2,295	2,185	2,926
Peanuts	13,828	15,423	14,802	12,379	15,090	12,005	10,851	13,080	11,464	10,669	9,060
Peas	3,066	3,333	3,466	3,705	3,233	4,523	2,825	3,859	3,498	3,244	3,168
Peppers	214	284	257	276	311	291	399	384	440	364	606
Potatoes	4,907	5,921	5,233	4,945	5,392	5,051	5,620	4,266	4,348	4,317	4,045
Pumpkins	238	254	244	265	246	290	293	267	130	95	168
Radishes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Rice	9,659	9,199	9,170	9,214	10,496	8,712	9,712	9,028	10,687	17,999	20,037
Sorghum Grain	5,348	4,588	5,361	3,883	3,553	2,936	3,462	2,503	2,698	2,311	2,272
Sorghum for silage	218	236	282	252	179	211	225	187	168	167	121
Soybeans	70,073	67,980	63,414	57,642	66,042	52,916	56,572	51,691	55,228	50,664	50,411
Squash	97	56	56	70	87	103	105	111	92	70	149
Sugar beets	6,277	6,482	7,213	6,166	7,228	6,084	4,504	4,486	3,420	3,934	4,749
Sugarcane	19,061	18,530	17,444	16,158	14,347	12,147	13,280	12,690	12,663	14,968	15,376
Sunflower	654	434	713	649	680	523	465	429	733	1,243	750
Sweet Potatoes	2,432	2,739	3,102	3,085	2,891	2,860	3,410	3,540	1,695	1,459	3,079
Tobacco	3,450	2,546	2,174	2,051	2,332	1,941	1,903	2,216	1,753	1,365	1,257
Tomatoes	2,567	2,623	2,840	2,856	3,010	3,016	3,004	2,127	3,039	4,321	2,982
Wheat	42,145	32,638	40,295	38,640	33,911	31,264	33,943	33,578	31,322	25,797	29,723
Total	762,484	726,638	744,564	681,091	731,766	677,633	669,956	656,211	642,645	624,478	569,854

1

Crop Type	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Alfalfa	62,642	62,504	57,362	56,258	52,225	53,611	53,721	49,848	49,151	48,496	45,641
Asparagus	14	15	8	23	18	13	20	9	6	7	12
Barley	2,152	2,931	2,119	3,561	1,634	1,928	1,814	2,353	3,387	3,464	3,183
Beans and Lentils	1,788	2,389	1,967	1,421	2,204	2,234	2,224	2,130	2,245	2,499	3,086
Broccoli	8	1	6	0	3	2	1	10	0	2	8
Cabbage	55	60	40	26	24	38	55	79	36	53	41
Carrots	2,053	3,012	2,011	1,640	654	1,330	450	1,145	919	1,207	2,530
Cauliflower	2	4	4	0	5	0	0	5	1	0	5
Celery	287	445	403	693	632	630	731	718	640	43	47
Corn	114,825	101,695	110,754	125,805	112,545	113,901	129,388	123,378	131,972	118,018	119,829
Corn for silage	4,943	4,644	4,747	4,595	4,016	3,862	4,874	4,136	3,148	3,369	3,682
Cotton	47,280	42,225	46,101	39,763	45,836	44,746	34,876	31,812	29,707	34,049	40,214
Cucumbers	5	36	52	76	30	29	17	15	0	0	23

Flaxseed	7,615	6,205	6,483	4,995	5,662	4,742	4,537	4,019	5,333	4,880	3,771
Garlic	592	296	338	367	407	497	331	351	338	66	101
Greens	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hay Grass	35,074	33,468	35,766	35,552	31,241	28,897	30,394	29,387	28,696	27,765	26,698
Hay legume	31,120	29,950	30,343	28,541	26,310	24,668	24,915	24,415	24,724	23,527	22,687
Lettuce Head	7	9	34	16	23	43	68	55	58	206	79
Lettuce Leaf	23	46	8	17	21	4	12	20	3	0	9
Melons											
Cantaloup	661	419	442	448	406	263	419	322	281	1,006	616
Melons											
Honeydew	87	143	113	141	73	64	50	18	0	6	37
Melons											
Watermelon	3,666	3,345	3,642	4,521	3,676	3,733	4,176	4,835	4,479	2,593	4,891
Millet	139,408	79,101	92,480	104,170	109,375	95,290	124,607	122,910	126,667	121,519	108,278
Oats	1,716	1,667	1,658	1,721	2,019	1,540	1,584	1,732	2,073	1,868	1,305
Onions	573	621	711	1,067	771	808	860	985	1,013	1,046	1,579
Other Vegetables	2,552	2,748	2,622	2,767	2,993	2,574	3,052	2,453	2,512	952	1,022
Peanuts	12,198	10,447	11,961	14,464	13,977	10,533	12,173	12,259	10,775	12,284	11,419
Peas	5,793	4,706	4,646	6,401	5,336	4,253	4,981	4,137	5,594	4,779	3,523
Peppers	677	665	688	660	504	569	564	673	665	641	550
Potatoes	3,857	5,357	4,765	4,557	4,874	6,515	4,524	4,918	4,982	4,279	5,589
Pumpkins	131	194	206	259	219	196	200	291	188	974	877
Radishes	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rice	12,505	12,280	10,362	11,660	11,741	10,078	8,815	9,487	10,804	10,807	9,220
Sorghum Grain	1,810	1,357	1,633	1,727	1,324	946	2,017	1,508	688	1,019	1,032
Sorghum for silage	76	130	193	133	195	175	205	115	220	173	76
Soybeans	49,766	49,052	43,170	52,790	51,285	50,506	44,114	47,300	52,562	51,685	44,491
Squash	156	132	119	178	159	144	147	120	120	356	165
Sugar beets	3,555	2,955	2,560	2,999	2,560	3,373	1,630	1,887	1,796	3,799	2,223
Sugarcane	15,019	15,472	15,441	17,283	16,033	18,923	16,296	13,743	13,828	11,800	12,669
Sunflower	842	344	451	374	388	718	741	793	753	411	663
Sweet Potatoes	2,346	2,420	1,954	1,417	2,140	1,237	1,630	1,091	1,829	2,608	2,377
Tobacco	923	824	914	1,172	775	1,044	851	1,105	801	817	459
Tomatoes	3,270	3,382	3,206	4,005	2,812	3,513	3,795	3,297	3,445	5,366	3,795
Wheat	23,357	20,961	27,902	26,404	24,732	20,419	22,511	29,263	25,360	26,126	24,705
Total	595,531	508,657	530,385	564,667	541,856	518,590	548,369	539,128	551,800	534,564	513,209

1

Crop Type	2012
Alfalfa	40,879
Asparagus	6
Barley	3,932
Beans and Lentils	2,522
Broccoli	4
Cabbage	47
Carrots	1,375
Cauliflower	4
Celery	81
Corn	107,230
Corn for silage	2,642
Cotton	38,179
Cucumbers	92
Flaxseed	3,658
Garlic	92
Greens	0
Hay Grass	24,077
Hay legume	20,211
Lettuce Head	31

Lettuce Leaf	5
Melons	
Cantaloup	591
Melons	
Honeydew	71
Melons	
Watermelon	4,332
Millet	74,845
Oats	1,286
Onions	1,513
Other	
Vegetables	833
Peanuts	16,557
Peas	4,009
Peppers	864
Potatoes	6,080
Pumpkins	898
Radishes	0
Rice	8,640
Sorghum Grain	824
Sorghum for silage	147
Soybeans	44,875
Squash	302
Sugar beets	2,658
Sugarcane	13,471
Sunflower	761
Sweet Potatoes	2,743
Tobacco	1,065
Tomatoes	4,305
Wheat	24,343
Total	461,080

Note: The latter part of the time series (i.e., 2013-2016) in this Inventory is estimated with data splicing methods. Additional activity data will be collected and the Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Step 1e: Additional Activity Data for Indirect N₂O Emissions

A portion of the N that is applied as synthetic fertilizer, livestock manure, biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge), and other organic amendments volatilizes as NH₃ and NO_x. In turn, this N is returned to soils through atmospheric deposition, thereby increasing mineral N availability and enhancing N₂O production. Additional N is lost from soils through leaching as water percolates through a soil profile and through runoff with overland water flow. N losses from leaching and runoff enter groundwater and waterways, from which a portion is emitted as N₂O. However, N leaching is assumed to be an insignificant source of indirect N₂O in cropland and grassland systems where the amount of precipitation plus irrigation does not exceed 80 percent of the potential evapotranspiration. These areas are typically semi-arid to arid, and nitrate leaching to groundwater is a relatively uncommon event; moreover IPCC (2006) recommends limiting the amount of nitrate leaching assumed to be a source of indirect N₂O emissions based on precipitation, irrigation and potential evapotranspiration.

The activity data for synthetic fertilizer, livestock manure, other organic amendments, residue N inputs, biosolids N, and other N inputs are the same as those used in the calculation of direct emissions from agricultural mineral soils, and may be found in Table A-203 through Table A-208, and Table A-210.

Using the DayCent model, volatilization and leaching/surface run-off of N from soils is estimated in the simulations for crops and non-federal grasslands in the Tier 3 method. DayCent simulates the processes leading to these losses of N based on environmental conditions (i.e., weather patterns and soil characteristics), management impacts (e.g., plowing, irrigation, harvest), and soil N availability. Note that the DayCent model accounts for losses of N from all anthropogenic activity, not just the inputs of N from mineral fertilization and organic amendments, which are addressed in the Tier 1 methodology. Similarly, the N available for producing indirect emissions resulting from grassland management as well as deposited PRP manure is also estimated by DayCent. However, indirect emissions are not estimated if the amount of precipitation plus irrigation does not exceed 80 percent of the potential evapotranspiration. Volatilized losses of N are summed for each day in the annual cycle to provide an estimate of the amount of N subject to indirect N₂O emissions. In addition, the daily losses

of N through leaching and runoff in overland flow are summed for the annual cycle. Uncertainty in the estimates is derived from the measure of variability in the fertilizer and organic amendment activity data (see Step 1a for further information).

The Tier 1 method is used to estimate N losses from mineral soils due to volatilization and leaching/runoff for crops, biosolids applications, and PRP manure on federal grasslands, which are not simulated by DayCent. To estimate volatilized losses, synthetic fertilizers, manure, biosolids, and other organic N inputs are multiplied by the fraction subject to gaseous losses using the respective default values of 0.1 kg N/kg N added as mineral fertilizers and 0.2 kg N/kg N added as manure (IPCC 2006). Uncertainty in the volatilized N ranges from 0.03-0.3 kg NH₃-N+NO_x-N/kg N for synthetic fertilizer and 0.05-0.5 kg NH₃-N+NO_x-N/kg N for organic amendments (IPCC 2006). Leaching/runoff losses of N are estimated by summing the N additions from synthetic and other organic fertilizers, manure, biosolids, and above- and below-ground crop residues, and then multiplying by the default fraction subject to leaching/runoff losses of 0.3 kg N/kg N applied, with an uncertainty from 0.1–0.8 kg NO₃-N/kg N (IPCC 2006). However, N leaching is assumed to be an insignificant source of indirect N₂O emissions if the amount of precipitation plus irrigation did not exceed 80 percent of the potential evapotranspiration. PDFs are derived for each of the N inputs in the same manner as direct N₂O emissions, discussed in Steps 1a and 1c.

Volatilized N is summed for losses from croplands and grasslands. Similarly, the annual amounts of N lost from soil profiles through leaching and surface runoff are summed to obtain the total losses for this pathway.

Step 2: Estimate Soil Organic C Stock Changes, Direct N₂O Emissions from Mineral Soils, and CH₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation

In this step, soil organic C stock changes, N₂O emissions, and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation are estimated for cropland and non-federal grasslands. Three methods are used to estimate soil organic C stock changes, direct N₂O emissions from mineral soils, and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation. The DayCent process-based model is used for the croplands and non-federal grasslands included in the Tier 3 method. A Tier 2 method is used to estimate soil organic C stock changes for crop histories that included crops that are not simulated by DayCent and land use change other than conversions between cropland and grassland. A Tier 1 methodology is used to estimate N₂O emissions from crops that are not simulated by DayCent, PRP manure N deposition on federal grasslands, and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation. Soil organic C stock changes and N₂O emissions are not estimated for federal grasslands (other than the effect of PRP manure N), but are under evaluation as a planned improvement and may be estimated in future inventories.

Step 2a: Estimate Soil Organic C Stock Changes, N₂O Emissions, and CH₄ emissions for Crops and Non-Federal Grassland with the Tier 3 DayCent Model

Crops that are simulated with DayCent include alfalfa hay, barley, corn, cotton, dry beans, grass hay, grass-clover hay, oats, onions, peanuts, potatoes, rice, sorghum, soybeans, sugar beets, sunflowers, tomatoes, and wheat, which combined represent approximately 90 percent of total cropland in the United States. The DayCent simulations also includes all non-federal grasslands in the United States.

The methodology description is divided into two sub-steps. First, the DayCent model is used to establish the initial conditions and C stocks for 1979, which is the first year of the NRI survey. In the second sub-step, DayCent is used to simulate changes in soil organic C stocks, direct N₂O emissions, and CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation based on the land-use and management histories recorded in the NRI (USDA-NRCS 2015).

Simulate Initial Conditions (Pre-NRI Conditions): DayCent model initialization involves two steps, with the goal of estimating the most accurate stock for the pre-NRI history, and the distribution of organic C among the pools represented in the model (e.g., Structural, Metabolic, Active, Slow, and Passive). Each pool has a different turnover rate (representing the heterogeneous nature of soil organic matter), and the amount of C in each pool at any point in time influences the forward trajectory of the total soil organic C storage. There is currently no national set of soil C measurements that can be used for establishing initial conditions in the model. Sensitivity analysis of the soil organic C algorithms showed that the rate of change of soil organic matter is relatively insensitive to the *amount* of total soil organic C but is highly sensitive to the relative *distribution* of C among different pools (Parton et al. 1987). By simulating the historical land use prior to the inventory period, initial pool distributions are estimated in an unbiased way.

The first step involves running the model to a steady-state condition (e.g., equilibrium) under native vegetation, historical climate data based on the PRISM product (1981 through 2010), and the soil physical attributes for the NRI points. Native vegetation is represented at the MLRA level for pre-settlement time periods in the United States. The model simulates 5,000 years in the pre-settlement era in order to achieve a steady-state condition.

The second step is to simulate the period of time from European settlement and expansion of agriculture to the beginning of the NRI survey, representing the influence of historic land-use change and management, particularly the conversion of native vegetation to agricultural uses. This encompasses a varying time period from land conversion (depending on historical

settlement patterns) to 1979. The information on historical cropping practices used for DayCent simulations has been gathered from a variety of sources, ranging from the historical accounts of farming practices reported in the literature (e.g., Miner 1998) to national level databases (e.g., NASS 2004). A detailed description of the data sources and assumptions used in constructing the base history scenarios of agricultural practices can be found in Williams and Paustian (2005).

NRI History Simulations: After model initialization, DayCent is used to simulate the NRI land use and management histories from 1979 through 2012. The simulations address the influence of soil management on direct N₂O emissions, soil organic C stock changes and losses of N from the profile through leaching/runoff and volatilization. The NRI histories identify the land use and land use change histories for the NRI survey locations, as well as cropping patterns and irrigation history (see Step 1a for description of the NRI data). The input data for the model simulations also include the PRISM weather dataset and SSURGO soils data, synthetic N fertilizer rates, managed manure amendments to cropland and grassland, manure deposition on grasslands (i.e., PRP), tillage histories and EVI data (See Step 1b for description of the inputs). The total number of DayCent simulations is over 18 million with 100 repeated simulations (i.e., iterations) for each NRI point location in a Monte Carlo Analysis. The simulation system incorporates a dedicated MySQL database server and a 30-node parallel processing computer cluster. Input/output operations are managed by a set of run executive programs written in PERL.

The simulations for the NRI history are integrated with the uncertainty analysis. Evaluating uncertainty is an integral part of the analysis and includes three components: (1) uncertainty in the main activity data inputs affecting soil C and N₂O emissions (input uncertainty); (2) uncertainty in the model formulation and parameterization (structural uncertainty); and (3) uncertainty in the land-use and management system areas (scaling uncertainty) (Ogle et al. 2010; Del Grosso et al. 2010). For component 1, input uncertainty is evaluated for fertilization management, manure applications, and tillage, which are the primary management activity data that are supplemental to the NRI observations and have significant influence on soil organic C dynamics, soil N₂O and CH₄ emissions. As described in Step 1b, PDFs are derived from surveys at the county scale for the inputs in most cases. In addition, uncertainty is included for predictions of EVI data that are needed to fill-data gaps and extend the time series (see Enhanced Vegetation Index in Step 1b). To represent uncertainty in all of these inputs, a Monte-Carlo Analysis is used with 100 iterations for each NRI point; random draws are made from PDFs for fertilizer, manure application, tillage, and EVI predictions. As described above, an adjustment factor is also selected from PDFs with normal densities to represent the dependence between manure amendments and N fertilizer application rates.

The second component deals with uncertainty inherent in model formulation and parameterization. This component is the largest source of uncertainty in the Tier 3 model-based inventory analysis, accounting for more than 80 percent of the overall uncertainty in the final estimates (Ogle et al. 2010; Del Grosso et al. 2010). An empirically-based procedure is applied to develop a structural uncertainty estimator from the relationship between modeled results and field measurements from agricultural experiments (Ogle et al. 2007). For soil organic C, the DayCent model is evaluated with measurements from 92 long-term field experiments that have over 900 treatment observations, representing a variety of management conditions (e.g., variation in crop rotation, tillage, fertilization rates, and manure amendments). There are 41 experimental sites available with over 200 treatment observations to evaluate structural uncertainty in the N₂O emission predictions from DayCent (Del Grosso et al. 2010). There are 10 experiments with 126 treatment observations for CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation. The inputs to the model are essentially known in the simulations for the long-term experiments, and, therefore, the analysis is designed to evaluate uncertainties associated with the model structure (i.e., model algorithms and parameterization). USDA is developing a national soil monitoring network to evaluate the Inventory in the future (Spencer et al. 2011).

The relationship between modeled soil organic C stocks and field measurements are statistically analyzed using linear-mixed effect modeling techniques (Figure A-11). Additional fixed effects are included in the mixed effect model if they explained significant variation in the relationship between modeled and measured stocks (i.e., if they met an alpha level of 0.05 for significance). Several variables are tested, including land-use class; type of tillage; cropping system; geographic location; climate; soil texture; time since the management change; original land cover (i.e., forest or grassland); grain harvest as predicted by the model compared to the experimental values; and variation in fertilizer and residue management. The final cropland model includes variables for modeled soil organic C inclusion of hay/pasture in cropping rotations, use of no-till, set-aside lands, organic matter amendments, and inclusion of bare fallow in the rotation, which are significant at an alpha level of 0.05. The final grassland model only included the model soil organic C. These fixed effects are used to make an adjustment to modeled values due to biases that are creating significant mismatches between the modeled and measured stocks. For soil N₂O, simulated DayCent emissions are a highly significant predictor of the measurements, with a p-value of <0.01. Several other variables are considered in the statistical model to evaluate if DayCent exhibits bias under certain conditions related to climate, soil types, and management practices (Figure A-13). Random effects are included in the model to capture the dependence in time series and data collected from the same site, which are needed to estimate appropriate standard deviations for parameter coefficients. For rice CH₄ emissions, simulated DayCent emissions are a significant predictor of measured emission, similar to the results for soil N₂O emissions. Several other variables are tested including soil characteristics, geographic location (i.e., state), and management practices (e.g., with and without winter flooding) (Figure A-14). The only other significant variable is geographic location because the model does not predict emissions as

accurately for California as other rice-producing states. Random effects are included to capture the dependence in time series and the data collected from the same site.

A Monte Carlo approach is used to apply the uncertainty estimator (Ogle et al. 2010). Parameter values for the statistical equation (i.e., fixed effects) are selected from their joint probability distribution, as well as random error associated with fine-scale estimates at NRI points, and the residual or unexplained error associated with the linear mixed-effect model. The estimate and associated management information is then used as input into the equation, and adjusted values are computed for each C stock, N₂O and CH₄ emissions estimate. The variance of the adjusted estimates is computed from the 100 simulated values from the Monte Carlo analysis.

The third element is the uncertainty associated with scaling the DayCent results for each NRI point to the entire land base, using the expansion factors provided with the NRI survey dataset. The expansion factors represent the number of hectares associated with the land-use and management history for a particular point. This uncertainty is determined by computing the variances from a set of replicated weights for the expansion factor. For the land base that is simulated with the DayCent model, soil organic C stock changes are provided in Table A-211, soil N₂O emissions are provided in Table A-212, and rice cultivation CH₄ emissions in Table A-213.

Table A-211: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Land Base Simulated with the Tier 3 DayCent Model-Based Approach (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Cropland Remaining Cropland			Land Converted to Cropland		Grassland Remaining Grassland		Land Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
1990	(65.75)	(98.30) to (33.20)	20.62	11.32 to 29.93	(10.20)	(47.18) to 26.77	(5.11)	(9.71) to (.51)
1991	(71.64)	(103.66) to (39.63)	21.41	11.46 to 31.37	(12.53)	(50.86) to 25.80	(5.19)	(9.27) to (1.12)
1992	(63.04)	(91.32) to (34.76)	23.61	13.62 to 33.60	(6.81)	(37.06) to 23.44	(4.92)	(10.03) to .18
1993	(43.64)	(73.09) to (14.20)	17.95	7.22 to 28.69	1.66	(33.17) to 36.50	(5.53)	(10.31) to (.74)
1994	(55.49)	(86.59) to (24.40)	14.40	3.88 to 24.92	(24.13)	(58.06) to 9.80	(7.36)	(12.99) to (1.73)
1995	(49.18)	(80.21) to (18.15)	20.04	8.90 to 31.17	(0.96)	(33.43) to 31.50	(6.37)	(12.27) to (.48)
1996	(57.70)	(87.89) to (27.50)	16.93	7.08 to 26.79	(22.31)	(53.52) to 8.90	(7.59)	(14.10) to (1.08)
1997	(55.46)	(89.14) to (21.79)	18.98	8.58 to 29.37	(9.10)	(47.05) to 28.84	(7.46)	(13.49) to (1.43)
1998	(44.19)	(76.62) to (11.76)	12.57	1.18 to 23.95	(16.03)	(53.16) to 21.10	(8.12)	(15.15) to (1.10)
1999	(59.68)	(88.69) to (30.67)	12.78	2.58 to 22.98	(3.96)	(36.93) to 29.02	(8.55)	(15.40) to (1.69)
2000	(65.43)	(100.61) to (30.26)	12.95	1.93 to 23.98	(33.13)	(72.27) to 6.01	(10.51)	(17.58) to (3.44)
2001	(58.29)	(91.06) to (25.51)	11.21	.34 to 22.09	(8.82)	(40.46) to 22.82	(9.81)	(17.37) to (2.26)
2002	(54.71)	(83.13) to (26.29)	11.21	.07 to 22.34	(9.63)	(45.47) to 26.20	(10.51)	(17.31) to (3.70)
2003	(47.63)	(78.33) to (16.94)	13.08	2.53 to 23.63	(6.34)	(39.14) to 26.46	(10.52)	(17.46) to (3.59)
2004	(47.56)	(79.85) to (15.27)	12.63	3.60 to 21.66	0.42	(34.25) to 35.09	(9.91)	(17.96) to (1.86)
2005	(50.81)	(84.26) to (17.36)	12.40	1.10 to 23.71	1.97	(34.50) to 38.43	(10.22)	(17.93) to (2.52)
2006	(47.47)	(76.01) to (18.92)	13.21	3.03 to 23.39	(14.85)	(48.99) to 19.29	(12.24)	(20.62) to (3.86)
2007	(45.56)	(76.20) to (14.92)	11.83	1.45 to 22.21	1.80	(31.07) to 34.67	(10.92)	(19.03) to (2.81)
2008	(34.45)	(67.84) to (1.06)	12.68	2.46 to 22.89	(10.05)	(43.50) to 23.39	(10.84)	(18.52) to (3.17)
2009	(29.33)	(58.63) to (.04)	12.56	3.13 to 21.99	(5.66)	(43.85) to 32.53	(10.64)	(17.89) to (3.38)
2010	(29.43)	(62.67) to 3.80	14.53	5.38 to 23.68	1.34	(30.62) to 33.30	(10.76)	(19.24) to (2.29)
2011	(43.60)	(76.77) to (10.44)	14.27	4.15 to 24.40	(15.97)	(54.46) to 22.52	(10.97)	(18.96) to (2.98)
2012	(46.60)	(83.06) to (10.14)	13.38	2.10 to 24.66	(24.56)	(60.90) to 11.78	(11.21)	(19.48) to (2.94)

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 3 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-212: Annual N₂O Emissions (95% Confidence Interval) for the Land Base Simulated with the Tier 3 DayCent Model-Based Approach (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Year	Tier 3 Cropland		Non-Federal Grasslands	
	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
1990	128.5	121.74 to 137.33	51.2	48.03 to 55.26
1991	128.4	121.69 to 137.19	52.4	49.16 to 56.50
1992	128.5	121.81 to 137.26	51.4	48.61 to 55.10
1993	128.5	121.73 to 137.53	53.0	50.04 to 56.74
1994	127.8	121.29 to 136.23	49.4	46.52 to 53.03
1995	129.1	122.46 to 137.81	50.8	47.92 to 54.42
1996	129.6	122.94 to 138.48	53.9	50.62 to 58.21
1997	129.2	122.48 to 138.03	54.0	50.91 to 57.96
1998	136.2	128.94 to 145.71	58.6	55.19 to 62.99
1999	129.6	122.95 to 138.19	49.2	46.60 to 52.59
2000	132.2	125.41 to 141.24	49.7	46.63 to 53.68

2001	134.0	127.0 to 143.26	51.8	48.89 to 55.69
2002	132.5	125.60 to 141.66	53.8	50.52 to 58.06
2003	135.4	128.41 to 144.74	52.3	49.40 to 56.13
2004	142.0	134.79 to 151.32	62.7	58.77 to 67.99
2005	134.7	127.87 to 143.71	53.4	50.55 to 56.97
2006	135.7	128.82 to 144.66	55.9	52.77 to 60.04
2007	140.8	133.4 to 150.41	57.7	54.19 to 62.42
2008	137.3	130.17 to 146.68	54.7	51.81 to 58.49
2009	139.6	132.41 to 148.95	58.2	54.74 to 62.67
2010	144.2	136.70 to 154.10	57.4	54.31 to 61.52
2011	138.0	130.98 to 147.26	50.9	48.40 to 54.24
2012	135.7	128.72 to 144.87	47.7	44.84 to 51.4

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 3 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-213: Annual CH₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation (95% Confidence Interval) for Rice Cultivation Simulated with the Tier 3 DayCent Model-Based Approach (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Year	Estimate	95% CI
1990	14.39	10.22 to 18.57
1991	15.18	10.86 to 19.49
1992	15.17	10.58 to 19.76
1993	15.24	11.05 to 19.44
1994	13.10	9.20 to 16.99
1995	14.23	10.22 to 18.23
1996	14.40	10.32 to 18.48
1997	14.22	10.16 to 18.27
1998	14.35	9.96 to 18.73
1999	14.82	10.13 to 19.52
2000	14.98	10.45 to 19.51
2001	13.62	9.32 to 17.93
2002	14.62	10.23 to 19.01
2003	12.58	8.76 to 16.41
2004	12.26	8.40 to 16.12
2005	14.93	10.35 to 19.52
2006	11.38	7.96 to 14.80
2007	12.54	8.82 to 16.27
2008	9.92	6.85 to 12.99
2009	12.76	8.80 to 16.71
2010	14.09	9.85 to 18.33
2011	12.59	8.92 to 16.26
2012	9.96	6.70 to 13.22

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Rice Cultivation* section for more information). The Tier 3 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

In DayCent, the model cannot distinguish among the original sources of N after the mineral N enters the soil pools, and therefore it is not possible to determine which management activity led to specific N₂O emissions. This means, for example, that N₂O emissions from applied synthetic fertilizer cannot be separated from emissions due to other N inputs, such as crop residues. It is desirable, however, to report emissions associated with specific N inputs. Thus, for each NRI point, the N inputs in a simulation are determined for anthropogenic practices discussed in IPCC (2006), including synthetic mineral N fertilization, organic amendments, and crop residue N added to soils (including N-fixing crops). The percentage of N input for anthropogenic practices is divided by the total N input, and this proportion is used to determine the amount of N₂O emissions assigned to each of the practices.¹⁰⁰ For example, if 70 percent of the mineral N made available in the soil is due to mineral fertilization, then 70 percent of the N₂O emissions are assigned to this practice. The remainder of soil N₂O emissions is reported under “other N inputs,” which includes mineralization due to decomposition of soil organic matter and litter, as well as asymbiotic N fixation from the atmosphere. Asymbiotic N fixation by soil bacteria is a minor source of N,

¹⁰⁰ This method is a simplification of reality to allow partitioning of N₂O emissions, as it assumes that all N inputs have an identical chance of being converted to N₂O. This is unlikely to be the case, but DAYCENT does not track N₂O emissions by source of mineral N so this approximation is the only approach that can be used currently for partitioning N₂O emissions by source of N input. Moreover, this approach is similar to the IPCC Tier 1 method (IPCC 2006), which uses the same direct emissions factor for most N sources (e.g., PRP). Further research and model development may allow for other approaches in the future.

typically not exceeding 10 percent of total N inputs to agroecosystems. Mineralization of soil organic matter is a more significant source of N, but is still typically less than half of the amount of N made available in the cropland soils compared to application of synthetic fertilizers and manure amendments, along with symbiotic fixation. Mineralization of soil organic matter accounts for the majority of available N in grassland soils. Accounting for the influence of “other N inputs” is necessary because the processes leading to these inputs of N are influenced by management. While this method allows for attribution of N₂O emissions to the individual N inputs to the soils, it is important to realize that sources such as synthetic fertilization may have a larger impact on N₂O emissions than would be suggested by the associated level of N input for this source (Delgado et al. 2009). Further research will be needed to improve upon this attribution method, however. The results associated with subdividing the N₂O emissions based on N inputs are provided in Table A-214 and Table A-215.

Table A-214: Direct N₂O Emissions from Cropland Soils (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Mineral Soils	144.1	144.2	143.9	143.0	147.1	146.2	148.2	147.0	154.3	148.1	149.2	148.9	148.0	152.4	159.5	150.6
Tier 3	128.5	128.4	128.5	128.5	127.8	129.1	129.6	129.2	136.2	129.6	132.2	134.0	132.5	135.4	142.0	134.7
Synthetic Fertilizer	47.5	47.8	49.3	47.1	48.6	46.2	48.7	48.0	47.9	45.4	47.8	46.8	47.5	47.3	48.3	47.6
Managed Manure	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.9	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4
Residue N ^a	18.6	20.1	18.3	18.9	18.4	20.2	19.2	19.2	18.9	22.1	20.5	20.2	20.5	20.9	19.6	20.5
Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	58.4	56.7	56.9	58.5	56.9	59.2	58.1	58.3	65.5	57.5	59.2	62.4	59.8	62.6	69.6	62.2
Tier 1	15.7	15.8	15.5	14.5	19.3	17.1	18.6	17.9	18.1	18.5	17.0	14.9	15.4	17.0	17.6	15.8
Synthetic Fertilizer	6.0	6.1	5.8	5.3	9.4	7.0	8.7	8.0	8.5	9.6	8.1	6.0	6.7	8.0	8.8	7.0
Managed Manure and Other Organic																
Commercial Fertilizer	6.2	6.4	6.3	6.1	6.6	7.0	6.8	6.9	6.7	6.1	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.5	6.3	6.4
Residue N ^a	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.5
Organic Soils	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3
Total^a	147.5	147.5	147.2	146.3	150.3	149.5	151.5	150.3	157.5	151.4	152.5	152.3	151.3	155.7	162.9	153.9

^a Residue N inputs include unharvested fixed N from legumes as well as crop residue N.

Activity	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Mineral Soils	153.1	157.4	153.3	154.1	159.5	155.1	153.5
Tier 3	135.7	140.8	137.3	139.6	144.2	138.0	135.7
Synthetic Fertilizer	47.9	50.8	48.9	48.0	48.3	49.5	51.0
Managed Manure	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.0
Residue N ^a	20.3	20.4	19.3	19.6	21.5	21.5	21.4
Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	63.0	64.9	64.7	67.2	69.6	62.1	58.2
Tier 1	17.4	16.6	16.0	14.5	15.3	17.1	17.8
Synthetic Fertilizer	8.2	7.4	6.8	5.7	6.7	8.5	9.4
Managed Manure and Other Organic							
Commercial Fertilizer	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.3	6.1	6.2	6.2
Residue N ^a	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.1
Organic Soils	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2
Total^a	156.4	160.7	156.5	157.3	162.7	158.3	156.7

^a Residue N inputs include unharvested fixed N from legumes as well as crop residue N.

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 1 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-215: Direct N₂O Emissions from Grasslands (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Mineral Soils	61.3	62.3	61.6	63.2	59.6	61.0	63.9	63.4	67.6	58.0	58.2	60.0	61.8	60.1	70.4	61.1
Tier 3	51.2	52.4	51.4	53.0	49.4	50.8	53.9	54.0	58.6	49.2	49.7	51.8	53.8	52.3	62.7	53.4
Synthetic Fertilizer	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8
PRP Manure	6.3	6.2	6.3	6.5	6.6	6.6	7.2	6.7	7.5	6.2	6.5	6.6	7.0	6.6	7.5	6.5
Managed Manure	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1
Residue N ^a Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	14.5	14.6	14.7	15.3	13.4	15.0	14.6	15.2	15.1	15.3	13.9	15.0	14.9	14.9	15.8	15.8
	28.5	29.9	28.6	29.5	27.5	27.5	30.3	30.4	33.9	26.0	27.5	28.5	30.0	29.0	37.5	29.2
Tier 1	10.1	9.9	10.2	10.3	10.3	10.2	10.0	9.4	9.1	8.7	8.5	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.7	7.8
PRP Manure Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge)	9.9	9.7	9.9	10.0	10.0	9.9	9.6	9.1	8.7	8.4	8.1	7.8	7.6	7.3	7.2	7.3
	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5
Organic Soils	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Total	64.5	65.6	64.8	66.5	63.0	64.3	67.2	66.7	71.0	61.3	61.5	63.5	65.3	63.6	73.9	64.6

^a Residue N inputs include unharvested fixed N from legumes as well as crop residue N.

Activity	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Mineral Soils	63.7	65.1	62.2	65.8	65.1	58.8	55.7
Tier 3	55.9	57.7	54.7	58.2	57.4	50.9	47.7
Synthetic Fertilizer	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
PRP Manure	7.1	6.9	6.6	7.0	6.6	6.3	5.9
Managed Manure	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Residue N ^a Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	15.6	16.5	15.5	15.4	16.5	14.8	14.2
	31.3	32.6	30.9	33.8	32.4	28.1	25.8
Tier 1	7.8	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.8	8.0
PRP Manure	7.3	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.3	7.4
Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6
Organic Soils	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3
Total	67.2	68.5	65.6	69.1	68.5	62.1	59.0

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 1 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Step 2b: Soil N₂O Emissions from Agricultural Lands on Mineral Soils Approximated with the Tier 1 Approach

To estimate direct N₂O emissions from N additions to crops in the Tier 1 method, the amount of N in applied synthetic fertilizer, manure and other commercial organic fertilizers (i.e., dried blood, tankage, compost, and other) is added to N inputs from crop residues, and the resulting annual totals are multiplied by the IPCC default emission factor of 0.01 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006) (see Table A-214). The uncertainty is determined based on simple error propagation methods (IPCC 2006). The uncertainty in the default emission factor ranges from 0.3–3.0 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006). For flooded rice soils, the IPCC default emission factor is 0.003 kg N₂O-N/kg N and the uncertainty range is 0.000–0.006 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006).¹⁰¹ Uncertainties in the emission factor and fertilizer additions are combined with uncertainty in the equations used to calculate residue N additions from above- and below-ground biomass dry matter and N concentration to derive overall uncertainty.

The Tier 1 method is also used to estimate emissions from manure N deposited by livestock on federal lands (i.e., PRP manure N), and from biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) application to grasslands. These two sources of N inputs to soils are multiplied by the IPCC (2006) default emission factors (0.01 kg N₂O-N/kg N for sludge and horse, sheep, and goat manure,

¹⁰¹ Due to lack of data, uncertainties in managed manure N production, PRP manure N production, other commercial organic fertilizer amendments, indirect losses of N in the DAYCENT simulations, and biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) amendments to soils are currently treated as certain; these sources of uncertainty will be included in future Inventories.

and 0.02 kg N₂O-N/kg N for cattle, swine, and poultry manure) to estimate N₂O emissions (Table A-215). The uncertainty is determined based on the Tier 1 error propagation methods provided by the IPCC (2006) with uncertainty in the default emission factor ranging from 0.007 to 0.06 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006).

Step 2c: Soil CH₄ Emissions from Agricultural Lands Approximated with the Tier 1 Approach

To estimate CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation for the Tier 1 method, an adjusted daily emission factor is calculated using the default baseline emission factor of 1.30 kg CH₄ ha⁻¹ d⁻¹ (ranging 0.8-2.2 kg CH₄ ha⁻¹ d⁻¹) multiplied by a scaling factor for the cultivation water regime, pre-cultivation water regime and a scaling factor for organic amendments (IPCC 2006). The water regime during cultivation is continuously flooded for rice production in the United States and so the scaling factor is always 1 (ranging from 0.79 to 1.26). The pre-season water regime varies based on the proportion of land with winter flooding; land that does not have winter flooding is assigned a value of 0.68 (ranging from 0.58 to 0.80) and areas with winter flooding are assigned a value of 1 (ranging from 0.88 to 1.14). Organic amendments are estimated based on the amount of rice straw and multiplied by 1 (ranging 0.97 to 1.04) for straw incorporated greater than 30 days before cultivation, and by 0.29 (0.2 to 0.4) for straw incorporated greater than 30 days before cultivation. The adjusted daily emission factor is multiplied by the cultivation period and harvested area to estimate the total CH₄ emissions. The uncertainty is propagated through the calculation using an Approach 2 method with a Monte Carlo analysis (IPCC 2006), combining uncertainties associated with the adjusted daily emission factor and the harvested areas derived from the USDA NRI survey data.

Step 2d: Soil Organic C Stock Changes in Agricultural Lands on Mineral Soils Approximated with the Tier 2 Approach

Mineral soil organic C stock values are derived for crop rotations that were not simulated by DayCent and land converted from non-agricultural land uses to cropland or grassland from 1990 through 2012, based on the land-use and management activity data in conjunction with appropriate reference C stocks, land-use change, management, input, and wetland restoration factors. Each input to the inventory calculations for the Tier 2 approach has uncertainty that is quantified in PDFs, including the land-use and management activity data, reference C stocks, and management factors. A Monte Carlo Analysis is used to quantify uncertainty in soil organic C stock changes for the inventory period based on uncertainty in the inputs. Input values are randomly selected from PDFs in an iterative process to estimate SOC change for 50,000 times and produce a 95 percent confidence interval for the inventory results.

Derive Mineral Soil Organic C Stock Change Factors: Stock change factors representative of U.S. conditions are estimated from published studies (Ogle et al. 2003; Ogle et al. 2006). The numerical factors quantify the impact of changing land use and management on SOC storage in mineral soils, including tillage practices, cropping rotation or intensification, and land conversions between cultivated and native conditions (including set-asides in the Conservation Reserve Program). Studies from the United States and Canada are used in this analysis under the assumption that they would best represent management impacts for the Inventory.

The IPCC inventory methodology for agricultural soils divides climate into eight distinct zones based upon average annual temperature, average annual precipitation, and the length of the dry season (IPCC 2006) (Table A-216). Seven of these climate zones occur in the conterminous United States and Hawaii (Eve et al. 2001).

Table A-216: Characteristics of the IPCC Climate Zones that Occur in the United States

Climate Zone	Annual Average Temperature (°C)	Average Annual Precipitation (mm)	Length of Dry Season (months)
Cold Temperate, Dry	< 10	< Potential Evapotranspiration	NA
Cold Temperate, Moist	< 10	≥ Potential Evapotranspiration	NA
Warm Temperate, Dry	10 – 20	< 600	NA
Warm Temperate, Moist	10 – 20	≥ Potential Evapotranspiration	NA
Sub-Tropical, Dry ^a	> 20	< 1,000	Usually long
Sub-Tropical, Moist (w/short dry season) ^a	> 20	1,000 – 2,000	< 5

^a The climate characteristics listed in the table for these zones are those that correspond to the tropical dry and tropical moist zones of the IPCC. They have been renamed “sub-tropical” here.

Mean precipitation and temperature (1950-2000) variables from the WorldClim data set (Hijmans et al. 2005)) and potential evapotranspiration data from the Consortium for Spatial Information (CGIAR-CSI) (Zomer et al. 2008; Zomer et al. 2007) are used to classify climate zones (Figure A-15). IPCC climate zones are assigned to NRI point locations.

Soils are classified into one of seven classes based upon texture, morphology, and ability to store organic matter (IPCC 2006). Six of the categories are mineral types and one is organic (i.e., *Histosol*). Reference C stocks, representing estimates from conventionally managed cropland, are computed for each of the mineral soil types across the various climate zones, based on pedon (i.e., soil) data from the National Soil Survey Characterization Database (NRCS 1997) (Table A-217). These stocks are used in conjunction with management factors to estimate the change in SOC stocks that result from management

and land-use activity. PDFs, which represent the variability in the stock estimates, are constructed as normal densities based on the mean and variance from the pedon data. Pedon locations are clumped in various parts of the country, which reduces the statistical independence of individual pedon estimates. To account for this lack of independence, samples from each climate by soil zone are tested for spatial autocorrelation using the Moran's I test, and variance terms are inflated by 10 percent for all zones with significant p-values.

Figure A-15: IPCC Climate Zones




Table A-217: U.S. Soil Groupings Based on the IPCC Categories and Dominant Taxonomic Soil, and Reference Carbon Stocks (Metric Tons C/ha)

IPCC Inventory Soil Categories	USDA Taxonomic Soil Orders	Reference Carbon Stock in Climate Regions					
		Cold Temperate, Dry	Cold Temperate, Moist	Warm Temperate, Dry	Warm Temperate, Moist	Sub-Tropical, Dry	Sub-Tropical, Moist
High Clay Activity Mineral Soils	Vertisols, Mollisols, Inceptisols, Aridisols, and high base status Alfisols	42 (n = 133)	65 (n = 526)	37 (n = 203)	51 (n = 424)	42 (n = 26)	57 (n = 12)
Low Clay Activity Mineral Soils	Ultisols, Oxisols, acidic Alfisols, and many Entisols	45 (n = 37)	52 (n = 113)	25 (n = 86)	40 (n = 300)	39 (n = 13)	47 (n = 7)
Sandy Soils	Any soils with greater than 70 percent sand and less than 8 percent clay (often Entisols)	24 (n = 5)	40 (n = 43)	16 (n = 19)	30 (n = 102)	33 (n = 186)	50 (n = 18)
Volcanic Soils	Andisols	124 (n = 12)	114 (n = 2)	124 (n = 12)	124 (n = 12)	124 (n = 12)	128 (n = 9)
Spodic Soils	Spodosols	86 (n=20)	74 (n = 13)	86 (n=20)	107 (n = 7)	86 (n=20)	86 (n=20)
Aquic Soils	Soils with Aquic suborder	86 (n = 4)	89 (n = 161)	48 (n = 26)	51 (n = 300)	63 (n = 503)	48 (n = 12)
Organic Soils ^a	Histosols	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

^a C stocks are not needed for organic soils.

Notes: C stocks are for the top 30 cm of the soil profile, and are estimated from pedon data available in the National Soil Survey Characterization database (NRCS 1997); sample size provided in parentheses (i.e., 'n' values refer to sample size).

To estimate the land use, management and input factors, studies had to report SOC stocks (or information to compute stocks), depth of sampling, and the number of years since a management change to be included in the analysis. The data are analyzed using linear mixed-effect models, accounting for both fixed and random effects. Fixed effects included depth, number of years since a management change, climate, and the type of management change (e.g., reduced tillage vs. no-till). For depth increments, the data are not aggregated for the C stock measurements; each depth increment (e.g., 0-5 cm, 5-10 cm, and 10-30 cm) is included as a separate point in the dataset. Similarly, time-series data are not aggregated in these datasets. Linear

regression models assume that the underlying data are independent observations, but this is not the case with data from the same experimental site, or plot in a time series. These data are more related to each other than data from other sites (i.e., not independent). Consequently, random effects are needed to account for the dependence in time-series data and the dependence among data points representing different depth increments from the same study. Factors are estimated for the effect of management practices at 20 years for the top 30 cm of the soil (Table A-218). Variance is calculated for each of the U.S. factor values, and used to construct PDFs with a normal density. In the IPCC method, specific factor values are given for improved grassland, high input cropland with organic amendments, and for wetland rice, each of which influences C stock changes in soils. Specifically, higher stocks are associated with increased productivity and C inputs (relative to native grassland) on improved grassland with both medium and high input.¹⁰² Organic amendments in annual cropping systems also increase SOC stocks due to greater C inputs, while high SOC stocks in rice cultivation are associated with reduced decomposition due to periodic flooding. There are insufficient field studies to derive factor values for these systems from the published literature, and, thus, estimates from IPCC (2006) are used under the assumption that they would best approximate the impacts, given the lack of sufficient data to derive U.S.-specific factors. A measure of uncertainty is provided for these factors in IPCC (2006), which is used to construct PDFs.

Table A-218: Soil Organic Carbon Stock Change Factors for the United States and the IPCC Default Values Associated with Management Impacts on Mineral Soils

		U.S. Factor			
	IPCC default	Warm Moist Climate	Warm Dry Climate	Cool Moist Climate	Cool Dry Climate
Land-Use Change Factors					
Cultivated ^a	1	1	1	1	1
General Uncult. ^{a,b} (n=251)	1.4	1.42±0.06	1.37±0.05	1.24±0.06	1.20±0.06
Set-Aside ^a (n=142)	1.25	1.31±0.06	1.26±0.04	1.14±0.06	1.10±0.05
Improved Grassland Factors					
Medium Input	1.1	1.14±0.06	1.14±0.06	1.14±0.06	1.14±0.06
High Input	NA	1.11±0.04	1.11±0.04	1.11±0.04	1.11±0.04
Wetland Rice Production Factor ^b	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Tillage Factors					
Conv. Till	1	1	1	1	1
Red. Till (n=93)	1.05	1.08±0.03	1.01±0.03	1.08±0.03	1.01±0.03
No-till (n=212)	1.1	1.13±0.02	1.05±0.03	1.13±0.02	1.05±0.03
Cropland Input Factors					
Low (n=85)	0.9	0.94±0.01	0.94±0.01	0.94±0.01	0.94±0.01
Medium	1	1	1	1	1
High (n=22)	1.1	1.07±0.02	1.07±0.02	1.07±0.02	1.07±0.02
High with amendment ^b	1.2	1.38±0.06	1.34±0.08	1.38±0.06	1.34±0.08

^a Factors in the IPCC documentation (IPCC 2006) are converted to represent changes in SOC storage from a cultivated condition rather than a native condition.

^b U.S.-specific factors are not estimated for land improvements, rice production, or high input with amendment because of few studies addressing the impact of legume mixtures, irrigation, or manure applications for crop and grassland in the United States, or the impact of wetland rice production in the US. Factors provided in IPCC (2006) are used as the best estimates of these impacts.

Note: The "n" values refer to sample size.

Wetland restoration management also influences SOC storage in mineral soils, because restoration leads to higher water tables and inundation of the soil for at least part of the year. A stock change factor is estimated assessing the difference in SOC storage between restored and unrestored wetlands enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (Euliss and Gleason 2002), which represents an initial increase of C in the restored soils over the first 10 years (Table A-219). A PDF with a normal density is constructed from these data based on results from a linear regression model. Following the initial increase of C, natural erosion and deposition leads to additional accretion of C in these wetlands. The mass accumulation rate of organic C is estimated using annual sedimentation rates (cm/yr) in combination with percent organic C, and soil bulk density (g/cm³) (Euliss and Gleason 2002). Procedures for calculation of mass accumulation rate are described in Dean and Gorham (1998); the resulting rate and standard deviation are used to construct a PDF with a normal density (Table A-219).

Table A-219: Rate and standard deviation for the Initial Increase and Subsequent Annual Mass Accumulation Rate (Mg C/ha-yr) in Soil Organic C Following Wetland Restoration of Conservation Reserve Program

Variable	Value
Factor (Initial Increase—First 10 Years)	1.22±0.18
Mass Accumulation (After Initial 10 Years)	0.79±0.05

¹⁰² Improved grasslands are identified in the NRI as grasslands that are irrigated or seeded with legumes, in addition to those reclassified as improved with manure amendments.

Note: Mass accumulation rate represents additional gains in C for mineral soils after the first 10 years (Euliss and Gleason 2002).

Estimate Annual Changes in Mineral Soil Organic C Stocks: In accordance with IPCC methodology, annual changes in mineral soil C are calculated by subtracting the beginning stock from the ending stock and then dividing by 20.¹⁰³ For this analysis, stocks are estimated for each year and difference between years is the stock change. From the final distribution of 50,000 values, a 95 percent confidence interval is generated based on the simulated values at the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles in the distribution (Ogle et al. 2003). Soil organic C stock changes are provided in Table A-220 through Table A-225.

Step 2e: Estimate Additional Changes in Soil Organic C Stocks Due to Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge) Amendments

There are two additional land use and management activities in U.S. agricultural lands that are not estimated in Steps 2a and 2b. The first activity involves the application of biosolids to agricultural lands. Minimal data exist on where and how much biosolids are applied to U.S. agricultural soils, but national estimates of mineral soil land area receiving biosolids can be approximated based on biosolids N production data, and the assumption that amendments are applied at a rate equivalent to the assimilative capacity from Kellogg et al. (2000). In this Inventory, it is assumed that biosolids for agricultural land application is only applied to grassland. The impact of organic amendments on SOC is calculated as 0.38 metric tonnes C/ha-yr. This rate is based on the IPCC default method and country-specific factors (see Table A-218), by calculating the effect of converting nominal, medium-input grassland to high input improved grassland. The assumptions are that reference C stock are 50 metric tonnes C/ha, which represents a mid-range value of reference C stocks for the cropland soils in the United States,¹⁰⁴ that the land use factor for grassland of 1.4 and 1.11 for high input improved grassland are representative of typical conditions, and that the change in stocks are occurring over a 20 year (default value) time period (i.e., $[50 \times 1.4 \times 1.11 - 50 \times 1.4] / 20 = 0.38$). A nominal ± 50 percent uncertainty is attached to these estimates due to limited information on application and the rate of change in soil C stock change with biosolids amendments. The influence of biosolids on soil organic C stocks are provided in Table A-226.

¹⁰³ The difference in C stocks is divided by 20 because the stock change factors represent change over a 20-year time period.

¹⁰⁴ Reference C stocks are based on cropland soils for the Tier 2 method applied in this Inventory.

Table A-220: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Non-Federal Cropland Land Base Estimated with the Tier 2 Analysis using U.S. Factor Values (MMT CO₂ Eq./yr)

Non-Federal Croplands:	Cropland Remaining Cropland		Grassland Converted to Cropland		Forest Converted to Cropland		Other Land Converted to Cropland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils								
1990	-5.44	(7.97) to (2.99)	1.32	(0.72) to 2.26	0.22	(0.12) to .38	0.16	(0.09) to 0.28
1991	-6.19	(8.94) to (3.53)	1.26	(0.84) to 2.25	0.20	(0.13) to .36	0.15	(0.10) to 0.27
1992	-6.19	(9.77) to (3.63)	1.29	(1.07) to 2.32	0.19	(0.16) to .35	0.16	(0.13) to 0.29
1993	-6.95	(10.16) to (3.79)	1.35	(0.75) to 2.45	0.18	(0.10) to .32	0.17	(0.09) to 0.31
1994	-6.70	(9.93) to (3.52)	1.48	(0.37) to 2.63	0.18	(0.05) to .33	0.19	(0.05) to 0.35
1995	-6.46	(9.52) to (3.48)	1.59	(0.35) to 2.76	0.19	(0.04) to .32	0.21	(0.05) to 0.36
1996	-6.10	(9.09) to (3.14)	1.65	(0.35) to 2.86	0.19	(0.04) to .33	0.22	(0.05) to 0.37
1997	-7.63	(11.37) to (3.99)	1.41	(0.47) to 2.63	0.15	(0.05) to .29	0.19	(0.06) to 0.35
1998	-7.33	(11.0) to (3.79)	1.63	(0.38) to 3.01	0.15	(0.04) to .28	0.20	(0.05) to 0.36
1999	-7.06	(10.56) to (3.71)	1.49	(0.33) to 2.79	0.13	(0.03) to .24	0.19	(0.04) to 0.35
2000	-6.75	(10.09) to (3.56)	1.48	(0.39) to 2.78	0.12	(0.03) to .22	0.22	(0.06) to 0.42
2001	-6.71	(9.94) to (3.62)	1.54	(0.36) to 2.85	0.10	(0.02) to .18	0.23	(0.05) to 0.42
2002	-6.72	(9.79) to (3.79)	1.45	(0.30) to 2.66	0.09	(0.02) to .16	0.20	(0.04) to 0.36
2003	-6.05	(8.97) to (3.30)	1.42	(0.24) to 2.59	0.08	(0.01) to .15	0.19	(0.03) to 0.34
2004	-5.42	(8.24) to (2.74)	1.60	(0.18) to 2.79	0.08	(0.01) to .15	0.21	(0.02) to 0.37
2005	-5.39	(7.97) to (2.97)	1.53	(0.18) to 2.70	0.08	(0.01) to .13	0.19	(0.02) to 0.34
2006	-4.36	(6.67) to (2.21)	1.77	(0.19) to 2.89	0.09	(0.01) to .14	0.23	(0.02) to 0.37
2007	-3.96	(6.14) to (1.97)	1.83	(0.13) to 2.92	0.08	(0.01) to .13	0.23	(0.02) to 0.36
2008	-3.37	(5.37) to (1.53)	1.86	(0.06) to 2.98	0.06	0 to 0.10	0.24	(0.01) to 0.38
2009	-3.52	(5.32) to (1.88)	1.70	(0.02) to 2.72	0.06	0 to 0.09	0.22	0 to 0.36
2010	-3.58	(5.45) to (1.91)	1.68	0.02 to 2.68	0.06	0 to 0.09	0.22	0 to 0.35
2011	-3.49	(5.17) to (1.99)	1.70	0.01 to 2.68	0.06	0 to 0.09	0.22	0 to 0.35
2012	-2.88	(4.40) to (1.55)	1.69	(0.01) to 2.64	0.06	0 to 0.10	0.22	0 to 0.34

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Non-Federal Croplands:	Settlements Converted to Cropland		Wetlands Converted to Cropland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils				
1990	0.06	(0.04) to 0.11	0.11	(0.06) to 0.19
1991	0.06	(0.04) to 0.11	0.10	(0.07) to 0.18
1992	0.06	(0.05) to 0.11	0.10	(0.08) to 0.18
1993	0.06	(0.04) to 0.12	0.12	(0.07) to 0.22
1994	0.07	(0.02) to 0.12	0.15	(0.04) to 0.26
1995	0.07	(0.02) to 0.13	0.15	(0.03) to 0.27
1996	0.07	(0.02) to 0.13	0.16	(0.03) to 0.28
1997	0.06	(0.02) to 0.12	0.14	(0.05) to 0.25
1998	0.08	(0.02) to 0.14	0.15	(0.03) to 0.27
1999	0.07	(0.02) to 0.13	0.14	(0.03) to 0.25
2000	0.07	(0.02) to 0.14	0.14	(0.04) to 0.26
2001	0.08	(0.02) to 0.14	0.14	(0.03) to 0.26
2002	0.07	(0.02) to 0.14	0.13	(0.03) to 0.25
2003	0.07	(0.01) to 0.12	0.13	(0.02) to 0.23
2004	0.07	(0.01) to 0.12	0.14	(0.02) to 0.25
2005	0.07	(0.01) to 0.12	0.13	(0.02) to 0.23
2006	0.08	(0.01) to 0.13	0.15	(0.02) to 0.25
2007	0.09	(0.01) to 0.14	0.14	(0.01) to 0.23
2008	0.08	0 to 0.13	0.14	0 to 0.22

2009	0.07	0 to 0.12	0.11	0 to 0.18
2010	0.08	0 to 0.12	0.11	0 to 0.18
2011	0.09	0 to 0.14	0.12	0 to 0.19
2012	0.09	0 to 0.15	0.12	0 to 0.19

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-221: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Federal Cropland Land Base Estimated with the Tier 2 Analysis using U.S. Factor Values (MMT CO₂ Eq./yr)

Federal Croplands:	Cropland Remaining Cropland		Grassland Converted to Cropland		Forest Converted to Cropland		Other Land Converted to Cropland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils								
1990	0.00	(0.01) to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1991	0.00	(0.01) to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1992	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1993	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1994	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1995	0.00	(0.03) to 0.03	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1996	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1997	-0.01	(0.05) to 0.02	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1998	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1999	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2000	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2001	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2002	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2003	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2004	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2005	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2006	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2007	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2008	0.00	(0.01) to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2009	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2010	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2011	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
2012	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Federal Croplands:	Settlements Converted to Cropland		Wetlands Converted to Cropland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils				
1990	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1991	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1992	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1993	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1994	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1995	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1996	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1997	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1998	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
1999	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2000	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2001	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2002	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2003	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2004	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2005	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2006	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2007	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2008	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01

2009	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2010	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2011	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01
2012	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.01

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-222: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Total Cropland Land Base Estimated with the Tier 2 Analysis using U.S. Factor Values (MMT CO₂ Eq./yr)

Total Croplands:	Cropland Remaining Cropland		Grassland Converted to Cropland		Forest Converted to Cropland		Other Land Converted to Cropland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils								
1990	-5.44	(7.97) to (3.0)	1.32	(.72) to 2.26	0.22	(.12) to .38	0.16	(.09) to .28
1991	-6.19	(8.94) to (3.53)	1.26	(.84) to 2.25	0.20	(.13) to .36	0.15	(.10) to .27
1992	-6.19	(9.77) to (3.63)	1.29	(1.07) to 2.32	0.19	(.16) to .35	0.16	(.13) to .29
1993	-6.95	(10.17) to (3.79)	1.35	(.75) to 2.45	0.18	(.10) to .32	0.17	(.09) to .31
1994	-6.71	(9.94) to (3.52)	1.48	(.37) to 2.63	0.18	(.05) to .33	0.19	(.05) to .35
1995	-6.46	(9.52) to (3.48)	1.59	(.35) to 2.76	0.19	(.04) to .32	0.21	(.05) to .36
1996	-6.10	(9.10) to (3.15)	1.65	(.35) to 2.86	0.19	(.04) to .33	0.22	(.05) to .37
1997	-7.64	(11.38) to (4.0)	1.41	(.47) to 2.63	0.15	(.05) to .29	0.19	(.06) to .35
1998	-7.33	(11.0) to (3.79)	1.63	(.37) to 3.01	0.15	(.04) to .28	0.20	(.05) to .36
1999	-7.07	(10.57) to (3.71)	1.49	(.33) to 2.79	0.13	(.03) to .24	0.19	(.04) to .35
2000	-6.75	(10.09) to (3.56)	1.48	(.39) to 2.78	0.12	(.03) to .22	0.22	(.06) to .42
2001	-6.71	(9.94) to (3.62)	1.54	(.35) to 2.85	0.10	(.02) to .18	0.23	(.05) to .42
2002	-6.72	(9.79) to (3.80)	1.45	(.30) to 2.66	0.09	(.02) to .16	0.20	(.04) to .36
2003	-6.05	(8.97) to (3.30)	1.42	(.24) to 2.59	0.08	(.01) to .15	0.19	(.03) to .34
2004	-5.43	(8.24) to (2.75)	1.60	(.17) to 2.79	0.08	(.01) to .15	0.21	(.02) to .37
2005	-5.40	(7.97) to (2.98)	1.53	(.18) to 2.70	0.08	(.01) to .13	0.19	(.02) to .34
2006	-4.36	(6.67) to (2.22)	1.77	(.19) to 2.89	0.09	(.01) to .14	0.23	(.02) to .37
2007	-3.96	(6.14) to (1.98)	1.83	(.13) to 2.92	0.08	(.01) to .13	0.23	(.02) to .36
2008	-3.37	(5.38) to (1.53)	1.86	(.06) to 2.98	0.06	.0 to .10	0.24	(.01) to .38
2009	-3.52	(5.33) to (1.88)	1.70	(.02) to 2.72	0.06	.0 to .09	0.22	.0 to .36
2010	-3.58	(5.45) to (1.91)	1.68	.02 to 2.68	0.06	.0 to .09	0.22	.0 to .35
2011	-3.49	(5.17) to (1.99)	1.70	.01 to 2.68	0.06	.0 to .09	0.22	.0 to .35
2012	-2.88	(4.41) to (1.55)	1.70	(.01) to 2.64	0.06	.0 to .10	0.22	.0 to .34
Organic Soils								
1990	30.25	20.02 to 43.38	2.52	1.46 to 3.95	0.11	.06 to .18	0.10	.0 to .22
1991	29.75	19.76 to 42.59	2.55	1.53 to 3.87	0.11	.06 to .18	0.10	.0 to .24
1992	29.71	19.60 to 42.96	2.58	1.50 to 4.0	0.10	.05 to .17	0.04	.0 to .14
1993	29.54	19.53 to 42.63	2.71	1.60 to 4.16	0.10	.06 to .17	0.10	.0 to .24
1994	29.37	19.32 to 42.42	2.71	1.62 to 4.14	0.10	.05 to .17	0.10	.0 to .23
1995	29.34	19.27 to 42.49	2.93	1.71 to 4.50	0.09	.05 to .16	0.10	.0 to .24
1996	29.27	19.18 to 42.44	3.02	1.76 to 4.66	0.10	.05 to .17	0.10	.0 to .24
1997	29.26	19.19 to 42.51	3.00	1.79 to 4.61	0.10	.05 to .17	0.10	.0 to .24
1998	28.83	18.80 to 42.07	3.51	1.82 to 5.76	0.09	.04 to .17	0.06	.0 to .20
1999	24.45	15.81 to 35.47	3.53	1.82 to 5.80	0.09	.04 to .16	0.06	.0 to .20
2000	24.53	15.85 to 35.55	3.25	1.76 to 5.24	0.09	.04 to .16	0.06	.0 to .20
2001	28.99	18.76 to 42.52	4.18	1.92 to 7.59	0.08	.04 to .15	0.06	.0 to .20
2002	29.32	19.09 to 42.88	4.18	1.91 to 7.52	0.06	.02 to .12	0.06	.0 to .20
2003	29.65	19.33 to 43.45	3.99	1.78 to 7.27	0.08	.03 to .15	0.06	.0 to .20
2004	29.95	19.52 to 43.88	3.39	1.51 to 6.05	0.05	.01 to .10	0.06	.0 to .20
2005	29.66	19.26 to 43.32	3.33	1.47 to 5.93	0.04	.01 to .10	0.06	.0 to .20
2006	29.59	19.24 to 43.36	3.26	1.49 to 5.77	0.04	.01 to .09	0.06	.0 to .20
2007	29.46	19.33 to 42.90	3.23	1.39 to 5.83	0.02	.01 to .05	0.06	.0 to .20
2008	29.35	19.18 to 42.70	3.00	1.25 to 5.54	0.03	.01 to .07	0.06	.0 to .20
2009	29.70	19.31 to 43.44	2.94	1.20 to 5.41	0.03	.01 to .07	0.06	.0 to .20
2010	29.65	19.31 to 43.32	2.87	1.23 to 5.30	0.03	.01 to .07	0.00	.0 to .0
2011	27.95	18.31 to 40.44	2.98	1.09 to 5.61	0.02	.0 to .05	0.00	.0 to .0
2012	28.10	18.47 to 40.58	3.03	1.18 to 5.65	0.02	.0 to .03	0.00	.0 to .0

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Total Croplands:	Settlements Converted to Cropland		Wetlands Converted to Cropland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils				
1990	0.06	(0.04) to 0.11	0.11	(0.06) to 0.19
1991	0.06	(0.04) to 0.11	0.10	(0.07) to 0.18
1992	0.06	(0.05) to 0.11	0.10	(0.08) to 0.18
1993	0.06	(0.04) to 0.12	0.12	(0.07) to 0.22
1994	0.07	(0.02) to 0.12	0.15	(0.04) to 0.26
1995	0.07	(0.02) to 0.13	0.15	(0.03) to 0.27
1996	0.07	(0.02) to 0.13	0.16	(0.03) to 0.28
1997	0.06	(0.02) to 0.12	0.14	(0.05) to 0.25
1998	0.08	(0.02) to 0.14	0.15	(0.03) to 0.28
1999	0.07	(0.02) to 0.13	0.14	(0.03) to 0.26
2000	0.07	(0.02) to 0.14	0.14	(0.04) to 0.26
2001	0.08	(0.02) to 0.14	0.14	(0.03) to 0.26
2002	0.07	(0.02) to 0.14	0.14	(0.03) to 0.25
2003	0.07	(0.01) to 0.12	0.13	(0.02) to 0.24
2004	0.07	(0.01) to 0.12	0.14	(0.01) to 0.25
2005	0.07	(0.01) to 0.12	0.13	(0.01) to 0.23
2006	0.08	(0.01) to 0.13	0.15	(0.01) to 0.25
2007	0.09	(0.01) to 0.14	0.15	(0.01) to 0.23
2008	0.08	0.0 to 0.13	0.14	0.0 to 0.22
2009	0.07	0.0 to 0.12	0.12	0.0 to 0.18
2010	0.08	0.0 to 0.12	0.11	0.0 to 0.18
2011	0.09	0.0 to 0.14	0.12	0.0 to 0.19
2012	0.09	0.0 to 0.15	0.12	0.0 to 0.19
Organic Soils				
1990	0.03	.0 to .06	0.62	.30 to 1.07
1991	0.03	.0 to .07	0.63	.29 to 1.10
1992	0.03	.0 to .06	0.63	.34 to 1.03
1993	0.03	.0 to .06	0.81	.48 to 1.23
1994	0.05	.02 to .09	0.96	.56 to 1.48
1995	0.04	.01 to .07	0.99	.61 to 1.49
1996	0.05	.02 to .09	1.01	.59 to 1.55
1997	0.04	.01 to .07	1.00	.58 to 1.55
1998	0.04	.01 to .08	0.95	.55 to 1.49
1999	0.04	.01 to .08	0.95	.54 to 1.50
2000	0.04	.01 to .08	0.86	.48 to 1.36
2001	0.04	.01 to .08	0.83	.44 to 1.33
2002	0.04	.01 to .08	0.81	.44 to 1.29
2003	0.03	.0 to .06	0.69	.36 to 1.13
2004	0.03	.0 to .07	0.72	.40 to 1.14
2005	0.03	.0 to .08	0.71	.40 to 1.14
2006	0.03	.0 to .08	0.71	.40 to 1.14
2007	0.05	.02 to .10	0.69	.36 to 1.16
2008	0.05	.01 to .11	0.55	.31 to .87
2009	0.05	.01 to .10	0.50	.29 to .78
2010	0.05	.01 to .10	0.50	.28 to .80
2011	0.07	.02 to .15	0.53	.30 to .84
2012	0.09	.04 to .17	0.53	.31 to .83

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future Inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-223: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Non-Federal Grasslands Land Base Estimated with the Tier 2 Analysis using U.S. Factor Values (MMT CO₂ Eq./yr)

Non-Federal Grasslands:	Grassland Remaining Grassland		Cropland Converted to Grassland		Forest Converted to Grassland		Other Land Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils								
1990	-0.43	(1.02) to (.03)	-2.90	(4.17) to (1.74)	-0.75	(1.09) to (0.45)	-0.54	(0.78) to (0.33)

1991	-0.54	(1.18) to (.08)	-2.90	(4.16) to (1.75)	-0.77	(1.10) to (0.46)	-0.56	(0.81) to (0.34)
1992	-0.54	(1.50) to (.13)	-2.79	(4.01) to (1.68)	-0.75	(1.08) to (0.45)	-0.58	(0.83) to (0.35)
1993	-0.44	(1.05) to (.04)	-2.94	(4.22) to (1.77)	-0.74	(1.07) to (0.45)	-0.67	(0.96) to (0.40)
1994	-0.09	(0.52) to 0.28	-3.10	(4.46) to (1.86)	-0.72	(1.04) to (0.44)	-0.79	(1.14) to (0.47)
1995	-0.09	(0.49) to 0.26	-2.89	(4.16) to (1.73)	-0.70	(1.01) to (0.42)	-0.80	(1.15) to (0.48)
1996	-0.10	(0.49) to 0.23	-2.69	(3.87) to (1.62)	-0.70	(1.0) to (0.42)	-0.79	(1.13) to (0.47)
1997	-0.22	(0.65) to 0.07	-2.59	(3.69) to (1.59)	-0.70	(0.99) to (0.43)	-0.84	(1.20) to (0.51)
1998	-0.09	(0.51) to 0.27	-3.22	(4.61) to (1.94)	-0.70	(1.01) to (0.42)	-0.92	(1.32) to (0.56)
1999	-0.06	(0.45) to 0.29	-3.11	(4.46) to (1.89)	-0.69	(0.99) to (0.42)	-0.96	(1.37) to (0.58)
2000	-0.13	(0.54) to 0.17	-3.16	(4.52) to (1.91)	-0.70	(1.01) to (0.43)	-1.12	(1.61) to (0.68)
2001	-0.10	(0.48) to 0.21	-3.06	(4.39) to (1.84)	-0.67	(0.96) to (0.40)	-1.16	(1.66) to (0.70)
2002	-0.06	(0.41) to 0.24	-2.78	(4.0) to (1.67)	-0.62	(0.90) to (0.37)	-1.09	(1.57) to (0.65)
2003	-0.01	(0.32) to 0.29	-2.51	(3.62) to (1.49)	-0.55	(0.79) to (0.33)	-1.03	(1.49) to (0.61)
2004	0.06	(0.23) to 0.39	-2.65	(3.83) to (1.58)	-0.53	(0.76) to (0.31)	-1.07	(1.54) to (0.64)
2005	0.05	(0.24) to 0.39	-2.43	(3.51) to (1.44)	-0.47	(0.68) to (0.28)	-1.08	(1.56) to (0.64)
2006	0.05	(0.25) to 0.40	-1.91	(2.82) to (1.07)	-0.35	(0.52) to (0.20)	-0.90	(1.33) to (0.51)
2007	0.10	(0.17) to 0.43	-1.59	(2.37) to (0.88)	-0.29	(0.43) to (0.16)	-0.83	(1.25) to (0.46)
2008	0.16	(0.08) to 0.52	-1.45	(2.15) to (0.80)	-0.25	(0.37) to (0.14)	-0.83	(1.24) to (0.46)
2009	0.26	(0.02) to 0.69	-1.38	(2.06) to (0.77)	-0.24	(0.36) to (0.14)	-0.85	(1.26) to (0.47)
2010	0.31	0.02 to 0.73	-1.31	(1.95) to (0.73)	-0.23	(0.34) to (0.13)	-0.84	(1.25) to (0.47)
2011	0.31	0.02 to 0.76	-1.22	(1.83) to (0.67)	-0.21	(0.31) to (0.12)	-0.81	(1.22) to (0.45)
2012	0.24	(0.01) to 0.65	-1.16	(1.73) to (0.64)	-0.20	(0.29) to (0.11)	-0.80	(1.19) to (0.44)

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Grassland Remaining Grassland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Non-Federal Grasslands:	Settlements Converted to Grassland		Wetlands Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils				
1990	-0.08	(0.12) to (0.05)	-0.32	(0.46) to (0.19)
1991	-0.09	(0.13) to (0.05)	-0.39	(0.56) to (0.23)
1992	-0.09	(0.12) to (0.05)	-0.46	(0.66) to (0.28)
1993	-0.10	(0.14) to (0.06)	-0.48	(0.69) to (0.29)
1994	-0.11	(0.15) to (0.06)	-0.50	(0.72) to (0.30)
1995	-0.10	(0.15) to (0.06)	-0.48	(0.70) to (0.29)
1996	-0.11	(0.16) to (0.07)	-0.47	(0.67) to (0.28)
1997	-0.11	(0.16) to (0.07)	-0.47	(0.66) to (0.29)
1998	-0.12	(0.18) to (0.07)	-0.49	(0.70) to (0.29)
1999	-0.13	(0.18) to (0.08)	-0.48	(0.69) to (0.29)
2000	-0.13	(0.19) to (0.08)	-0.50	(0.71) to (0.30)
2001	-0.14	(0.20) to (0.08)	-0.49	(0.70) to (0.29)
2002	-0.14	(0.19) to (0.08)	-0.45	(0.65) to (0.27)
2003	-0.12	(0.17) to (0.07)	-0.42	(0.61) to (0.25)
2004	-0.12	(0.18) to (0.07)	-0.44	(0.63) to (0.26)
2005	-0.12	(0.18) to (0.07)	-0.43	(0.62) to (0.26)
2006	-0.11	(0.16) to (0.06)	-0.36	(0.53) to (0.20)
2007	-0.10	(0.15) to (0.05)	-0.32	(0.48) to (0.18)
2008	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.26	(0.39) to (0.15)
2009	-0.09	(0.13) to (0.05)	-0.23	(0.34) to (0.13)
2010	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.19	(0.29) to (0.11)
2011	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.16	(0.23) to (0.09)
2012	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.11	(0.17) to (0.06)

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Grassland Remaining Grassland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-224: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Federal Grasslands Land Base Estimated with the Tier 2 Analysis using U.S. Factor Values (MMT CO₂ Eq./yr)

Federal Grasslands:	Grassland Remaining Grassland		Cropland Converted to Grassland		Forest Converted to Grassland		Other Land Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI

Mineral Soils								
1990	-0.20	(8.94) to 9.45	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1991	-0.30	(9.28) to 8.76	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1992	-0.30	(10.08) to 8.06	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1993	-1.16	(11.03) to 7.60	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1994	-1.50	(11.79) to 7.18	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1995	-1.52	(12.0) to 7.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1996	-0.90	(10.65) to 7.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1997	-0.83	(10.42) to 7.27	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1998	-1.62	(13.58) to 7.15	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.10	(0.75) to 0.52	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
1999	-1.44	(13.27) to 7.24	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.10	(0.74) to 0.52	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2000	-1.70	(12.68) to 6.38	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.10	(0.74) to 0.51	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2001	-1.71	(12.81) to 6.44	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.10	(0.73) to 0.51	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2002	-2.72	(14.63) to 7.05	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.11	(0.70) to 0.45	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2003	-2.73	(14.72) to 7.76	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.11	(0.70) to 0.45	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2004	-1.28	(11.29) to 8.85	0.00	(0.03) to 0.02	-0.11	(0.70) to 0.46	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2005	-1.37	(11.44) to 8.50	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.86) to 0.70	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2006	-1.51	(11.82) to 8.56	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.86) to 0.70	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2007	-1.63	(11.93) to 8.11	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.86) to 0.70	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2008	-1.67	(12.11) to 8.20	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.86) to 0.70	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2009	-1.46	(11.57) to 7.14	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.85) to 0.70	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2010	-1.53	(11.51) to 7.48	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.86) to 0.69	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2011	-1.15	(10.79) to 8.01	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.85) to 0.69	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02
2012	-0.67	(9.89) to 8.69	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.07	(0.85) to 0.69	0.00	(0.02) to 0.02

1

Federal Grasslands:	Settlements Converted to Grassland		Wetlands Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils				
1990	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1991	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1992	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1993	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1994	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1995	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1996	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1997	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	0.0 to 0.0
1998	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.05) to 0.03
1999	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.05) to 0.03
2000	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.05) to 0.03
2001	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.05) to 0.03
2002	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2003	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2004	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	-0.01	(0.04) to 0.03
2005	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2006	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2007	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2008	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2009	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2010	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2011	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03
2012	0.00	0.0 to 0.0	0.00	(0.04) to 0.03

2

3

4

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Grassland Remaining Grassland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-225: Annual Change in Soil Organic Carbon Stocks (95% Confidence Interval) for the Total Grassland Land Base Estimated with the Tier 2 Analysis using U.S. Factor Values (MMT CO₂ Eq./yr)

Total Grasslands:	Grassland Remaining Grassland		Cropland Converted to Grassland		Forest Converted to Grassland		Other Land Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils								
1990	-0.62	(9.39) to 9.03	-2.90	(4.17) to (1.74)	-0.75	(1.09) to (0.45)	-0.54	(0.78) to (0.33)
1991	-0.84	(9.85) to 8.23	-2.90	(4.16) to (1.75)	-0.77	(1.10) to (0.46)	-0.56	(0.81) to (0.34)
1992	-0.84	(10.83) to 7.36	-2.79	(4.01) to (1.68)	-0.75	(1.08) to (0.45)	-0.58	(0.83) to (0.35)
1993	-1.60	(11.49) to 7.16	-2.94	(4.22) to (1.77)	-0.74	(1.07) to (0.45)	-0.67	(0.96) to (0.40)
1994	-1.59	(11.89) to 7.09	-3.10	(4.46) to (1.86)	-0.72	(1.04) to (0.44)	-0.79	(1.14) to (0.47)
1995	-1.61	(12.10) to 6.93	-2.89	(4.16) to (1.73)	-0.70	(1.01) to (0.42)	-0.80	(1.15) to (0.48)
1996	-1.00	(10.76) to 6.92	-2.69	(3.87) to (1.62)	-0.70	(1.0) to (0.42)	-0.79	(1.13) to (0.47)
1997	-1.05	(10.65) to 7.06	-2.59	(3.69) to (1.59)	-0.70	(.99) to (0.43)	-0.84	(1.20) to (0.51)
1998	-1.71	(13.68) to 7.07	-3.22	(4.61) to (1.95)	-0.80	(1.52) to (0.12)	-0.92	(1.32) to (0.56)
1999	-1.49	(13.34) to 7.19	-3.12	(4.46) to (1.89)	-0.79	(1.50) to (0.12)	-0.96	(1.38) to (0.58)
2000	-1.84	(12.83) to 6.25	-3.16	(4.52) to (1.91)	-0.80	(1.51) to (0.14)	-1.13	(1.61) to (0.68)
2001	-1.81	(12.91) to 6.35	-3.06	(4.39) to (1.84)	-0.77	(1.46) to (0.10)	-1.17	(1.67) to (0.70)
2002	-2.78	(14.69) to 7.0	-2.78	(4.0) to (1.67)	-0.74	(1.38) to (0.12)	-1.10	(1.57) to (0.66)
2003	-2.74	(14.73) to 7.75	-2.51	(3.62) to (1.49)	-0.66	(1.30) to (0.06)	-1.04	(1.50) to (0.62)
2004	-1.22	(11.23) to 8.91	-2.66	(3.84) to (1.58)	-0.63	(1.27) to (0.03)	-1.08	(1.55) to (0.64)
2005	-1.32	(11.39) to 8.56	-2.43	(3.51) to (1.44)	-0.54	(1.36) to 0.25	-1.08	(1.56) to (0.64)
2006	-1.45	(11.77) to 8.62	-1.91	(2.82) to (1.07)	-0.42	(1.23) to 0.36	-0.90	(1.34) to (0.51)
2007	-1.53	(11.84) to 8.21	-1.59	(2.37) to (.88)	-0.35	(1.16) to 0.42	-0.84	(1.25) to (0.46)
2008	-1.50	(11.95) to 8.37	-1.45	(2.15) to (.80)	-0.31	(1.12) to 0.46	-0.84	(1.24) to (0.47)
2009	-1.20	(11.32) to 7.41	-1.38	(2.06) to (.77)	-0.31	(1.10) to 0.46	-0.85	(1.26) to (0.47)
2010	-1.22	(11.20) to 7.80	-1.31	(1.95) to (.73)	-0.29	(1.09) to 0.47	-0.84	(1.25) to (0.47)
2011	-0.84	(10.48) to 8.34	-1.22	(1.83) to (.67)	-0.28	(1.07) to 0.49	-0.82	(1.23) to (0.45)
2012	-0.43	(9.65) to 8.94	-1.16	(1.73) to (.64)	-0.26	(1.05) to 0.50	-0.80	(1.19) to (0.44)
Organic Soils								
1990	7.21	4.07 to 11.35	0.53	.23 to .98	0.01	.0 to .03	0.04	.01 to .09
1991	7.16	4.0 to 11.43	0.53	.23 to .97	0.01	.0 to .03	0.04	.01 to .09
1992	7.08	3.95 to 11.25	0.51	.22 to .94	0.01	.0 to .03	0.04	.01 to .09
1993	7.03	3.90 to 11.26	0.57	.26 to 1.0	0.02	.01 to .04	0.04	.01 to .09
1994	6.99	3.91 to 11.08	0.70	.32 to 1.27	0.02	.01 to .04	0.04	.01 to .09
1995	6.93	3.88 to 11.02	0.70	.31 to 1.27	0.02	.01 to .03	0.04	.01 to .09
1996	6.85	3.82 to 10.90	0.68	.30 to 1.24	0.02	.01 to .03	0.04	.01 to .09
1997	6.77	3.77 to 10.77	0.69	.32 to 1.23	0.02	.01 to .03	0.03	.0 to .07
1998	6.67	3.70 to 10.68	0.86	.43 to 1.49	0.02	.0 to .03	0.03	.0 to .07
1999	6.62	3.67 to 10.58	0.84	.41 to 1.44	0.01	.0 to .03	0.03	.0 to .07
2000	6.50	3.61 to 10.34	0.88	.44 to 1.51	0.05	.01 to .10	0.03	.0 to .07
2001	6.20	3.42 to 9.91	0.99	.50 to 1.67	0.06	.02 to .12	0.03	.0 to .08
2002	6.14	3.39 to 9.79	1.10	.55 to 1.84	0.06	.02 to .12	0.03	.0 to .08
2003	6.05	3.33 to 9.69	1.03	.53 to 1.74	0.07	.03 to .14	0.03	.0 to .08
2004	6.01	3.28 to 9.65	1.13	.57 to 1.91	0.09	.04 to .16	0.04	.01 to .09
2005	5.97	3.27 to 9.58	1.13	.58 to 1.91	0.09	.04 to .16	0.04	.01 to .09
2006	5.76	3.12 to 9.33	1.13	.57 to 1.90	0.09	.04 to .17	0.04	.01 to .09
2007	5.73	3.11 to 9.26	1.11	.57 to 1.87	0.09	.04 to .17	0.04	.01 to .09
2008	5.69	3.08 to 9.18	1.07	.54 to 1.82	0.10	.04 to .19	0.05	.01 to .10
2009	5.68	3.08 to 9.17	1.15	.59 to 1.92	0.10	.04 to .18	0.03	.01 to .07
2010	5.64	3.07 to 9.12	1.15	.59 to 1.92	0.10	.04 to .18	0.03	.01 to .07
2011	5.61	3.05 to 9.08	1.14	.58 to 1.93	0.10	.04 to .19	0.05	.02 to .11
2012	5.53	3.0 to 8.91	1.12	.57 to 1.88	0.10	.04 to .19	0.05	.02 to .11

Total Grasslands:	Settlements Converted to Grassland		Wetlands Converted to Grassland	
Year	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Mineral Soils				
1990	-0.08	(0.12) to (0.05)	-0.32	(0.46) to (0.19)
1991	-0.09	(0.13) to (0.05)	-0.39	(0.56) to (0.23)
1992	-0.09	(0.12) to (0.05)	-0.46	(0.66) to (0.28)

1993	-0.10	(0.14) to (0.06)	-0.48	(0.69) to (0.29)
1994	-0.11	(0.15) to (0.06)	-0.50	(0.72) to (0.30)
1995	-0.10	(0.15) to (0.06)	-0.48	(0.70) to (0.29)
1996	-0.11	(0.16) to (0.07)	-0.47	(0.67) to (0.28)
1997	-0.11	(0.16) to (0.07)	-0.47	(0.66) to (0.29)
1998	-0.12	(0.18) to (0.07)	-0.49	(0.71) to (0.30)
1999	-0.13	(0.18) to (0.08)	-0.49	(0.70) to (0.29)
2000	-0.13	(0.19) to (0.08)	-0.50	(0.72) to (0.30)
2001	-0.14	(0.20) to (0.08)	-0.49	(0.71) to (0.30)
2002	-0.14	(0.19) to (0.08)	-0.46	(0.66) to (0.28)
2003	-0.12	(0.17) to (0.07)	-0.43	(0.62) to (0.25)
2004	-0.12	(0.18) to (0.07)	-0.45	(0.65) to (0.26)
2005	-0.12	(0.18) to (0.07)	-0.43	(0.63) to (0.25)
2006	-0.11	(0.16) to (0.06)	-0.36	(0.54) to (0.20)
2007	-0.10	(0.15) to (0.05)	-0.33	(0.49) to (0.18)
2008	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.26	(0.40) to (0.14)
2009	-0.09	(0.13) to (0.05)	-0.23	(0.34) to (0.12)
2010	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.20	(0.30) to (0.10)
2011	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.16	(0.24) to (0.08)
2012	-0.09	(0.14) to (0.05)	-0.11	(0.18) to (0.05)
Organic Soils				
1990	0.00	.0 to .0	0.12	.05 to .23
1991	0.00	.0 to .0	0.12	.05 to .22
1992	0.00	.0 to .0	0.12	.02 to .30
1993	0.00	.0 to .01	0.18	.07 to .36
1994	0.01	.0 to .02	0.24	.11 to .42
1995	0.01	.0 to .02	0.24	.12 to .40
1996	0.01	.0 to .02	0.24	.13 to .39
1997	0.01	.0 to .03	0.24	.13 to .40
1998	0.02	.0 to .04	0.25	.13 to .41
1999	0.02	.0 to .04	0.25	.13 to .41
2000	0.02	.0 to .04	0.30	.16 to .48
2001	0.02	.0 to .04	0.30	.16 to .49
2002	0.02	.0 to .04	0.28	.15 to .45
2003	0.02	.0 to .04	0.24	.14 to .38
2004	0.02	.0 to .04	0.24	.13 to .39
2005	0.02	.0 to .04	0.26	.14 to .42
2006	0.02	.0 to .04	0.28	.15 to .44
2007	0.02	.0 to .04	0.28	.15 to .45
2008	0.02	.0 to .04	0.28	.16 to .46
2009	0.02	.0 to .04	0.33	.19 to .52
2010	0.02	.0 to .04	0.34	.19 to .54
2011	0.02	.0 to .04	0.33	.19 to .53
2012	0.02	.0 to .04	0.33	.19 to .52

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Grassland Remaining Grassland* section for more information). The Tier 2 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Step 3: Estimate Soil Organic C Stock Changes and Direct N₂O Emissions from Organic Soils

In this step, soil organic C losses and N₂O emissions are estimated for organic soils that are drained for agricultural production.

Step 3a: Direct N₂O Emissions Due to Drainage of Organic Soils in Cropland and Grassland

To estimate annual N₂O emissions from drainage of organic soils in cropland and grassland, the area of drained organic soils in croplands and grasslands for temperate regions is multiplied by the IPCC (2006) default emission factor for temperate soils and the corresponding area in sub-tropical regions is multiplied by the average (12 kg N₂O-N/ha cultivated) of IPCC (2006) default emission factors for temperate (8 kg N₂O-N/ha cultivated) and tropical (16 kg N₂O-N/ha cultivated) organic soils. The uncertainty is determined based on simple error propagation methods (IPCC 2006), including uncertainty in the default emission factor ranging from 2–24 kg N₂O-N/ha (IPCC 2006).

Step 3b: Soil Organic C Stock Changes Due to Drainage of Organic Soils in Cropland and Grassland

Change in soil organic C stocks due to drainage of cropland and grassland soils are estimated annually from 1990 through 2012, based on the land-use and management activity data in conjunction with appropriate emission factors. The activity data are based on annual data from 1990 through 2012 from the NRI. Organic Soil emission factors representative of U.S. conditions have been estimated from published studies (Ogle et al. 2003), based on subsidence studies in the United States and Canada (Table A-227). PDFs are constructed as normal densities based on the mean C loss rates and associated variances. Input values are randomly selected from PDFs in a Monte Carlo analysis to estimate SOC change for 50,000 times and produce a 95 percent confidence interval for the inventory results. Losses of soil organic C from drainage of cropland and grassland soils are provided in Table A-220 and Table A-223.

Step 4: Estimate Indirect N₂O Emissions for Croplands and Grasslands

In this step, N₂O emissions are estimated for the two indirect emission pathways (N₂O emissions due to volatilization, and N₂O emissions due to leaching and runoff of N), which are summed to yield total indirect N₂O emissions from croplands and grasslands.

Step 4a: Indirect Soil N₂O Emissions Due to Volatilization

Indirect emissions from volatilization of N inputs from synthetic and commercial organic fertilizers, and PRP manure, are calculated according to the amount of mineral N that is transported in gaseous forms from the soil profile and later emitted as soil N₂O following atmospheric deposition. See Step 1e for additional information about the methods used to compute N losses due to volatilization. The estimated N volatilized is multiplied by the IPCC default emission factor of 0.01 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006) to estimate total N₂O emissions from volatilization. The uncertainty is estimated using simple error propagation methods (IPCC 2006), by combining uncertainties in the amount of N volatilized, with uncertainty in the default emission factor ranging from 0.002–0.05 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006). The estimates are provided in Table A-228 and implied Tier 3 emission factors are in Table A-231 and Table A-232.

Step 4b: Indirect Soil N₂O Emissions Due to Leaching and Runoff

The amount of mineral N from synthetic fertilizers, commercial organic fertilizers, PRP manure, crop residue, N mineralization, asymbiotic fixation that is transported from the soil profile in aqueous form is used to calculate indirect emissions from leaching of mineral N from soils and losses in runoff of water associated with overland flow. See Step 1e for additional information about the methods used to compute N losses from soils due to leaching and runoff in overland water flows. The total amount of N transported from soil profiles through leaching and surface runoff is multiplied by the IPCC default emission factor of 0.0075 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006) to estimate emissions for this source. The emission estimates are provided in Table A-229 and implied Tier 3 emission factors are in Table A-231 and Table A-232. The uncertainty is estimated based on simple error propagation methods (IPCC 2006), including uncertainty in the default emission factor ranging from 0.0005 to 0.025 kg N₂O-N/kg N (IPCC 2006).

Step 5: Estimate Total Soil Organic C Stock Changes and N₂O Emissions for U.S. Soils

Step 5a: Estimate Total Soil N₂O Emissions

Total N₂O emissions are estimated by adding total direct emissions (from mineral cropland soils, drainage and cultivation of organic soils, and grassland management) to indirect emissions. Uncertainties in the final estimate are combined using simple error propagation methods (IPCC 2006), and expressed as a 95 percent confidence interval. Estimates are provided in Table A-230.

Direct and indirect simulated emissions of soil N₂O vary regionally in croplands as a function of N input amount and timing of fertilization, tillage intensity, crop rotation sequence, weather, and soil type. Note that there are other management practices, such as fertilizer formulation (Halvorson et al. 2013), that influence emissions but are not represented in the model simulations. The highest total N₂O emissions occur in Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska and Texas (Table A-234). On a per area unit basis, direct N₂O emissions are high in some Northeast, Midwest, and many of the Mississippi River Basin states where there are high N inputs to hay, corn and soybean crops, and in some western states where irrigated crops are grown that require high N inputs. Note that although the total crop area in the northeast is relatively low, emissions are high on a per unit area basis because of freeze/thaw cycles during spring that saturate surface soil layers and enhance denitrification rates.

Direct emissions from non-federal grasslands are typically lower than the emissions from croplands (Table A-234) because N inputs tend to be lower, particularly from synthetic fertilizer. Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Montana, Missouri, and Kentucky are the highest emitters for this category due to large land areas used for pastures and rangeland (Table A-234). On a per-

unit of area basis, direct N₂O emissions are higher in some of the Southeastern, Appalachian, and Midwestern states because these grasslands are more intensively managed (legume seeding, fertilization) while western rangelands receive few, if any, N inputs. Also, rainfall is limited in most of the western United States, and grasslands are not typically irrigated so minimal leaching and runoff of N occurs in these grasslands, and therefore there are lower indirect N₂O emissions.

Step 5b: Estimate Total Soil Organic Stock Change

The sum of total CO₂ emissions and removals from the Tier 3 DayCent Model Approach, Tier 2 IPCC Methods and additional land-use and management considerations are provided in Table A-235. The states with highest total amounts of C sequestration are California, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, North Dakota and Tennessee (Table A-236). For organic soils, emission rates are highest in the regions that contain the majority of drained organic soils, including California, Florida, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina and Wisconsin. On a per unit of area basis, the emission rate patterns are very similar to the total emissions in each state, with the highest rates in coastal states of the Southeast, states surrounding the Great Lakes, and California.

Step 5c: Estimate Total CH₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation

The sum of total CH₄ emissions from the Tier 3 DayCent Model Approach and Tier 1 IPCC Methods are provided in Table A-233. The states with highest total emissions are Arkansas, California, Louisiana and Texas (Table A-237). These states also have the largest areas of rice cultivation, and Louisiana and Texas have a relatively large proportion of fields with a second ratoon crop each year. Ratoon crops extend the period of time under flooded conditions, which leads to more CH₄ emissions.

Table A-226: Assumptions and Calculations to Estimate the Contribution to Soil Organic Carbon Stocks from Application of Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge) to Mineral Soils

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Biosolids N Applied to Agricultural Land (Mg N) ^a	51,848	55,107	58,480	61,971	64,721	67,505	72,081	75,195	78,353	80,932
Assimilative Capacity (Mg N/ha) ^b	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122
Area covered by Available Biosolids N (ha) ^c	432,067	459,226	487,336	507,957	530,503	553,322	590,828	616,357	642,240	663,381
Average Annual Rate of C storage (Mg C/ha-yr) ^d	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
Contribution to Soil C (MMT CO₂/yr)^{e,f}	-0.60	-0.64	-0.68	-0.71	-0.74	-0.77	-0.82	-0.86	-0.89	-0.92
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Biosolids N Applied to Agricultural Land (Mg N) ^a	83,523	86,124	88,736	91,358	93,991	98,400	101,314	104,222	107,123	110,018
Assimilative Capacity (Mg N/ha) ^b	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122
Area covered by Available Biosolids N (ha) ^c	684,612	705,932	727,341	748,836	770,418	806,559	830,447	854,276	878,055	901,790
Average Annual Rate of C storage (Mg C/ha-yr) ^d	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
Contribution to Soil C (MMT CO₂/yr)^{e,f}	-0.95	-0.98	-1.01	-1.04	-1.07	-1.12	-1.16	-1.19	-1.22	-1.26
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016			
Biosolids N Applied to Agricultural Land (Mg N) ^a	112,909	115,797	118,681	121,563	124,443	127,322	130,200			
Assimilative Capacity (Mg N/ha) ^b	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122	0.122			
Area covered by Available Biosolids N (ha) ^c	925,487	949,154	972,796	996,417	1,020,025	1,043,622	1,067,213			
Average Annual Rate of C storage (Mg C/ha-yr) ^d	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38			
Contribution to Soil C (MMT CO₂/yr)^{e,f}	-1.29	-1.32	-1.36	-1.39	-1.42	-1.45	-1.49			

^a N applied to soils described in Step 1d.

^b Assimilative Capacity is the national average amount of manure-derived N that can be applied on cropland without buildup of nutrients in the soil (Kellogg et al., 2000).

^c Area covered by biosolids N available for application to soils is the available N applied at the assimilative capacity rate. The 1992 assimilative capacity rate was applied to 1990 – 1992 and the 1997 rate was applied to 1993-2016.

^d Annual rate of C storage based on national average increase in C storage for grazing lands that is attributed to organic matter amendments (0.38 Mg/ha-yr)

^e Contribution to Soil C is estimated as the product of the area covered by the available biosolids N and the average annual C storage attributed to an organic matter amendment.

^f Some small, undetermined fraction of this applied N is probably not applied to agricultural soils, but instead is applied to forests, home gardens, and other lands.

Note: Values in parentheses indicate net C storage.

Table A-227: Carbon Loss Rates for Organic Soils Under Agricultural Management in the United States, and IPCC Default Rates (Metric Ton C/ha-yr)

Region	IPCC	Cropland U.S. Revised	IPCC	Grassland U.S. Revised
Cold Temperate, Dry & Cold Temperate, Moist	1	11.2±2.5	0.25	2.8±0.5 ^a
Warm Temperate, Dry & Warm Temperate, Moist	10	14.0±2.5	2.5	3.5±0.8 ^a
Sub-Tropical, Dry & Sub-Tropical, Moist	1	14.3±2.5	0.25	2.8±0.5 ^a

^a There are not enough data available to estimate a U.S. value for C losses from grassland. Consequently, estimates are 25 percent of the values for cropland, which is an assumption that is used for the IPCC default organic soil C losses on grassland.

Table A-228: Indirect N₂O Emissions from Volatilization and Atmospheric Deposition (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Croplands	5.9	5.9	5.7	5.8	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.4	6.4	6.7	6.9	6.6	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.5	7.0	6.8	6.5
Grasslands	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.2
Total	10.2	10.4	10.1	10.2	10.7	10.8	10.8	10.8	11.3	10.9	10.8	10.8	10.7	11.1	11.6	11.1	11.3	11.2	11.0	11.0	11.6	11.0	10.8

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 1 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-229: Indirect N₂O Emissions from Leaching and Runoff (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Croplands	25.0	21.3	24.3	31.4	18.0	23.7	23.5	21.4	27.3	22.0	19.4	25.2	21.9	24.2	28.6	21.4	24.9	26.8	29.1	29.2	28.6	29.0	18.9
Grasslands	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.5	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.7	2.7	2.5	3.2	3.3	2.7	3.5	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.3	3.7	2.9	3.5	2.6
Total	28.2	24.4	27.2	34.9	20.9	26.7	26.5	24.4	31.0	24.7	21.8	28.4	25.2	26.8	32.1	23.9	27.7	30.1	32.4	32.8	31.5	32.6	21.5

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 1 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-230: Total N₂O Emissions from Agricultural Soil Management (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Activity	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total Direct	212.0	213.0	212.1	212.8	213.3	213.7	218.7	217.1	228.5	212.6	214.0	215.8	216.7	219.3	236.7	218.5
Direct Emissions from Mineral Cropland Soils	144.1	144.2	143.9	143.0	147.1	146.2	148.2	147.0	154.3	148.1	149.2	148.9	148.0	152.4	159.5	150.6
Synthetic Fertilizer	53.6	53.9	55.0	52.4	58.0	53.2	57.4	56.0	56.4	54.9	55.9	52.7	54.2	55.4	57.0	54.6
Organic Amendment ^a	10.0	10.2	10.3	10.0	10.4	10.5	10.6	10.7	10.6	10.7	11.0	10.9	11.1	11.1	10.8	10.9
Residue N ^b	22.1	23.4	21.7	22.0	21.7	23.3	22.2	22.2	21.8	25.0	23.1	22.9	22.8	23.3	22.2	22.9
Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	58.4	56.7	56.9	58.5	56.9	59.2	58.1	58.3	65.5	57.5	59.2	62.4	59.8	62.6	69.6	62.2
Direct Emissions from Drained Organic Cropland Soils	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3
Direct Emissions from Mineral Grassland Soils	61.3	62.3	61.6	63.2	59.6	61.0	63.9	63.4	67.6	58.0	58.2	60.0	61.8	60.1	70.4	61.1
Synthetic Mineral Fertilizer	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8
PRP Manure	16.1	15.9	16.2	16.5	16.6	16.5	16.9	15.8	16.2	14.5	14.6	14.4	14.6	14.0	14.7	13.8
Managed Manure	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1
Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge)	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5
Residue ^b	14.5	14.6	14.7	15.3	13.4	15.0	14.6	15.2	15.1	15.3	13.9	15.0	14.9	14.9	15.8	15.8
Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	28.5	29.9	28.6	29.5	27.5	27.5	30.3	30.4	33.9	26.0	27.5	28.5	30.0	29.0	37.5	29.2
Direct Emissions from Drained Organic Grassland Soils	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Total Indirect	38.5	34.8	37.4	45.1	31.7	37.5	37.3	35.2	42.4	35.7	32.6	39.1	35.9	37.9	43.7	35.0
Volatilization	10.2	10.4	10.1	10.2	10.7	10.8	10.8	10.8	11.3	10.9	10.8	10.7	10.7	11.1	11.6	11.1
Leaching/Runoff	28.2	24.4	27.2	34.9	20.9	26.7	26.5	24.4	31.0	24.7	21.8	28.4	25.2	26.8	32.1	23.9
Total Emissions	250.5	247.8	249.4	257.9	244.9	251.3	256.0	252.3	270.9	248.3	246.6	254.9	252.6	257.2	280.5	253.5

Activity	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Direct	223.6	229.2	222.1	226.4	231.1	220.4	215.6
Direct Emissions from Mineral Cropland Soils	153.1	157.4	153.3	154.1	159.5	155.1	153.5

Synthetic Fertilizer	56.2	58.2	55.7	53.7	55.0	58.0	60.4
Organic Amendment ^a	11.3	11.4	11.2	11.1	11.0	11.2	11.3
Residue N ^b	22.6	22.8	21.7	22.1	24.0	23.9	23.5
Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	63.0	64.9	64.7	67.2	69.6	62.1	58.2
Direct Emissions from Drained Organic Cropland Soils	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2
Direct Emissions from Mineral Grassland Soils	63.7	65.1	62.2	65.8	65.1	58.8	55.7
Synthetic Mineral Fertilizer	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
PRP Manure	14.4	13.7	13.5	14.1	13.7	13.6	13.3
Managed Manure	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Biosolids (i.e., Sewage Sludge)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6
Residue ^b	15.6	16.5	15.5	15.4	16.5	14.8	14.2
Mineralization and Asymbiotic Fixation	31.3	32.6	30.9	33.8	32.4	28.1	25.8
Direct Emissions from Drained Organic Grassland Soils	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3
Total Indirect	39.0	41.3	43.5	43.8	43.1	43.6	32.3
Volatilization	11.3	11.2	11.0	11.0	11.6	11.0	10.7
Leaching/Runoff	27.7	30.1	32.4	32.8	31.5	32.6	21.5
Total Emissions	262.6	270.5	265.6	270.2	274.3	263.9	247.9

^a Organic amendment inputs include managed manure amendments, daily spread manure and other commercial organic fertilizer (i.e., dried blood, tankage, compost, and other).

^b Residue N inputs include unharvested fixed N from legumes as well as crop residue N.

Note: Emissions values are presented in CO₂ equivalent mass units using IPCC AR4 GWP values. Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 1 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-231: Implied Tier 3 Cropland Indirect Emission Factors

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Indirect N Inputs												
N Inputs Volatilization (N fertilizer + N manure)	10,500	10,383	10,665	10,754	10,468	10,174	10,523	10,527	10,414	10,308	10,674	10,486
N Inputs Leachnig (N fertilizer + N manure + N residue)	14,379	14,488	14,387	14,805	14,208	14,357	14,457	14,494	14,305	14,912	14,897	14,685
Total Indirect Activity												
Volatilization	866.3	869.5	832.0	870.2	870.7	906.5	876.0	888.6	959.2	938.2	965.0	970.6
Leaching/Runoff	6,330.6	5,268.8	6,149.5	8,208.6	4,102.8	5,841.1	5,695.1	5,147.7	6,797.5	5,258.9	4,591.5	6,382.3
Implied EF Volatilization	0.083	0.084	0.078	0.081	0.083	0.089	0.083	0.084	0.092	0.091	0.090	0.093
Implied EF Leaching	0.440	0.364	0.427	0.554	0.289	0.407	0.394	0.355	0.475	0.353	0.308	0.435
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Indirect N Inputs												
N Inputs Volatilization (N fertilizer + N manure)	10,518	10,526	10,482	10,618	10,382	11,242	10,787	10,743	10,926	10,950	11,127	
N Inputs Leachnig (N fertilizer + N manure + N residue)	14,721	14,829	14,436	14,836	14,464	15,413	14,755	14,815	15,411	15,376	15,497	
Total Indirect Activity												
Volatilization	945.0	973.9	1010.6	998.3	989.5	991.1	979.6	995.5	1101.7	996.5	925.2	
Leaching/Runoff	5,393.7	5,949.8	7,191.6	5,232.5	6,129.7	6,739.7	7,415.4	7,543.1	7,333.1	7,323.4	4,375.4	
Implied EF Volatilization	0.090	0.093	0.096	0.094	0.095	0.088	0.091	0.093	0.101	0.091	0.083	
Implied EF Leaching	0.366	0.401	0.498	0.353	0.424	0.437	0.503	0.509	0.476	0.476	0.282	

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 3 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-232: Implied Tier 3 Grassland Indirect Emission Factors

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Indirect N Inputs													
N Inputs Volatilization (N fertilizer + N PRP manure + N managed manure)	3,875	3,892	4,041	4,078	4,242	4,287	4,286	4,258	4,293	4,250	4,172	4,130	4,183
N Inputs Leachnig (N residue)	7,967	7,946	8,192	8,392	7,653	8,588	8,073	8,226	7,540	9,150	8,131	8,490	8,117
N Inputs Leachnig (N fertilizer + N PRP manure + N managed manure + N residue)	11,841	11,838	12,233	12,470	11,896	12,875	12,360	12,483	11,832	13,400	12,304	12,620	12,300
Total Indirect Activity													
Volatilization	701.5	714.9	712.8	707.1	703.9	731.8	729.0	737.7	789.6	730.7	695.9	741.0	745.9
Leaching/Runoff	664.2	638.1	575.2	726.1	571.8	599.1	594.9	612.9	834.5	561.4	493.0	709.5	731.2
Implied Fraction of N Volatilization	0.181	0.184	0.176	0.173	0.166	0.171	0.170	0.173	0.184	0.172	0.167	0.179	0.178
Implied Fraction of N Leaching/Runoff	0.056	0.054	0.047	0.058	0.048	0.047	0.048	0.049	0.071	0.042	0.040	0.056	0.059

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Indirect N Inputs										
N Inputs Volatilization (N fertilizer + N PRP manure + N managed manure)	4,221	4,224	4,261	4,318	4,231	4,195	4,194	4,179	4,074	3,992
N Inputs Leachnig (N residue)	8,549	7,746	8,722	8,070	8,757	8,454	8,242	8,903	8,508	9,005
N Inputs Leachnig (N fertilizer + N PRP manure + N managed manure + N residue)	12,770	11,971	12,984	12,389	12,988	12,649	12,436	13,082	12,582	12,997
Total Indirect Activity										
Volatilization	768.0	843.0	779.0	776.7	788.2	771.1	782.9	798.3	722.7	716.7
Leaching/Runoff	559.5	792.2	515.6	599.6	731.8	759.1	844.4	612.7	802.0	545.9
Implied Fraction of N Volatilization	0.182	0.200	0.183	0.180	0.186	0.184	0.187	0.191	0.177	0.180
Implied Fraction of N Leaching/Runoff	0.044	0.066	0.040	0.048	0.056	0.060	0.068	0.047	0.064	0.042

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Agricultural Soil Management* section for more information). The Tier 3 method will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-233: Total CH₄ Emissions from Cultivation of Rice Estimated with Tier 1 and 3 Inventory Approaches (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Rice Methane (MMT CO ₂ Eq)																	
Approach	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Tier 1	1.63	1.64	1.70	1.70	1.75	1.53	1.57	1.58	1.76	3.25	3.29	1.93	1.84	1.72	1.85	1.74	1.48
Tier 3	14.39	15.18	15.17	15.24	13.10	14.23	14.40	14.22	14.35	14.82	14.98	13.62	14.62	12.58	12.26	14.93	11.38
Total	16.02	16.82	16.87	16.94	14.84	15.76	15.97	15.80	16.10	18.08	18.27	15.56	16.46	14.31	14.11	16.68	12.86

Approach	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Tier 1	1.40	1.59	1.70	1.79	1.51	1.38
Tier 3	12.54	9.92	12.76	14.09	12.59	9.96
Total	13.94	11.51	14.45	15.88	14.10	11.34

Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Rice Cultivation* section for more information). The Tier 1 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-234: Total 2012 N₂O Emissions (Direct and Indirect) from Agricultural Soil Management by State (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

State	Croplands ^a	Grasslands ^b	Total	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AL	1.57	1.27	3.00	2.44	4.13
AR	4.84	1.38	6.50	5.18	9.10
AZ	0.55	0.87	1.84	1.45	3.14
CA	4.17	1.12	8.69	5.85	18.38
CO	2.87	2.06	5.13	4.33	6.80
CT	0.11	0.02	0.14	0.10	0.24

DE	0.16	0.01	0.19	0.13	0.34
FL	1.91	2.98	5.72	4.45	10.09
GA	2.47	0.94	3.68	2.76	5.69
HI ^c	0.01	0.13	0.14	0.04	0.27
IA	13.34	1.38	15.12	12.13	20.45
ID	2.74	0.86	3.81	3.04	5.67
IL	12.68	0.71	13.40	10.32	18.72
IN	7.58	0.63	8.19	6.24	11.80
KS	10.22	2.93	13.44	11.16	17.35
KY	3.26	2.33	5.60	4.62	7.31
LA	3.09	0.98	4.51	3.65	6.13
MA	0.14	1.26	0.20	0.15	0.30
MD	0.73	0.12	1.00	0.75	1.57
ME	0.23	0.17	0.38	0.27	0.58
MI	3.99	0.65	5.08	4.03	7.26
MN	9.62	0.91	11.33	9.22	14.99
MO	7.33	3.08	10.61	8.64	14.08
MS	3.45	0.94	4.44	3.52	6.13
MT	3.29	3.04	6.34	5.33	7.94
NC	2.84	0.68	3.76	2.75	6.03
ND	6.02	1.05	7.02	5.61	9.08
NE	9.49	1.42	11.27	9.13	15.34
NH	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.09	0.20
NJ	0.15	0.11	0.23	0.17	0.36
NM	0.74	2.30	2.95	2.41	4.28
NV	0.25	1.23	0.76	0.61	1.18
NY	2.93	0.73	4.01	3.13	6.12
OH	6.39	0.71	8.32	6.51	12.36
OK	3.05	3.61	6.75	5.68	8.68
OR	1.25	1.02	2.51	2.06	3.63
PA	2.76	0.57	3.68	2.85	5.74
RI	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.04
SC	1.13	0.40	1.51	1.08	2.39
SD	5.33	1.83	7.16	5.86	9.23
TN	2.50	1.80	4.35	3.53	5.83
TX	12.07	11.64	24.67	20.69	31.66
UT	0.59	0.76	1.44	1.16	2.16
VA	1.43	1.24	2.71	2.23	3.60
VT	0.45	0.12	0.64	0.48	1.04
WA	2.05	0.63	3.06	2.54	4.35
WI	5.84	1.01	7.64	6.24	11.05
WV	0.28	0.41	0.70	0.58	0.91
WY	0.95	1.56	2.76	2.33	3.77

^a Emissions from non-manure organic N inputs for crops not simulated by DayCent were not estimated (NE) at the state level.

^b Emissions from biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) applied to grasslands and were not estimated (NE) at the state level.

^c N₂O emissions are not reported for Hawaii except from cropland organic soils.

Table A-235: Annual Soil C Stock Change in Cropland Remaining Cropland (CRC), Land Converted to Cropland (LCC), Grassland Remaining Grassland (GRG), and Land Converted to Grassland (LCG), in U.S. Agricultural Soils (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Net emissions based on Tier 3 Century-based analysis (Step 2)																
CRC	(65.7)	(71.6)	(63.0)	(43.6)	(55.5)	(49.2)	(57.7)	(55.5)	(44.2)	(59.7)	(65.4)	(58.3)	(54.7)	(47.6)	(47.6)	(50.8)
GCC	20.6	21.4	23.6	18.0	14.4	20.0	16.9	19.0	12.6	12.8	13.0	11.2	11.2	13.1	12.6	12.4
GRG	(10.2)	(12.5)	(6.8)	1.7	(24.1)	(1.0)	(22.3)	(9.1)	(16.0)	(4.0)	(33.1)	(8.8)	(9.6)	(6.3)	0.4	2.0
CCG	(5.1)	(5.2)	(4.9)	(5.5)	(7.4)	(6.4)	(7.6)	(7.5)	(8.1)	(8.5)	(10.5)	(9.8)	(10.5)	(10.5)	(9.9)	(10.2)
Net emissions based on the IPCC Tier 2 analysis (Step 3)																
Mineral Soils																
CRC	(5.4)	(6.2)	(6.6)	(6.9)	(6.7)	(6.5)	(6.1)	(7.6)	(7.3)	(7.1)	(6.7)	(6.7)	(6.7)	(6.0)	(5.4)	(5.4)
GCC	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.5
FCC	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
OCC	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
SCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
WCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
GRG	(0.6)	(0.8)	(1.4)	(1.6)	(1.6)	(1.6)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.7)	(1.5)	(1.8)	(1.8)	(2.8)	(2.7)	(1.2)	(1.3)

CCG	(2.9)	(2.9)	(2.8)	(2.9)	(3.1)	(2.9)	(2.7)	(2.6)	(3.2)	(3.1)	(3.2)	(3.1)	(2.8)	(2.5)	(2.7)	(2.4)
FCG	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.6)	(0.5)
OCG	(0.5)	(0.6)	(0.6)	(0.7)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.9)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.2)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.1)
SCG	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)
WCG	(0.3)	(0.4)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)
Organic Soils																
CRC	30.3	29.8	29.7	29.5	29.4	29.3	29.3	29.3	28.8	24.4	24.5	29.0	29.3	29.6	29.9	29.7
GCC	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.3	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.4	3.3
FCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
OCC	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
SCC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
WCC	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
GRG	7.2	7.2	7.1	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.8	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.5	6.2	6.1	6.1	6.0	6.0
CCG	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1
FCG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
OCG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SCG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
WCG	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3
Additional changes in net emissions from mineral soils based on application of biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) to agricultural land (Step 4)																
GRG	(0.6)	(0.6)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.9)	(0.9)	(0.9)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.1)
Additional changes in net emissions from mineral soils based on additional enrollment of CRP land (Step 4)																
CRC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Total Stock Changes by Land Use/Land-Use Change Category (Step 5)

CRC	(40.9)	(48.1)	(40.0)	(21.1)	(32.8)	(26.3)	(34.5)	(33.8)	(22.7)	(42.3)	(47.7)	(36.0)	(32.1)	(24.0)	(23.0)	(26.5)
GCC	24.5	25.2	27.5	22.0	18.6	24.6	21.6	23.4	17.7	17.8	17.7	16.9	16.8	18.5	17.6	17.3
FCC	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
OCC	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
SCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
WCC	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8
GRG	(4.2)	(6.9)	(1.8)	6.4	(19.5)	3.6	(17.3)	(4.2)	(12.0)	0.2	(29.4)	(5.4)	(7.3)	(4.1)	4.1	5.5
CCG	(7.5)	(7.6)	(7.2)	(7.9)	(9.8)	(8.6)	(9.6)	(9.4)	(10.5)	(10.8)	(12.8)	(11.9)	(12.2)	(12.0)	(11.4)	(11.5)
FCG	(0.7)	(0.8)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.6)	(0.5)	(0.4)
OCG	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.6)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.9)	(0.9)	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.0)
SCG	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)
WCG	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)
Total	(28.3)	(37.5)	(21.9)	(0.8)	(43.5)	(6.7)	(39.7)	(24.1)	(27.7)	(35.5)	(72.8)	(37.0)	(35.3)	(22.2)	(13.3)	(15.8)

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate net C accumulation.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Net emissions based on Tier 3 Century-based analysis (Step 2)							
CRC	(47.5)	(45.6)	(34.4)	(29.3)	(29.4)	(43.6)	(46.6)
GCC	13.2	11.8	12.7	12.6	14.5	14.3	13.4
GRG	(14.8)	1.8	(10.1)	(5.7)	1.3	(16.0)	(24.6)
CCG	(12.2)	(10.9)	(10.8)	(10.6)	(10.8)	(11.0)	(11.2)
Net emissions based on the IPCC Tier 2 analysis (Step 3)							
Mineral Soils							
CRC	(4.4)	(4.0)	(3.4)	(3.5)	(3.6)	(3.5)	(2.9)
GCC	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
FCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
OCC	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
SCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
WCC	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
GRG	(1.5)	(1.5)	(1.5)	(1.2)	(1.2)	(0.8)	(0.4)
CCG	(1.9)	(1.6)	(1.4)	(1.4)	(1.3)	(1.2)	(1.2)
FCG	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)
OCG	(0.9)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)
SCG	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)
WCG	(0.4)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.1)
Organic Soils							
CRC	29.6	29.5	29.3	29.7	29.6	27.9	28.1
GCC	3.3	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0
FCC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
SCC	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
WCC	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
GRG	5.8	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.5
CCG	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
FCG	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
OCG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1

SCG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
WCG	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Additional changes in net emissions from mineral soils based on application of biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) to agricultural land (Step 4)							
GRG	(1.2)	(1.2)	(1.2)	(1.3)	(1.3)	(1.3)	(1.4)
Additional changes in net emissions from mineral soils based on additional enrollment of CRP land (Step 4)							
CRC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Stock Changes by Land Use/Land-Use Change Category (Step 5)							
CRC	(22.2)	(20.1)	(8.5)	(3.2)	(3.4)	(19.1)	(21.4)
GCC	18.2	16.9	17.5	17.2	19.1	19.0	18.1
FCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
OCC	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
SCC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
WCC	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7
GRG	(11.7)	4.8	(7.1)	(2.4)	4.5	(12.5)	(20.8)
CCG	(13.0)	(11.4)	(11.2)	(10.9)	(10.9)	(11.0)	(11.3)
FCG	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)
OCG	(0.9)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.8)	(0.7)
SCG	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)
WCG	(0.1)	(0.0)	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Total	(28.7)	(9.6)	(9.1)	0.9	9.4	(23.5)	(35.0)

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Note: Estimates after 2012 are based on a data splicing method (See the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* section for more information). The Tier 2 and 3 methods will be applied in a future inventory to recalculate the part of the time series that is estimated with the data splicing methods.

Table A-236: Soil C Stock Change for Mineral and Organic Soils in 2012 by State (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

State	Mineral Soil	Organic Soil	Total
AL	(1.03)	0.01	(1.02)
AR	(1.00)	-	(1.00)
AZ	(0.42)	-	(0.42)
CA	(3.72)	1.58	(2.13)
CO	(0.02)	0.00	(0.01)
CT	(0.02)	0.01	(0.02)
DE	(0.04)	-	(0.04)
FL	0.12	12.21	12.32
GA	0.18	-	0.18
HI	(0.08)	0.77	0.69
IA	(9.18)	0.73	(8.45)
ID	(1.25)	0.03	(1.22)
IL	(6.20)	0.52	(5.68)
IN	(1.64)	2.36	0.72
KS	(2.43)	-	(2.43)
KY	(1.39)	-	(1.39)
LA	(0.13)	0.51	0.39
MA	(0.06)	0.28	0.23
MD	(0.19)	0.01	(0.18)
ME	(0.11)	0.01	(0.10)
MI	(0.02)	3.40	3.37
MN	(4.11)	7.65	3.55
MO	(5.91)	-	(5.91)
MS	(1.05)	0.01	(1.04)
MT	(4.40)	0.15	(4.26)
NC	(0.57)	1.89	1.32
ND	(10.32)	0.01	(10.30)
NE	(5.17)	0.00	(5.16)
NH	(0.03)	0.02	(0.01)
NJ	(0.02)	0.12	0.10
NM	2.64	-	2.64
NV	(1.08)	0.00	(1.08)
NY	(0.33)	0.53	0.20
OH	(1.52)	0.48	(1.04)
OK	(0.62)	-	(0.62)
OR	(0.61)	0.30	(0.31)
PA	(0.43)	0.05	(0.38)

RI	(0.00)	0.02	0.02
SC	(0.56)	0.02	(0.54)
SD	(5.89)	-	(5.89)
TN	(1.51)	-	(1.51)
TX	2.44	-	2.44
UT	0.95	0.08	1.02
VA	(1.29)	0.00	(1.29)
VT	(0.08)	0.06	(0.02)
WA	(0.60)	0.38	(0.23)
WI	(0.06)	2.90	2.85
WV	(0.53)	-	(0.53)
WY	(2.96)	-	(2.96)

"-" Indicates there are no cropland or grassland organic soils in the state.

Note: Parentheses indicate net C accumulation. Estimates do not include soil C stock change associated with federal croplands and grasslands, CRP enrollment after 2012, or biosolids (i.e., sewage sludge) application to soils, which were only estimated at the national scale. The sum of state results will not match the national results because state results are generated in a separate programming package, the biosolids are not included, and differences arise due to rounding of values in this table. Only national-scale soil C stock changes are estimated for 2013 to 2016 in this Inventory using a splicing method, and therefore the state-scale stock changes are based on inventory data from 2012.

Table A-237: Total CH₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation in 2012 by State (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

State	Total
AL	-
AR	3.75
AZ	-
CA	2.04
CO	-
CT	-
DE	-
FL	-
GA	-
HI	-
IA	-
ID	-
IL	-
IN	-
KS	-
KY	-
LA	3.79
MA	-
MD	-
ME	-
MI	-
MN	0.03
MO	0.29
MS	0.47
MT	-
NC	-
ND	-
NE	-
NH	-
NJ	-
NM	-
NV	-
NY	-
OH	-
OK	-
OR	-
PA	-
RI	-
SC	-
SD	-
TN	-
TX	0.85

UT	-
VA	-
VT	-
WA	-
WI	-
WV	-
WY	-

Note: Only national-scale CH₄ emissions from rice cultivation are estimated for 2013 to 2016 in this Inventory using a splicing method, and therefore the state-scale emissions are based on inventory data from 2012.

References

- AAPFCO (2008 through 2012) Commercial Fertilizers: 2008-2012. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials. University of Missouri. Columbia, MO.
- AAPFCO (1995 through 2000a, 2002 through 2007) Commercial Fertilizers: 1995-2007. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials. University of Kentucky. Lexington, KY.
- Abdalla, M., Jones, J. Yeluripati, P. Smith, J. Burke and D M. Williams (2010) Testing DayCent and DNDC model simulations of N₂O fluxes and assessing the impacts of climate change on the gas flux and biomass production from a humid pasture. *Atmos. Environ.* 44: 2961–2970.
- BLM (2014) Rangeland Inventory, Monitoring, and Evaluation Reports. Bureau of Land Management. U.S. Department of the Interior. Available online at: http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/rangeland_management/rangeland_inventory.html.
- BOEM (2014) Year 2011 Gulfwide Emissions Inventory Study (BOEM 2014-666) Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, U.S. Department of the Interior (November 2014) <http://www.data.boem.gov/PI/PDFImages/ESPIS/5/5440.pdf>.
- Cantens, G. (2004 through 2005) Personal Communication. Janet Lewis, Assistant to Gaston Cantens, Vice President of Corporate Relations, Florida Crystals Company and ICF International.
- Cheng, K., S.M. Ogle, W.J. Parton, G. Pan (2014) Simulating greenhouse gas mitigation potentials for Chinese croplands using the DAYCENT ecosystem model. *Global Change Biology* 20:948-962.
- Cheng, K., S.M. Ogle, W.J. Parton and G. Pan (2013) Predicting methanogenesis from rice paddies using the DAYCENT ecosystem model. *Ecological Modelling* 261-262:19-31.
- Cibrowski, P. (1996) Personal Communication. Peter Cibrowski, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and Heike Mainhardt, ICF Incorporated. July 29, 1996.
- Coulston, J.W., Woodall, C.W., Domke, G.M., and Walters, B.F. (in preparation). Refined Delineation between Woodlands and Forests with Implications for U.S. National Greenhouse Gas Inventory of Forests. *Climatic Change*.
- CTIC (2004) 2004 Crop Residue Management Survey. Conservation Technology Information Center. Available online at <http://www.ctic.purdue.edu/CRM/>.
- Daly, C., G.H. Taylor, W.P. Gibson, T. Parzybok, G.L. Johnson, and P.A. Pasteris (1998) “Development of high-quality spatial datasets for the United States.” *Proc., 1st International Conference on Geospatial Information in Agriculture and Forestry*, Lake Buena Vista, FL, I-512-I-519. June 1-3, 1998.
- Daly, C., R.P. Neilson, and D.L. Phillips (1994) “A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain.” *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 33:140-158.
- Dean, W. E., and E. Gorham (1998) Magnitude and significance of carbon burial in lakes, reservoirs, and peatlands. *Geology* 26:535-538.
- Del Grosso, S.J., S.M. Ogle, W.J. Parton. (2011) Soil Organic Matter Cycling and Greenhouse Gas Accounting Methodologies, Chapter 1, pp 3-13 DOI: 10.1021/bk-2011-1072.ch001. In: L. Guo, A. Gunasekara, L. McConnell (Eds.) *Understanding Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Agricultural Management*, American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C.
- Del Grosso, S.J., W.J. Parton, C.A. Keough, and M. Reyes-Fox. (2011) Special features of the DayCent modeling package and additional procedures for parameterization, calibration, validation, and applications, in *Methods of Introducing System Models into Agricultural Research*, L.R. Ahuja and Liwang Ma, editors, p. 155-176, American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI. USA.
- Del Grosso, S.J., S.M. Ogle, W.J. Parton, and F.J. Breidt (2010) “Estimating Uncertainty in N₂O Emissions from U.S. Cropland Soils.” *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 24, GB1009, doi:10.1029/2009GB003544.
- Del Grosso, S.J., T. Wirth, S.M. Ogle, W.J. Parton (2008) Estimating agricultural nitrous oxide emissions. *EOS* 89, 529-530.
- Del Grosso, S.J., A.R. Mosier, W.J. Parton, and D.S. Ojima (2005) “DAYCENT Model Analysis of Past and Contemporary Soil N₂O and Net Greenhouse Gas Flux for Major Crops in the USA.” *Soil Tillage and Research*, 83: 9-24. doi: 10.1016/j.still.2005.02.007.

Del Grosso, S.J., W.J. Parton, A.R. Mosier, M.D. Hartman, J. Brenner, D.S. Ojima, and D.S. Schimel (2001) "Simulated Interaction of Carbon Dynamics and Nitrogen Trace Gas Fluxes Using the DAYCENT Model." In Schaffer, M., L. Ma, S. Hansen, (eds.); Modeling Carbon and Nitrogen Dynamics for Soil Management. CRC Press. Boca Raton, Florida. 303-332.

Del Grosso, S.J., W.J. Parton, A.R. Mosier, D.S. Ojima, A.E. Kulmala and S. Phongpan (2000) General model for N₂O and N₂ gas emissions from soils due to denitrification. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 14:1045-1060.

Delgado, J.A., S.J. Del Grosso, and S.M. Ogle (2009) "15N isotopic crop residue cycling studies and modeling suggest that IPCC methodologies to assess residue contributions to N₂O-N emissions should be reevaluated." *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, DOI 10.1007/s10705-009-9300-9.

Deren, C. (2002) Personal Communication and Dr. Chris Deren, Everglades Research and Education Centre at the University of Florida and Caren Mintz, ICF International. August 15, 2002.

Domke, G.M., Woodall, C.W., Smith, J.E., Westfall, J.A., McRoberts, R.E. (2012) Consequences of alternative tree-level biomass estimation procedures on U.S. forest carbon stock estimates. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 270: 108-116.

Domke, G.M., Smith, J.E., and Woodall, C.W. (2011) Accounting for density reduction and structural loss in standing dead trees: Implications for forest biomass and carbon stock estimates in the United States. *Carbon Balance and Management*. 6:14.

Domke, G.M., Woodall, C.W., Walters, B.F., McRoberts, R.E., Hatfield, M.A. (In Review) Strategies to compensate for the effects of nonresponse on forest carbon baseline estimates from the national forest inventory of the United States. *Forest Ecology and Management*.

Domke, G.M., Woodall, C.W., Walters, B.F., Smith, J.E. (2013) From models to measurements: comparing down dead wood carbon stock estimates in the U.S. forest inventory. *PLoS ONE* 8(3): e59949.

Domke, G.M., Perry, C.H., Walters, B.F., Woodall, C.W., and Smith, J.E. (in preparation). Estimation of forest floor carbon using the national forest inventory of the United States. Intended outlet: *Geoderma*.

Easter, M., S. Williams, and S. Ogle. (2008) Gap-filling NRI data for the Soil C Inventory. Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. Report provided to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Tom Wirth.

Edmonds, L., N. Gollehon, R.L. Kellogg, B. Kintzer, L. Knight, C. Lander, J. Lemunyon, D. Meyer, D.C. Moffitt, and J. Schaeffer (2003) "Costs Associated with Development and Implementation of Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans." Part 1. Nutrient Management, Land Treatment, Manure and Wastewater Handling and Storage, and Recordkeeping. Natural Resource Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

EIA (2007) Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Reports for EIA Form 1605B (Reporting Year 2006). Available online at <ftp://ftp.eia.doe.gov/pub/oiaf/1605/cdrom/>.

Euliss, N., and R. Gleason (2002) Personal communication regarding wetland restoration factor estimates and restoration activity data. Ned Euliss and Robert Gleason of the U.S. Geological Survey, Jamestown, ND, to Stephen Ogle of the National Resource Ecology Laboratory, Fort Collins, CO. August 2002.

Fleskes, J.P., Perry, W.M., Petrik, K.L., Spell, R., and Reid, F. (2005) Change in area of winter-flood and dry rice in the northern Central Valley of California determined by satellite imagery. *California Fish and Game*, 91: 207-215.

Fry, J., Xian, G., Jin, S., Dewitz, J., Homer, C., Yang, L., Barnes, C., Herold, N., and Wickham, J. (2011) Completion of the 2006 National Land Cover Database for the Conterminous United States, PE&RS, Vol. 77(9):858-864.

Gonzalez, R. (2007 through 2014) Email correspondence. Rene Gonzalez, Plant Manager, Sem-Chi Rice Company and ICF International.

Gurung, R.B., F.J. Breidt, A. Dutin, and S.M. Ogle (2009) Predicting Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI) for ecosystem modeling applications. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 113:2186-2193.

Halvorson, A.D., C.S. Snyder, A.D. Blaylock, and S.J. Del Grosso (2013) Enhanced Efficiency Nitrogen Fertilizers: Potential Role in Nitrous Oxide Emission Mitigation. *Agronomy Journal*, doi:10.2134/agronj2013.0081

Hardke, J.T. (2015) Trends in Arkansas rice production, 2014. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies 2014. Norman, R.J., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 626, Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

Hardke, J.T., and Wilson, C.E. Jr. (2013) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies 2012. Norman, R.J., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 609, Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

Hardke, J.T., and Wilson, C.E. Jr. (2014) Trends in Arkansas rice production, 2013. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies 2013. Norman, R.J., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 617, Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

Harmon, M.E., C.W. Woodall, B. Fasth, J. Sexton, M. Yatkov. (2011) Differences between standing and downed dead tree wood density reduction factors: A comparison across decay classes and tree species. Res. Paper. NRS-15. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 40 p.

Hollier, C. A. (ed) (1999) Louisiana rice production handbook. Louisiana State University Agricultural Center. LCES Publication Number 2321. 116 pp.

Hijmans, R.J., S.E. Cameron, J.L. Parra, P.G. Jones and A. Jarvis (2005) Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology* 25: 1965-1978.

IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.

IPCC (2003) *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry*. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, J. Penman, et al., eds. August 13, 2004. Available online at <<http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf.htm>>.

Johnson, D.M., and R. Mueller (2010) The 2009 Cropland Data Layer. *Photogrammetric engineering and remote sensing* 76:1201-1205.

Kirstein, A. (2003 through 2004, 2006) Personal Communication. Arthur Kirstein, Coordinator, Agricultural Economic Development Program, Palm Beach County Cooperative Extension Service, FL and ICF International.

Kraft, D.L. and H.C. Orender (1993) "Considerations for Using Sludge as a Fuel." *Tappi Journal*, 76(3): 175-183.

Li, Y., D. Chen, Y. Zhang, R. Edis and H. Ding (2005) Comparison of three modeling approaches for simulating denitrification and nitrous oxide emissions from loam-textured arable soils. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19, GB3002.

LSU (2015) Louisiana ratoon crop and conservation: Ratoon & Conservation Tillage Estimates. Louisiana State University, College of Agriculture AgCenter. Available online at: <<http://www.lsuagcenter.com>>.

McGill, W.B., and C.V. Cole (1981) Comparative aspects of cycling of organic C, N, S and P through soil organic matter. *Geoderma* 26:267-286.

Metherell, A.K., L.A. Harding, C.V. Cole, and W.J. Parton (1993) "CENTURY Soil Organic Matter Model Environment." Agroecosystem version 4.0. Technical documentation, GPSR Tech. Report No. 4, USDA/ARS, Ft. Collins, CO.

Miller, M.R., Garr, J.D., and Coates, P.S. (2010) Changes in the status of harvested rice fields in the Sacramento Valley, California: Implications for wintering waterfowl. *Wetlands*, 30: 939-947.

Miner, C. (1998) *Harvesting the High Plains: John Kriss and the business of wheat farming, 1920-1950*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Miner, R. (2008) "Calculations documenting the greenhouse gas emissions from the pulp and paper industry." Memorandum from Reid Minor, National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI) to Becky Nicholson, RTI International, May 21, 2008.

Mosier, A.R., Duxbury, J.M., Freney, J.R., Heinemeyer, O., and Minami, K. (1998) Assessing and mitigating N₂O emissions from agricultural soils. *Climatic Change* 40:7-38.

Nair, P.K.R. and V.D. Nair. (2003) Carbon storage in North American Agroforestry systems. In Kimble J., Heath L.S., Birdsey R.A., Lal R., editors. *The potential of U.S. forest soils to sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect*. CRC Press. Boca Raton, FL, 333-346.

NASS (2004) *Agricultural Chemical Usage: 2003 Field Crops Summary*. Report AgCh1(04)a, National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available online at <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/nassr/other/pcu-bb/agcs0504.pdf>>.

NASS (1999) Agricultural Chemical Usage: 1998 Field Crops Summary. Report AgCh1(99). National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available online at <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/nassr/other/pcu-bb/agch0599.pdf>>.

NASS (1992) Agricultural Chemical Usage: 1991 Field Crops Summary. Report AgCh1(92). National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available online at <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/nassr/other/pcu-bb/agch0392.txt>>.

Nevison, C.D., (2000) Review of the IPCC methodology for estimating nitrous oxide emissions associated with agricultural leaching and runoff, *Chemosphere – Global Change Science* 2, 493-500.

NRAES (1992) On-Farm Composting Handbook (NRAES-54). Natural Resource, Agriculture, and Engineering Service. Available online at <http://compost.css.cornell.edu/OnFarmHandbook/onfarm_TOC.html>.

NRCS (1997) “National Soil Survey Laboratory Characterization Data,” Digital Data, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Lincoln, NE.

NRCS (1981) Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, USDA Agriculture Handbook 296, United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln, NE, pp. 156.

NRIAI (2003) Regional Budget and Cost Information. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Natural Resources Inventory and Analysis Institute. Available online at <<http://www.economics.nrcs.usda.gov/care/budgets/index.html>>.

Nusser, S.M., F.J. Breidt, and W.A. Fuller (1998) “Design and Estimation for Investigating the Dynamics of Natural Resources, Ecological Applications, 8:234-245.

Nusser, S.M., J.J. Goebel (1997) The national resources inventory: a long term monitoring programme. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 4, 181-204.

Ogle, S.M., Woodall, C.W., Swan, A., Smith, J., and Wirth, T. (in preparation). Determining the Managed Land Base for Delineating Carbon Sources and Sinks in the United States. *Environmental Science and Policy*.

Ogle, S.M., F.J. Breidt, M. Easter, S. Williams, K. Killian, and K. Paustian (2010) “Scale and uncertainty in modeled soil organic carbon stock changes for U.S. croplands using a process-based model.” *Global Change Biology* 16:810-822.

Ogle, S.M., F.J. Breidt, M. Easter, S. Williams and K. Paustian. (2007) “Empirically-Based Uncertainty Associated with Modeling Carbon Sequestration Rates in Soils.” *Ecological Modeling* 205:453-463.

Ogle, S.M., F.J. Breidt, and K. Paustian. (2006) “Bias and variance in model results due to spatial scaling of measurements for parameterization in regional assessments.” *Global Change Biology* 12:516-523.

Ogle, S.M., M.D. Eve, F.J. Breidt, and K. Paustian (2003) “Uncertainty in estimating land use and management impacts on soil organic carbon storage for U.S. agroecosystems between 1982 and 1997.” *Global Change Biology* 9:1521-1542.

Parton, W.J., D.S. Schimel, C.V. Cole, D.S. Ojima (1987) “Analysis of factors controlling soil organic matter levels in Great Plains grasslands.” *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 51:1173-1179.

Parton, W. J., J. M. O. Scurlock, D. S. Ojima, T. G. Gilmanov, R. J. Scholes, D. S. Schimel, T. Kirchner, J.-C. Menaut, T. Seastedt, E. G. Moya, A. Kamnalrut, and J. I. Kinyamario (1993) Observations and modeling of biomass and soil organic matter dynamics for grassland biomes worldwide. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 7:785-809.

Parton, W.J., D.S. Ojima, C.V. Cole, and D.S. Schimel (1994) “A General Model for Soil Organic Matter Dynamics: Sensitivity to litter chemistry, texture and management,” in *Quantitative Modeling of Soil Forming Processes*. Special Publication 39, Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, 147-167.

Parton, W.J., M.D. Hartman, D.S. Ojima, and D.S. Schimel (1998) “DAYCENT: Its Land Surface Submodel: Description and Testing”. *Glob. Planet. Chang.* 19: 35-48.

Parton, W.J., E.A. Holland, S.J. Del Grosso, M.D. Hartman, R.E. Martin, A.R. Mosier, D.S. Ojima, and D.S. Schimel (2001) Generalized model for NO_x and N₂O emissions from soils. *Journal of Geophysical Research*. 106 (D15):17403-17420.

Peer, R., S. Thorneloe, and D. Epperson (1993) “A Comparison of Methods for Estimating Global Methane Emissions from Landfills.” *Chemosphere*, 26(1-4):387-400.

Potter, C. S., J.T. Randerson, C.B. Fields, P.A. Matson, P.M. Vitousek, H.A. Mooney, and S.A. Klooster. (1993) "Terrestrial ecosystem production: a process model based on global satellite and surface data." *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 7:811-841.

Potter, C., S. Klooster, A. Huete, and V. Genovese (2007) Terrestrial carbon sinks for the United States predicted from MODIS satellite data and ecosystem modeling. *Earth Interactions* 11, Article No. 13, DOI 10.1175/EI228.1.

PRISM Climate Group, Oregon State University, <<http://prism.oregonstate.edu>>, created 24 July 2015.

Quam, V.C., J. Gardner, J.R. Brandle, and T.K. Boes (1992) Windbreaks in Sustainable Agricultural Systems. EC-91-1772. University of Nebraska Extension. Lincoln, NE.

Ruddy B.C., D.L. Lorenz, and D.K. Mueller (2006) County-level estimates of nutrient inputs to the land surface of the conterminous United States, 1982-2001. Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5012. U.S. Department of the Interior.

Saghafi, Abouna (2013) Estimation of fugitive emissions from open cut coal mining and measurable gas content, 13th Coal Operators' Conference, University of Wollongong, The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy & Mine Managers Association of Australia, 2013, 306-313.

Sass, R.L., F.M. Fisher, S.T. Lewis, M.F. Jund, and F.T. Turner (1994) "Methane emissions from rice fields: effect of soil texture." *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 8:135-140.

Savitzky, A., and M. J. E. Golay (1964) Smoothing and Differentiation of Data by Simplified Least Squares Procedures. *Analytical Chemistry* 36:1627-1639.

Saxton, K.E., W.J. Rawls, J.S. Romberger, and R.I. Papendick (1986) "Estimating Generalized Soil-Water Characteristics From Texture." *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 50:1031-1036.

Schueneman, T. (1997, 1999 through 2001) Personal Communication. Tom Schueneman, Agricultural Extension Agent, Palm Beach County, FL and ICF International.

Smith, J. (2008) E-mail correspondence between Jean Kim, ICF, and Jim Smith, U.S. Forest Service, December 3, 2008.

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. (2015) State Soil Geographic (STATSGO) Database for State. Available online at <<http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/statsgo/index.html>>.

Spencer, S., S.M. Ogle, F.J. Breidt, J. Goebel, and K. Paustian (2011) Designing a national soil carbon monitoring network to support climate change policy: a case example for U.S. agricultural lands. *Greenhouse Gas Management & Measurement* 1:167-178.

Stehfest, E., and C. Müller (2004), Simulation of N₂O emissions from a urine-affected pasture in New Zealand with the ecosystem model DayCent, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D03109, doi:10.1029/2003JD004261.

Strehler, A., and W. Stützel (1987) "Biomass Residues." In Hall, D.O. and Overend, R.P. (eds.). *Biomass*. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd. Chichester, UK.

TAMU (2015) Texas Rice Crop Survey. Texas A&M AgriLIFE Research Center at Beaumont. Online at: <<https://beaumont.tamu.edu/>>.

Towery, D. (2001) Personal Communication. Dan Towery regarding adjustments to the CTIC (1998) tillage data to reflect long-term trends, Conservation Technology Information Center, West Lafayette, IN, and Marlen Eve, National Resource Ecology Laboratory, Fort Collins, CO. February 2001.

TVA (1992b) Fertilizer Summary Data 1992. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.

TVA (1991 through 1992a, 1993 through 1994) Commercial Fertilizers. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.

UCCE, 2015. Rice Production Manual. Revised 2015. University of California Cooperative Extension, Davis, in collaboration with the California Rice Research Board.

USDA (2010a) Crop Production 2009 Summary, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Agricultural Statistics Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Available online at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu>.

USDA (2015) Quick Stats: U.S. & All States Data - Crops. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, DC. U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. Washington, D.C., Available online at <<http://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/>>.

1 USDA (2003, 2005 through 2006, 2008 through 2009) Crop Production Summary, National Agricultural Statistics Service,
2 Agricultural Statistics Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Available online at
3 <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu>>.

4 USDA (1998) Field Crops Final Estimates 1992-1997. Statistical Bulletin Number 947a. National Agricultural Statistics
5 Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, DC. Available online at <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu>>.
6 Accessed July 2001.

7 USDA (1996) Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook, National Engineering Handbook (NEH), Part 651. Natural
8 Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. July 1996.

9 USDA (1994) Field Crops: Final Estimates, 1987-1992. Statistical Bulletin Number 896, National Agriculture Statistics
10 Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, DC. Available online at <[http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-](http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/94896/sb896.txt)
11 <[sets/crops/94896/sb896.txt](http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/data-sets/crops/94896/sb896.txt)>.

12 USDA (1991) *State Soil Geographic (STATSGO) Data Base Data use information*. Miscellaneous Publication Number 1492,
13 National Soil Survey Center, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fort Worth,
14 TX.

15 USDA-ERS (2015) Agricultural Resource Management Survey (ARMS) Farm Financial and Crop Production Practices:
16 Tailored Reports. Online at: [http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/arms-farm-financial-and-crop-production-](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/arms-farm-financial-and-crop-production-practices/arms-data.aspx)
17 <[practices/arms-data.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/arms-farm-financial-and-crop-production-practices/arms-data.aspx)>.

18 USDA-ERS (1997) Cropping Practices Survey Data—1995. Economic Research Service, United States Department of
19 Agriculture. Available online at <<http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/archive/93018/>>.

20 USDA-FSA (2014) Conservation Reserve Program Monthly Summary – September 2014. U.S. Department of Agriculture,
21 Farm Service Agency, Washington, DC, Available online at [https://www.fsa.usda.gov/Assets/USDA-FSA-](https://www.fsa.usda.gov/Assets/USDA-FSA-Public/usdfiles/Conservation/PDF/summarysept2014.pdf)
22 <[Public/usdfiles/Conservation/PDF/summarysept2014.pdf](https://www.fsa.usda.gov/Assets/USDA-FSA-Public/usdfiles/Conservation/PDF/summarysept2014.pdf)>.

23 USDA-NASS (2015) Quick Stats: U.S. & All States Data; Crops; Production and Area Harvested; 1990 - 2014. National
24 Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Agriculture,
25 National Agricultural Statistics Service. Washington, D.C., Available online at: <<http://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/>>.

26 USDA-NRCS (2015) Summary Report: 2012 National Resources Inventory, Natural Resources Conservation Service,
27 Washington, D.C., and Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
28 <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcseprd396218.pdf>.

29 USFWS (2010) Strategic Plan: The Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, Stewardship of Fish and Wildlife Through
30 Voluntary Conservation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC, USA. <
31 <<http://www.fws.gov/partners/docs/783.pdf>>.

32 Vogelmann, J.E., S.M. Howard, L. Yang, C. R. Larson, B. K. Wylie, and J. N. Van Driel (2001) “Completion of the 1990’s
33 National Land Cover Data Set for the conterminous United States.” Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing,
34 67:650-662.

35 Way, M.O., McCauley, G.M., Zhou, X.G., Wilson, L.T., and Morace, B. (Eds.). (2014) 2014 Texas Rice Production
36 Guidelines. Texas A&M AgriLIFE Research Center at Beaumont.

37 Williams, S.A. (2006) Data compiled for the Consortium for Agricultural Soils Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases (CASMGs)
38 from an unpublished manuscript. Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University.

39 Williams, S. and K. Paustian (2005) Developing Regional Cropping Histories for Century Model U.S.-level Simulations.
40 Colorado State University, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory, Fort Collins, CO.

41 Wilson, C.E. Jr., and Branson, J.W. (2006) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies
42 2005. Norman, R.J., Meullenet, J.-F., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 540, Arkansas Agricultural
43 Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

44 Wilson, C.E. Jr., and Branson, J.W. (2005) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies
45 2004. Norman, R.J., Meullenet, J.-F., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 529, Arkansas Agricultural
46 Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

47 Wilson, C.E. Jr., and Runsick, S.K. (2008) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies
48 2007. Norman, R.J., Meullenet, J.-F., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 560, Arkansas Agricultural
49 Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

1 Wilson, C.E. Jr., and Runsick, S.K. (2007) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies
2 2006. Norman, R.J., Meullenet, J.-F., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 550, Arkansas Agricultural
3 Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

4 Wilson, C.E. Jr., Runsick, S.K., Mazzanti, R. (2009) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research
5 Studies 2008. Norman, R.J., Meullenet, J.-F., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 571, Arkansas
6 Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

7 Wilson, C.E. Jr., Runsick, S.K., and Mazzanti, R. (2010) Trends in Arkansas rice production. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice
8 Research Studies 2009. Norman, R.J., and Moldenhauer, K.A.K., (Eds.). Research Series 581, Arkansas Agricultural
9 Experiment Station, University of Arkansas.

10 Zomer RJ, Trabucco A, Bossio DA, van Straaten O, Verchot LV (2008) Climate Change Mitigation: A Spatial Analysis of
11 Global Land Suitability for Clean Development Mechanism Afforestation and Reforestation. *Agric. Ecosystems and*
12 *Envir.* 126: 67-80.

13 Zomer RJ, Bossio DA, Trabucco A, Yuanjie L, Gupta DC & Singh VP (2007) Trees and Water: Smallholder Agroforestry
14 on Irrigated Lands in Northern India. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute. pp 45. (IWMI
15 Research Report 122).

3.13. Methodology for Estimating Net Carbon Stock Changes in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and *Land Converted to Forest Land*


This sub-annex expands on the methodology used to estimate net changes in carbon (C) stocks in forest ecosystems and harvested wood products for *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and *Land Converted to Forest Land* as well as non-CO₂ emissions from forest fires. Full details of the C conversion factors and procedures may be found in the cited references. For details on the methods used to estimate changes in soil C stocks in the *Land Converted to Forest Land* section please refer to Annex 3.12.

Carbon stocks and net stock change in forest ecosystems

The inventory-based methodologies for estimating forest C stocks are based on a combination of approaches (Woodall et al 2015a) and are consistent with IPCC (2003, 2006) stock-difference (used for the conterminous United States (U.S.)) and gain-loss (used for Alaska) methods. Estimates of ecosystem C are based on data from the network of annual national forest inventory (NFI) plots established and measured by the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program within the USDA Forest Service; either direct measurements or attributes of the NFI are the basis for estimating metric tons of C per hectare in IPCC pools (i.e., above- and belowground biomass, dead wood, litter, and soil carbon). For the conterminous U.S., plot-level estimates are used to inform land area (by use) and stand age transition matrices across time which can be summed annually for an estimate of forest C stock change for *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and *Land Converted to Forest Land*. A general description of the land use and stand age transition matrices that are informed by the annual NFI of the U.S. and were used in the estimation framework to compile estimates for the conterminous U.S. in this Inventory are described in Coulston et al. (2015). The annual NFI data in the conterminous U.S. allows for empirical estimation of net change in forest ecosystem carbon stocks within the estimation framework. In contrast, Wyoming and West Oklahoma have no remeasurement data so theoretical age transition matrices were developed (Figure A-16). Furthermore, this is the first year that all managed forest land in Alaska was included in the Inventory. The incorporation of all managed forest land in Alaska was facilitated by an analysis to determine the managed land base in Alaska (Ogle et al. 2018), the expansion of the NFI into interior Alaska beginning in 2014, and a myriad of publicly available data products that provided information necessary to prediction carbon stocks and stock change on plots that have yet to be measured as part of the NFI.

The following subsections of this annex will describe the estimation system used this year (Figure A-16) including the methods for estimating individual pools of forest C in addition to the approaches to informing land use and stand age transitions.

Figure A-16: Flowchart of the inputs necessary in the estimation framework, including the methods for estimating individual pools of forest C in the conterminous United States



Note: An empirical age class transition matrix was used in every state in the conterminous United States with the exception of west Oklahoma and Wyoming where a theoretical age class transition matrix was used due to a lack of remeasurements in the annual NFI.

Forest Land Definition

The definition of forest land within the United States and used for this Inventory is defined in Oswalt et al. (2014) as “Land at least 120 feet (37 meters) wide and at least 1 acre (0.4 hectare) in size with at least 10 percent cover (or equivalent stocking) by live trees including land that formerly had such tree cover and that will be naturally or artificially regenerated. Trees are woody plants having a more or less erect perennial stem(s) capable of achieving at least 3 inches (7.6 cm) in diameter at breast height, or 5 inches (12.7 cm) diameter at root collar, and a height of 16.4 feet (5 meters) at maturity in situ. The definition here includes all areas recently having such conditions and currently regenerating or capable of attaining such condition in the near future. Forest land also includes transition zones, such as areas between forest and non-forest


lands that have at least 10 percent cover (or equivalent stocking) with live trees and forest areas adjacent to urban and built-up lands. Unimproved roads and trails, streams, and clearings in forest areas are classified as forest if they are less than 120 feet (36.6 meters) wide or an acre (0.4 hectare) in size. Forest land does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use.” Timberland is productive forest land, which is on unreserved land and is producing or capable of producing crops of industrial wood. This is an important subclass of forest land because timberland is the primary source of C incorporated into harvested wood products. Productivity for timberland is at a minimum rate of 20 cubic feet per acre (1.4 cubic meters per hectare) per year of industrial wood (Woudenberg and Farrenkopf 1995). There are about 205 million hectares of timberland in the conterminous United States, which represents 80 percent of all forest lands over the same area (Oswalt et al. 2014).

Forest Inventory Data

The estimates of forest C stocks are based on data from the annual NFI. NFI data were obtained from the USDA Forest Service, FIA Program (Frayer and Furnival 1999; USDA Forest Service 2018a; USDA Forest Service 2018b). NFI data include remote sensing information and a collection of measurements in the field at sample locations called plots. Tree measurements include diameter at breast height, height, and species. On a subset of plots, additional measurements or samples are taken of downed dead wood, litter, and soil attributes. The technical advances needed to estimate C stocks from these data are ongoing (Woodall et al. 2015a) with the latest research incorporated on an annual basis (see Domke et al. 2016, Domke et al. 2017). The field protocols are thoroughly documented and available for download from the USDA Forest Service (2018c). Bechtold and Patterson (2005) provide the estimation procedures for standard NFI results. The data are freely available for download at USDA Forest Service (2011b) as the FIA Database (FIADB) Version 7.2 (USDA Forest Service 2018b; USDA Forest Service 2018c); these are the primary sources of NFI data used to estimate forest C stocks. In addition to the field sampling component, fine-scale remotely sensed imagery (National Agriculture Imagery Program; NAIP 2015; Woodall et al. 2015b) is used to assign the land use at each sample location which has a nominal spatial resolution (raster cell size) of 1 m². Prior to field measurement of each year’s collection of annual plots due for measurement (i.e., panel), each sample location in the panel (i.e., systematic distribution of plots within each state each year) is photo-interpreted manually to classify the land use. As annual NFIs have only just begun in the U.S. Territories and in Hawaii, there is an assumption that these areas account for a net C change of zero. Annual NFI data are available for the temperate oceanic ecoregion of Alaska (southeast and south central) from 2004 to present as well as for interior Alaska from a pilot inventory in 2014 which became operational in 2016. Agroforestry systems are not currently accounted for in the U.S. Inventory, since they are not explicitly inventoried by either of the two primary national natural resource inventory programs: the FIA program of the USDA Forest Service and the National Resources Inventory (NRI) of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (Perry et al. 2005). The majority of these tree-based practices do not meet the size and definitions for forests within each of these resource inventories.

A national plot design and annualized sampling (USDA Forest Service 2015a) were introduced by FIA with most new annual NFIs beginning after 1998. These are the only NFIs used in the compilation of estimates for this Inventory. These NFIs involve the sampling of all forest land including reserved and lower productivity lands. All states with the exception of Hawaii have annualized NFI data available with substantial remeasurement in the conterminous U.S. (Figure A-17). Annualized sampling means that a portion of plots throughout the state is sampled each year, with the goal of measuring all plots once every 5 to 10 years, depending on the region of the U.S. The full unique set of data with all measured plots, such that each plot has been measured one time, is called a cycle. Sampling is designed such that partial inventory cycles provide usable, unbiased samples of forest inventory within the state, but with higher sampling errors than the full cycle. After all plots have been measured once, the sequence continues with remeasurement of the first year’s plots, starting the next new cycle. Most eastern states have completed two or three cycles of the annualized NFI, and most western states are on their second annual cycle. Annually updated estimates of forest C stocks are affected by the redundancy in the data used to generate the annual updates of C stock. For example, a typical annual inventory update for an eastern state will include new data from remeasurement on 20 percent of plots; data from the remaining 80 percent of plots is identical to that included in the previous year’s annual update. The interpretation and use of the annual inventory data can affect trend estimates of C stocks and stock changes (e.g., estimates based on 60 percent of an inventory cycle will be different than estimates with a complete (100 percent) cycle). In general, the C stock and stock change calculations use annual NFI summaries (updates) with unique sets of plot-level data (that is, without redundant sets); the most-recent annual update (i.e., 2017) is the exception because it is included in stock change calculations in order to include the most recent available data for each state. The specific inventories used in this report are listed in Table A-238 and this list can be compared with the full set of summaries available for download (USDA Forest Service 2018b).

Figure A-17: Annual FIA plots (remeasured and not remeasured) across the United States including coastal Alaska through the 2015 field season



Note: Due to the vast number of plots (where land use is measured even if no forest is present) they appear as spatially contiguous when displayed at the scale and resolution presented in this figure.

It should be noted that as the FIA program explores expansion of its vegetation inventory beyond the forest land use to other land uses (e.g., woodlands and urban areas) and this will require that subsequent inventory observations will need to be delineated between forest and other land uses as opposed to a strict forest land use inventory. The forest C estimates provided here represent C stocks and stock change on managed forest lands (IPCC 2006, see Section 6.1 Representation of the U.S. Land Base), which is how all forest lands are classified on the 48 conterminous states. Alaska has substantial areas of managed and unmanaged forest land. A new model delineating managed versus unmanaged lands for the United States (Ogle et al. 2018), and used in this Inventory, is consistent with the assumption of managed forest lands on the 48 states. In some cases there are NFI plots that do not meet the height component of the definition of forest land (Coulston et al. 2016). These plots are identified as “wooded lands” (i.e., not forest land use) and were removed from forest estimates and classified as grassland.¹⁰⁵ Note that minor differences in identifying and classifying woodland as “forest” versus “wooded land” exist between the current Resources Planning Act Assessment (RPA) data (Oswalt et al. 2014) and the FIADB (USDA Forest Service 2015b) due to a refined modelling approach developed specifically for this report (Coulston et al. 2016). Plots in the coastal region of the conterminous U.S. were also evaluated using National Land Cover Database and Coastal Change Analysis Program data products to ensure that land areas were completely accounted for in this region and also that they were not included in both the Wetlands category and the Forest Land category. This resulted in several NFI plots being removed from the Forest Land compilation.

¹⁰⁵ See the *Grassland Remaining Grassland and Land Converted to Grassland* sections for details.

Table A-238: Specific annual forest inventories by state used in development of forest C stock and stock change estimates

Remeasured Annual Plots			Split Annual Cycle Plots		
State	Time 1 Year Range	Time 2 Year Range	State	Time 1 Year Range	Time 2 Year Range
Alabama	2001 - 2011	2006 - 2015	Alaska (Coastal)	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Arkansas	2006 - 2010	2011 - 2015	Arizona	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Connecticut	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015	California	2001 - 2005	2006 - 2010
Delaware	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015	Colorado	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Florida	2002 - 2011	2010 - 2014	Idaho	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Georgia	2005 - 2009	2010 - 2014	Montana	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Illinois	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015	Nevada	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Indiana	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015	New Mexico	1999	2005 - 2013
Iowa	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015	Oklahoma (West)	2009 - 2010	2011 - 2013
Kansas	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015	Oregon	2001 - 2005	2006 - 2010
Kentucky	2000 - 2009	2006 - 2013	Texas (West)	2004 - 2007	2008 - 2012
Louisiana	2001 - 2008	2009 - 2014	Utah	2004 - 2008	2009 - 2013
Maine	2006 - 2010	2011 - 2015	Washington	2002 - 2006	2007 - 2011
Maryland	2004 - 2009	2009 - 2014	Wyoming	2000	2011 - 2013
Massachusetts	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Michigan	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Minnesota	2006 - 2010	2011 - 2015			
Mississippi	2006	2009 - 2014			
Missouri	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Nebraska	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
New Hampshire	2004 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
New Jersey	2004 - 2009	2009 - 2014			
New York	2003 - 2009	2009 - 2014			
North Carolina	2003 - 2007	2009 - 2015			
North Dakota	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Ohio	2003 - 2009	2009 - 2014			
Oklahoma (East)	2008	2010 - 2014			
Pennsylvania	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Rhode Island	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
South Carolina	2002 - 2011	2009 - 2015			
South Dakota	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Tennessee	2000 - 2009	2005 - 2013			
Texas (East)	2002 - 2008	2005 - 2012			
Vermont	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			
Virginia	2002 - 2011	2009 - 2014			
West Virginia	2004 - 2009	2009 - 2014			
Wisconsin	2005 - 2010	2010 - 2015			

Note: Remeasured annual plots represent a complete inventory cycle between measurements of the same plots while split annual cycle plots represent a single inventory cycle of plots that are split where remeasurements have yet to occur.

Estimating Forest Inventory Plot-Level C-Density

For each inventory plot in each state, field data from the FIA program are used alone or in combination with auxiliary information (e.g., climate, surficial geology, elevation) to predict C density for each IPCC pool (i.e., aboveground and belowground biomass, dead wood, litter, SOC). In the past, most of the conversion factors and models used for inventory-based forest C estimates (Smith et al. 2010; Heath et al. 2011) were initially developed as an offshoot of the forest C simulation model FORCARB (Heath et al. 2010). The conversion factors and model coefficients were usually categorized by region and forest type. Thus, region and type are specifically defined for each set of estimates. More recently, the coarse approaches of the past have been updated with empirical information regarding C attributes of individual forest C pools such

as dead wood and litter (e.g., Domke et al. 2013 and Domke et al. 2016). Factors are applied to the forest inventory data at the scale of NFI plots which are a systematic sample of all forest attributes and land uses within each state. The results are estimates of C density (T per hectare) for the various forest pools. Carbon density for live trees, standing dead trees, understory vegetation, downed dead wood, litter, and soil organic matter are estimated. All non-soil C pools except litter and downed dead wood can be separated into aboveground and belowground components. The live tree and understory C pools are combined into the biomass pool in this Inventory. Similarly, standing dead trees and downed dead wood are pooled as dead wood in this inventory. C stocks and fluxes for *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and *Land Converted to Forest Land* are reported in pools following IPCC (2006).

Live tree C pools

Live tree C pools include aboveground and belowground (coarse root) biomass of live trees with diameter at diameter breast height (d.b.h.) of at least 2.54 cm at 1.37 m above the forest floor. Separate estimates are made for above- and below-ground biomass components. If inventory plots include data on individual trees, tree C is based on Woodall et al. (2011), which is also known as the component ratio method (CRM), and is a function of volume, species, diameter, and, in some regions, tree height and site quality. The estimated sound volume (i.e., after rotten/missing deductions) provided in the tree table of the FIADB is the principal input to the CRM biomass calculation for each tree (Woodall et al. 2011). The estimated volumes of wood and bark are converted to biomass based on the density of each. Additional components of the trees such as tops, branches, and coarse roots, are estimated according to adjusted component estimates from Jenkins et al. (2003). Live trees with d.b.h. of less than 12.7 cm do not have estimates of sound volume in the FIADB, and CRM biomass estimates follow a separate process (see Woodall et al. 2011 for details). An additional component of foliage, which was not explicitly included in Woodall et al. (2011), was added to each tree following the same CRM method. Carbon is estimated by multiplying the estimated oven-dry biomass by a C constant of 0.5 because biomass is 50 percent of dry weight (IPCC 2006). Further discussion and example calculations are provided in Woodall et al. 2011 and Domke et al. 2012.

Understory vegetation

Understory vegetation is a minor component of total forest ecosystem biomass. Understory vegetation is defined as all biomass of undergrowth plants in a forest, including woody shrubs and trees less than one-inch d.b.h. In this Inventory, it is assumed that 10 percent of understory C mass is belowground. This general root-to-shoot ratio (0.11) is near the lower range of temperate forest values provided in IPCC (2006) and was selected based on two general assumptions: ratios are likely to be lower for light-limited understory vegetation as compared with larger trees, and a greater proportion of all root mass will be less than 2 mm diameter.

Estimates of C density are based on information in Birdsey (1996), which was applied to FIA permanent plots. These were fit to the model:

$$\text{Ratio} = e^{(A - B \times \ln(\text{live tree C density}))} \quad (1)$$

In this model, the ratio is the ratio of understory C density (T C/ha) to live tree C density (above- and below-ground) according to Jenkins et al. (2003) and expressed in T C/ha. An additional coefficient is provided as a maximum ratio; that is, any estimate predicted from the model that is greater than the maximum ratio is set equal to the maximum ratio. A full set of coefficients are in Table A-239. Regions and forest types are the same classifications described in Smith et al. (2003). As an example, the basic calculation for understory C in aspen-birch forests in the Northeast is:

$$\text{Understory (T C/ha)} = (\text{live tree C density}) \times e^{(0.855 - 1.03 \times \ln(\text{tree C density}))} \quad (2)$$

This calculation is followed by three possible modifications. First, the maximum value for the ratio is set to 2.02 (see value in column “maximum ratio”); this also applies to stands with zero tree C, which is undefined in the above model. Second, the minimum ratio is set to 0.005 (Birdsey 1996). Third, nonstocked (i.e., currently lacking tree cover but still in the forest land use) and pinyon/juniper forest types (see Table A-239) are set to coefficient A, which is a C density (T C/ha) for these types only.

Table A-239: Coefficients for Estimating the Ratio of C Density of Understory Vegetation (above- and belowground, T C/ha) by Region and Forest Type^a

Region ^b	Forest Type ^b	A	B	Maximum ratio ^c
NE	Aspen-Birch	0.855	1.032	2.023
	MBB/Other Hardwood	0.892	1.079	2.076
	Oak-Hickory	0.842	1.053	2.057
	Oak-Pine	1.960	1.235	4.203
	Other Pine	2.149	1.268	4.191
	Spruce-Fir	0.825	1.121	2.140

	White-Red-Jack Pine	1.000	1.116	2.098
	Nonstocked	2.020	2.020	2.060
NLS	Aspen-Birch	0.777	1.018	2.023
	Lowland Hardwood	0.650	0.997	2.037
	Maple-Beech-Birch	0.863	1.120	2.129
	Oak-Hickory	0.965	1.091	2.072
	Pine	0.740	1.014	2.046
	Spruce-Fir	1.656	1.318	2.136
	Nonstocked	1.928	1.928	2.117
NPS	Conifer	1.189	1.190	2.114
	Lowland Hardwood	1.370	1.177	2.055
	Maple-Beech-Birch	1.126	1.201	2.130
	Oak-Hickory	1.139	1.138	2.072
	Oak-Pine	2.014	1.215	4.185
	Nonstocked	2.052	2.052	2.072
PSW	Douglas-fir	2.084	1.201	4.626
	Fir-Spruce	1.983	1.268	4.806
	Hardwoods	1.571	1.038	4.745
	Other Conifer	4.032	1.785	4.768
	Pinyon-Juniper	4.430	4.430	4.820
	Redwood	2.513	1.312	4.698
	Nonstocked	4.431	4.431	4.626
PWE	Douglas-fir	1.544	1.064	4.626
	Fir-Spruce	1.583	1.156	4.806
	Hardwoods	1.900	1.133	4.745
	Lodgepole Pine	1.790	1.257	4.823
	Pinyon-Juniper	2.708	2.708	4.820
	Ponderosa Pine	1.768	1.213	4.768
	Nonstocked	4.315	4.315	4.626
PWW	Douglas-fir	1.727	1.108	4.609
	Fir-Spruce	1.770	1.164	4.807
	Other Conifer	2.874	1.534	4.768
	Other Hardwoods	2.157	1.220	4.745
	Red Alder	2.094	1.230	4.745
	Western Hemlock	2.081	1.218	4.693
	Nonstocked	4.401	4.401	4.589
RMN	Douglas-fir	2.342	1.360	4.731
	Fir-Spruce	2.129	1.315	4.749
	Hardwoods	1.860	1.110	4.745
	Lodgepole Pine	2.571	1.500	4.773
	Other Conifer	2.614	1.518	4.821
	Pinyon-Juniper	2.708	2.708	4.820
	Ponderosa Pine	2.099	1.344	4.776
	Nonstocked	4.430	4.430	4.773
RMS	Douglas-fir	5.145	2.232	4.829
	Fir-Spruce	2.861	1.568	4.822
	Hardwoods	1.858	1.110	4.745
	Lodgepole Pine	3.305	1.737	4.797
	Other Conifer	2.134	1.382	4.821
	Pinyon-Juniper	2.757	2.757	4.820
	Ponderosa Pine	3.214	1.732	4.820
	Nonstocked	4.243	4.243	4.797
SC	Bottomland Hardwood	0.917	1.109	1.842
	Misc. Conifer	1.601	1.129	4.191
	Natural Pine	2.166	1.260	4.161
	Oak-Pine	1.903	1.190	4.173
	Planted Pine	1.489	1.037	4.124
	Upland Hardwood	2.089	1.235	4.170
	Nonstocked	4.044	4.044	4.170
SE	Bottomland Hardwood	0.834	1.089	1.842
	Misc. Conifer	1.601	1.129	4.191
	Natural Pine	1.752	1.155	4.178
	Oak-Pine	1.642	1.117	4.195
	Planted Pine	1.470	1.036	4.141
	Upland Hardwood	1.903	1.191	4.182

Nonstocked

4.033

4.033

4.182

^a Prediction of ratio of understory C to live tree C is based on the model: $\text{Ratio} = \exp(A - B \times \ln(\text{tree\_carbon\_tph}))$, where "ratio" is the ratio of understory C density to live tree (above-and below- ground) C density, and "tree_carbon_density" is live tree (above-and below- ground) C density in T C/ha. Note that this ratio is multiplied by tree C density on each plot to produce understory vegetation.

^b Regions and types as defined in Smith et al. (2003).

^c Maximum ratio: any estimate predicted from the model that is greater than the maximum ratio is set equal to the maximum ratio.

Dead Wood

The standing dead tree estimates are primarily based on plot-level measurements (Domke et al. 2011; Woodall et al. 2011). This C pool includes aboveground and belowground (coarse root) mass and includes trees of at least 12.7 cm d.b.h. Calculations follow the basic CRM method applied to live trees (Woodall et al. 2011) with additional modifications to account for decay and structural loss. In addition to the lack of foliage, two characteristics of standing dead trees that can significantly affect C mass are decay, which affects density and thus specific C content (Domke et al. 2011; Harmon et al. 2011), and structural loss such as branches and bark (Domke et al. 2011). Dry weight to C mass conversion is by multiplying by 0.5.

Downed dead wood, inclusive of logging residue, are sampled on a subset of NFI plots. Despite a reduced sample intensity, a single down woody material population estimate (Woodall et al. 2010; Domke et al. 2013; Woodall et al. 2013) per state is now incorporated into these empirical downed dead wood estimates. Downed dead wood is defined as pieces of dead wood greater than 7.5 cm diameter, at transect intersection, that are not attached to live or standing dead trees. It also includes stumps and roots of harvested trees. Ratio estimates of downed dead wood to live tree biomass were developed using FORCARB2 simulations and applied at the plot level (Smith et al. 2004). Estimates for downed dead wood correspond to the region and forest type classifications described in Smith et al. (2003). A full set of ratios is provided in Table A-240. An additional component of downed dead wood is a regional average estimate of logging residue based on Smith et al. (2006) applied at the plot level. These are based on a regional average C density at age zero and first order decay; initial densities and decay coefficients are provided in Table A-241. These amounts are added to explicitly account for downed dead wood following harvest. The sum of these two components are then adjusted by the ratio of population totals; that is, the ratio of plot-based to modeled estimates (Domke et al. 2013). An example of this 3-part calculation for downed dead wood in a 25-year-old naturally regenerated loblolly pine forest with 82.99 T C/ha in live trees (Jenkins et al. 2003) in Louisiana is as follows:

First, an initial estimate from live tree C density and Table A-240 (SC, Natural Pine)

C density = $82.99 \times 0.068 = 5.67$ (T C/ha)

Second, an average logging residue from age and Table A-240 (SC, softwood)

C density = $5.5 \times e(-25/17.9) = 1.37$ (T C/ha)

Third, adjust the sum by the downed dead wood ratio plot-to-model for Louisiana, which was $27.6/31.1 = 0.886$

C density = $(5.67 + 1.37) \times 0.886 = 6.24$ (T C/ha)

Table A-240: Ratio for Estimating Downed Dead Wood by Region and Forest Type

Region ^a	Forest type ^a	Ratio ^b
NE	Aspen-Birch	0.078
	MBB/Other Hardwood	0.071
	Oak-Hickory	0.068
	Oak-Pine	0.061
	Other Pine	0.065
	Spruce-Fir	0.092
	White-Red-Jack Pine	0.055
	Nonstocked	0.019
NLS	Aspen-Birch	0.081
	Lowland Hardwood	0.061
	Maple-Beech-Birch	0.076
	Oak-Hickory	0.077
	Pine	0.072
	Spruce-Fir	0.087
	Nonstocked	0.027
NPS	Conifer	0.073
	Lowland Hardwood	0.069
	Maple-Beech-Birch	0.063

	Oak-Hickory	0.068
	Oak-Pine	0.069
	Nonstocked	0.026
PSW	Douglas-fir	0.091
	Fir-Spruce	0.109
	Hardwoods	0.042
	Other Conifer	0.100
	Pinyon-Juniper	0.031
	Redwood	0.108
	Nonstocked	0.022
PWE	Douglas-fir	0.103
	Fir-Spruce	0.106
	Hardwoods	0.027
	Lodgepole Pine	0.093
	Pinyon-Juniper	0.032
	Ponderosa Pine	0.103
	Nonstocked	0.024
PWW	Douglas-fir	0.100
	Fir-Spruce	0.090
	Other Conifer	0.073
	Other Hardwoods	0.062
	Red Alder	0.095
	Western Hemlock	0.099
	Nonstocked	0.020
RMN	Douglas-fir	0.062
	Fir-Spruce	0.100
	Hardwoods	0.112
	Lodgepole Pine	0.058
	Other Conifer	0.060
	Pinyon-Juniper	0.030
	Ponderosa Pine	0.087
	Nonstocked	0.018
RMS	Douglas-fir	0.077
	Fir-Spruce	0.079
	Hardwoods	0.064
	Lodgepole Pine	0.098
	Other Conifer	0.060
	Pinyon-Juniper	0.030
	Ponderosa Pine	0.082
	Nonstocked	0.020
SC	Bottomland Hardwood	0.063
	Misc. Conifer	0.068
	Natural Pine	0.068
	Oak-Pine	0.072
	Planted Pine	0.077
	Upland Hardwood	0.067
	Nonstocked	0.013
SE	Bottomland Hardwood	0.064
	Misc. Conifer	0.081
	Natural Pine	0.081
	Oak-Pine	0.063
	Planted Pine	0.075
	Upland Hardwood	0.059
	Nonstocked	0.012

^a Regions and types as defined in Smith et al. (2003).

^b The ratio is multiplied by the live tree C density on a plot to produce downed dead wood C density (T C/ha).

Table A-241: Coefficients for Estimating Logging Residue Component of Downed Dead Wood

Region ^a	Forest Type Group ^b (softwood/ hardwood)	Initial C Density	
		(T/ha)	Decay Coefficient
Alaska	hardwood	6.9	12.1
Alaska	softwood	8.6	32.3
NE	hardwood	13.9	12.1
NE	softwood	12.1	17.9

NLS	hardwood	9.1	12.1
NLS	softwood	7.2	17.9
NPS	hardwood	9.6	12.1
NPS	softwood	6.4	17.9
PSW	hardwood	9.8	12.1
PSW	softwood	17.5	32.3
PWE	hardwood	3.3	12.1
PWE	softwood	9.5	32.3
PWW	hardwood	18.1	12.1
PWW	softwood	23.6	32.3
RMN	hardwood	7.2	43.5
RMN	softwood	9.0	18.1
RMS	hardwood	5.1	43.5
RMS	softwood	3.7	18.1
SC	hardwood	4.2	8.9
SC	softwood	5.5	17.9
SE	hardwood	6.4	8.9
SE	softwood	7.3	17.9

^a Regions are defined in Smith et al. (2003) with the addition of coastal Alaska.

^b Forest types are according to majority hardwood or softwood species.

Litter carbon

Carbon in the litter layer is currently sampled on a subset of the FIA plots. Litter C is the pool of organic C (including material known as duff, humus, and fine woody debris) above the mineral soil and includes woody fragments with diameters of up to 7.5 cm. Because litter attributes are only collected on a subset of FIA plots, a model (3) was developed to predict C density based on plot/site attributes for plots that lacked litter information (Domke et al. 2016):

$$P(FFC_{Full}) = f(lat, lon, elev, fortypgrp, above, ppt, tmax, gmi) + u \quad (3)$$

where: *lat* = latitude, *lon* = longitude, *elev* = elevation, *fortypgrp* = forest type group, *above* = aboveground live tree C (trees ≥ 2.54 cm dbh), *ppt* = mean annual precipitation, *tmax* = average maximum temperature, *gmi* = the ratio of precipitation to potential evapotranspiration, *u* = the uncertainty in the prediction resulting from the sample-based estimates of the model parameters and observed residual variability around this prediction.

Due to data limitation in certain regions and inventory periods a series of reduced random forest regression models were used rather than replacing missing variables with imputation techniques in random forest. Database records used to compile estimates for this report were grouped by variable availability and the approaches described herein were applied. Litter C predictions are expressed in T•ha⁻¹.

Soil organic carbon

This section provides a summary of the methodology used to predict SOC for this report. A complete description of the approach is in Domke et al. (2017). The data used to develop the modeling framework to predict SOC on forest land came from the NFI and the International Soil Carbon Network. Since 2001, the FIA program has collected soil samples on every 16th base intensity plot distributed approximately every 38,848 ha, where at least one forested condition exists (Woodall et al. 2010). On fully forested plots, mineral and organic soils were sampled adjacent to subplots 2 by taking a single core at each location from two layers: 0 to 10.16 cm and 10.16 to 20.32 cm. The texture of each soil layer was estimated in the field, and physical and chemical properties were determined in the laboratory (U.S. Forest Service 2011). For this analysis, estimates of SOC from the NFI were calculated following O'Neill et al. (2005):

$$\sum SOC_{FIA\_TOTAL} = C_i \cdot BD_i \cdot t_i \cdot ucf \quad (4)$$

Where $\sum SOC_{FIA\_TOTAL}$ = total mass (Mg C ha⁻¹) of the mineral and organic soil C over all *i*th layers, *c_i* = percent organic C in the *i*th layer, *BD_i* = bulk density calculated as weight per unit volume of soil (g•cm⁻³) at the *i*th soil layer, *t_i* = thickness (cm) of the *i*th soil layer (either 0 to 10.16 cm or 10.16 to 20.32 cm), and *ucf* = unit conversion factor (100).

The $SOC_{FIA-TOTAL}$ estimates from each plot were assigned by forest condition on each plot, resulting in 3,667 profiles with SOC layer observations at 0 to 10.16 and 10.16 to 20.32 cm depths. Since the United States has historically

reported SOC estimates to a depth of 100 cm (Heath et al. 2011, USEPA 2015), ISCN data from forests in the United States were harmonized with the FIA soil layer observations to develop model functions of SOC by soil order to a depth of 100 cm. All observations used from the ISCN were contributed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. A total of 16,504 soil layers from 2,037 profiles were used from ISCN land uses defined as deciduous, evergreen, or mixed forest. The FIA-ISCN harmonized dataset used for model selection and prediction included a total of 5,704 profiles with 23,838 layer observations at depths ranging from 0 to 1,148 cm.

The modeling framework developed to predict SOC for this report was built around strategic-level forest and soil inventory information and auxiliary variables available for all FIA plots in the United States. The first phase of the new estimation approach involved fitting models using the midpoint of each soil layer from the harmonized dataset and SOC estimates at those midpoints. Several linear and nonlinear models were evaluated, and a log-log model provided the optimal fit to the harmonized data:

$$\log_{10} SOC_i = I + \log_{10} Depth \quad (5)$$

Where $\log_{10} SOC_i$ = SOC density (Mg C ha⁻¹ cm depth⁻¹) at the midpoint depth, I = intercept, $\log_{10} Depth$ = profile midpoint depth (cm).

The model was validated by partitioning the complete harmonized dataset multiple times into training and testing groups and then repeating this step for each soil order to evaluate model performance by soil order. Extra sum of squares F tests were used to evaluate whether there were statistically significant differences between the model coefficients from the model fit to the complete harmonized dataset and models fit to subsets of the data by soil order. Model coefficients for each soil order were used to predict SOC for the 20.32 to 100 cm layer for all FIA plots with soil profile observations. Next, the SOC layer observations from the FIA and predictions over the 100 cm profile for each FIA plot were summed:

$$SOC_{100} = SOC_{FIA\_TOTAL} + SOC_{20-100} \quad (6)$$

Where SOC_{100} = total estimated SOC density from 0-100 cm for each forest condition with a soil sample in the FIA database, SOC_{FIA_TOTAL} as previously defined in model (4), SOC_{20-100} = predicted SOC from 20.32 to 100 cm from model (5).

In the second phase of the modeling framework, SOC_{100} estimates for FIA plots were used to predict SOC for plots lacking SOC_{100} estimates using Random forests, a machine learning tool that uses bootstrap aggregating (i.e., bagging) to develop models to improve prediction (Breimen 2001). Random forests also relies on random variable selection to develop a forest of uncorrelated regression trees. These trees recognize the relationship between a dependent variable, in this case SOC_{100} , and a set of predictor variables. All relevant predictor variables—those that may influence the formation, accumulation, and loss of SOC—from annual inventories collected on all base intensity plots and auxiliary climate, soil, and topographic variables obtained from the PRISM climate group (Northwest Alliance 2015), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS 2015), and U.S. Geological Survey (Danielson and Gesch 2011), respectively, were included in the RF analysis. Due to regional differences in sampling protocols, many of the predictor variables included in the RF variable selection process were not available for all base intensity plots. To avoid problems with data limitations, pruning was used to reduce the RF models to the minimum number of relevant predictors (including both continuous and categorical variables) without substantial loss in explanatory power or increase in root mean squared error (RMSE). The general form of the full RF models were:

$$P(SOC) = f(lat, lon, elev, forttypgrp, ppt, tmax, gmi, order, surfgeo) \quad (7)$$

where lat = latitude, lon = longitude, $elev$ = elevation, $forttypgrp$ = forest type group, ppt = mean annual precipitation, $tmax$ = average maximum temperature, gmi = the ratio of precipitation to potential evapotranspiration, $order$ = soil order, $surfgeo$ = surficial geological description.

Compilation of population estimates using NFI plot data

Methods for the conterminous United States

The estimation framework is fundamentally driven by the annual NFI. Unfortunately, the annual NFI does not extend to 1990 and the periodic data from the NFI are not consistent (e.g., different plot design) with the annual NFI necessitating the adoption of a system to predict the annual C parameters back to 1990. To facilitate the prediction C parameters, the estimation framework is comprised of a forest dynamics module (age transition matrices) and a land use dynamics module (land area transition matrices). The forest dynamics module assesses forest uptake, forest aging, and disturbance effects (i.e., disturbances such as wind, fire, and floods identified by foresters on inventory plots). The land use dynamics module assesses C stock transfers associated with afforestation and deforestation (e.g., Woodall et al. 2015b). Both modules are developed from land use area statistics and C stock change or C stock transfer by age class. The required inputs are estimated from more than 625,000 forest and nonforest observations in the NFI database (U.S. Forest Service 2018a-c). Model predictions for before or after the annual NFI period are constructed from the estimation framework using only the annual observations. This modeling framework includes opportunities for user-defined scenarios to evaluate the impacts of land use change and disturbance rates on future C stocks and stock changes. As annual NFIs have largely completed at least one cycle and been remeasured, age and area transition matrices can be empirically informed. In contrast, as annual inventories in west Oklahoma and Wyoming are still undergoing their first complete cycle they are still in the process of being remeasured, and as a result theoretical transition matrices need to be developed.

Wear and Coulston (2015) and Coulston et al. (2015) provide the framework for the model. The overall objective is to estimate unmeasured historical changes and future changes in forest C parameters consistent with annual NFI estimates. For most regions, forest conditions are observed at time t_0 and at a subsequent time $t_1=t_0+s$, where s is the time step (time measured in years) and is indexed by discrete (5 year) forest age classes. The inventory from t_0 is then predicted back to the year 1990 and projected from t_1 to 2018. This prediction approach requires simulating changes in the age-class distribution resulting from forest aging and disturbance events and then applying C density estimates for each age class. For all states in the conterminous U.S. (except for Wyoming and west Oklahoma) age class transition matrices are estimated from observed changes in age classes between t_0 and t_1 . In west Oklahoma and Wyoming only one inventory was available (t_0) so transition matrices were obtained from theory but informed by the condition of the observed inventory to predict from t_0 to 1990 and predict from t_0 to 2018.

Theoretical Age Transition Matrices

Without any mortality-inducing disturbance, a projection of forest conditions would proceed by increasing all forest ages by the length of the time step until all forest resided in a terminal age class where the forest is retained indefinitely (this is by assumption, where forest C per unit area reaches a stable maximum). For the most basic case, disturbances (e.g., wildfire or timber harvesting) can reset some of the forest to the first age class. Disturbance can also alter the age class in more subtle ways. If a portion of trees in a multiple-age forest dies, the trees comprising the average age calculation change, thereby shifting the average age higher or lower (generally by one age class).

With n age classes, the age transition matrix ($\mathbf{T}$) is an $n \times n$ matrix, and each element ($\mathbf{T}_{qr}$) defines the proportion of forest area in class q transitioning to class r during the time step (s). The values of the elements of $\mathbf{T}$ depend on a number of factors, including forest disturbances such as harvests, fire, storms, and the value of s , especially relative to the span of the age classes. For example, holding area fixed, allowing for no mortality, defining the time step s equivalent to the span of age classes, and defining five age classes results in:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where all forest area progresses to the next age class and forests within the terminal age class are retained forever. With this version of $\mathbf{T}$, after five time steps all forests would be in the terminal age class. Relaxing these assumptions changes the structure of $\mathbf{T}$. If all disturbances, including harvesting and fire, that result in stand regeneration are accounted for and stochastic elements in forest aging are allowed, $\mathbf{T}$ defines a traditional Lefkovitch matrix population model (e.g., Caswell 2001) and becomes:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - t_1 - d_1 & d_2 & d_3 & d_4 & d_5 \\ t_1 & 1 - t_2 - d_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t_2 & 1 - t_3 - d_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_3 & 1 - t_4 - d_4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t_4 & 1 - d_5 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Where t_q is the proportion of forest of age class q transitioning to age class $q+1$, d_q is the proportion of age class q that experiences a stand-replacing disturbance, and $(1 - t_q - d_q)$ is the proportion retained within age class q ($\mathbf{T}_{qr}$).

Projections and Backcast for West Oklahoma and Wyoming

Projections of forest C in west Oklahoma and Wyoming are based on a life stage model:

$$\Delta C_t = C_{t+m} - C_t = (\mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{T} - \mathbf{F}_t) \cdot \mathbf{Den} + \mathbf{L}_t \cdot \mathbf{Den} \quad (10)$$

In this framework $\mathbf{T}$ is an age transition matrix that shifts the age distribution of the forest $\mathbf{F}$. The difference in forest area by age class between time t and $t+s$ is $\mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{T} - \mathbf{F}_t$. This quantity is multiplied by C density by age class ($\mathbf{Den}$) to estimate C stock change of forest remaining forest between t and $t+s$. Land use change is accounted for by the addition of $\mathbf{L}_t \cdot \mathbf{Den}$, where $\mathbf{L}_t$ identifies the age distribution of net land shifts into or out of forests. A query of the forest inventory databases provides estimates of $\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{Den}$, while inventory observations and modeling assumptions are used to estimate $\mathbf{T}$. By expanding $\mathbf{Den}$ to a matrix of C contained in all the constituent pools of forest carbon, projections for all pools are generated.

Land use change is incorporated as a $1 \times n$ vector $\mathbf{L}$, with positive entries indicating increased forest area and negative entries indicating loss of forest area, which provides insights of net change only. Implementing a forest area change requires some information and assumptions about the distribution of the change across age classes (the n dimension of $\mathbf{L}$). In the eastern states, projections are based on the projection of observed gross area changes by age class. In western states, total forest area changes are applied using rules. When net gains are positive, the area is added to the youngest forest age class; when negative, area is subtracted from all age classes in proportion to the area in each age class category.

Backcasting forest C inventories generally involve the same concepts as forecasting. An initial age class distribution is shifted at regular time steps backwards through time, using a transition matrix ($\mathbf{B}$):

$$\mathbf{F}_{t-s} = \mathbf{F}_t \cdot \mathbf{B} \quad (11)$$

$\mathbf{B}$ is constructed based on similar logic used for creating $\mathbf{T}$. The matrix cannot simply be derived as the inverse of $\mathbf{T}$ ($\mathbf{F}_{t-s} = \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{T}^{-1}$) because of the accumulating final age class (i.e., $\mathbf{T}$ does not contain enough information to determine the proportion of the final age class derived from the $n-1$ age class and the proportion that is retained in age class n from the previous time step).¹⁰⁶ However, $\mathbf{B}$ can be constructed using observed changes from the inventory and assumptions about transition/accumulation including nonstationary elements of the transition model:

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \sum_q d_q & b_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ d_1 & 1 - b_2 & b_3 & 0 & 0 \\ d_2 & 0 & 1 - b_3 & b_4 & 0 \\ d_3 & 0 & 0 & 1 - b_4 & b_r \\ d_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 - b_r \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

Forest area changes need to be accounted for in the backcasts as well:

$$\mathbf{F}_{t-s} = \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L}_t \quad (13)$$

¹⁰⁶ Simulation experiments show that a population that evolves as a function of $\mathbf{T}$ can be precisely predicted using $\mathbf{T}^{-1}$. However, applying the inverse to a population that is not consistent with the long-run outcomes of the transition model can result in predictions of negative areas within some stage age classes.

Where L_t is the forest area change between t_1 and t_0 as previously defined.

In west Oklahoma and Wyoming the theoretical life-stage models described by matrices (9) and (10) were applied. The disturbance factors (d) in both T and B are obtained from the current NFI by assuming that the area of forest in age class 1 resulted from disturbance in the previous period, the area in age class 2 resulted from disturbance in the period before that, and so on. The source of disturbed forest was assumed to be proportional to the area of forest in each age class. For projections (T), the average of implied disturbance for the previous two periods was applied. For the backcast (B), the disturbance frequencies implied by the age class distribution for each time step are moved. For areas with empirical transition matrices, change in forest area (L_t) was backcasted/projected using the change in forest area observed for the period t_0 to t_1 .

Projections and Backcast for CONUS (excluding west Oklahoma and Wyoming)

For all states in the conterminous United States (with the exception of west Oklahoma and Wyoming) remeasured plots were available. When remeasured data are available, the previously described approach is extended to estimate change more directly; in this case $\Delta C_t = F_t \cdot \delta C$, where ΔC is net stock change by pool within the analysis area, F is as previously defined, and δC is an $n \times cp$ matrix of per unit area forest C stock change per year by pool (cp) arrayed by forest age class. Inter-period forest C dynamics are previously described, and the age transition matrix (T) is estimated from the observed data directly. Forest C change at the end of the next period is defined as: $\Delta C_{t+s} = F_t \cdot T \cdot \delta C$. Land use change and disturbances such as cutting, fire, weather, insects, and diseases were incorporated by generalizing to account for the change vectors and undisturbed forest remaining as undisturbed forest:

$$\Delta C_{t+s} = \sum_{d \in L} (A_{td} \cdot T_d \cdot \delta C_d) \quad (14)$$

Where A_{td} = area by age class of each mutually exclusive land category in L which includes d disturbances at time t .

$L = (FF, NFF, FNF, Fcut, Ffire, Fweather, Fid)$ where FF =undisturbed forest remaining as undisturbed forest, NFF =nonforest to forest conversion, FNF =forest to nonforest conversion, $Fcut$ =cut forest remaining as forest, $Ffire$ =forest remaining as forest disturbed by fire, $Fweather$ =forest remaining as forest disturbed by weather, and Fid =forest remaining as forest disturbed by insects and diseases. In the case of land transfers (FNF and NFF), T_d is an $n \times n$ identity matrix and δC_d is a C stock transfer rate by age. Paired measurements for all plots in the inventory provide direct estimates of all elements of δC , T_d , and A_{td} matrices.

Predictions are developed by specifying either F_{t+s} or A_{t+sd} for either a future or a past state. To move the system forward, T is specified so that the age transition probabilities are set up as the probability between a time 0 and a time 1 transition. To move the system backward, T is replaced by B so that the age transition probabilities are for transitions from time 1 to time 0. Forecasts were developed by assuming the observed land use transitions and disturbance rates would continue for the next 5 years. Prediction moving back in time were developed using a Markov Chain process for land use transitions, observed disturbance rates for fire, weather, and insects. Historical forest cutting was incorporated by using the relationship between the area of forest cutting estimated from the inventory plots and the volume of roundwood production from the Timber Products Output program (U.S. Forest Service 2018d). This relationship allowed for the modification of $Fcut$ such that it followed trends described by Oswalt et al. (2014).

Methods for Alaska

Inventory and sampling

The NFI has been measuring plots in southeast and southcentral coastal Alaska as part of the annual NFI since 2004. In 2014, a pilot inventory was established in the Tanana Valley State Forest and Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge in Interior Alaska. This inventory was a collaboration between the USDA Forest Service, FIA program, the National Aeronautical and Space Administration, and many other federal, state, and local partners. This effort resulted in the establishment of 98 field plots which were measured during the summer of 2014 integrated with NASA's Goddard LiDAR/Hyperspectral/Thermal (G-LiHT) imaging system. Given the remote nature of Interior Alaska forest, the NFI plots in the pilot campaign were sampled at a lower intensity than base NFI plots (1 plot per 2403 ha) in the CONUS and coastal Alaska. Several plot-level protocols were also adapted to accommodate the unique conditions of forests in this region (see Pattison et al. 2018 for details on plot design and sampling protocols). The pilot field campaign became operational in 2016 and plots measured on the 1/5 intensity (1 plot per 12013 ha) from 2014, 2016, and 2017 interior NFI were used ($n = 446$) with base-intensity annual NFI plots from coastal AK ($n = 2748$) in this analysis.

A spatially balanced sampling design was used to identify field sample locations across all of Alaska following standard FIA procedures with a tessellation of hexagons and one sample plot selected per hexagon – 1/5 intensity in interior

Alaska and base-intensity in coastal Alaska (Bechtold and Patterson 2005). The sampling locations were classified as forest or non-forest using the NLCD from 2001 and 2011. It is important to note that this is different from how NFI plots are classified into land cover and land use categories in the CONUS where high resolution areal imagery is used. Since the fine-scale remotely sensed imagery (National Agriculture Imagery Program; NAIP 2015) used in the conterminous U.S. were not available for AK and given that the NLCD has been used to classify land use categories in Alaska in the *Representation of the U.S. Land Base* in this Inventory, the NLCD was the most consistent and credible option for classification. Next, the forest land was further classified as managed or unmanaged following the definition in the *Representation of the U.S. Land Base* and using similar procedures (see Ogle et al. 2018 for details on the managed land layer for the U.S.).

While only a subset of the total NFI sample was available at the time of this Inventory, all NFI plot locations within the sampling frame were used in this analysis. Auxiliary climate, soil, structural, disturbance, and topographic variables were harmonized with each plot location and year of occurrence (if relevant and available) over the entire time series (1990 to 2017).

Prediction

The harmonized data were used to predict plot-level parameters using non-parametric random forests (RF) for regression, a machine learning tool that uses bootstrap aggregating (i.e., bagging) to develop models to improve prediction (Breiman 2001). Random forests also relies on random variable selection to develop a forest of uncorrelated regression trees. These trees uncover the relationship between a dependent variable (e.g., live aboveground biomass carbon) and a set of predictor variables. The RF analysis included predictor variables ($n > 100$) that may influence carbon stocks within each forest ecosystem pool at each plot location over the entire time series. To avoid problems with data limitations over the time series, variable pruning was used to reduce the RF models to the minimum number of relevant predictors without substantial loss in explanatory power or increase in root mean squared error (RMSE; see Domke et al. 2017, Domke et al. In prep for more information). The harmonized dataset used to develop the RF models for each plot-level parameter were partitioned 10 times into training (70 percent) and testing (30 percent) groups and the results were evaluated graphically and with a variety of statistical metrics including Spearman's rank correlation, equivalence tests (Wellek 2003), as well as RMSE. All analyses were conducted using R statistical software (R Core Team 2018).

The RF predictions of carbon stocks for the year 2016 were used as a baseline for plots that have not yet been measured. Next, simple linear regression was used to predict average annual gains/losses by forest ecosystem carbon pool using the chronosequence of plot measurements available at the time of this Inventory. These predicted gains/losses were applied over the time series from the year of measurement or the 2016 base year in the case of plots that have not yet been measured. Since the RF predictions of carbon stocks and the predicted gains/losses were obtained from empirical measurements on NFI plots that may have been disturbed at some point over the time series, the predictions inherently incorporate gains/losses associated with natural disturbance and harvesting. That said, there was no evidence of fire disturbance on the plots that have been measured to date. To account for carbon losses associated with fire, carbon stock predictions for plots that have not been measured but were within a fire perimeter during the Inventory period were adjusted to account for area burned (see Table A-252) and the IPCC (Table 2.6, IPCC 2006) default combustion factor for boreal forests was applied to all live, dead, and litter biomass carbon stocks in the year of the disturbance. The plot-level predictions in each year were then multiplied by the area they represent within the sampling frame to compile population estimates over the time series for this Inventory.

Carbon in Harvested Wood Products

Estimates of the Harvested Wood Product (HWP) contribution to forest C sinks and emissions (hereafter called "HWP Contribution") are based on methods described in Skog (2008) using the WOODCARB II model and the U.S. forest products module (Ince et al. 2011). These methods are based on IPCC (2006) guidance for estimating HWP C. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines provide methods that allow Parties to report HWP Contribution using one of several different accounting approaches: production, stock change, and atmospheric flow, as well as a default method. The various approaches are described below. The approaches differ in how HWP Contribution is allocated based on production or consumption as well as what processes (atmospheric fluxes or stock changes) are emphasized.

- **Production approach:** Accounts for the net changes in C stocks in forests and in the wood products pool, but attributes both to the producing country.
- **Stock-change approach:** Accounts for changes in the product pool within the boundaries of the consuming country.
- **Atmospheric-flow approach:** Accounts for net emissions or removals of C to and from the atmosphere within national boundaries. Carbon removal due to forest growth is accounted for in the producing country while C emissions to the atmosphere from oxidation of wood products are accounted for in the consuming country.

- **Default approach:** Assumes no change in C stocks in HWP. IPCC (2006) requests that such an assumption be justified if this is how a Party is choosing to report.

The United States uses the production accounting approach (as in previous years) to report HWP Contribution (Table A-242). Annual estimates of change are calculated by tracking the additions to and removals from the pool of products held in end uses (i.e., products in use such as housing or publications) and the pool of products held in solid waste disposal sites (SWDS).

Estimates of five HWP variables that can be used to calculate HWP contribution for the stock change and atmospheric flow approaches for imports and exports are provided in Table A-240. The HWP variables estimated are:

- (1A) annual change of C in wood and paper products in use in the United States,
- (1B) annual change of C in wood and paper products in SWDS in the United States,
- (2A) annual change of C in wood and paper products in use in the United States and other countries where the wood came from trees harvested in the United States,
- (2B) annual change of C in wood and paper products in SWDS in the United States and other countries where the wood came from trees harvested in the United States,
- (3) Carbon in imports of wood, pulp, and paper to the United States,
- (4) Carbon in exports of wood, pulp and paper from the United States, and
- (5) Carbon in annual harvest of wood from forests in the United States. The sum of these variables yield estimates for HWP contribution under the production accounting approach.

Table A-242: Harvested Wood Products from Wood Harvested in the United States—Annual Additions of C to Stocks and Total Stocks under the Production Approach

Year	Net C additions per year (MMT C per year)			Total C stocks (MMT C)		
	Total	Products in use	Products in SWDS	Total	Products in use	Products in SWDS
		Total	Total			
1990	(33.8)	(14.9)	(18.8)	1,895	1,249	646
1991	(33.8)	(16.3)	(17.4)	1,929	1,264	665
1992	(32.9)	(15.0)	(17.9)	1,963	1,280	683
1993	(33.4)	(15.9)	(17.5)	1,996	1,295	701
1994	(32.3)	(15.1)	(17.2)	2,029	1,311	718
1995	(30.6)	(14.1)	(16.5)	2,061	1,326	735
1996	(32.0)	(14.7)	(17.3)	2,092	1,340	752
1997	(31.1)	(13.4)	(17.7)	2,124	1,355	769
1998	(32.5)	(14.1)	(18.4)	2,155	1,368	787
1999	(30.8)	(12.8)	(18.0)	2,188	1,382	805
2000	(25.5)	(8.7)	(16.8)	2,218	1,395	823
2001	(26.8)	(9.6)	(17.2)	2,244	1,404	840
2002	(25.6)	(9.5)	(16.2)	2,271	1,414	857
2003	(28.6)	(12.3)	(16.3)	2,296	1,423	873
2004	(28.1)	(11.8)	(16.3)	2,325	1,435	890
2005	(29.5)	(12.2)	(17.3)	2,353	1,447	906
2006	(28.1)	(10.7)	(17.4)	2,382	1,459	923
2007	(20.9)	(3.8)	(17.1)	2,411	1,470	941
2008	(14.6)	2.1	(16.7)	2,431	1,474	958
2009	(16.2)	0.4	(16.6)	2,446	1,472	974
2010	(18.3)	(1.6)	(16.8)	2,462	1,471	991
2011	(17.9)	(1.1)	(16.9)	2,481	1,473	1,008
2012	(18.9)	(1.9)	(17.0)	2,498	1,474	1,025
2013	(20.6)	(3.5)	(17.1)	2,517	1,476	1,042
2014	(20.8)	(3.7)	(17.1)	2,538	1,479	1,059
2015	(26.1)	(8.6)	(17.6)	2,559	1,483	1,076
2016	(27.2)	(9.1)	(18.0)	2,585	1,492	1,093
2017	(28.2)	(9.7)	(18.4)	2,612	1,501	1,111

Note: Parentheses indicate net C sequestration (i.e., a net removal of C from the atmosphere).

Table A-243: Comparison of Net Annual Change in Harvested Wood Products C Stocks Using Alternative Accounting Approaches (kt CO₂ Eq./year)

HWP Contribution to LULUCF Emissions/ removals (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)			
Inventory Year	Stock-Change Approach	Atmospheric Flow Approach	Production Approach
1990	(116,345)	(131,436)	(123,758)
1991	(119,985)	(131,633)	(123,791)
1992	(126,805)	(127,819)	(120,708)
1993	(129,954)	(129,882)	(122,498)
1994	(125,981)	(128,010)	(118,411)
1995	(122,340)	(122,495)	(112,219)
1996	(131,434)	(127,378)	(117,344)
1997	(137,218)	(122,781)	(114,188)
1998	(147,057)	(127,427)	(119,182)
1999	(141,195)	(120,395)	(112,969)
2000	(125,039)	(100,417)	(93,479)
2001	(130,714)	(103,339)	(98,188)
2002	(125,812)	(98,663)	(93,967)
2003	(143,193)	(108,453)	(104,747)
2004	(142,102)	(107,342)	(103,215)
2005	(138,130)	(113,897)	(108,034)
2006	(115,181)	(111,489)	(102,984)
2007	(73,134)	(88,392)	(76,807)
2008	(41,284)	(68,789)	(53,386)
2009	(47,980)	(78,261)	(59,367)
2010	(50,802)	(90,214)	(67,279)
2011	(54,008)	(89,470)	(65,710)
2012	(64,774)	(94,413)	(69,154)
2013	(80,511)	(102,379)	(75,552)
2014	(85,209)	(102,765)	(76,356)
2015	(130,361)	(119,057)	(95,859)
2016	(134,510)	(119,863)	(99,618)
2017	(138,960)	(121,201)	(103,270)

Note: Parentheses indicate net C sequestration (i.e., a net removal of C from the atmosphere).

Table A-244: Harvested Wood Products Sectoral Background Data for LULUCF—United States

Inventory year	1A Annual Change in stock of HWP in use from consumption	1B Annual Change in stock of HWP in SWDS from consumption	2A Annual Change in stock of HWP in use produced from domestic harvest	2B Annual Change in stock of HWP in SWDS produced from domestic harvest	3 Annual Imports of wood, and paper products plus wood fuel, pulp, recovered paper, roundwood/chips	4 Annual Exports of wood, and paper products plus wood fuel, pulp, recovered paper, roundwood/chips	5 Annual Domestic Harvest	6 Annual release of C to the atmosphere from HWP consumption (from fuelwood and products in use and products in SWDS)	7 Annual release of C to the atmosphere from HWP (including firewood) where wood came from domestic harvest (from products in use and products in SWDS)	8 HWP Contribution to AFOLU CO ₂ emissions/removals
	ΔCHWP IU DC	ΔCHWP SWDS DC	ΔC HWP IU DH	ΔCHWP SWDS DH	PIM	PEX	H	↑CHWP DC	↑CHWP DH	
									kt C/yr	kt CO ₂ /yr
1990	13,129	18,602	14,940	18,812	11,552	15,667	144,435	108,588	110,682	(123,758)
1991	15,718	17,006	16,334	17,427	12,856	16,032	139,389	103,489	105,627	(123,791)
1992	16,957	17,627	14,971	17,949	14,512	14,788	134,554	99,694	101,633	(120,708)
1993	18,221	17,221	15,930	17,479	15,685	15,665	134,750	99,328	101,342	(122,498)
1994	17,307	17,051	15,065	17,229	16,712	17,266	137,027	102,115	104,733	(118,411)
1995	17,018	16,348	14,092	16,513	16,691	16,733	134,477	101,069	103,872	(112,219)
1996	18,756	17,090	14,740	17,263	17,983	16,877	135,439	100,699	103,436	(117,344)
1997	19,654	17,769	13,404	17,738	18,994	15,057	134,206	100,720	103,064	(114,188)
1998	21,444	18,662	14,146	18,359	20,599	15,245	134,193	99,440	101,689	(119,182)
1999	20,000	18,508	12,840	17,970	21,858	16,185	133,694	100,859	102,884	(112,969)
2000	16,491	17,610	8,713	16,781	22,051	15,336	127,896	100,510	102,402	(93,479)
2001	17,414	18,235	9,566	17,213	23,210	15,744	126,866	98,683	100,087	(98,188)
2002	16,986	17,326	9,453	16,175	23,707	16,303	123,606	96,698	97,978	(93,967)
2003	21,409	17,644	12,273	16,294	26,428	16,953	118,852	89,274	90,284	(104,747)
2004	20,990	17,765	11,826	16,324	26,793	17,312	120,393	91,118	92,244	(103,215)
2005	19,085	18,587	12,158	17,306	25,445	18,836	118,544	87,481	89,080	(108,034)
2006	13,104	18,309	10,661	17,425	21,663	20,657	115,827	85,421	87,740	(102,984)
2007	2,434	17,512	3,825	17,122	16,997	21,159	101,525	77,418	80,577	(76,807)
2008	(5,364)	16,623	(2,098)	16,657	13,115	20,616	90,576	71,815	76,016	(53,386)
2009	(3,191)	16,277	(383)	16,574	14,162	22,420	92,792	71,448	76,601	(59,367)
2010	(2,281)	16,136	1,559	16,790	13,923	24,672	97,134	72,530	78,785	(67,279)
2011	(1,299)	16,028	1,055	16,866	13,580	23,252	99,934	75,533	82,013	(65,710)
2012	1,555	16,110	1,900	16,960	14,700	22,783	103,331	77,582	84,471	(69,154)
2013	5,600	16,358	3,535	17,070	16,881	22,845	118,155	90,233	97,550	(75,552)
2014	6,764	16,475	3,731	17,094	17,478	22,266	108,071	80,044	87,247	(76,356)
2015	17,967	17,587	8,566	17,577	21,686	18,603	110,347	77,877	84,204	(95,859)
2016	18,154	18,530	9,142	18,026	22,649	18,655	112,630	79,940	85,461	(99,618)
2017	18,554	19,344	9,727	18,438	23,551	18,707	114,913	81,858	86,748	(103,270)

Note: Parentheses indicate net C sequestration (i.e., a net removal of C from the atmosphere).

Annual estimates of variables 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B were calculated by tracking the additions to and removals from the pool of products held in end uses (e.g., products in uses such as housing or publications) and the pool of products held in SWDS. In the case of variables 2A and 2B, the pools include products exported and held in other countries and the pools in the United States exclude products made from wood harvested in other countries. Solidwood products added to pools include lumber and panels. End-use categories for solidwood include single and multifamily housing, alteration and repair of housing, and other end uses. There is one product category and one end-use category for paper. Additions to and removals from pools are tracked beginning in 1900, with the exception that additions of softwood lumber to housing begins in 1800. Solidwood and paper product production and trade data are from USDA Forest Service and other sources (Hair and Ulrich 1963; Hair 1958; USDC Bureau of Census 1976; Ulrich, 1985, 1989; Steer 1948; AF&PA 2006a, 2006b; Howard 2003).

The rate of removals from products in use and the rate of decay of products in SWDS are specified by first order (exponential) decay curves with given half-lives (time at which half of amount placed in use will have been discarded from use). Half-lives for products in use, determined after calibration of the model to meet two criteria, are shown in Table A-245. The first criterion is that the WOODCARB II model estimate of C in houses standing in 2001 needed to match an independent estimate of C in housing based on U.S. Census and USDA Forest Service survey data. The second criterion is that the WOODCARB II model estimate of wood and paper being discarded to SWDS needed to match EPA estimates of discards over the period 1990 to 2000. This calibration strongly influences the estimate of variable 1A, and to a lesser extent variable 2A. The calibration also determines the amounts going to SWDS. In addition, WOODCARB II landfill decay rates have been validated by making sure that estimates of methane emissions from landfills based on EPA data are reasonable in comparison to methane estimates based on WOODCARB II landfill decay rates.

Decay parameters for products in SWDS are shown in Table A-246. Estimates of 1B and 2B also reflect the change over time in the fraction of products discarded to SWDS (versus burning or recycling) and the fraction of SWDS that are sanitary landfills versus dumps.

Variables 2A and 2B are used to estimate HWP contribution under the production accounting approach. A key assumption for estimating these variables is that products exported from the United States and held in pools in other countries have the same half-lives for products in use, the same percentage of discarded products going to SWDS, and the same decay rates in SWDS. Summaries of net fluxes and stocks for harvested wood in products and SWDS are in Table A-242 and Table A-243. The decline in net additions to HWP C stocks continued through 2009 from the recent high point in 2006. This is due to sharp declines in U.S. production of solidwood and paper products in 2009 primarily due to the decline in housing construction. The low level of gross additions to solidwood and paper products in use in 2009 was exceeded by discards from uses. The result is a net reduction in the amount of HWP C that is held in products in use during 2009. For 2009 additions to landfills still exceeded emissions from landfills and the net additions to landfills have remained relatively stable. Overall, there were net C additions to HWP in use and in landfills combined.

A key assumption for estimating these variables is that products exported from the United States and held in pools in other countries have the same half-lives for products in use, the same percentage of discarded products going to SWDS, and the same decay rates in SWDS. Summaries of net fluxes and stocks for harvested wood in products and SWDS are in *Land Converted to Forest Land – Soil C Methods*.

Table A-245: Half-life of Solidwood and Paper Products in End-Uses

Parameter	Value	Units
Half-life of wood in single family housing 1920 and before	78.0	Years
Half-life of wood in single family housing 1920–1939	78.0	Years
Half-life of wood in single family housing 1940–1959	80.0	Years
Half-life of wood in single family housing 1960–1979	81.9	Years
Half-life of wood in single family housing 1980 +	83.9	Years
Ratio of multifamily half-life to single family half life	0.61	
Ratio of repair and alterations half-life to single family half-life	0.30	
Half-life for other solidwood product in end uses	38.0	Years
Half-life of paper in end uses	2.54	Years

Source: Skog, K.E. (2008) "Sequestration of C in harvested wood products for the U.S." *Forest Products Journal* 58:56–72.

Table A-246: Parameters Determining Decay of Wood and Paper in SWDS

Parameter	Value	Units
Percentage of wood and paper in dumps that is subject to decay	100	Percent
Percentage of wood in landfills that is subject to decay	23	Percent
Percentage of paper in landfills that is subject to decay	56	Percent
Half-life of wood in landfills / dumps (portion subject to decay)	29	Years
Half-life of paper in landfills/ dumps (portion subject to decay)	14.5	Years

Source: Skog, K.E. (2008) "Sequestration of C in harvested wood products for the U.S." *Forest Products Journal* 58:56–72.

Table A-247: Net CO₂ Flux from Forest Pools in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and Harvested Wood Pools (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Carbon Pool	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Forest	(556.3)	(538.1)	(518.9)	(497.8)	(514.9)	(421.2)	(471.5)	(531.4)	(530.1)	(538.8)	(511.6)	(541.0)	(520.9)	(548.7)	(535.0)	(541.1)	(492.4)	(549.4)	(529.3)	(517.0)
Aboveground Biomass	(378.7)	(371.0)	(353.8)	(350.3)	(354.3)	(338.2)	(347.7)	(361.2)	(362.8)	(366.7)	(364.9)	(371.8)	(365.8)	(380.2)	(370.1)	(379.5)	(361.8)	(377.5)	(371.3)	(357.1)
Belowground Biomass	(90.7)	(88.9)	(84.8)	(84.2)	(84.8)	(81.4)	(83.5)	(86.1)	(86.4)	(87.1)	(86.0)	(87.9)	(86.6)	(88.4)	(89.3)	(89.2)	(84.4)	(88.6)	(87.1)	(83.9)
Dead Wood	(76.0)	(76.9)	(77.1)	(75.1)	(77.0)	(68.1)	(73.0)	(78.9)	(78.8)	(79.7)	(76.5)	(79.7)	(78.3)	(82.1)	(78.6)	(79.4)	(74.5)	(82.6)	(81.9)	(77.4)
Litter	(4.2)	(2.8)	(3.9)	11.1	0.7	66.2	32.6	(5.1)	(2.9)	(5.2)	16.4	0.2	(1.6)	(4.1)	4.9	(0.9)	30.0	(3.3)	(1.2)	(3.8)
Soil (Mineral)	1.2	0.8	+	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.5)	(0.6)	0.1	(0.7)	(1.2)	(1.7)	5.8	4.8	(3.3)	6.8	(1.6)	0.5	9.2	2.3
Soil (Organic)	(8.7)	(0.1)	+	+	+	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.9)	4.8	0.5	0.6	0.3	(1.0)	1.3	2.2	2.1
Drained Organic Soil ^a	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Harvested Wood	(123.8)	(112.2)	(93.5)	(98.2)	(94.0)	(104.7)	(103.2)	(108.0)	(103.0)	(76.8)	(53.4)	(59.4)	(67.3)	(65.7)	(69.2)	(75.6)	(76.4)	(95.9)	(99.6)	(103.3)
Products in Use	(54.8)	(51.7)	(31.9)	(35.1)	(34.7)	(45.0)	(43.4)	(44.6)	(39.1)	(14.0)	7.7	1.4	(5.7)	(3.9)	(7.0)	(13.0)	(13.7)	(31.4)	(33.5)	(35.7)
SWDS	(69.0)	(60.5)	(61.5)	(63.1)	(59.3)	(59.7)	(59.9)	(63.5)	(63.9)	(62.8)	(61.1)	(60.8)	(61.6)	(61.8)	(62.2)	(62.6)	(62.7)	(64.4)	(66.1)	(67.6)
Total Net Flux	(680.1)	(650.4)	(612.4)	(596.0)	(608.9)	(525.9)	(574.8)	(639.4)	(633.1)	(615.6)	(565.0)	(600.4)	(588.2)	(614.4)	(604.1)	(616.7)	(568.8)	(645.2)	(628.9)	(620.3)

1 + Absolute value does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

2 ^a These estimates include C stock changes from drained organic soils from both *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and *Land Converted to Forest Land*.

3 Note: Parentheses indicate negative values. Quality control uncovered minor errors in the estimates for "Soil (Organic)" that will be corrected in the final version of this Inventory.

4

Table A-248: Net C Flux from Forest Pools in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and Harvested Wood Pools (MMT C)

Carbon Pool	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Forest	(151.7)	(146.8)	(141.5)	(135.8)	(140.4)	(114.9)	(128.6)	(144.9)	(144.6)	(146.9)	(139.5)	(147.6)	(142.1)	(149.6)	(145.9)	(147.6)	(134.3)	(149.8)	(144.4)	(141.0)
Aboveground Biomass	(103.3)	(101.2)	(96.5)	(95.5)	(96.6)	(92.2)	(94.8)	(98.5)	(98.9)	(100.0)	(99.5)	(101.4)	(99.8)	(103.7)	(100.9)	(103.5)	(98.7)	(102.9)	(101.3)	(97.4)
Belowground Biomass	(24.7)	(24.3)	(23.1)	(23.0)	(23.1)	(22.2)	(22.8)	(23.5)	(23.6)	(23.8)	(23.5)	(24.0)	(23.6)	(24.1)	(24.4)	(24.3)	(23.0)	(24.2)	(23.8)	(22.9)
Dead Wood	(20.7)	(21.0)	(21.0)	(20.5)	(21.0)	(18.6)	(19.9)	(21.5)	(21.5)	(21.7)	(20.9)	(21.7)	(21.4)	(22.4)	(21.4)	(21.7)	(20.3)	(22.5)	(22.3)	(21.1)
Litter	(1.1)	(0.8)	(1.1)	3.0	0.2	18.1	8.9	(1.4)	(0.8)	(1.4)	4.5	0.1	(0.4)	(1.1)	1.3	(0.2)	8.2	(0.9)	(0.3)	(1.0)
Soil (Mineral)	0.3	0.2	+	+	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.2)	+	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.5)	1.6	1.3	(0.9)	1.9	(0.4)	0.1	2.5	0.6
Soil (Organic)	(2.4)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	(0.1)	+	(0.3)	1.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	(0.3)	0.4	0.6	0.6
Drained Organic Soil ^a	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Harvested Wood	(33.8)	(30.6)	(25.5)	(26.8)	(25.6)	(28.6)	(28.1)	(29.5)	(28.1)	(20.9)	(14.6)	(16.2)	(18.3)	(17.9)	(18.9)	(20.6)	(20.8)	(26.1)	(27.2)	(28.2)
Products in Use	(14.9)	(14.1)	(8.7)	(9.6)	(9.5)	(12.3)	(11.8)	(12.2)	(10.7)	(3.8)	2.1	0.4	(1.6)	(1.1)	(1.9)	(3.5)	(3.7)	(8.6)	(9.1)	(9.7)
SWDS	(18.8)	(16.5)	(16.8)	(17.2)	(16.2)	(16.3)	(16.3)	(17.3)	(17.4)	(17.1)	(16.7)	(16.6)	(16.8)	(16.9)	(17.0)	(17.1)	(17.1)	(17.6)	(18.0)	(18.4)
Total Net Flux	(185.5)	(177.4)	(167.0)	(162.5)	(166.1)	(143.4)	(156.8)	(174.4)	(172.7)	(167.9)	(154.1)	(163.7)	(160.4)	(167.6)	(164.8)	(168.2)	(155.1)	(176.0)	(171.5)	(169.2)

5 + Absolute value does not exceed 0.05 MMT C.

6 ^a These estimates include C stock changes from drained organic soils from both *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and *Land Converted to Forest Land*.

7 Note: Parentheses indicate negative values. Quality control uncovered minor errors in the estimates for "Soil (Organic)" that will be corrected in the final version of this Inventory.

Table A-249: Forest area (1,000 ha) and C Stocks in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* and Harvested Wood Pools (MMT C)

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Forest Area (1000 ha)	269,959	270,720	271,530	271,883	272,034	272,182	272,325	272,469	272,609	272,726	272,850	273,035	273,170	273,346	273,494	273,623	273,791
Carbon Pools																	
Forest	53,668	54,419	55,144	55,807	55,952	56,096	56,244	56,383	56,531	56,673	56,823	56,969	57,117	57,252	57,402	57,546	57,687
Aboveground Biomass	11,870	12,385	12,881	13,357	13,456	13,555	13,655	13,754	13,856	13,955	14,059	14,160	14,263	14,362	14,465	14,566	14,664
Belowground Biomass	2,378	2,501	2,620	2,734	2,757	2,781	2,805	2,828	2,852	2,876	2,900	2,924	2,949	2,972	2,996	3,020	3,042
Dead Wood	2,153	2,257	2,362	2,463	2,485	2,506	2,528	2,549	2,571	2,592	2,615	2,636	2,658	2,678	2,700	2,723	2,744
Litter	3,663	3,670	3,675	3,646	3,647	3,648	3,649	3,645	3,645	3,645	3,647	3,645	3,645	3,637	3,638	3,638	3,639
Soil (Mineral)	27,824	27,822	27,822	27,822	27,822	27,822	27,822	27,823	27,823	27,822	27,820	27,821	27,819	27,820	27,820	27,817	27,816
Soil (Organic)	5,781	5,784	5,784	5,784	5,784	5,784	5,784	5,784	5,784	5,783	5,783	5,783	5,783	5,783	5,782	5,782	5,781
Harvested Wood	1,895	2,061	2,218	2,353	2,382	2,411	2,431	2,446	2,462	2,481	2,498	2,517	2,538	2,559	2,585	2,612	2,640
Products in Use	1,249	1,326	1,395	1,447	1,459	1,470	1,474	1,472	1,471	1,473	1,474	1,476	1,479	1,483	1,492	1,501	1,510
SWDS	646	735	823	906	923	941	958	974	991	1,008	1,025	1,042	1,059	1,076	1,093	1,111	1,130
Total Stock	55,563	56,480	57,363	58,159	58,334	58,507	58,675	58,829	58,993	59,154	59,322	59,487	59,655	59,810	59,987	60,158	60,328

2 Note: Quality control uncovered minor errors in the estimates for "Soil (Organic)" that will be corrected in the final version of this Inventory.

Land Converted to Forest Land

The following section includes a description of the methodology used to estimate stock changes in all forest C pools for *Land Converted to Forest Land*. Forest Inventory and Analysis data and IPCC (2006) defaults for reference C stocks were used to compile separate estimates for the five C storage pools within an age class transition matrix for the 20 year conversion period (where possible). The 2009 USDA National Resources Inventory (NRI) land-use survey points were classified according to land-use history records starting in 1982 when the NRI survey began. Consequently the classifications from 1990 to 2001 were based on less than 20 years. Furthermore, the FIA data used to compile estimates of carbon sequestration in the age class transition matrix are based on 5- to 10-yr remeasurements so the exact conversion period was limited to the remeasured data over the time series. Estimates for Aboveground and Belowground Biomass, Dead wood and Litter were based on data collected from the extensive array of permanent, annual forest inventory plots and associated models (e.g., live tree belowground biomass) in the United States (USDA Forest Service 2015b, 2015c). Carbon conversion factors were applied at the disaggregated level of each inventory plot and then appropriately expanded to population estimates. To ensure consistency in the *Land Converted to Forest Land* category where C stock transfers occur between land-use categories, all soil estimates are based on methods from Ogle et al. (2003, 2006) and IPCC (2006).

Live tree C pools

Live tree C pools include aboveground and belowground (coarse root) biomass of live trees with diameter at diameter breast height (d.b.h.) of at least 2.54 cm at 1.37 m above the forest floor. Separate estimates are made for above- and below-ground biomass components. If inventory plots include data on individual trees, tree C is based on Woodall et al. (2011), which is also known as the component ratio method (CRM), and is a function of volume, species, diameter, and, in some regions, tree height and site quality. The estimated sound volume (i.e., after rotten/missing deductions) provided in the tree table of the FIADB is the principal input to the CRM biomass calculation for each tree (Woodall et al. 2011). The estimated volumes of wood and bark are converted to biomass based on the density of each. Additional components of the trees such as tops, branches, and coarse roots, are estimated according to adjusted component estimates from Jenkins et al. (2003). Live trees with d.b.h of less than 12.7 cm do not have estimates of sound volume in the FIADB, and CRM biomass estimates follow a separate process (see Woodall et al. 2011 for details). An additional component of foliage, which was not explicitly included in Woodall et al. (2011), was added to each tree following the same CRM method. Carbon is estimated by multiplying the estimated oven-dry biomass by a C constant of 0.5 because biomass is 50 percent of dry weight (IPCC 2006). Further discussion and example calculations are provided in Woodall et al. 2011 and Domke et al. 2012.

Understory vegetation

Understory vegetation is a minor component of total forest ecosystem biomass. Understory vegetation is defined as all biomass of undergrowth plants in a forest, including woody shrubs and trees less than one-inch d.b.h. In this Inventory, it is assumed that 10 percent of understory C mass is belowground. This general root-to-shoot ratio (0.11) is near the lower range of temperate forest values provided in IPCC (2006) and was selected based on two general assumptions: ratios are likely to be lower for light-limited understory vegetation as compared with larger trees, and a greater proportion of all root mass will be less than 2 mm diameter.

Estimates of C density are based on information in Birdsey (1996), which was applied to FIA permanent plots. See model (1) in the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* section of the Annex.

In this model, the ratio is the ratio of understory C density (T C/ha) to live tree C density (above- and below-ground) according to Jenkins et al. (2003) and expressed in T C/ha. An additional coefficient is provided as a maximum ratio; that is, any estimate predicted from the model that is greater than the maximum ratio is set equal to the maximum ratio. A full set of coefficients are in Table A-239. Regions and forest types are the same classifications described in Smith et al. (2003). An example calculation for understory C in aspen-birch forests in the Northeast is provided in the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* section of the Annex.

This calculation is followed by three possible modifications. First, the maximum value for the ratio is set to 2.02 (see value in column “maximum ratio”); this also applies to stands with zero tree C, which is undefined in the above model. Second, the minimum ratio is set to 0.005 (Birdsey 1996). Third, nonstocked (i.e., currently lacking tree cover but still in the forest land use) and pinyon/juniper forest types (see Table A-239) are set to coefficient A, which is a C density (T C/ha) for these types only.

Dead wood

The standing dead tree estimates are primarily based on plot-level measurements (Domke et al. 2011; Woodall et al. 2011). This C pool includes aboveground and belowground (coarse root) mass and includes trees of at least 12.7 cm d.b.h. Calculations follow the basic CRM method applied to live trees (Woodall et al. 2011) with additional modifications to account for decay and structural loss. In addition to the lack of foliage, two characteristics of standing dead trees that can

significantly affect C mass are decay, which affects density and thus specific C content (Domke et al. 2011; Harmon et al. 2011), and structural loss such as branches and bark (Domke et al. 2011). Dry weight to C mass conversion is by multiplying by 0.5.

Downed dead wood, inclusive of logging residue, are sampled on a subset of FIA plots. Despite a reduced sample intensity, a single down woody material population estimate (Woodall et al. 2010; Domke et al. 2013; Woodall et al. 2013) per state is now incorporated into these empirical downed dead wood estimates. Downed dead wood is defined as pieces of dead wood greater than 7.5 cm diameter, at transect intersection, that are not attached to live or standing dead trees. It also includes stumps and roots of harvested trees. Ratio estimates of downed dead wood to live tree biomass were developed using FORCARB2 simulations and applied at the plot level (Smith et al. 2004). Estimates for downed dead wood correspond to the region and forest type classifications described in Smith et al. (2003). A full set of ratios is provided in Table A-240. An additional component of downed dead wood is a regional average estimate of logging residue based on Smith et al. (2006) applied at the plot level. These are based on a regional average C density at age zero and first order decay; initial densities and decay coefficients are provided in Table A-241. These amounts are added to explicitly account for downed dead wood following harvest. The sum of these two components are then adjusted by the ratio of population totals; that is, the ratio of plot-based to modeled estimates (Domke et al. 2013).

Litter carbon

Carbon in the litter layer is currently sampled on a subset of the FIA plots. Litter C is the pool of organic C (including material known as duff, humus, and fine woody debris) above the mineral soil and includes woody fragments with diameters of up to 7.5 cm. Because litter attributes are only collected on a subset of FIA plots, a model was developed to predict C density based on plot/site attributes for plots that lacked litter information (Domke et al. 2016).

As the litter, or forest floor, estimates are an entirely new model this year, a more detailed overview of the methods is provided here. The first step in model development was to evaluate all relevant variables—those that may influence the formation, accumulation, and decay of forest floor organic matter—from annual inventories collected on FIADB plots (P2) using all available estimates of forest floor C ($n = 4,530$) from the P3 plots (hereafter referred to as the research dataset) compiled from 2000 through 2014 (Domke et al. 2016).

Random forest, a machine learning tool (Domke et al. 2016), was used to evaluate the importance of all relevant forest floor C predictors available from P2 plots in the research dataset. Given many of the variables were not available due to regional differences in sampling protocols during periodic inventories, the objective was to reduce the random forest regression model to the minimum number of relevant predictors without substantial loss in explanatory power. The model (3) and parameters are described in the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* section of the Annex.

Due to data limitation in certain regions and inventory periods a series of reduced random forest regression models were used rather than replacing missing variables with imputation techniques in random forest. Database records used to compile estimates for this report were grouped by variable availability and the approaches described herein were applied to replace forest floor model predictions from Smith and Heath (2002). Forest floor C predictions are expressed in $T\cdot ha^{-1}$.

Mineral Soil – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

A Tier 2 method is applied to estimate soil C stock changes for *Land Converted to Forest Land* (Ogle et al. 2003, 2006; IPCC 2006). For this method, land is stratified by climate, soil types, land-use, and land management activity, and then assigned reference C levels and factors for the forest land and the previous land use. The difference between the stocks is reported as the stock change under the assumption that the change occurs over 20 years. Reference C stocks have been estimated from data in the National Soil Survey Characterization Database (USDA-NRCS 1997), and U.S.-specific stock change factors have been derived from published literature (Ogle et al. 2003; Ogle et al. 2006). Land use and land use change patterns are determined from a combination of the Forest Inventory and Analysis Dataset (FIA), the 2010 National Resources Inventory (NRI) (USDA-NRCS 2013), and National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) (Homer et al. 2007). See Annex 3.12 for more information about this method (Methodology for Estimating N_2O Emissions, CH_4 Emissions and Soil Organic C Stock Changes from Agricultural Soil Management).

Table A-250 summarizes the annual change in mineral soil C stocks from U.S. soils that were estimated using a Tier 2 method (MMT C/year). The range is a 95 percent confidence interval from 50,000 simulations (Ogle et al. 2003, 2006).

Table A-251 summarizes the total land areas by land use/land use change subcategory for mineral soils between 1990 and 2015 estimated with a Tier 2 approach and based on analysis of USDA National Resources Inventory data (USDA-NRCS 2013).

Table A-250: Annual change in Mineral Soil C stocks from U.S. agricultural soils that were estimated using a Tier 2 method (MMT C/year)

Category	1990	1995	2000	2005	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Cropland Converted to Forest Land	0.10 (0.04 to 0.16)	0.08 (0.03 to 0.13)	0.07 (0.02 to 0.13)	0.05 (0 to 0.11)	0.04 (0 to 0.1)	0.04 (0 to 0.1)	0.05 (0 to 0.1)	0.04 (-0.01 to 0.09)	0.04 (-0.01 to 0.08)	0.03 (-0.01 to 0.07)	0.03 (-0.01 to 0.07)	0.02 (-0.01 to 0.06)	0.02 (-0.01 to 0.04)
Grassland Converted to Forest Land	-0.07 (-0.13 to -0.02)	-0.07 (-0.14 to -0.01)	-0.10 (-0.19 to -0.02)	-0.12 (-0.21 to -0.03)	-0.13 (-0.23 to -0.03)	-0.13 (-0.23 to -0.03)	-0.12 (-0.22 to -0.03)	-0.13 (-0.23 to -0.03)	-0.13 (-0.23 to -0.04)	-0.13 (-0.22 to -0.04)	-0.09 (-0.17 to -0.03)	-0.08 (-0.13 to -0.02)	-0.07 (-0.13 to -0.02)
Other Lands Converted to Forest Land	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)
Settlements Converted to Forest Land	0.03 (0.02 to 0.05)	0.04 (0.02 to 0.05)	0.04 (0.02 to 0.05)	0.04 (0.03 to 0.05)	0.04 (0.04 to 0.05)	0.05 (0.04 to 0.06)	0.05 (0.04 to 0.06)	0.06 (0.05 to 0.06)	0.05 (0.05 to 0.06)	0.05 (0.04 to 0.06)	0.05 (0.04 to 0.05)	0.04 (0.04 to 0.05)	0.04 (0.03 to 0.05)
Wetlands Converted to Forest Land	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)	0.00 (0 to 0)
Total Lands Converted to Forest Lands	0.06	0.04	0.00	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.05	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02

Note: The range is a 95 percent confidence interval from 50,000 simulations (Ogle et al. 2003, 2006).

Table A-251: Total land areas (hectares) by land use/land use change subcategory for mineral soils between 1990 to 2017

Conversion Land Areas (Hectares x 106)	1990	1995	2000	2005	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Cropland Converted to Forest Land	0.19	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.15
Grassland Converted to Forest Land	0.84	0.82	0.84	0.88	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.92	0.76	0.75	0.75
Other Lands Converted to Forest Land	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09
Settlements Converted to Forest Land	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wetlands Converted to Forest Land	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Total Lands Converted to Forest Lands	1.09	1.07	1.12	1.17	1.20	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.20	1.01	1.00	1.00

Note: Estimated with a Tier 2 approach and based on analysis of USDA National Resources Inventory data (USDA-NRCS 2013).

Uncertainty Analysis – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

The uncertainty analyses for total net flux of forest C (see Table 6-11 in the FLRFL section) are consistent with the IPCC-recommended Tier 1 methodology (IPCC 2006). Specifically, they are considered approach 1 (propagation of error [Section 3.2.3.1]) (IPCC 2006). To better understand the effects of covariance, the contributions of sampling error and modeling error were parsed out. In addition, separate analyses were produced for forest ecosystem and HWP flux.

Estimates of forest C stocks in the United States are based on C estimates assigned to each of several thousand inventory plots from a regular grid. Uncertainty in these estimates and uncertainty associated with change estimates arise from many sources including sampling error and modeling error. Here we focus on these two types of error but acknowledge several other sources of error are present in the overall stock and stock change estimates. In terms of sampling based uncertainty, design based estimators described by Bechtold and Patterson (2005) were used to quantify the variance of C stock estimates. In this section we denote the estimate of C stock at time t as C_t and the variances of the estimate of C stock for time t as $\text{Var}(C_t)$. These calculations follow Bechtold and Patterson (2005). The variance of stock change is then:

$$\text{Var}(C_{t2}-C_{t1})=\text{Var}(C_{t2})+\text{Var}(C_{t1})-2\cdot\text{Cov}(C_{t2},C_{t1}) \quad (15)$$

The uncertainty of a stock estimate associated with sampling error is $U(C_t)_s=\text{Var}(C_t)^{0.5}$. The uncertainty of a stock changes estimate associated with sampling error is $U(\Delta C)_s=\text{Var}(C_{t2}-C_{t1})^{0.5}$.

Model-based uncertainty is important because the pool-level C models have error. The total modeling mean-squared error (MSE_m) is approximately 1,622 (Mg/ha)². The percent modeling error at time t is

$$\%U(C_t)_m=100\cdot\text{MSE}_m/dt \quad (16)$$

Where dt is the total C stock density at time t calculated as C_t/A_t where A_t is the forest area at time t .

The uncertainty of C_t from modeling error is

$$U(C_t)_m=C_t\cdot\%U(C_t)_m/100 \quad (17)$$

The model-based uncertainty with respect to stock change is then

$$U(\Delta C)_m=(U(C_{t1})_m+U(C_{t2})_m-2\cdot\text{Cov}(U(C_{t1})_m,U(C_{t2})_m))^{0.5} \quad (18)$$

The sampling and model based uncertainty are combined for an estimate of total uncertainty. We considered these sources of uncertainty independent and combined as follow for stock change for stock change (ΔC):

$$U(\Delta C)=(U(\Delta C)_m^2+U(\Delta C)_s^2)^{0.5} \text{ and the 95 percent confidence bounds was } \pm 2\cdot U(\Delta C) \quad (19)$$

The mean square error (MSE) of pool models was (MSE, [Mg C/ha]²): soil C (1143.0), litter (78.0), live tree (259.6), dead trees (101.5), understory (0.9), down dead wood (38.9), total MSE (1,621.9).

Numerous assumptions were adopted for creation of the forest ecosystem uncertainty estimates. Potential pool error correlations were ignored. Given the magnitude of the MSE for soil, including correlation among pool error would not appreciably change the modeling error contribution. Modeling error correlation between time 1 and time 2 was assumed to be 1. Because the MSE was fixed over time we assumed a linear relationship dependent on either the measurements at two points in time or an interpolation of measurements to arrive at annual flux estimates. Error associated with interpolation to arrive at annual flux is not included.

Uncertainty about net C flux in HWP is based on Skog et al. (2004) and Skog (2008). Latin hypercube sampling is the basis for the HWP Monte Carlo simulation. Estimates of the HWP variables and HWP Contribution under the production approach are subject to many sources of uncertainty. An estimate of uncertainty is provided that evaluated the effect of uncertainty in 13 sources, including production and trade data and parameters used to make the estimate. Uncertain data and parameters include data on production and trade and factors to convert them to C, the census-based estimate of C in housing in 2001, the EPA estimate of wood and paper discarded to SWDS for 1990 to 2000, the limits on decay of wood and paper in SWDS, the decay rate (half-life) of wood and paper in SWDS, the proportion of products produced in the United States made with wood harvested in the United States, and the rate of storage of wood and paper C in other countries that came from U.S. harvest, compared to storage in the United States.

The uncertainty about HWP and forest ecosystem net C flux were combined and assumed to be additive. Typically when propagating error from two estimates the variances of the estimates are additive. However, the uncertainty around the HWP flux was approximated using a Monte Carlo approach which resulted in the lack of a variance estimate for HWP C flux. Therefore, we considered the uncertainty additive between the HWP sequestration and the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* sequestration. Further, we assumed there was no covariance between the two estimates which is plausible as the observations used to construct each estimate are independent.

Emissions from Forest Fires

CO₂ Emissions from Forest Fires

As stated in other sections, the forest inventory approach implicitly accounts for CO₂ emissions due to disturbances. Net C stock change is estimated from successive C stock estimates. A disturbance, such as a forest fire, removes C from the forest. The inventory data, on which net C stock estimates are based, already reflects the C loss from such disturbances because only C remaining in the forest is estimated. Estimating the CO₂ emissions from a disturbance such as fire and adding those emissions to the net CO₂ change in forests would result in double-counting the loss from fire because the inventory data already reflect the loss. There is interest, however, in the size of the CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O emissions from disturbances such as fire. These estimated emissions from forest fires are based on IPCC (2006) methodology, which includes a combination of U.S.-specific data on forest area burned, potential fuel available, and individual fire severity along with IPCC default emission factors and some combustion factors.

Emissions were calculated following IPCC (2006) methodology, according to equation 2.27 of IPCC (2006, Volume 4, Chapter 2), which in general terms is:

$$\text{Emissions} = \text{Area burned} \times \text{Fuel available} \times \text{Combustion factor} \times \text{Emission factor} \times 10^{-3} \quad (20)$$

Where the estimate for emissions is in units of metric tons (MT), which is generally summarized as million metric tons (MMT) per year. Area burned is the annual total area of forest fire in hectares. Fuel available is the mass of fuel available for combustion in metric tons dry weight per hectare. Combustion factor is the proportion of fuel consumed by fire and is unitless. The emission factor is gram of emission (in this case CO₂) per kilogram dry matter burnt, and the '10⁻³' balances units. The first three factors are based on datasets specific to U.S. forests, whereas the emissions factor and in some cases an emission factor employ IPCC (2006) default values. Area burned is based on annual area of forest coincident with fires according to Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity (MTBS) (MTBS Data Summaries 2018; Eidenshink et al. 2007) dataset summaries, which include fire data for all 49 states that are a part of these estimates. That is, the MTBS data used here include the 48 conterminous states as well as Alaska, including interior Alaska; but note that the fire data used are also reduced to only include managed land (Ogle et al. 2018). Summary information includes fire identity, origin, dates, location, spatial perimeter of the area burned, and a spatial raster mosaic reflecting variability of the estimated fire severity within the perimeter. In addition to forest fires, the MTBS data include all wildland and prescribed fires on other ecosystems such as grasslands and rangelands; the 'forest fire' distinction is not explicitly included as a part of identifying information for each fire.

Area of forest within the MTBS fire perimeters was determined according to one of the National Land Cover (NLCD) datasets (Homer et al. 2015). Alternate estimates of forest land would provide different estimates; for example Ruefenacht et al. (2008) and the FIADB (USDA Forest Service 2017) provide slightly different estimates and difference vary with location. Some of these differences can be incorporated into the estimates of uncertainty. The choice of NLCD cover for these estimates is because it readily facilitates incorporating the MTBS per-fire severity estimates. The Alaska forest area was allocated to managed and unmanaged areas according to Ogle et al. (2018).

Estimates of fuel availability are based on plot level forest inventory data, which are summarized by ecological province (see description of the data field 'ecosubcd' in the FIADB, USDA Forest Service 2015). These data are applied to estimates for fires located within the respective regions. Plot level C stocks (Smith et al. 2013, USDA Forest Service 2017) are grouped according to live aboveground biomass (live trees and understory), large dead wood (standing dead and down dead wood), and litter. It is assumed that while changes in forests have occurred over the years since the 1990 start of the reporting interval, the current general range of plot level C densities as determined by forest types and stand structures can be used as a representation of the potential fuel availability over forest lands. The current forest inventory data and the distribution of metric tons dry matter per hectare are used as the inputs for fuel availability.

Each MTBS defined fire perimeter included information on burn severity, which generally varied across the burned area. Combustion is set to similarly vary. Probabilistic definitions are assigned for combustion factors as uniform sampling distributions for each the live, dead wood, and litter fuels. Currently, the uniform distributions for live biomass combustion are defined as 0-0.3, 0.2-0.8, and 0.7-1.0, for burn severity classes 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Similarly, for dead wood combustion, distributions are defined as 0-0.05, 0.05-0.5, 0.3-0.9 and 0.8-1.0, for burn severity classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Finally, litter combustion distributions are defined as 0-0.05, 0-0.1, 0.1-0.7, 0.7-1.0, and 1.0, for burn severity classes 'increased greenness', 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively (see MTBS documentation for additional information on classifications). Specific classifications not noted above as well as unburned forest within the perimeter are assumed to have zero fire-based emissions. The combustion factors used here for temperate forests are interim probabilistic ranges generally based on MTBS related publications and are subject to change with ongoing improvements (see Planned Improvements in the LULUCF chapter). In contrast, the combustion factor used in previous inventories (for temperate forests) was 0.45 (see Table 2.6 Volume 4, Chapter 2 of IPCC 2006).

1

Table A-252: Areas (Hectares) from Wildfire Statistics and Corresponding Estimates of C and CO₂ (MMT/year) Emissions for Wildfires and Prescribed Fires^a

		1990	1995	2000	2005	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017 ^b
Conterminous 48 States - Wildfires	Forest area burned (1000 ha)	169.9	157.8	1,146.6	455.9	437.0	128.9	916.4	1,304.6	568.7	539.5	987.9	674.6	674.6
	C emitted (MMT/yr)	3.9	2.0	25.9	6.4	7.0	2.5	13.0	31.1	15.9	17.7	32.4	14.0	14.0
	CO ₂ emitted (MMT/yr)	14.3	7.2	95.1	23.4	25.8	9.3	47.7	114.1	58.3	64.8	118.9	51.2	51.2
Alaska - Wildfires	Forest area burned (1000 ha)	77.5	1.4	59.3	687.6	398.0	105.1	28.0	14.9	185.5	52.9	643.4	27.0	27.0
	C emitted (MMT/yr)	1.4	0.0	1.0	12.1	7.0	1.8	0.5	0.3	3.3	0.9	11.3	0.5	0.5
	CO ₂ emitted (MMT/yr)	5.0	0.1	3.8	44.3	25.7	6.7	1.8	1.0	11.9	3.4	41.5	1.7	1.7
Prescribed Fires (all 49 states)	Forest area burned (1000 ha)	6.6	14.7	19.0	47.6	245.6	605.4	189.7	82.5	287.6	294.0	181.7	316.2	316.2
	C emitted (MMT/yr)	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	2.7	7.5	2.1	0.9	3.2	3.5	2.0	3.2	3.2
	CO ₂ emitted (MMT/yr)	0.3	0.5	1.1	1.6	9.8	27.5	7.6	3.2	11.6	12.7	7.2	11.9	11.9
Wildfires (all 49 states)	CH ₄ emitted (kt/yr)	57.5	21.7	296.2	202.8	154.4	48.1	148.1	344.7	210.6	204.6	481.0	158.5	158.5
	N ₂ O emitted (kt/yr)	3.2	1.2	16.4	11.2	8.5	2.7	8.2	19.1	11.6	11.3	26.6	8.8	8.8
	CO emitted (kt/yr)	1,310.6	493.6	6,749.4	4,614.2	3,509.7	1,096.0	3,372.3	7,851.0	4,782.0	4,659.8	10,936.5	3,615.7	3,615.7
	NO _x emitted (kt/yr)	36.7	13.8	189.1	129.5	98.3	30.8	94.5	220.3	134.5	130.5	306.8	101.3	101.3
Prescribed Fires (all 49 states)	CH ₄ emitted (kt/yr)	1.0	1.5	3.3	4.8	29.2	82.3	22.7	9.5	34.8	38.0	21.5	35.5	35.5
	N ₂ O emitted (kt/yr)	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.6	4.6	1.3	0.5	1.9	2.1	1.2	2.0	2.0
	CO emitted (kt/yr)	23.2	33.5	75.1	108.4	665.4	1,874.9	517.1	215.6	791.5	865.6	488.8	808.9	808.9
	NO _x emitted (kt/yr)	0.6	0.9	2.1	3.0	18.7	52.5	14.5	6.0	22.2	24.3	13.7	22.7	22.7

^a These emissions have already been accounted for in the estimates of net annual changes in C stocks, which accounts for the amount sequestered minus any emissions, including the assumption that combusted wood may continue to decay through time.

^b The data for 2017 were unavailable when these estimates were summarized; therefore 2015, the most recent available estimate, is applied to 2017.

2

3

4

Table A-253: Emission Factors for Extra Tropical Forest Burning and 100-year GWP (AR4), or Equivalence Ratios, of CH₄ and N₂O to CO₂

Emission Factor (g per kg dry matter burned) ^a		Equivalence Ratios ^b	
CH ₄	4.70	CH ₄ to CO ₂	25
N ₂ O	0.26	N ₂ O to CO ₂	298
CO ₂	1,569	CO ₂ to CO ₂	1

^a Source: IPCC (2006)

^b Source: IPCC (2007)

Non-CO₂ Emissions from Forest Fires

Emissions of non-CO₂ gases—specifically, methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O)—from forest fires are estimated using the same methodology described above (i.e., equation 2.27 of IPCC 2006, Volume 4, Chapter 2). The only difference in calculations is the gas-specific emission factors, which are listed in Table A-253. Conversion of the CH₄ and N₂O estimates to CO₂ equivalents (as provided in Chapter 6-2) is based on global warming potentials (GWPs) provided in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) (IPCC 2007), which are the equivalence ratios listed in Table A-253. An example application of these ratios for the current year's estimate of CH₄ emissions is: 4.85 MMT CO₂ Eq. = 194,049 MT CH₄ × (25 kg CO₂ / 1 kg CH₄) × 10⁻⁶.

Uncertainty about the non-CO₂ estimates is based on assigning a probability distribution to represent the estimated precision of each factor in equation 2.27 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (IPCC 2006). These probability distributions are randomly sampled with each calculation, and this is repeated a large number of times to produce a histogram, or frequency distribution of values for the calculated emissions. That is, a simple Monte Carlo ("Approach 2") method was employed to propagate uncertainty in the equation (IPCC 2006). The probabilities used for the factors in equation 2.27 are considered marginal distributions. The distribution for forest area burned is a uniform distribution based on the difference in local estimates of forest area – NLCD versus FIA inventory estimates. Fuel availability is the standard error for the inventory plots within each eco-province. Combustion factor uncertainty is defined above, and emission factors are normal distributions with mean and standard deviations as defined in the tables IPCC (2006) Tables 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6. These were sampled independently by year, and truncated to positive values where necessary. The equivalence ratios (Table A-253) to represent estimates as CO₂ equivalent were not considered uncertain values for these results.

References

- AF&PA. (2006a and earlier). Statistical roundup. (Monthly). Washington, DC: American Forest & Paper Association.
- AF&PA. (2006b and earlier). Statistics of paper, paperboard and wood pulp. Washington, DC: American Forest & Paper Association.
- Amichev, B. Y. and J. M. Galbraith (2004) “A Revised Methodology for Estimation of Forest Soil Carbon from Spatial Soils and Forest Inventory Data Sets.” *Environmental Management* 33(Suppl. 1): S74-S86.
- Bechtold, W.A.; Patterson, P.L. (2005) The enhanced forest inventory and analysis program—national sampling design and estimation procedures. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 85 p.
- Birdsey, R. (1996) “Carbon Storage for Major Forest Types and Regions in the Conterminous United States.” In R.N. Sampson and D. Hair, (eds); *Forest and Global Change, Volume 2: Forest Management Opportunities for Mitigating Carbon Emissions*. American Forests. Washington, DC, 1-26 and 261-379 (appendices 262 and 263).
- Bodner, T.E. (2008) What improves with increased missing data imputations? *Structural Equation Modeling*. 15: 651-675.
- Breiman L. (2001) Random forests. *Machine Learning*. 45(1):5-32.
- Caswell, H. (2001) Matrix population models. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, Inc. 722 p.
- Coulston, J.W., Wear, D.N., and Vose, J.M. (2015) Complex forest dynamics indicate potential for slowing carbon accumulation in the southeastern United States. *Scientific Reports*. 5: 8002.
- Coulston, J.W. (In preparation). Tier 1 approaches to approximate the carbon implications of disturbances. On file with J.W. Coulston (jcoulston@fs.fed.us).
- Coulston, J.W., Woodall, C.W., Domke, G.M., and Walters, B.F. (in preparation). Refined Delineation between Woodlands and Forests with Implications for U.S. National Greenhouse Gas Inventory of Forests.
- Danielson J.J.; Gesch D.B. (2011) Global multi-resolution terrain elevation data 2010 (GMTED2010). Open-file report 2011–1073. Reston, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. 26 p.
- De Vos, B.; Cools, N.; Ilvesniemi, H.; Vesterdal, L.; Vanguelova, E.; Carnicelli, S. (2015) Benchmark values for forest soil carbon stocks in Europe: results from a large scale forest soil survey. *Geoderma*. 251: 33-46.
- Domke, G.M., Woodall, C.W., Smith, J.E., Westfall, J.A., McRoberts, R.E. (2012) Consequences of alternative tree-level biomass estimation procedures on U.S. forest carbon stock estimates. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 270: 108-116.
- Domke, G.M., Smith, J.E., and Woodall, C.W. (2011) Accounting for density reduction and structural loss in standing dead trees: Implications for forest biomass and carbon stock estimates in the United States. *Carbon Balance and Management*. 6:14.
- Domke, G.M., Woodall, C.W., Walters, B.F., Smith, J.E. (2013) From models to measurements: comparing down dead wood carbon stock estimates in the U.S. forest inventory. *PLoS ONE* 8(3): e59949.
- Domke, G.M., Perry, C.H., Walters, B.F., Woodall, C.W., and Smith, J.E. (2016). A framework for estimating litter carbon stocks in forests of the United States. *Science of the Total Environment*. 557–558, 469–478.
- Domke, G.M., Perry, C.H., Walters, B.F., Woodall, C.W., Nave, L., Swanston, C. (2017) Toward inventory-based estimates of soil organic carbon in forests of the United States. *Ecological Applications*. 27(4), 1223-1235.
- Eidenshink, J., B. Schwind, K. Brewer, Z. Zhu, B. Quayle, and S. Howard. (2007) A project for monitoring trends in burn severity. *Fire Ecology* 3(1): 3-21.
- Frayser, W.E., and G.M. Furnival (1999) “Forest Survey Sampling Designs: A History.” *Journal of Forestry* 97(12): 4-10.
- Freed, R. (2004) Open-dump and Landfill timeline spreadsheet (unpublished). ICF International. Washington, D.C.
- Hair, D. and A.H. Ulrich (1963) The Demand and price situation for forest products – 1963. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Misc Publication No. 953. Washington, DC.
- Hair, D. (1958) “Historical forestry statistics of the United States.” Statistical Bull. 228. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Washington, DC.
- Hao, W.M. and N.K. Larkin. (2014) Wildland fire emissions, carbon, and climate: Wildland fire detection and burned area in the United States. *Forest Ecology and Management* 317: 20–25.

- 1 Harmon, M.E., C.W. Woodall, B. Fasth, J. Sexton, M. Yatkov. (2011) Differences between standing and downed dead tree
2 wood density reduction factors: A comparison across decay classes and tree species. Res. Paper. NRS-15. Newtown
3 Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 40 p.
- 4 Heath, L.S., M.C. Nichols, J.E. Smith, and J.R. Mills. (2010) FORCARB2: An updated version of the U.S. Forest Carbon
5 Budget Model. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-67. USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA. 52
6 p. [CD-ROM].
- 7 Heath, L.S., J.E. Smith, K.E. Skog, D.J. Nowak, and C.W. Woodall. (2011) Managed forest carbon estimates for the U.S.
8 Greenhouse Gas Inventory, 1990-2008. *Journal of Forestry* 109(3):167-173.
- 9 Homer, C.G., J.A. Dewitz, L. Yang, S. Jin, P. Danielson, G. Xian, J. Coulston, N.D. Herold, J.D. Wickham, and K.
10 Megown. (2015) Completion of the 2011 National Land Cover Database for the conterminous United States-
11 Representing a decade of land cover change information. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 81(5):
12 345-354.
- 13 Homer, C., Dewitz, J., Fry, J., Coan, M., Hossain, N., Larson, C., Herold, N., McKerrow, A., VanDriel, J.N., and
14 Wickham, J. (2007) Completion of the 2001 National Land Cover Database for the Conterminous United States.
15 *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, Vol. 73, No. 4, pp 337-341.
- 16 Howard, James L. (2003) *U.S. timber production, trade, consumption, and price statistics 1965 to 2002*. Res. Pap. FPL-
17 RP-615. Madison, WI: USDA, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory. Available online at
18 <<http://www.fpl.fs.fed.us/documnts/fplrp/fplrp615/fplrp615.pdf>>.
- 19 Ince, P.J., Kramp, A.D., Skog, K.E., Spelter, H.N. and Wear, D.N. (2011) U.S. Forest Products Module: a technical
20 document supporting the forest service 2010 RPA assessment. Research Paper-Forest Products Laboratory, USDA
21 Forest Service, (FPL-RP-662).
- 22 IPCC (2007) *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth*
23 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen,
24 M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United
25 Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 996 pp.
- 26 IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
27 Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T Ngara, and K.
28 Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- 29 IPCC (2003) *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry*. The Intergovernmental Panel on
30 Climate Change, National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, J. Penman, et al., eds. August 13, 2004. Available
31 online at <<http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf.htm>>.
- 32 ISCN. (2015) International Soil Carbon Monitoring Network (<http://iscn.fluxdata.org/>) database.
- 33 Jandl, R., Rodeghiero, M., Martinez, C., Cotrufo, M. F., Bampa, F., van Wesemael, B., Harrison, R.B., Guerrini, I.A., deB
34 Richter Jr., D., Rustad, L., Lorenz, K., Chabbi, A., Miglietta, F. 2014. Current status, uncertainty and future needs in
35 soil organic carbon monitoring. *Science of the Total Environment*, 468, 376-383.
- 36 Jenkins, J.C., D.C. Chojnacky, L.S. Heath, and R.A. Birdsey (2003) "National-scale biomass estimators for United States
37 tree species." *Forest Science* 49(1): 12-35.
- 38 Jobbagy, E.G.; Jackson, R.B. (2000) The vertical distribution of soil organic carbon and its relation to climate and
39 vegetation. *Ecological Applications*. 10: 423-436.
- 40 Lal, R. (2005) Forest soils and carbon sequestration. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 220(1): 242-258.
- 41 MTBS Data Summaries. 2018. MTBS Data Access: Fire Level Geospatial Data. (2018, August - last revised). MTBS
42 Project (USDA Forest Service/U.S. Geological Survey). Available online: <http://mtbs.gov/direct-download>
43 [06Aug2018].
- 44 NAIP. (2015) National Agriculture Imagery Program. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.
45 <http://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/aerial-photography/imagery-programs/naip-imagery/> <last accessed
46 November 23, 2015>.
- 47 Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS]. (2015) Soil geography: Description of STATSGO2 database.
48 <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/survey/geo/?cid=nrcs142p2_053629> (accessed October 6,
49 2015).

- 1 Northwest Alliance for Computational Science and Engineering. (2015) PRISM Climate Data. Available at
2 <<http://prism.oregonstate.edu>> (accessed October 6, 2015).
- 3 Ogle, S.M., M.D. Eve, F.J. Breidt, and K. Paustian (2003) "Uncertainty in estimating land use and management impacts
4 on soil organic carbon storage for U.S. agroecosystems between 1982 and 1997." *Global Change Biology* 9:1521-
5 1542.
- 6 Ogle, S.M., F.J. Breidt, and K. Paustian. (2006) "Bias and variance in model results due to spatial scaling of measurements
7 for parameterization in regional assessments." *Global Change Biology* 12:516-523.
- 8 Ogle, S. M., G. M. Domke, W. A. Kurz, M. T. Rocha, T. Huffman, A. Swan, J. E. Smith, C. W. Woodall, and T. Krug.
9 2018. Delineating managed land for reporting national greenhouse gas emissions and removals to the United Nations
10 framework convention on climate change. *Carbon Balance and Management* 13:9.
- 11 O'Neill, K.P., Amacher, M.C., Perry, C.H. (2005) Soils as an indicator of forest health: a guide to the collection, analysis,
12 and interpretation of soil indicator data in the Forest Inventory and Analysis program. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-258. St.
13 Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 53 p.
- 14 Oswalt, S.N.; Smith, W.B; Miles, P.D.; Pugh, S.A. (2014) Forest Resources of the United States, 2012: a technical
15 document supporting the Forest Service 2015 update of the RPA Assessment. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-91. Washington,
16 DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office. 218 p.
- 17 Perry, C.H., C.W. Woodall, and M. Schoeneberger (2005) Inventorying trees in agricultural landscapes: towards an
18 accounting of "working trees". In: "Moving Agroforestry into the Mainstream." *Proc. 9th N. Am. Agroforestry Conf.*,
19 Brooks, K.N. and Ffolliott, P.F. (eds). 12-15 June 2005, Rochester, MN [CD-ROM]. Dept. of Forest Resources, Univ.
20 Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, 12 p. Available online at <<http://cinram.umn.edu/afta2005/>> (verified 23 Sept 2006).
- 21 R Core Team (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
22 Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 23 Ruefenacht, B., M.V. Finco, M.D. Nelson, R. Czaplewski, E.H. Helmer, J.A. Blackard, G.R. Holden, A.J. Lister, D.
24 Salajanu, D. Weyermann, K. Winterberger. 2008. Conterminous U.S. and Alaska Forest Type Mapping Using Forest
25 Inventory and Analysis. USDA Forest Service - Forest Inventory and Analysis Program & Remote Sensing
26 Applications Center. Available online at <http://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/rastergateway/forest_type/>. Accessed 8
27 September 2015.
- 28 Skog, K.E., K. Pingoud, and J.E. Smith (2004) "A method countries can use to estimate changes in carbon stored in
29 harvested wood products and the uncertainty of such estimates." *Environmental Management* 33(Suppl. 1):S65-S73.
- 30 Skog, K.E. (2008) "Sequestration of Carbon in harvested wood products for the United States." *Forest Products Journal*,
31 58(6): 56-72.
- 32 Smith, J. E., L. S. Heath, and C. M. Hoover. 2013. Carbon factors and models for forest carbon estimates for the 2005-
33 2011 National Greenhouse Gas Inventories of the United States. *For. Ecology and Management* 307:7–19.
- 34 Smith, J.E., L.S. Heath, and M.C. Nichols (2010). U.S. Forest Carbon Calculation Tool User's Guide: Forestland Carbon
35 Stocks and Net Annual Stock Change. General Technical Report NRS-13 revised, U.S. Department of Agriculture
36 Forest Service, Northern Research Station.
- 37 Smith, J.E., L.S. Heath, K.E. Skog, R.A. Birdsey. (2006) Methods for calculating forest ecosystem and harvested carbon
38 with standard estimates for forest types of the United States. Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-343. U.S. Department of
39 Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station. Newtown Square, PA.
- 40 Smith, J.E., L. S. Heath, and P. B. Woodbury (2004) "How to estimate forest carbon for large areas from inventory data."
41 *Journal of Forestry* 102:25-31.
- 42 Smith, J.E., L. S. Heath, and J. C. Jenkins (2003) *Forest Volume-to-Biomass Models and Estimates of Mass for Live and*
43 *Standing Dead Trees of U.S. Forests*. General Technical Report NE-298, USDA Forest Service, Northeastern
44 Research Station, Newtown Square, PA.
- 45 Smith, J.E., and L.S. Heath (2002) "A model of forest floor carbon mass for United States forest types." Res. Paper NE-
46 722. USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA.
- 47 Steer, Henry B. (1948) *Lumber production in the United States*. Misc. Pub. 669, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest
48 Service. Washington, DC.

- 1 Sun, O.J.; Campbell, J.; Law, B.E.; Wolf, V. (2004) Dynamics of carbon stocks in soils and detritus across
2 chronosequences of different forest types in the Pacific Northwest, USA. *Global Change Biology*. 10(9): 1470-1481.
- 3 Tan, Z.X.; Lal, R.; Smeck, N.E.; Calhoun, F.G. (2004) Relationships between surface soil organic carbon pool and site
4 variables. *Geoderma*. 121(3): 187-195.
- 5 Thompson, J.A.; Kolka, R.K. (2005) Soil carbon storage estimation in a forested watershed using quantitative soil-
6 landscape modeling. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 69(4): 1086-1093.
- 7 Ulrich, A.H. (1989) *U.S. Timber Production, Trade, Consumption, and Price Statistics, 1950-1987*. USDA Miscellaneous
8 Publication No. 1471, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Washington, DC, 77.
- 9 Ulrich, A.H. (1985) *U.S. Timber Production, Trade, Consumption, and Price Statistics 1950-1985*. Misc. Pub. 1453, U.S.
10 Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Washington, DC.
- 11 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2013) Report on the individual review of the inventory
12 submission of the United States of America submitted in 2012. FCCC/ARR/2012/USA. 42 p.
- 13 USDC Bureau of Census (1976) *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, Vol. 1*. Washington,
14 DC.
- 15 USDA Forest Service (2018a) Forest Inventory and Analysis National Program: Program Features. U.S. Department of
16 Agriculture Forest Service. Washington, D.C. Available online at <<http://fia.fs.fed.us/program-features/>>. Accessed 1
17 November 2018.
- 18 USDA Forest Service. (2018b) Forest Inventory and Analysis National Program: FIA Data Mart. U.S. Department of
19 Agriculture Forest Service. Washington, D.C. Available online at <[http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-](http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html)
20 [downloads/datamart.html](http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html)>. Accessed 1 November 2018.
- 21 USDA Forest Service. (2018c) Forest Inventory and Analysis National Program, FIA library: Field Guides, Methods and
22 Procedures. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. Washington, D.C. Available online at
23 <<http://www.fia.fs.fed.us/library/field-guides-methods-proc/>>. Accessed 1 November 2018.
- 24 USDA Forest Service (2018d) Forest Inventory and Analysis National Program, FIA library: Database Documentation.
25 U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office. Available online at
26 <<http://fia.fs.fed.us/library/database-documentation/>>. Accessed 1 November 2018.
- 27 USDA-NRCS (1997) "National Soil Survey Laboratory Characterization Data," Digital Data, Natural Resources
28 Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Lincoln, NE.
- 29 USDA-NRCS (2013) Summary Report: 2010 National Resources Inventory, Natural Resources Conservation Service,
30 Washington, D.C., and Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
31 <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1167354.pdf>.
- 32 U.S. EPA. (2015) Annex 3.13 Methodology for estimating net carbon stock changes in forest lands remaining forest lands.
33 in Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2013. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA
34 430-R-15-004.
- 35 Wear, D.N., Coulston, J.W. (2015) From sink to source: Regional variation in U.S. forest carbon futures. *Scientific*
36 *Reports*. 5: 16518.
- 37 Wellek, S. (2003) Testing statistical hypotheses of equivalence. London, England: Chapman & Hall.
- 38 Woldelessie, M.; Van Miegroet, H.; Gruselle, M.C.; Hambly, N. (2012) Storage and stability of soil organic carbon in
39 aspen and conifer forest soils of northern Utah. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 76(6): 2230-2240.
- 40 Woodall, C.W., L.S. Heath, G.M. Domke, and M.C. Nichols. (2011) Methods and equations for estimating aboveground
41 volume, biomass, and carbon for trees in the U.S. forest inventory, 2010. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-88. Newtown Square,
42 PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 30 p.
- 43 Woodall, C.W., B.L. Conkling, M.C. Amacher, J.W. Coulston, S. Jovan, C.H. Perry, B. Schulz, G.C. Smith, S. Will Wolf.
44 (2010). The Forest Inventory and Analysis Database Version 4.0: Database Description and Users Manual for Phase
45 3. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-61. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern
46 Research Station. 180 p.
- 47 Woodall, C.W., Coulston, J.W., Domke, G.M., Walters, B.F., Wear, D.N., Smith, J.E., Anderson, H.-E., Clough, B.J.,
48 Cohen, W.B., Griffith, D.M., Hagan, S.C., Hanou, I.S.; Nichols, M.C., Perry, C.H., Russell, M.B., Westfall, J.A.,

- 1 Wilson, B.T. (2015a) The U.S. Forest Carbon Accounting Framework: Stocks and Stock change 1990-2016. Gen.
2 Tech. Rep. NRS-154. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research
3 Station. 49 pp.
- 4 Woodall, C.W., Walters, B.F., Coulston, J.W., D'Amato, A.W., Domke, G.M., Russell, M.B., Sowers, P.A. (2015b)
5 Monitoring network confirms land use change is a substantial component of the forest carbon sink in the eastern
6 United States. *Scientific Reports*. 5: 17028.
- 7 Woodall, C.W., Domke, G.M., MacFarlane, D.W., Oswalt, C.M. (2012) Comparing Field- and Model-Based Standing
8 Dead Tree Carbon Stock Estimates Across Forests of the United States. *Forestry* 85(1): 125-133.
- 9 Woodall, C.W., Walters, B.F., Oswalt, S.N., Domke, G.M., Toney, C., Gray, A.N. (2013) Biomass and carbon attributes
10 of downed woody materials in forests of the United States. *Forest Ecology and Management* 305: 48-59.
- 11 Woodall, C.W., Domke, G.M., MacFarlane, D.W., Oswalt, C.M. (2012) Comparing field- and model-based standing dead
12 tree carbon stock estimates across forests of the United States. *Forestry*. 85: 125-133.
- 13 Woudenberg, S.W. and T.O. Farrenkopf (1995) The Westwide forest inventory data base: user's manual. General
14 Technical Report INT-GTR-317. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station.

3.14. Methodology for Estimating CH₄ Emissions from Landfills


Landfill gas is a mixture of substances generated when bacteria decompose the organic materials contained in solid waste. By volume, landfill gas is about half CH₄ and half CO₂.¹⁰⁷ The amount and rate of CH₄ generation depends upon the quantity and composition of the landfilled material, as well as the surrounding landfill environment. Not all CH₄ generated within a landfill is emitted to the atmosphere. The CH₄ can be extracted and either flared or utilized for energy, thus oxidizing the CH₄ to CO₂ during combustion. Of the remaining CH₄, a portion oxidizes to CO₂ as it travels through the top layer of the landfill cover. In general, landfill-related CO₂ emissions are of biogenic origin and primarily result from the decomposition, either aerobic or anaerobic, of organic matter such as food or yard wastes.

Methane emissions from landfills are estimated using two primary methods. The first method uses the first order decay (FOD) model as described by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines to estimate CH₄ generation. The amount of CH₄ recovered and combusted from MSW landfills is subtracted from the CH₄ generation, and is then adjusted with an oxidation factor. The second method used to calculate CH₄ emissions from landfills, also called the back-calculation method, is based off directly measured amounts of recovered CH₄ from the landfill gas and is expressed by Equation HH-8 in CFR Part 98.343 of the EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP).

The current Inventory methodology uses both methods to estimate CH₄ emissions across the time series. The 1990-2015 Inventory was the first Inventory to incorporate directly reported GHGRP net CH₄ emissions data for landfills. In previous Inventories, only the first order decay method was used. EPA's GHGRP requires landfills meeting or exceeding a threshold of 25,000 metric tons of CH₄ generation per year to report a variety of facility-specific information, including historical and current waste disposal quantities by year, CH₄ generation, gas collection system details, CH₄ recovery, and CH₄ emissions. EPA's GHGRP provides a consistent methodology, a broader range of values for the oxidation factor, and allows for facility-specific annual waste disposal data to be used, thus these data are considered Tier 3 (highest quality data) under the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Using EPA's GHGRP data was a significant methodological change and required a merging of the GHGRP methodology with the Inventory methodology used in previous years to ensure time-series consistency.

Figure A-18 presents the CH₄ emissions process—from waste generation to emissions—in graphical format. A detailed discussion of the steps taken to compile the 1990 to 2017 Inventory are presented in the remainder of this Annex.

Figure A-18: Methane Emissions Resulting from Landfilling Municipal and Industrial Waste



^a MSW waste generation is not calculated because annual quantities of waste disposal are available through EPA 2018; annual production data used for industrial waste (Lockwood Post's Directory and the USDA).

^b Quantities of MSW landfilled for 1940 through 1988 are based on EPA 1988 and EPA 1993; 1989 through 2004 are based on BioCycle 2010; 2005 through 2017 are incorporated through the directly reported emissions from MSW landfills to the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (EPA 2018). Quantities of industrial waste landfilled are estimated using a disposal factor and industrial production data sourced from Lockwood Post's Directory and the USDA.

¹⁰⁷ Typically, landfill gas also contains small amounts of nitrogen, oxygen, and hydrogen, less than 1 percent nonmethane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs), and trace amounts of inorganic compounds.

^c The 2006 IPCC Guidelines – First Order Decay Model is used for industrial waste landfills. Two different methodologies are used in the time series for MSW landfills.

^d For 1990 to 2004, the 2006 IPCC Guidelines – First Order Decay Model is used. For 2005 to 2017 directly reported net CH₄ emissions from the GHGRP are used with the addition of a scale-up factor equal to 9 percent of each year's emissions. The scale-up factor accounts for emissions from landfills that do not report to the GHGRP.

^e Methane recovery from industrial waste landfills is not incorporated into the Inventory because it does not appear to be a common practice according to the GHGRP dataset.

^f Data are pulled from three recovery databases: EIA 2007, flare vendor database (2015), and EPA (GHGRP) 2016(b). These databases have not been updated past 2015 because the Inventory strictly uses net emissions from the GHGRP data.

^g For years 1990 to 2004, the total CH₄ generated from MSW landfills and industrial waste landfills are summed. For years 2005 to 2017, only the industrial waste landfills are considered because the directly reported GHGRP emissions are used for MSW landfills.

^h An oxidation factor of 10 percent is applied to all CH₄ generated in years 1990 to 2004 (2006 IPCC Guidelines; Mancinelli and McKay 1985; Czepiel et al 1996). For years 2005 to 2017 directly reported CH₄ emissions from the GHGRP are used for MSW landfills. Various oxidation factor percentages are included in the GHGRP dataset (0, 10, 25, and 35) with an average across the dataset of approximately 20 percent.

Step 1: Estimate Annual Quantities of Solid Waste Placed in MSW Landfills for 1940 to 2004

To estimate the amount of CH₄ generated in a landfill in a given year, information is needed on the quantity and composition of the waste in the landfill for multiple decades, as well as the landfill characteristics (e.g., size, aridity, waste density). Estimates and/or directly measured amounts of waste placed in municipal solid waste (MSW) and industrial waste landfills are available through various studies, surveys, and regulatory reporting programs (i.e., EPA's GHGRP). The composition of the amount of waste placed in these landfills is not readily available for most years the landfills were in operation. Consequently, and for the purposes of estimating CH₄ generation, the Inventory methodology assumes that all waste placed in MSW landfills is bulk MSW, and that all waste placed in industrial waste landfills is from either pulp and paper manufacturing facilities or food and beverage facilities.

Historical waste data, preferably since 1940, are required for the FOD model to estimate CH₄ generation for the Inventory time series. Estimates of waste placed in landfills in the 1940s and 1950s were developed based on U.S. population for each year and the per capital disposal rates from the 1960s. Estimates of the annual quantity of waste placed in landfills from 1960 through 1983 were developed from EPA's 1993 Report to Congress (EPA 1993) and a 1986 survey of MSW landfills (EPA 1988).

For 1989 to 2004, estimates of the annual quantity of waste placed in MSW landfills were developed from a survey of State agencies as reported in the State of Garbage (SOG) in America surveys (BioCycle 2010) and recent data from the Environmental Research & Education Foundation (EREF), adjusted to include U.S. Territories.¹⁰⁸ The SOG surveys and EREF (2016) provide state-specific landfill waste generation data and a national average disposal factor back to 1989. The SOG survey is no longer updated, but is available every two years for the years 2002 and 2004 (as published in BioCycle 2006). EREF published a report in 2016 for data years 2010 and 2013 using a similar methodology as the SOG surveys (EREF 2016). EREF plans to publish updated reports every three years. A linear interpolation was used to estimate the amount of waste generated in 2001, 2003.

Estimates of the quantity of waste landfilled are determined by applying a waste disposal factor to the total amount of waste generated. A waste disposal factor is determined for each year a SOG survey and EREF report is published and is the ratio of the total amount of waste landfilled to the total amount of waste generated. The waste disposal factor is interpolated for the years in-between the SOG surveys and EREF data, and extrapolated for years after the last year of data. Methodological changes have occurred over the time that the SOG survey has been published, and this has resulted in fluctuating trends in the data.

Table A-254 shows estimates of waste quantities contributing to CH₄ emissions. The table shows SOG and EREF (EREF 2016) estimates of total waste generated and total waste landfilled (adjusted for U.S. Territories) for various years over the 1990 to 2017 timeframe even though the Inventory methodology does not use the data for 2005 onward.

Table A-254: Solid Waste in MSW and Industrial Waste Landfills Contributing to CH₄ Emissions (MMT unless otherwise noted)

	1990	2005	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Total MSW Generated ^a	270	368	319	319	320	322	324	326

¹⁰⁸ Since the SOG survey does not include U.S. Territories, waste landfilled in U.S. Territories was estimated using population data for the U.S. Territories (U.S. Census Bureau 2018) and the per capita rate for waste landfilled from BioCycle (2010).

Percent of MSW Landfilled	77%	64%	63%	64%	64%	64%	64%	64%
Total MSW Landfilled	205	234	200	201	202	203	205	206
MSW last 30 years	4,876	5,992	6,388	6,411	6,432	6,451	6,468	6,485
MSW since 1940 ^a	6,808	9,925	11,474	11,675	11,878	12,081	12,286	12,492
Total Industrial Waste Landfilled	9.7	10.9	10.5	10.3	10.4	10.3	10.3	10.2
Food and Beverage Sector ^c	6.4	6.9	6.2	6.0	6.2	6.1	6.1	6.0
Pulp and Paper Sector ^d	3.3	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2

^a This estimate represents the waste that has been in place for 30 years or less, which contributes about 90 percent of the CH₄ generation. Values are based on EPA (1993) for years 1940 to years 1988 (not presented in table), *BioCycle* 2001, 2004, 2006, and 2010 for years 1989 to 2014 (1981 to 2004, and 2006 to 2011 are not presented in table). Values for years 2010 to 2017 are based on EREF (2016) and annual population data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2018).

^b This estimate represents the cumulative amount of waste that has been placed in landfills since 1940 to the year indicated and is the sum of the annual disposal rates used in the first order decay model. Values are based on EPA 1993; *BioCycle* 2001, 2004, 2006, and 2010; and EREF 2016.

^c Food production values for 1990 to 2017 are from ERG. 2018 USDA-NASS Ag QuickStats available at <http://quickstats.nass.usda.gov>.

^d Production data from 1990 and 2001 are from Lockwood-Post's Directory, 2002. Production data from 2002 to 2017 are from the FAOSTat database available at: <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html#DOWNLOAD>. Accessed on September 8, 2017.

Step 2: Estimate CH₄ Generation at MSW Landfills for 1990 to 2004

The FOD method is exclusively used for 1990 to 2004. For the FOD method, methane generation is based on nationwide MSW generation data, to which a national average disposal factor is applied; it was not landfill-specific. Directly reported CH₄ emissions from EPA's GHGRP are used for years they are available (i.e., 2010 to 2015), and then back-casted for years 2005 to 2009. Landfill facilities reporting to EPA's GHGRP use a combination of the FOD method and the back-calculation method to develop their CH₄ emissions values. Landfills reporting to EPA's GHGRP without gas collection and control apply the FOD method, while the landfills with gas collection and control may apply either the FOD method or the back-calculation method, whichever is most appropriate for their site-specific landfill condition. It should be noted that most landfills with gas collection and control report using the back-calculation method.

The FOD method is presented below, and is similar to Equation HH-5 in CFR Part 98.343 for MSW landfills, and Equation TT-6 in CFR Part 98.463 for industrial waste landfills.

$$CH_{4,Solid\ Waste} = [CH_{4,MSW} + CH_{4,Ind} - R] - Ox$$

where,

CH _{4,Solid Waste}	=	Net CH ₄ emissions from solid waste
CH _{4,MSW}	=	CH ₄ generation from MSW landfills
CH _{4,Ind}	=	CH ₄ generation from industrial landfills
R	=	CH ₄ recovered and combusted (only for MSW landfills)
Ox	=	CH ₄ oxidized from MSW and industrial waste landfills before release to the atmosphere

The input parameters needed for the FOD model equations are the mass of waste disposed each year (discussed under Step 1), degradable organic carbon (DOC) as a function of methane generation potential (Lo), and the decay rate constant (k). The equation below provides additional detail on the activity data and emission factors used in the CH_{4,MSW} equation presented above.

$$CH_{4,MSW} = \left[\sum_{x=S}^{T-1} \left\{ W_x \times Lo \times \frac{16}{12} \times (e^{-k(T-x-1)} - e^{-k(T-x)}) \right\} \right]$$

where,

CH _{4,MSW}	=	Total CH ₄ generated from MSW landfills
T	=	Reporting year for which emissions are calculated
x	=	Year in which waste was disposed
S	=	Start year of calculation
W _x	=	Quantity of waste disposed of in the landfill in a given year
Lo	=	Methane generation potential (100 m ³ CH ₄ /Mg waste; EPA 1998, 2008)
16/12	=	conversion factor from CH ₄ to C
k	=	Decay rate constant (yr ⁻¹ , see Table A-255)

The DOC is determined from the CH₄ generation potential (L₀ in m³ CH₄/Mg waste) as shown in the following equation:

$$\text{DOC} = [L_0 \times 6.74 \times 10^{-4}] \div [F \times 16/12 \times \text{DOC}_f \times \text{MCF}]$$

where,

DOC = degradable organic carbon (fraction, kt C/kt waste),
L₀ = CH₄ generation potential (100 m³ CH₄/Mg waste; EPA 1998, 2008),
6.74 × 10⁻⁴ = CH₄ density (Mg/m³),
F = fraction of CH₄ by volume in generated landfill gas (equal to 0.5)
16/12 = molecular weight ratio CH₄/C,
DOC_f = fraction of DOC that can decompose in the anaerobic conditions in the landfill (fraction equal to 0.5 for MSW), and
MCF = methane correction factor for year of disposal (fraction equal to 1 for anaerobic managed sites).

DOC values can be derived for individual landfills if a good understanding of the waste composition over time is known. A default DOC value is used in the Inventory because waste composition data are not regularly collected for all landfills nationwide. When estimating CH₄ generation for the years 1990 to 2004, a default DOC value is used. This DOC value is calculated from a national CH₄ generation potential¹⁰⁹ of 100 m³ CH₄/Mg waste (EPA 2008) as described in the next few paragraphs.

The DOC value used in the CH₄ generation estimates from MSW landfills for 1990-2004 is 0.2028, and is based on the CH₄ generation potential of 100 m³ CH₄/Mg waste (EPA 1998; EPA 2008). After EPA developed the L₀ value, RTI analyzed data from a set of 52 representative landfills across the United States in different precipitation ranges to evaluate L₀, and ultimately the national DOC value. The 2004 Chartwell Municipal Solid Waste Facility Directory confirmed that each of the 52 landfills chosen accepted or accepts both MSW and construction and demolition (C&D) waste (Chartwell 2004; RTI 2009). The Values for L₀ were evaluated from landfill gas recovery data for this set of 52 landfills, which resulted in a best fit value for L₀ of 99 m³/Mg of waste (RTI 2004). This value compares favorably with a range of 50 to 162 (midrange of 106) m³/Mg presented by Peer, Thorneloe, and Epperson (1993); a range of 87 to 91 m³/Mg from a detailed analysis of 18 landfills sponsored by the Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA 1998); and a value of 100 m³/Mg recommended in EPA's compilation of emission factors (EPA 1998; EPA 2008; based on data from 21 landfills). Based on the results from these studies, a value of 100 m³/Mg appears to be a reasonable best estimate to use in the FOD model for the national inventory for years 1990 through 2004, and is the value used to derive the DOC value of 0.2028.

In 2004, the FOD model was also applied to the gas recovery data for the 52 landfills to calculate a decay rate constant (k) directly for L₀ = 100 m³/Mg. The decay rate constant was found to increase with annual average precipitation; consequently, average values of k were developed for three precipitation ranges, shown in Table A-255 and recommended in EPA's compilation of emission factors (EPA 2008).

Table A-255: Average Values for Rate Constant (k) by Precipitation Range (yr⁻¹)

Precipitation range (inches/year)	k (yr ⁻¹)
<20	0.020
20-40	0.038
>40	0.057

These values for k show reasonable agreement with the results of other studies. For example, EPA's compilation of emission factors (EPA 1998; EPA 2008) recommends a value of 0.02 yr⁻¹ for arid areas (less than 25 inches/year of precipitation) and 0.04 yr⁻¹ for non-arid areas. The SWANA (1998) study of 18 landfills reported a range in values of k from 0.03 to 0.06 yr⁻¹ based on CH₄ recovery data collected generally in the time frame of 1986 to 1995.

Using data collected primarily for the year 2000, the distribution of waste-in-place versus precipitation was developed from over 400 landfills (RTI 2004). A distribution was also developed for population versus precipitation for comparison. The two distributions were very similar and indicated that population in areas or regions with a given precipitation range was a reasonable proxy for waste landfilled in regions with the same range of precipitation. Using U.S. Census data and rainfall data, the distributions of population versus rainfall were developed for each Census decade from 1950 through 2010. The distributions showed that the U.S. population has shifted to more arid areas over the past several

¹⁰⁹ Methane generation potential (L₀) varies with the amount of organic content of the waste material. A higher L₀ occurs with a higher content of organic waste.

decades. Consequently, the population distribution was used to apportion the waste landfilled in each decade according to the precipitation ranges developed for k, as shown in Table A-256.

Table A-256: Percent of U.S. Population within Precipitation Ranges (%)

Precipitation Range (inches/year)	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010
<20	10	13	14	16	19	19	18
20-40	40	39	37	36	34	33	44
>40	50	48	48	48	48	48	38

Source: Years 1950 through 2000 are from RTI (2004) using population data from the U.S. Census Bureau and precipitation data from the National Climatic Data Center's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Year 2010 is based on the methodology from RTI (2004) and the U.S. Bureau of Census and precipitation data from the National Climatic Data Center's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration where available.

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines also require annual proportions of waste disposed of in managed landfills versus unmanaged and uncategorized sites prior to 1980. Based on the historical data presented by Mintz et al. (2003), a timeline was developed for the transition from the use of unmanaged and uncategorized sites for solid waste disposed to the use of managed landfills. Based on this timeline, it was estimated that 6 percent of the waste that was land disposed in 1940 was disposed of in managed landfills and 94 percent was managed in uncategorized sites. The uncategorized sites represent those where not enough information was available to assign a percentage to unmanaged shallow versus unmanaged deep solid waste disposal sites. Between 1940 and 1980, the fraction of waste that was land disposed transitioned towards managed landfills until 100 percent of the waste was disposed of in managed landfills in 1980. For wastes disposed of in the uncategorized sites, a methane correction factor (MCF) of 0.6 was used based on the recommended IPCC default value for uncharacterized land disposal (IPCC 2006). The recommended IPCC default value for the MCF for managed landfills of 1 (IPCC 2006) has been used for the managed landfills for the years where the first order decay methodology was used (i.e., 1990 to 2004).

Step 3: Estimate CH₄ Emissions Avoided from MSW Landfills for 1990 to 2004

The estimated landfill gas recovered per year (R) at MSW landfills is based on a combination of four databases that include recovery from flares and/or landfill gas-to-energy projects:

- a database developed by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) for the voluntary reporting of greenhouse gases (EIA 2007),
- a database of LFGE projects that is primarily based on information compiled by EPA LMOP (EPA 2016),
- the flare vendor database (contains updated sales data collected from vendors of flaring equipment), and the
- EPA's GHGRP MSW landfills database (EPA 2015).¹¹⁰

The EPA's GHGRP MSW landfills database was first introduced as a data source for the 1990 to 2013 Inventory. The GHGRP MSW landfills database contains facility-reported data that undergoes rigorous verification and is considered to contain the least uncertain data of the four databases. However, this database only contains a portion of the landfills in the United States (although, presumably the highest emitters since only those landfills that meet the methane generation threshold must report) and only contains data from 2010 and later. For landfills in this database, methane recovery data reported data for 2010 and later were linearly back-casted to 1990, or the date the landfill gas collection system at a facility began operation, whichever is earliest.

A destruction efficiency of 99 percent was applied to amounts of CH₄ recovered to estimate CH₄ emissions avoided for all recovery databases. This value for destruction efficiency was selected based on the range of efficiencies (86 to 99+ percent) recommended for flares in EPA's AP-42 Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Draft Chapter 2.4, Table 2.4-3 (EPA 2008). A typical value of 97.7 percent was presented for the non-methane components (i.e., volatile organic compounds and non-methane organic compounds) in test results (EPA 2008). An arithmetic average of 98.3 percent and a median value of 99 percent are derived from the test results presented in EPA 2008. Thus, a value of 99 percent for the destruction efficiency of flares has been used in Inventory methodology. Other data sources supporting a 99 percent destruction efficiency include those used to establish New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for landfills and in recommendations for closed flares used in the EPA's LMOP.

¹¹⁰ The 2015 GHGRP dataset is used in the GHGRP MSW landfills dataset described in Step 3a. This database is no longer updated because the methodology has changed such that the directly reported net methane emissions are used. The GHGRP dataset is available through Envirofacts <<http://www.epa.gov/enviro/facts/ghg/search.html>>.

Step 3a: Estimate CH₄ Emissions Avoided Through Landfill Gas-to-Energy (LFGE) and Flaring Projects

The quantity of CH₄ avoided due to LFGE systems was estimated based on information from three sources: (1) a database developed by the EIA for the voluntary reporting of greenhouse gases (EIA 2007); (2) a database compiled by LMOP and referred to as the LFGE database for the purposes of this inventory (EPA 2016); and (3) the GHGRP MSW landfills dataset (EPA 2015). The EIA database included location information for landfills with LFGE projects, estimates of CH₄ reductions, descriptions of the projects, and information on the methodology used to determine the CH₄ reductions. In general, the CH₄ reductions for each reporting year were based on the measured amount of landfill gas collected and the percent CH₄ in the gas. For the LFGE database, data on landfill gas flow and energy generation (i.e., MW capacity) were used to estimate the total direct CH₄ emissions avoided due to the LFGE project. The GHGRP MSW landfills database contains the most detailed data on landfills that reported under EPA's GHGRP for years 2010 through 2015, however the amount of CH₄ recovered is not specifically allocated to a flare versus a LFGE project. The allocation into flares or LFGE was performed by matching landfills to the EIA and LMOP databases for LFGE projects and to the flare database for flares. Detailed information on the landfill name, owner or operator, city, and state are available for both the EIA and LFGE databases; consequently, it was straightforward to identify landfills that were in both databases against those in EPA's GHGRP MSW landfills database.

To avoid double-counting CH₄ recovery, a hierarchical approach is applied after matching landfills in one database to the other databases. If a landfill in the EIA database was also in the LFGE and/or the flare vendor database, the CH₄ recovery was based on the EIA data because landfill owners or operators directly reported the amount of CH₄ recovered using gas flow concentration and measurements, and because the reporting accounted for changes over time. The EIA database only includes facility-reported data through 2006; the amount of CH₄ recovered in this database for years 2007 and later were assumed to be the same as in 2006. Nearly all (93 percent) of landfills in the EIA database also report to EPA's GHGRP.

If both the flare data and LFGE recovery data were available for any of the remaining landfills (i.e., not in the EIA or EPA's GHGRP databases), then the CH₄ recovered were based on the LFGE data, which provides reported landfill-specific data on gas flow for direct use projects and project capacity (i.e., megawatts) for electricity projects. The LFGE database is based on the most recent EPA LMOP database (published annually). The remaining portion of avoided emissions is calculated by the flare vendor database, which estimates CH₄ combusted by flares using the midpoint of a flare's reported capacity. New flare vendor sales data were unable to be obtained for the current Inventory year. Given that each LFGE project is likely to also have a flare, double counting reductions from flares and LFGE projects in the LFGE database was avoided by subtracting emission reductions associated with LFGE projects for which a flare had not been identified from the emission reductions associated with flares (referred to as the flare correction factor).

Step 3b: Estimate CH₄ Emissions Avoided Through Flaring for the Flare Database

To avoid double counting, flares associated with landfills in EPA's GHGRP, EIA and LFGE databases were not included in the total quantity of CH₄ recovery from the flare vendor database. As with the LFGE projects, reductions from flaring landfill gas in the EIA database were based on measuring the volume of gas collected and the percent of CH₄ in the gas. The information provided by the flare vendors included information on the number of flares, flare design flow rates or flare dimensions, year of installation, and generally the city and state location of the landfill. When a range of design flare flow rates was provided by the flare vendor, the median landfill gas flow rate was used to estimate CH₄ recovered from each remaining flare (i.e., for each flare not associated with a landfill in the EIA, EPA's GHGRP, or LFGE databases). Several vendors have provided information on the size of the flare rather than the flare design gas flow rate for most years of the Inventory. Flares sales data has not been obtained for the past three Inventory years.

To estimate a median flare gas flow rate for flares associated with these vendors, the size of the flare was matched with the size and corresponding flow rates provided by other vendors. Some flare vendors reported the maximum capacity of the flare. An analysis of flare capacity versus measured CH₄ flow rates from the EIA database showed that the flares operated at 51 percent of capacity when averaged over the time series and at 72 percent of capacity for the highest flow rate for a given year. For those cases when the flare vendor supplied maximum capacity, the actual flow was estimated as 50 percent of capacity. Total CH₄ avoided through flaring from the flare vendor database was estimated by summing the estimates of CH₄ recovered by each flare for each year.

Step 3c: Reduce CH₄ Emissions Avoided Through Flaring

If comprehensive data on flares were available, each LFGE project in EPA's GHGRP, EIA, and LFGE databases would have an identified flare because it is assumed that most LFGE projects have flares. However, given that the flare vendor database only covers approximately 50 to 75 percent of the flare population, an associated flare was not identified for all LFGE projects. These LFGE projects likely have flares, yet flares were unable to be identified for one of two reasons:

1) inadequate identifier information in the flare vendor data, or 2) a lack of the flare in the flare vendor database. For those projects for which a flare was not identified due to inadequate information, CH₄ avoided would be overestimated, as both the CH₄ avoided from flaring and the LFGE project would be counted. To avoid overestimating emissions avoided from flaring, the CH₄ avoided from LFGE projects with no identified flares was determined and the flaring estimate from the flare vendor database was reduced by this quantity (referred to as a flare correction factor) on a state-by-state basis. This step likely underestimates CH₄ avoided due to flaring, but was applied to be conservative in the estimates of CH₄ emissions avoided.

Additional effort was undertaken to improve the methodology behind the flare correction factor for the 1990 to 2009 and 1990 to 2014 inventory years to reduce the total number of flares in the flare vendor database that were not matched to landfills and/or LFGE projects in the EIA and LFGE databases. Each flare in the flare vendor database not associated with a LFGE project in the EIA, LFGE, or EPA's GHGRP databases was investigated to determine if it could be matched. For some unmatched flares, the location information was missing or incorrectly transferred to the flare vendor database and was corrected during the review. In other instances, the landfill names were slightly different between what the flare vendor provided and the actual landfill name as listed in the EIA, LFGE and EPA's GHGRP databases. The remaining flares did not have adequate information through the name, location, or owner to identify it to a landfill in any of the recovery databases or through an Internet search; it is these flares that are included in the flare correction factor for the current inventory year.

A large majority of the unmatched flares are associated with landfills in the LFGE database that are currently flaring, but are also considering LFGE. These landfills projects considering a LFGE project are labeled as candidate, potential, or construction in the LFGE database. The flare vendor database was improved in the 1990 to 2009 inventory year to match flares with operational, shutdown as well as candidate, potential, and construction LFGE projects, thereby reducing the total number of unidentified flares in the flare vendor database, all of which are used in the flare correction factor. The results of this effort significantly decreased the number of flares used in the flare correction factor, and consequently, increased recovered flare emissions, and decreased net emissions from landfills for the 1990 through 2009 Inventory. The revised state-by-state flare correction factors were applied to the entire Inventory time series (RTI 2010).

Step 4: Estimate CH₄ Emissions from MSW Landfills for 2005 to 2009

For 2005 to 2009, back-casted GHGRP net emissions plus a scale-up factor to account for emission from landfills that do not report to the GHGRP are used. The GHGRP data were first incorporated into the methodology in the 1990 to 2015 Inventory. Including the GHGRP net emissions data was a significant methodological change from the FOD method previously described in Steps 1 to 3; therefore, EPA needed to merge the previous method with the new (GHGRP) dataset. A summary of how and why the GHGRP emissions were back-casted and how the scale-up factor was estimated are included here. The methodology described in this section was determined based on the good practice guidance in Volume 1: Chapter 5 Time Series Consistency of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Additional details including other options considered are included in RTI 2017a and RTI 2018.

Facilities reporting to the GHGRP without landfill gas collection and control use the FOD method. Facilities reporting to the GHGRP with landfill gas collection and control must use two methodologies, the FOD method (expressed by Equation HH-5 in CFR Part 98.343), and the back-calculation methodology, which is based on directly measured amounts of recovered CH₄ from the landfill gas and is expressed by Equation HH-8 in CFR Part 98.343 (also presented below). The two parts of Equation HH-8 consider the portion of CH₄ in the landfill gas that is not collected by the landfill gas collection system; and the portion that is collected. First, the recovered CH₄ is adjusted with the collection efficiency of the gas collection and control system and the fraction of hours the recovery system operated in the calendar year. This quantity represents the amount of CH₄ in the landfill gas that is not captured by the collection system; it is then adjusted for oxidation. The second portion of the equation adjusts the portion of CH₄ in the collected landfill gas with the efficiency of the destruction device(s), and the fraction of hours the destruction device(s) operated during the year.

$$CH_{4,Solid\ Waste} = \left[\left(\frac{R}{CE \times f_{REC}} - R \right) \times (1 - OX) + R \times (1 - (DE \times f_{Dest})) \right]$$

Where,

R	= Quantity of recovered CH ₄ from Equation HH-4 of the EPA's GHGRP
CE	= Collection efficiency estimated at the landfill, taking into account system coverage, operation, and cover system materials from Table HH-3 of the EPA's GHGRP. If area by soil cover type information is not available, the default value of 0.75 should be used. (percent)
f _{REC}	= fraction of hours the recovery system was operating (percent)
OX	= oxidation factor (percent)
DE	= destruction efficiency (percent)
f _{Dest}	= fraction of hours the destruction device was operating (fraction)

For completeness, and because the GHGRP only includes a subset of U.S. landfills, a scale-up factor had to be developed to estimate the amount of emissions from the landfills that do not report to the GHGRP. Landfills that do not meet the reporting threshold to the GHGRP are not required to report to the GHGRP. Therefore, the GHGRP dataset is only partially complete when considering the universe of MSW landfills. In theory, national emissions from MSW landfills equals the emissions from the GHGRP plus emissions from landfills that do not report to the GHGRP. The scale-up factor was first applied in the 1990 to 2015 Inventory (as 12.5 percent) and was revised for the 1990 to 2016 Inventory to 9 percent. The remainder of this section describes how the steps taken to increase time series consistency after incorporating the GHGRP data.

Regarding the time series and as stated in *2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 1: Chapter 5 Time Series Consistency* (IPCC 2006), “the time series is a central component of the greenhouse gas inventory because it provides information on historical emissions trends and tracks the effects of strategies to reduce emissions at the national level. All emissions in a time series should be estimated consistently, which means that as far as possible, the time series should be calculated using the same method and data sources in all years” (IPCC 2006). This chapter however, recommends against back-casting emissions back to 1990 with a limited set of data and instead provides guidance on techniques to splice, or join methodologies together. One of those techniques is referred to as the overlap technique. The overlap technique is recommended when new data becomes available for multiple years. This was the case with the GHGRP data, where directly reported CH₄ emissions data became available for more than 1,200 MSW landfills beginning in 2010. The GHGRP emissions data had to be merged with emissions from the FOD method to avoid a drastic change in emissions in 2010, when the datasets were combined. EPA also had to consider that according to IPCC’s good practice, efforts should be made to reduce uncertainty in Inventory calculations and that, when compared to the GHGRP data, the FOD method presents greater uncertainty.

In evaluating the best way to combine the two datasets, EPA considered either using the FOD method from 1990 to 2009, or using the FOD method for a portion of that time and back-casting the GHGRP emissions data to a year where emissions from the two methodologies aligned. Plotting the back-casted GHGRP emissions against the emissions estimates from the FOD method showed an alignment of the data in 2004 and later years which facilitated the use of the overlap technique while also reducing uncertainty. Therefore, EPA decided to back-cast the GHGRP emissions from 2009 to 2005 only to merge the datasets and adhere to the IPCC good practice guidance.

An important factor in this approach is that the back-casted emissions for 2005 to 2009 are subject to change with each Inventory because the GHGRP dataset may change as facilities revise their annual greenhouse gas reports.

For the 1990 to 2016 Inventory, EPA revisited the methodology used to calculate the scale-up factor in the 1990 to 2015 Inventory and, with stakeholder input, decided to base the scale-up factor on the total amount of buried waste between landfills not reporting to the GHGRP and those reporting to the GHGRP. There are significant uncertainties in the data quality of the total amount of buried waste at the non-reporting landfills, and for some landfills, no information was available at all. There is much less uncertainty in these amounts for the landfills reporting to the GHGRP. Additionally, this variable provides a direct basis for comparing emissions from these two sets of landfills because landfill methane generation emissions are directly related to the amount of waste disposed in addition to other less static variables (e.g., waste composition) and is the basis for the FOD method used in the earlier part of the time series (1990 to 2004). Details on how the 9 percent scale-up factor was derived is included in RTI 2018. Like the 1990 to 2015 Inventory, the scale-up factor is applied to all years from 2005 to 2017.

Step 5: Estimate CH₄ Emissions from MSW Landfills for 2010 to 2017

Directly reported CH₄ emissions to EPA’s GHGRP are used for 2010 to 2017. The 9 percent scale-up factor is applied annually as is done for 2005 to 2009 because the GHGRP does not capture emissions from all landfills in the United States.

Step 6: Estimate CH₄ Generation at Industrial Waste Landfills for 1990 to the Current Inventory Year

Industrial waste landfills receive waste from factories, processing plants, and other manufacturing activities. In national inventories prior to the 1990 through 2005 inventory, CH₄ generation at industrial landfills was estimated as seven percent of the total CH₄ generation from MSW landfills, based on a study conducted by EPA (1993). In 2005, the methodology was updated and improved by using activity factors (industrial production levels) to estimate the amount of industrial waste landfilled each year, and by applying the FOD model to estimate CH₄ generation. A nationwide survey of industrial waste landfills found that most of the organic waste placed in industrial landfills originated from two sectors: food processing (meat, vegetables, fruits) and pulp and paper (EPA 1993). Data for annual nationwide production for the food processing and pulp and paper sectors were taken from industry and government sources for recent years; estimates were developed for production for the earlier years for which data were not available. For the pulp and paper sector, production

data published by the Lockwood-Post's Directory were used for years 1990 to 2001 and production data published by the Food and Agriculture Organization were used for years 2002 through 2017. An extrapolation based on U.S. real gross domestic product was used for years 1940 through 1964. For the food processing sector, production levels were obtained or developed from the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the years 1990 through 2017 (ERG 2018). An extrapolation based on U.S. population was used for the years 1940 through 1989.

In addition to production data for the pulp and paper and food processing sectors, the following inputs are needed to use the FOD model for estimating CH₄ generation from industrial waste landfills: 1) quantity of waste that is disposed in industrial waste landfills (as a function of production), 2) CH₄ generation potential (L₀) from which a DOC value can be calculated, and 3) the decay rate constant (k).

Research into waste generation and disposal in landfills for the pulp and paper sector indicated that the quantity of waste landfilled was about 0.050 MT/MT of product compared to 0.046 MT/MT product for the food processing sector (RTI 2006). These factors were applied to estimates of annual production to estimate annual waste disposal in industrial waste landfills. Estimates for DOC were derived from available data (EPA, 2015b; Heath et al., 2010; NCASI, 2005; Kraft and Orender, 1993; NCASI 2008; Flores et al. 1999 as documented in RTI 2015). The DOC value for industrial pulp and paper waste is estimated at 0.15 (L₀ of 49 m³/MT); the DOC value for industrial food waste is estimated as 0.26 (L₀ of 128 m³/MT) (RTI 2015; RTI 2014). Estimates for k were taken from the default values in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; the value of k given for food waste with disposal in a wet temperate climate is 0.19 yr⁻¹, and the value given for paper waste is 0.06 yr⁻¹.

A literature review was conducted for the 1990 to 2010 and 1990 to 2014 inventory years with the intent of updating values for L₀ (specifically DOC) and k in the pulp and paper sector. Where pulp and paper mill wastewater treatment residuals or sludge are the primary constituents of pulp and paper waste landfilled, values for k available in the literature range from 0.01/yr to 0.1/yr, while values for L₀ range from 50 m³/Mt to 200 m³/Mt.¹¹¹ Values for these factors are highly variable and are dependent on the soil moisture content, which is generally related to rainfall amounts. At this time, sufficient data were available through EPA's GHGRP to warrant a change to the L₀ (DOC) from 99 to 49 m³/MT, but sufficient data were not obtained to warrant a change to k. EPA will consider an update to the k values for the pulp and paper sector as new data arises and will work with stakeholders to gather data and other feedback on potential changes to these values.

As with MSW landfills, a similar trend in disposal practices from unmanaged landfills, or open dumps to managed landfills was expected for industrial waste landfills; therefore, the same time line that was developed for MSW landfills was applied to the industrial landfills to estimate the average MCF. That is, between 1940 and 1980, the fraction of waste that was land disposed transitioned from 6 percent managed landfills in 1940 and 94 percent open dumps to 100 percent managed landfills in 1980 and on. For wastes disposed of in unmanaged sites, an MCF of 0.6 was used and for wastes disposed of in managed landfills, an MCF of 1 was used, based on the recommended IPCC default values (IPCC 2006).

The parameters discussed above were used in the integrated form of the FOD model to estimate CH₄ generation from industrial waste landfills.

Step 7: Estimate CH₄ Oxidation from MSW and Industrial Waste Landfills

A portion of the CH₄ escaping from a landfill oxidizes to CO₂ in the top layer of the soil. The amount of oxidation depends upon the characteristics of the soil and the environment. For purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that of the CH₄ generated, minus the amount of gas recovered for flaring or LFGE projects, 10 percent was oxidized in the soil (Jensen and Pipatti 2002; Mancinelli and McKay 1985; Czepiel et al 1996). The literature was reviewed in 2011 (RTI 2011) and 2017 (RTI 2017b) to provide recommendations for the most appropriate oxidation rate assumptions. It was found that oxidation values are highly variable and range from zero to over 100 percent (i.e., the landfill is considered to be an atmospheric sink by virtue of the landfill gas extraction system pulling atmospheric methane down through the cover). There is considerable uncertainty and variability surrounding estimates of the rate of oxidation because oxidation is difficult to measure and varies considerably with the presence of a gas collection system, thickness and type of the cover material, size and area of the landfill, climate, and the presence of cracks and/or fissures in the cover material through which methane can escape. IPCC (2006) notes that test results from field and laboratory studies may lead to over-estimations of oxidation in landfill cover soils because they largely determine oxidation using uniform and homogeneous soil layers. In addition, a number of studies note that gas escapes more readily through the side slopes of a landfill as compared to moving through the cover thus complicating the correlation between oxidation and cover type or gas recovery.

Sites with landfill gas collection systems are generally designed and managed better to improve gas recovery. More recent research (2006 to 2012) on landfill cover methane oxidation has relied on stable isotope techniques that may provide

¹¹¹ Sources reviewed included Heath et al. 2010; Miner 2008; Skog 2008; Upton et al. 2008; Barlaz 2006; Sonne 2006; NCASI 2005; Barlaz 1998; and Skog and Nicholson 2000.

1 a more reliable measure of oxidation. Results from this recent research consistently point to higher cover soil methane
2 oxidation rates than the IPCC (2006) default of 10 percent. A continued effort will be made to review the peer-reviewed
3 literature to better understand how climate, cover type, and gas recovery influence the rate of oxidation at active and closed
4 landfills. At this time, the IPCC recommended oxidation factor of 10 percent will continue to be used for all landfills for the
5 years 1990 to 2004.

6 For years 2005 to 2017, directly reported CH₄ emissions to EPA's GHGRP, which include the adjustment for
7 oxidation, are used. EPA's GHGRP allows facilities to use a range of oxidation factors: 0.0, 0.10, 0.25, 0.35. The average
8 oxidation factor across all facilities reporting to the GHGRP for the years data are available is approximately 20 percent,
9 thus this value is essentially the oxidation factor applied for years 2005 to 2017.

10 **Step 8: Estimate Total CH₄ Emissions for the Inventory**

11 For 1990 to 2004, total CH₄ emissions were calculated by adding emissions from MSW and industrial landfills,
12 and subtracting CH₄ recovered and oxidized, as shown in Table A-257. A different methodology is applied for 2005 to 2017.
13 Directly reported net CH₄ emissions to EPA's GHGRP plus the 9 percent scale-up factor were applied for 2010 to 2017. For
14 2005 to 2009, the directly-reported GHGRP net emissions from 2010 to 2017 were used to back-cast emissions for 2005 to
15 2009. Note that the emissions values for 2005 to 2009 are re-calculated for each Inventory and are subject to change if
16 facilities reporting to the GHGRP revise their annual greenhouse gas reports for any year. The 9 percent scale-up factor was
17 also applied annually for 2005 to 2009.

Table A-257: CH₄ Emissions from Landfills (kt)

	1990	1995	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
MSW CH ₄ Generation	8,214	9,140	10,270	10,477	10,669	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Industrial CH ₄ Generation	484	537	618	625	629	636	639	643	648	653	656	657	659	661	662	663	664	665
MSW CH₄ Recovered	(718)	(1,935)	(4,894)	(4,995)	(5,304)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MSW CH ₄ Oxidized	(750)	(720)	(538)	(548)	(537)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Industrial CH ₄ Oxidized	(48)	(54)	(62)	(63)	(63)	(64)	(64)	(64)	(65)	(65)	(66)	(66)	(66)	(66)	(66)	(66)	(66)	(67)
MSW Net CH₄ Emissions (GHGRP)	-	-	-	-	-	4,684	4,596	4,508	4,420	4,332	4,372	4,023	4,070	3,923	3,906	3,851	3,722	3,711
Net Emissions^a	7,182	6,967	5,394	5,496	5,395	5,256	5,171	5,087	5,004	4,920	4,963	4,614	4,662	4,517	4,502	4,448	4,319	4,309

"-" Not applicable due to methodology change.

Notes: MSW and Industrial CH₄ generation in Table A-257 represents emissions before oxidation. Totals may not sum exactly to the last significant figure due to rounding. Parentheses denote negative values.

^a MSW Net CH₄ emissions for years 2010 to 2017 are directly reported CH₄ emissions to the EPA's GHGRP for MSW landfills and are back-casted to estimate emissions for 2005 to 2009. A scale-up factor of 9 percent of each year's emissions from 2005 to 2017 is applied to 2005 to 2017 to account for landfills that do not report annual methane emissions to the GHGRP. Emissions for years 1990 to 2004 are calculated by the FOD methodology.

References

- Barlaz, M.A. (2006) "Forest Products Decomposition in Municipal Solid Waste Landfills." *Waste Management*, 26(4): 321-333.
- Barlaz, M.A. (1998) "Carbon Storage During Biodegradation of Municipal Solid Waste Components in Laboratory-scale Landfills." *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 12(2): 373-380, June 1998.
- BioCycle (2010) "The State of Garbage in America" By L. Arsova, R. Van Haaren, N. Goldstein, S. Kaufman, and N. Themelis. *BioCycle*. December 2010. Available online at <http://www.jgpress.com/archives/_free/002191.html>.
- Chartwell (2004) Municipal Solid Waste Directory. The Envirobiz Group.
- Czepiel, P., B. Mosher, P. Crill, and R. Harriss (1996) "Quantifying the Effect of Oxidation on Landfill Methane Emissions." *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 101(D11):16721-16730.
- EIA (2007) Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Reports for EIA Form 1605B (Reporting Year 2006). Available online at <<ftp://ftp.eia.doe.gov/pub/oiaf/1605/cdrom/>>.
- EPA (2018) Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP). 2018 Envirofacts. Subpart HH: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/enviro/facts/ghg/search.html>>.
- EPA (2016) *Landfill Gas-to-Energy Project Database*. Landfill Methane and Outreach Program. August 2015.
- EPA (2015) Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP). 2015 Envirofacts. Subpart HH: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. Available online at: <<http://www.epa.gov/enviro/facts/ghg/search.html>>.
- EPA (2008) *Compilation of Air Pollution Emission Factors, Publication AP-42*, Draft Section 2.4 Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. October 2008.
- EPA (1998) *Compilation of Air Pollution Emission Factors, Publication AP-42*, Section 2.4 Municipal Solid Waste Landfills. November 1998.
- EPA (1993) *Anthropogenic Methane Emissions in the United States, Estimates for 1990: Report to Congress*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation. Washington, D.C. EPA/430-R-93-003. April 1993.
- EPA (1988) *National Survey of Solid Waste (Municipal) Landfill Facilities*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. EPA/530-SW-88-011. September 1988.
- EREF (The Environmental Research & Education Foundation) (2016). Municipal Solid Waste Management in the United States: 2010 & 2013.
- ERG (2018) Draft Production Data Supplied by ERG for 1990-2017 for Pulp and Paper, Fruits and Vegetables, and Meat. August 2018.
- ERG (2014) Draft Production Data Supplied by ERG for 1990-2013 for Pulp and Paper, Fruits and Vegetables, and Meat. August.
- FAO (2016). FAOStat database 2016. Available at <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html#DOWNLOAD>, Accessed on July 18, 2016.
- Flores, R.A., C.W. Shanklin, M. Loza-Garay, S.H. Wie (1999) "Quantification and Characterization of Food Processing Wastes/Residues." *Compost Science & Utilization*, 7(1): 63-71.
- Heath, L.S. et al. 2010. Greenhouse Gas and Carbon Profile of the U.S. Forest Products Industry Value Chain. *Environmental Science and Technology* 44(2010) 3999-4005.
- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.). Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- Jensen, J.E.F., and R. Pipatti (2002) "CH₄ Emissions from Solid Waste Disposal." Background paper for the Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.
- Kraft, D.L. and H.C. Orender (1993) "Considerations for Using Sludge as a Fuel." *Tappi Journal*, 76(3): 175-183.
- Lockwood-Post Directory of Pulp and Paper Mills (2002). Available for purchase at <<http://www.risiinfo.com/product/lockwood-post/>>.
- Mancinelli, R. and C. McKay (1985) "Methane-Oxidizing Bacteria in Sanitary Landfills." *Proc. First Symposium on Biotechnical Advances in Processing Municipal Wastes for Fuels and Chemicals*, Minneapolis, MN, 437-450. August.

- 1 Miner, R. (2008). "Calculations documenting the greenhouse gas emissions from the pulp and paper industry." Memorandum
2 from Reid Minor, National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI) to Becky Nicholson, RTI International,
3 May 21, 2008.
- 4 Mintz C., R. Freed, and M. Walsh (2003) "Timeline of Anaerobic Land Disposal of Solid Waste." Memorandum to T. Wirth
5 (EPA) and K. Skog (USDA), December 31, 2003.
- 6 National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI) (2008) "Calculations Documenting the Greenhouse Gas
7 Emissions from the Pulp and Paper Industry." Memorandum to R. Nicholson (RTI).
- 8 National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI) (2005) "Calculation Tools for Estimating Greenhouse Gas
9 Emissions from Pulp and Paper Mills, Version 1.1." July 8, 2005.
- 10 Peer, R., S. Thorneloe, and D. Epperson (1993) "A Comparison of Methods for Estimating Global Methane Emissions from
11 Landfills." *Chemosphere*, 26(1-4):387-400.
- 12 RTI (2018) Methodological changes to the scale-up factor used to estimate emissions from municipal solid waste landfills in the
13 Inventory. Memorandum prepared by K. Bronstein and M. McGrath for R. Schmeltz (EPA). In progress.
- 14 RTI (2017a) Methodological changes to the methane emissions from municipal solid waste landfills as reflected in the public
15 review draft of the 1990-2015 Inventory. Memorandum prepared by K. Bronstein and M. McGrath for R. Schmeltz (EPA).
16 March 31, 2017.
- 17 RTI (2017b) Options for revising the oxidation factor for non-reporting landfills for years 1990-2004 in the Inventory time series.
18 Memorandum prepared by K. Bronstein, M. McGrath, and K. Weitz for R. Schmeltz (EPA). August 13, 2017.
- 19 RTI (2015) Investigate the potential to update DOC and k values for the Pulp and Paper industry in the US Solid Waste
20 Inventory. Memorandum prepared by K. Bronstein and M. McGrath for R. Schmeltz (EPA), December 4, 2015.
- 21 RTI (2014) Analysis of DOC Values for Industrial Solid Waste for the Pulp and Paper Industry and the Food Industry.
22 Memorandum prepared by J. Coburn for R. Schmeltz (EPA), October 28, 2014.
- 23 RTI (2011) Updated Research on Methane Oxidation in Landfills. Memorandum prepared by K. Weitz (RTI) for R. Schmeltz
24 (EPA), January 14, 2011.
- 25 RTI (2010) Revision of the flare correction factor to be used in the EPA Greenhouse Gas Inventory. Memorandum prepared by
26 K. Bronstein, K. Weitz, and J. Coburn for R. Schmeltz (EPA), January 8, 2010.
- 27 RTI (2009) GHG Inventory Improvement – Construction & Demolition Waste DOC and L₀ Value. Memorandum prepared by J.
28 Coburn and K. Bronstein (RTI) for R. Schmeltz, April 15, 2010.
- 29 RTI (2006) Methane Emissions for Industrial Landfills. Memorandum prepared by K. Weitz and M. Bahner for M. Weitz (EPA),
30 September 5, 2006.
- 31 RTI (2004) Documentation for Changes to the Methodology for the Inventory of Methane Emissions from Landfills.
32 Memorandum prepared by M. Branscome and J. Coburn (RTI) to E. Scheehle (EPA), August 26, 2004.
- 33 Skog, K.E. (2008) "Sequestration of Carbon in harvested wood products for the United States." *Forest Products Journal*, 58(6):
34 56-72.
- 35 Skog, K. and G.A. Nicholson (2000) "Carbon Sequestration in Wood and Paper Products." USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech.
36 Rep. RMRS-GTR-59.
- 37 Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) (1998) *Comparison of Models for Predicting Landfill Methane Recovery*.
38 Publication No. GR-LG 0075. March 1998.
- 39 Sonne, E. (2006) "Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Forestry Operations: A Life Cycle Assessment." *J. Environ. Qual.* 35:1439-
40 1450.
- 41 Upton, B., R. Miner, M. Spinney, L.S. Heath (2008) "The Greenhouse Gas and Energy Impacts of Using Wood Instead of
42 Alternatives in Residential Construction in the United States." *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 32: 1-10.
- 43 U.S. Census Bureau (2018) Annual Estimates of the Resident Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2017. Available online
44 at <[https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=PEP_2017_](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=PEP_2017_PEPANNRES&prodType=table)
45 [PEPANNRES&prodType=table](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=PEP_2017_PEPANNRES&prodType=table)>.
- 46 Waste Business Journal (WBJ) (2016) Directory of Waste Processing & Disposal Sites 2016.

ANNEX 4 IPCC Reference Approach for Estimating CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion

It is possible to estimate carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from fossil fuel consumption using alternative methodologies and different data sources than those described in the Estimating Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion Annex. For example, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) reporting guidelines request that countries, in addition to their “bottom-up” sectoral methodology, complete a “top-down” Reference Approach for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion. Volume 2: Energy, Chapter 6: Reference Approach of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC 2006) states, “comparability between the sectoral and reference approaches continues to allow a country to produce a second independent estimate of CO₂ emissions from fuel combustion with limited additional effort and data requirements.” This reference method estimates fossil fuel consumption by adjusting national aggregate fuel production data for imports, exports, and stock changes rather than relying on end-user consumption surveys. The basic principle is that once carbon (C)-based fuels are brought into a national economy, they are either saved in some way (e.g., stored in products, kept in fuel stocks, or left unoxidized in ash) or combusted, and therefore the C in them is oxidized and released into the atmosphere. Accounting for actual consumption of fuels at the sectoral or sub-national level is not required. The following discussion provides the detailed calculations for estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion from the United States using the IPCC-recommended Reference Approach.

Step 1: Collect and Assemble Data in Proper Format

To ensure the comparability of national inventories, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has recommended that countries report energy data using the International Energy Agency (IEA) reporting convention. National energy statistics were collected in physical units from several Energy Information Administration (EIA) documents in order to obtain the necessary data on production, imports, exports, and stock changes.

It was necessary to modify these data to generate more accurate apparent consumption estimates of these fuels. The first modification adjusts for consumption of fossil fuel feedstocks accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter, which include the following: unspecified coal for coal coke used in iron and steel production; natural gas, distillate fuel, and coal used in iron and steel production; natural gas used for ammonia production; petroleum coke used in the production of aluminum, ferroalloys, titanium dioxide, ammonia, and silicon carbide; and other oil and residual fuel oil used in the manufacture of C black. The second modification adjusts for the fact that EIA energy statistics include synthetic natural gas in coal and natural gas data. The third modification adjusts for the inclusion of ethanol in motor gasoline statistics. Ethanol is a biofuel, and net carbon fluxes from changes in biogenic carbon reservoirs in croplands are accounted for in the estimates for Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry (see Chapter 6). The fourth modification adjusts for consumption of bunker fuels, which refer to quantities of fuels used for international transportation estimated separately from U.S. totals. The fifth modification consists of the addition of U.S. Territories data that are typically excluded from the national aggregate energy statistics. The territories include Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Wake Island, and U.S. Pacific Islands. These data, as well as the production, import, export, and stock change statistics, are presented in Table A-258.

The C content of fuel varies with the fuel’s heat content. Therefore, for an accurate estimation of CO₂ emissions, fuel statistics were provided on an energy content basis (e.g., Btu or joules). Because detailed fuel production statistics are typically provided in physical units (as in Table A-258 for 2017), they were converted to units of energy before CO₂ emissions were calculated. Fuel statistics were converted to their energy equivalents by using conversion factors provided by EIA. These factors and their data sources are displayed in Table A-259. The resulting fuel type-specific energy data for 2017 are provided in Table A-260.

Step 2: Estimate Apparent Fuel Consumption

The next step of the IPCC Reference Approach is to estimate “apparent consumption” of fuels within the country. This requires a balance of primary fuels produced, plus imports, minus exports, and adjusting for stock changes. In this way, C enters an economy through energy production and imports (and decreases in fuel stocks) and is transferred out of the country through exports (and increases in fuel stocks). Thus, apparent consumption of primary fuels (including crude oil, natural gas liquids, anthracite, bituminous, subbituminous and lignite coal, and natural gas) can be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Apparent Consumption} = \text{Production} + \text{Imports} - \text{Exports} - \text{Stock Change}$$

Flows of secondary fuels (e.g., gasoline, residual fuel, coke) should be added to primary apparent consumption. The production of secondary fuels, however, should be ignored in the calculations of apparent consumption since the C contained in these fuels is already accounted for in the supply of primary fuels from which they were derived (e.g., the estimate for apparent consumption of crude oil already contains the C from which gasoline would be refined). Flows of secondary fuels should therefore be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Secondary Consumption} = \text{Imports} - \text{Exports} - \text{Stock Change}$$

Note that this calculation can result in negative numbers for apparent consumption of secondary fuels. This result is perfectly acceptable since it merely indicates a net export or stock increase in the country of that fuel when domestic production is not considered.

Next, the apparent consumption and secondary consumption need to be adjusted for feedstock uses of fuels accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter, international bunker fuels, and U.S. territory fuel consumption. Bunker fuels and feedstocks accounted for in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter are subtracted from these estimates, while fuel consumption in U.S. Territories is added.

The IPCC Reference Approach calls for estimating apparent fuel consumption before converting to a common energy unit. However, certain primary fuels in the United States (e.g., natural gas and steam coal) have separate conversion factors for production, imports, exports, and stock changes. In these cases, it is not appropriate to multiply apparent consumption by a single conversion factor since each of its components has different heat contents. Therefore, United States fuel statistics were converted to their heat equivalents before estimating apparent consumption. Results are provided in Table A-259.

Step 3: Estimate Carbon Emissions

Once apparent consumption is estimated, the remaining calculations are similar to those for the “bottom-up” Sectoral Approach (see Estimating Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion Annex). Potential CO₂ emissions were estimated using fuel-specific C coefficients (see Table A-260).¹¹² The C in products from non-energy uses of fossil fuels (e.g., plastics or asphalt) that is stored was then estimated and subtracted (see Table A-262). This step differs from the Sectoral Approach in that emissions from both fuel combustion and non-energy uses are accounted for in the Reference Approach. Finally, to obtain actual CO₂ emissions, net emissions were adjusted for any C that remained unoxidized as a result of incomplete combustion (e.g., C contained in ash or soot). The fraction oxidized was assumed to be 100 percent for petroleum, coal, and natural gas based on guidance in IPCC (2006) (see Annex 2.1 Methodology for Estimating Emissions of CO₂ from Fossil Fuel Combustion).

Step 4: Convert to CO₂ Emissions

Because the 2006 IPCC Guidelines recommend that countries report greenhouse gas emissions on a full molecular weight basis, the final step in estimating CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel consumption was converting from units of C to units of CO₂. Actual C emissions were multiplied by the molecular-to-atomic weight ratio of CO₂ to C (44/12) to obtain total CO₂ emitted from fossil fuel combustion in million metric tons (MMT). The results are contained in Table A-261.

Comparison Between Sectoral and Reference Approaches

These two alternative approaches can both produce reliable estimates that are comparable within a few percent. Note that the reference approach includes emissions from non-energy uses. Therefore, these totals should be compared to the aggregation of fuel use and emission totals from Emissions of CO₂ from Fossil Fuel Combustion and Carbon Emitted from Non-Energy Uses of Fossil Fuels Annexes. These two sections together are henceforth referred to as the Sectoral Approach. Other than this distinction, the major difference between methodologies employed by each approach lies in the energy data used to derive C emissions (i.e., the actual surveyed consumption for the Sectoral Approach versus apparent consumption derived for the Reference Approach). In theory, both approaches should yield identical results. In practice, however, slight discrepancies occur. An examination of past Common Reporting Format (CRF) table submissions during UNFCCC reviews has highlighted the need to further investigate these discrepancies. The investigation found that the most recent (two to three) inventory years tend to have larger differences in consumption and emissions estimates occurring earlier in the time series. This is a result of annual energy consumption data revisions in the EIA energy statistics, and the revisions

¹¹² Carbon coefficients from EIA were used wherever possible. Because EIA did not provide coefficients for coal, the IPCC-recommended emission factors were used in the top-down calculations for these fuels. See notes in Table A-261 for more specific source information.

have the greatest impact on the most recent few years of inventory estimates. As a result, the differences between the Sectoral and Reference Approach decrease and are resolved over time. For the United States, these differences are discussed below.

Differences in Total Amount of Energy Consumed

Table A-264 summarizes the differences between the Reference and Sectoral Approaches in estimating total energy consumption in the United States. Although theoretically the two methods should arrive at the same estimate for U.S. energy consumption, the Reference Approach provides an energy consumption total that is 1.5 percent lower than the Sectoral Approach for 2017. The greatest differences lie in lower estimates for coal and petroleum consumption for the Reference Approach (1.6 percent and 3.1 percent, respectively) and higher estimates for natural gas consumption for the Reference Approach (0.4 percent).

There are several potential sources for the discrepancies in consumption estimates:

- *Product Definitions.* The fuel categories in the Reference Approach are different from those used in the Sectoral Approach, particularly for petroleum. For example, the Reference Approach estimates apparent consumption for crude oil. Crude oil is not typically consumed directly, but refined into other products. As a result, the United States does not focus on estimating the energy content of the various grades of crude oil, but rather estimating the energy content of the various products resulting from crude oil refining. The United States does not believe that estimating apparent consumption for crude oil, and the resulting energy content of the crude oil, is the most reliable method for the United States to estimate its energy consumption. Other differences in product definitions include using sector-specific coal statistics in the Sectoral Approach (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial coking, industrial other, and transportation coal), while the Reference Approach characterizes coal by rank (i.e., anthracite, bituminous, etc.). Also, the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) statistics used in the bottom-up calculations are a composite category composed of natural gas liquids (NGL) and LPG.
- *Heat Equivalents.* It can be difficult to obtain heat equivalents for certain fuel types, particularly for categories such as "crude oil" where the key statistics are derived from thousands of producers in the United States and abroad.
- *Possible inconsistencies in U.S. Energy Data.* The United States has not focused its energy data collection efforts on obtaining the type of aggregated information used in the Reference Approach. Rather, the United States believes that its emphasis on collection of detailed energy consumption data is a more accurate methodology for the United States to obtain reliable energy data. Therefore, top-down statistics used in the Reference Approach may not be as accurately collected as bottom-up statistics applied to the Sectoral Approach.
- *Balancing Item.* The Reference Approach uses *apparent* consumption estimates while the Sectoral Approach uses *reported* consumption estimates. While these numbers should be equal, there always seems to be a slight difference that is often accounted for in energy statistics as a "balancing item."

Differences in Estimated CO₂ Emissions

Given these differences in energy consumption data, the next step for each methodology involved estimating emissions of CO₂. Table A-265 summarizes the differences between the two methods in estimated C emissions.

As mentioned above, for 2017, the Reference Approach resulted in a 1.5 percent lower estimate of energy consumption in the United States than the Sectoral Approach. The resulting emissions estimate for the Reference Approach was 1.4 percent lower. Estimates of natural gas emissions from the Reference Approach are higher (0.5 percent), and coal and petroleum emission estimates are lower (2.6 percent and 1.8 percent, respectively) than the Sectoral Approach. Potential reasons for these differences may include:

- *Product Definitions.* Coal data are aggregated differently in each methodology, as noted above. The format used for the Sectoral Approach likely results in more accurate estimates than in the Reference Approach. Also, the Reference Approach relies on a "crude oil" category for determining petroleum-related emissions. Given the many sources of crude oil in the United States, it is not an easy matter to track potential differences in C content between many different sources of crude; particularly since information on the C content of crude oil is not regularly collected.
- *Carbon Coefficients.* The Reference Approach relies on several default C coefficients by rank provided by IPCC (2006), while the Sectoral Approach uses annually updated category-specific coefficients by sector that are likely to be more accurate. Also, as noted above, the C coefficient for crude oil is more uncertain than that for specific secondary petroleum products, given the many sources and grades of crude oil consumed in the United States.

1 Although the two approaches produce similar results, the United States believes that the “bottom-up” Sectoral
2 Approach provides a more accurate assessment of CO₂ emissions at the fuel level. This improvement in accuracy is largely
3 a result of the data collection techniques used in the United States, where there has been more emphasis on obtaining the
4 detailed products-based information used in the Sectoral Approach than obtaining the aggregated energy flow data used in
5 the Reference Approach. The United States believes that it is valuable to understand both methods.

6 **References**

- 7 EIA (2018a) *Monthly Energy Review, October 2018*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.
8 Washington, D.C. DOE/EIA-0035(2018/10).
- 9 EIA (2018b) *Annual Coal Report 2017*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, D.C.
10 DOE/EIA-0584(2018).
- 11 EIA (1995-2017). *Petroleum Supply Annual*, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington,
12 DC, Volume I. DOE/EIA-0340.
- 13 EIA (1992). Coal and lignite production. *EIA State Energy Data Report 1992*, Energy Information Administration, U.S.
14 Department of Energy, Washington, DC.
- 15 EPA (2010). Carbon Content Coefficients Developed for EPA's Mandatory Reporting Rule. Office of Air and Radiation,
16 Office of Atmospheric Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
- 17 IPCC (2006). *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas
18 Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T., and Tanabe K. (eds.). Published: IGES, Japan.
- 19 SAIC (2004). Analysis prepared by Science Applications International Corporation for EPA, Office of Air and Radiation,
20 Market Policies Branch.
- 21 USGS (1998). *CoalQual Database Version 2.0*, U.S. Geological Survey.

1 **Table A-258: 2017 U.S. Energy Statistics (Physical Units)**

Fuel Category (Units)	Fuel Type	Production	Imports	Exports	Stock Change	Adjustment	Bunkers	U.S. Territories
Solid Fuels (Thousand Short Tons)	Anthracite Coal	1,912	[1]	[1]	[1]			
	Bituminous Coal	353,520	[1]	[1]	[1]			
	Sub-bituminous Coal	351,502	[1]	[1]	[1]	367		
	Lignite	67,675	[1]	[1]	[1]	4,746		
	Coke		58	1,209	(21)			
	Unspecified Coal		7,777	96,953	(29,451)	3,031		1,963
Gas Fuels (Million Cubic Feet)	Natural Gas	26,981,637	3,042,391	3,167,857	(254,100)	339,728		55,000
Liquid Fuels (Thousand Barrels)	Crude Oil	3,413,376	2,908,670	422,518	(95,227)			
	Nat Gas Liquids and Liquefied Refinery Gases	1,380,702	71,427	512,495	(10,191)			4,005
	Other Liquids	0	471,784	171,592	8,685			
	Motor Gasoline	27,566	11,784	273,483	(3,860)	237,215		34,263
	Aviation Gasoline		165	0	47			
	Kerosene		1,429	2,267	10			411
	Jet Fuel		58,273	67,161	(1,706)		181,199	8,044
	Distillate Fuel		54,975	504,155	(20,457)	104	13,526	18,586
	Residual Fuel		69,015	112,240	(12,098)	9,000	70,833	20,195
	Naphtha for petrochemical feedstocks		11,373	0	(162)			
	Petroleum Coke		3,662	215,873	1,536	12,304		
	Other Oil for petrochemical feedstocks		4,323	0	(195)	1,240		
	Special Naphthas		5,405	0	(26)			
	Lubricants		14,901	36,215	(347)			172
	Waxes		1,724	1,479	184			
	Asphalt/Road Oil		13,666	7,399	(1,184)			
	Still Gas		0	0	0			
	Misc. Products		64	279	(11)			13,144

[1] Included in Unspecified Coal

Note: Parentheses indicate negative values.

Sources: Solid and Gas Fuels: EIA (2018a and 2018b); Liquid Fuels: EIA (1995-2017).

1 **Table A-259: Conversion Factors to Energy Units (Heat Equivalents)**

Fuel Category (Units)	Fuel Type	Production	Imports	Exports	Stock Change	Adjustment	Bunkers	U.S. Territories
Solid Fuels (Million Btu/Short Ton)	Anthracite Coal	22.57						
	Bituminous Coal	23.89						
	Sub-bituminous Coal	17.14				28.16		
	Lignite	12.87				12.87		
	Coke		21.48	24.63	21.48			
	Unspecified		25.00	25.97	20.86	140.86		25.14
Natural Gas (BTU/Cubic Foot)		1,036	1,025	1,009	1,036	1,036		1,036
Liquid Fuels (Million Btu/Barrel)	Crude Oil	5.72	6.05	5.74	5.74		5.74	5.74
	Nat Gas Liquids and Liquefied Refinery Gases	3.70	3.70	3.70	3.70		3.70	3.70
	Other Liquids	5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83		5.83	5.83
	Motor Gasoline	5.06	5.06	5.06	5.06	5.06	5.06	5.06
	Aviation Gasoline		5.05	5.05	5.05		5.05	5.05
	Kerosene		5.67	5.67	5.67		5.67	5.67
	Jet Fuel		5.67	5.67	5.67		5.80	5.67
	Distillate Fuel		5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83
	Residual Oil		6.29	6.29	6.29	6.29	6.29	6.29
	Naphtha for petrochemical feedstocks		5.25	5.25	5.25		5.25	5.25
	Petroleum Coke		6.02	6.02	6.02	6.02	6.02	6.02
	Other Oil for petrochemical feedstocks		5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83	5.83
	Special Naphthas		5.25	5.25	5.25		5.25	5.25
	Lubricants		6.07	6.07	6.07		6.07	6.07
	Waxes		5.54	5.54	5.54		5.54	5.54
	Asphalt/Road Oil		6.64	6.64	6.64		6.64	6.64
	Still Gas		6.00	6.00	6.00		6.00	6.00
	Misc. Products		5.80	5.80	5.80		5.80	5.80

2 Sources: Coal and lignite production: EIA (1992); Unspecified Solid Fuels, Coke, Natural Gas and Petroleum Products: EIA (1995-2017).

3

1 **Table A-260: 2017 Apparent Consumption of Fossil Fuels (TBtu)**

Fuel Category	Fuel Type	Production	Imports	Exports	Stock Change	Adjustment	Bunkers	U.S. Territories	Apparent Consumption
Solid Fuels	Anthracite Coal	43.2							43.2
	Bituminous Coal	8,445.6							8,445.6
	Sub-bituminous Coal	6,024.8				10.3			6,014.4
	Lignite	870.7				61.1			809.6
	Coke		1.2	29.8	(0.5)				(28.1)
	Unspecified		194.4	2,518.1	(614.4)	427.9		49.3	(2,087.8)
Gas Fuels	Natural Gas	27,953.0	3,118.5	3,196.4	(263.2)	351.8		57.0	27,843.5
Liquid Fuels	Crude Oil	19,534.8	17,597.5	2,424.4	(546.4)				35,254.2
	Nat Gas Liquids and Liquefied Refinery Gases	5,107.2	264.2	1,895.7	(37.7)			14.8	3,528.2
	Other Liquids		2,748.1	999.5	50.6				1,698.0
	Motor Gasoline	139.3	59.6	1,382.5	(19.5)			173.2	(990.8)
	Aviation Gasoline		0.8	0.2	0.2				0.4
	Kerosene		8.1	12.9	0.1			2.3	(2.5)
	Jet Fuel		330.4	380.8	(9.7)		1,050.2	45.6	(1,045.4)
	Distillate Fuel		320.2	2,936.7	(119.2)	0.6	78.8	108.3	(2,468.4)
	Residual Oil		433.9	705.7	(76.1)	56.6	445.3	127.0	(570.6)
	Naphtha for petrochemical feedstocks		59.7		(0.9)				60.5
	Petroleum Coke		22.1	1,300.4	9.3	74.1			(1,361.7)
	Other Oil for petrochemical feedstocks		25.2		(1.1)	7.2			19.1
	Special Naphthas		28.4		(0.1)				28.5
	Lubricants		90.4	219.6	(2.1)			1.0	(126.1)
	Waxes		9.5	8.2	1.0				0.3
	Asphalt/Road Oil		90.7	49.1	(7.9)				49.4
	Still Gas								
	Misc. Products		0.4	1.6	(0.1)			76.2	75.0
Total		68,118.5	25,403.2	18,061.5	(1,637.6)	989.6	1,574.4	654.7	75,188.5

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-261: 2017 Potential CO₂ Emissions

Fuel Category	Fuel Type	Apparent Consumption (QBtu)	Carbon Coefficients (MMT Carbon/QBtu)	Potential Emissions (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Solid Fuels	Anthracite Coal	0.04	28.28	4.5
	Bituminous Coal	8.45	25.45	788.0
	Sub-bituminous Coal	6.01	26.22	578.3
	Lignite	0.81	26.68	79.2
	Coke	(0.03)	31.00	(3.2)
	Unspecified	(2.09)	25.34	(194.0)
Gas Fuels	Natural Gas	27.84	14.46	1,475.8
Liquid Fuels	Crude Oil	35.25	20.31	2,624.8
	Nat Gas Liquids and LRGs	3.53	16.84	217.8
	Other Liquids	1.70	20.31	126.4
	Motor Gasoline	(0.99)	19.46	(70.7)
	Aviation Gasoline	0.00	18.86	0.0
	Kerosene	(0.00)	19.96	(0.2)
	Jet Fuel	(1.05)	19.70	(75.5)
	Distillate Fuel	(2.47)	20.17	(182.6)
	Residual Oil	(0.57)	20.48	(42.9)
	Naphtha for petrochemical feedstocks	0.06	18.55	4.1
	Petroleum Coke	(1.36)	27.85	(139.0)
	Other Oil for petrochemical feedstocks	0.02	20.17	1.4
	Special Naphthas	0.03	19.74	2.1
	Lubricants	(0.13)	20.20	(9.3)
	Waxes	0.00	19.80	0.0
	Asphalt/Road Oil	0.05	20.55	3.7
	Still Gas		18.20	
	Misc. Products	0.08	20.31	5.6
Total				5,194.4

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

Sources: C content coefficients by coal rank from USGS (1998), SAIC (2004), and EIA (2018b); Unspecified Solid Fuels, EIA (1995-2017), Natural Gas and Liquid Fuels: EPA (2010).

Table A-262: 2017 Non-Energy Carbon Stored in Products

Fuel Type	Consumption for Non-Energy Use (TBtu)	Carbon Coefficients (MMT Carbon/QBtu)	Carbon Content (MMT Carbon)	Fraction Sequestered	Carbon Stored (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)
Coal	125.7	31.00	3.93	0.10	2.1
Natural Gas	306.9	14.46	4.44	0.67	10.9
Asphalt & Road Oil	849.2	20.55	17.45	1.00	63.7
LPG	2,186.8	17.06	37.31	0.67	92.0
Lubricants	267.9	20.20	5.41	0.09	1.8
Pentanes Plus	81.5	19.10	1.56	0.67	3.8
Petrochemical Feedstocks	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	37.9
Petroleum Coke	0.0	27.85	0.00	0.30	0.0
Special Naphtha	94.9	19.74	1.87	0.67	4.6

Waxes/Misc.	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	0.6
Misc. U.S. Territories Petroleum	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	0.6
Total					218.1

[1] Values for Misc. U.S. Territories Petroleum, Petrochemical Feedstocks and Waxes/Misc. are not shown because these categories are aggregates of numerous smaller components.
Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-263: 2017 Reference Approach CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Consumption (MMT CO₂ Eq. unless otherwise noted)

Fuel Category	Potential Emissions	Carbon Sequestered	Net Emissions	Fraction Oxidized	Total Emissions
Coal	1,252.8	2.1	1,250.7	100.0%	1,250.7
Petroleum	2,465.8	205.0	2,260.8	100.0%	2,260.8
Natural Gas	1,475.8	10.9	1,464.8	100.0%	1,464.8
Total	5,194.4	218.1	4,976.4		4,976.4

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-264: Fuel Consumption in the United States by Estimating Approach (Tbtu)^a

Approach	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Sectoral	69,703	74,898	82,514	83,881	81,170	76,398	78,902	77,498	75,701	77,774	78,450	77,539	76,799	76,372
Coal	18,072	19,187	21,748	22,067	21,753	19,231	20,267	19,071	16,827	17,452	17,370	15,041	13,784	13,417
Natural Gas	19,168	22,170	23,392	23,371	23,594	23,193	24,312	24,679	25,832	26,560	27,141	27,932	28,152	27,731
Petroleum	32,463	33,542	37,374	38,443	35,823	33,974	34,323	33,748	33,042	33,762	33,939	34,567	34,863	35,224
Reference (Apparent)	68,725	74,013	81,518	83,885	80,391	76,424	77,847	76,423	75,523	76,192	76,900	76,114	75,227	75,189
Coal	17,573	18,567	20,957	21,577	21,391	19,243	19,620	18,756	16,642	17,097	17,210	14,796	13,548	13,197
Natural Gas	19,276	22,274	23,484	23,441	23,666	23,277	24,409	24,778	25,924	26,637	27,225	28,011	28,236	27,843
Petroleum	31,877	33,172	37,076	38,867	35,334	33,904	33,818	32,889	32,957	32,458	32,465	33,307	33,444	34,148
Difference	-1.4%	-1.2%	-1.2%	0.0%	-1.0%	0.0%	-1.3%	-1.4%	-0.2%	-2.0%	-2.0%	-1.8%	-2.0%	-1.5%
Coal	-2.8%	-3.2%	-3.6%	-2.2%	-1.7%	0.1%	-3.2%	-1.7%	-1.1%	-2.0%	-0.9%	-1.6%	-1.7%	-1.6%
Natural Gas	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Petroleum	-1.8%	-1.1%	-0.8%	1.1%	-1.4%	-0.2%	-1.5%	-2.5%	-0.3%	-3.9%	-4.3%	-3.6%	-4.1%	-3.1%

^a Includes U.S. Territories. Does not include international bunker fuels.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Table A-265: CO₂ Emissions from Fossil Fuel Combustion by Estimating Approach (MMT CO₂ Eq.)^a

Approach	1990	1995	2000	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Sectoral	4,859	5,166	5,731	5,873	5,687	5,297	5,471	5,337	5,135	5,281	5,322	5,178	5,079	5,045
Coal	1,719	1,823	2,071	2,106	2,076	1,836	1,935	1,822	1,609	1,668	1,659	1,439	1,318	1,284
Natural Gas	1,006	1,164	1,227	1,231	1,243	1,221	1,277	1,297	1,357	1,397	1,427	1,469	1,479	1,458
Petroleum	2,134	2,179	2,432	2,537	2,369	2,241	2,259	2,218	2,169	2,217	2,235	2,270	2,281	2,303
Reference (Apparent)	4,794	5,132	5,683	5,888	5,653	5,330	5,407	5,280	5,146	5,183	5,227	5,093	4,988	4,976
Coal	1,654	1,756	1,988	2,053	2,036	1,831	1,867	1,789	1,586	1,628	1,640	1,411	1,289	1,251
Natural Gas	1,013	1,170	1,233	1,235	1,247	1,226	1,283	1,303	1,363	1,401	1,432	1,473	1,485	1,465
Petroleum	2,127	2,206	2,461	2,600	2,370	2,273	2,256	2,188	2,196	2,153	2,156	2,209	2,214	2,261
Difference	-1.3%	-0.7%	-0.8%	0.3%	-0.6%	0.6%	-1.2%	-1.1%	0.2%	-1.9%	-1.8%	-1.6%	-1.8%	-1.4%
Coal	-3.8%	-3.7%	-4.0%	-2.5%	-1.9%	-0.2%	-3.5%	-1.8%	-1.4%	-2.4%	-1.2%	-1.9%	-2.3%	-2.6%
Natural Gas	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
Petroleum	-0.3%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	0.1%	1.4%	-0.1%	-1.4%	1.3%	-2.8%	-3.5%	-2.7%	-2.9%	-1.8%

^a Includes U.S. Territories. Does not include international bunker fuels.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

ANNEX 5 Assessment of the Sources and Sinks of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Not Included

Although this report is intended to be a comprehensive assessment of anthropogenic¹¹³ sources and sinks of greenhouse gas emissions for the United States, certain sources have been identified but not included in the estimates presented for various reasons. Before discussing these sources and sinks, it is important to note that processes or activities that are not *anthropogenic in origin* or do not result in a *net source or sink* of greenhouse gas emissions are intentionally excluded from a national inventory of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, in line with guidance from the IPCC in their guidelines for national inventories.

The anthropogenic source and sink category of greenhouse gas emissions described in this annex are not included in the United States national inventory estimates. The reasons for not including that source in the national greenhouse gas Inventory include one or more of the following:

- Emissions are not likely to occur within the United States.
- A methodology for estimating emissions from a source does not currently exist.
- Though an estimating method has been developed, adequate data are not available to estimate emissions.
- Emissions are determined to be insignificant in terms of overall national emissions, as defined per UNFCCC reporting guidelines, based on available data or a preliminary assessment of significance. Further, data collection to estimate emissions would require disproportionate amount of effort (e.g., dependent on additional resources and impacting improvements to key categories, etc.).

In general, data availability remains the main constraint for estimating and including the emissions and removals from source and sink categories discussed below. Methods to estimate emissions and removals from these categories were introduced with *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Also, many of the categories discussed are determined to be insignificant in terms of overall national emissions based on qualitative information on activity levels per national circumstances, expert judgment, and available proxy information, and not including them introduces a very minor bias.

Reporting of inventories to the UNFCCC under Decision 24/CP.19 requests “Where methodological or data gaps in inventories exist, information on these gaps should be presented in a transparent manner.” Furthermore, these revised reporting guidelines allow a country to indicate that a disproportionate amount of effort would be required to collect data for a gas from a specific category that would be insignificant in terms of the overall level and trend in national emissions.¹¹⁴ Specifically, where the notation key “NE,” meaning not estimated, is used in the Common Reporting Format (CRF)¹¹⁵ tables that accompany this Inventory report submission to the UNFCCC, countries are required to describe why such emissions or removals have not been estimated (UNFCCC 2013).

Based on the latest UNFCCC reporting guidance, the United States is providing more information on the significance of these excluded categories below and aims to update information on the significance to the extent feasible during the annual compilation cycle. Data constraints may impact the feasibility of undertaking a quantitative significance assessment. The United States is continually working to improve the understanding of such sources or sinks and seeking to find the data required to estimate related emissions, prioritizing efforts and resources for significant categories. As such improvements are implemented, new emission and removal categories will be quantified and included in the Inventory to enhance completeness of the Inventory.

The full list of sources and sink categories not estimated, along with explanations for their exclusion, is provided in Table 9 of the CRF submission. Information on coverage of activities within the United States and its territories is provided within the sectoral chapters and category-specific estimate discussions and will be updated in this Annex in the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission).

¹¹³ The term “anthropogenic,” in this context, refers to greenhouse gas emissions and removals that are a direct result of human activities or are the result of natural processes that have been affected by human activities (*2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*).

¹¹⁴ Paragraph 37(b) of Decision 24/CP.19 “Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention.” See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf>>.

¹¹⁵ See <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/reporting_requirements/items/2759.php>.

Source and Sink Categories Not Estimated – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

The following section is arranged by sector and source or sink category, providing additional information on the reasons the category was not estimated.

Energy

CRF Category 1.A.3: CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Transport Fuel Combustion—Biomass

Emissions from biomass fuel use in domestic aviation (1.A.3.a), motorcycles (1.A.3.b), railways (1.A.3.c), and domestic navigation (1.A.3.d) are not currently estimated. EPA has determined that the use of biodiesel in rail and navigation was likely insignificant, and there are not readily available data sources to estimate biodiesel consumption from these sources.

Emissions from ethanol mixed with gasoline in low blends are included in the on-road gasoline emissions for motorcycles. If there is any use of high blend ethanol fuel in motorcycles, it is likely insignificant.

Prior to 2011, no biobased jet fuel was assumed to be used for domestic aviation. Between 2011 and 2015, 22 airlines have performed over 2,500 commercial passenger flights with blends of up to 50 percent biojet fuel. Furthermore, several airlines have concluded long-term offtake agreements with biofuel suppliers.¹¹⁶ An analysis was conducted based on the total annual volumes of fuels specified in the long-term agreements. Emissions of N₂O were estimated based on the factors for jet fuel combustion, and as for jet fuel use in commercial aircraft, contributions of methane (CH₄) emissions are reported as zero. It was determined that annual non-CO₂ greenhouse gas emissions from the volume of fuel used would be 16.4 kt CO₂ Eq. per year, well below 500 kt CO₂ Eq. per year and considered insignificant for the purposes of inventory reporting under the UNFCCC.

CRF Category 1.A.3.e.i: CO₂ Emissions from Liquid Fuels in Other Transportation—Pipeline Transport

Use of liquid fuels to power pipeline pumps is uncommon, but does occur. Data on use of these fuels are currently unavailable to characterize this activity. Data for fuel used in various activities including pipelines are based on survey data conducted by the U.S. Energy Information Association (EIA). In 1981, EIA eliminated the requirement to report crude oil use in pipelines or burned on leases as either distillate or residual fuel oil. It would require a disproportionate level of effort to change existing surveys to collect this data given this is not a significant activity.

CRF Category 1.A.3.e.ii: CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Biomass in Other Transportation—Non-Transportation Mobile

Biomass based fuels used in non-transportation mobile applications are currently not estimated. The use of biofuels in non-transportation mobile applications is insignificant and there are no readily available data sources to estimate it.

CRF Category 1.A.5.a: CO₂ Emissions from Non-Hazardous Industrial Waste Incineration and Medical Waste Incineration

Waste incineration of the municipal waste stream and hazardous waste incineration of fossil fuel-derived materials are reported in two sections of the Energy chapter of the Inventory, specifically in the section on CO₂ emissions from waste incineration, and in the calculation of emissions and storage from non-energy uses of fossil fuels.

Two additional categories of waste incineration that are not directly included in our calculations are industrial non-hazardous waste and medical waste incineration. Data are not readily available for these sources.

In the calculation of emissions and storage from non-energy uses of fossil fuels, there is an energy recovery component that includes emissions from waste gas; waste oils, tars, and related materials from the industrial sector. While this is not a comprehensive inclusion of non-hazardous industrial waste, it does capture a subset.

Furthermore, a conservative analysis was conducted based on a study of hospital/medical/infectious waste incinerator (HMIWI) facilities in the United States¹¹⁷ showing that medical waste incineration emissions could be considered insignificant. The analysis was based on assuming the total amount of annual waste throughput was of fossil origin and an

¹¹⁶ See : <https://www.iata.org/pressroom/facts_figures/fact_sheets/Documents/fact-sheet-alternative-fuels.pdf>.

¹¹⁷ RTI 2009. Updated Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator (HMIWI) Inventory Database.

1 assumption of 68.9 percent carbon composition of the waste. It was determined that annual greenhouse gas emissions for
2 medical waste incineration are ~333 kt CO₂ Eq. per year, below 500 kt CO₂ Eq. per year and considered insignificant for the
3 purposes of inventory reporting under the UNFCCC.¹¹⁸

4 **CRF Category 1.A.5.a: CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Stationary Fuel Combustion—Biomass in U.S. Territories**

5 Data are not available to estimate emissions from biomass in U.S. Territories. However, biomass consumption is
6 likely small in comparison with other fuel types, and therefore CH₄ and N₂O emissions are considered insignificant.

7 **CRF Category 1.B.1.a.1.i: CO₂ from Fugitive Emissions from Underground Coal Mining Activities and Post-Mining** 8 **Activities**

9 A preliminary analysis by EPA determined that CO₂ emissions for active underground coal mining activities are
10 negligible. Applying a CO₂ emission rate as a percentage of CH₄ emissions for active coal mines results in a national
11 emission estimate below 500 kt CO₂ Eq. per year or 0.05 percent of national emissions. Future inventories may quantify
12 these emissions, if it is deemed it will not require a disproportionate amount of effort.

13 **CRF Category 1.B.1.a.1.iii: CO₂ from Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines**

14 A preliminary analysis by EPA determined that CO₂ emissions for abandoned underground coal mining activities
15 are negligible. Applying a CO₂ emission rate as a percentage of CH₄ emissions for abandoned coal mines results in a national
16 emission estimate below 500 kt CO₂ Eq. per year or 0.05 percent of national emissions. Future inventories may quantify
17 these emissions, if it is deemed it will not require a disproportionate amount of effort.

18 **CRF Category 1.B.1.a.2.i: CO₂ from Fugitive Emissions from Surface Coal Mining Activities**

19 A preliminary analysis by EPA determined that CO₂ emissions for active surface coal mining activities are
20 negligible. Applying a CO₂ emission rate as a percentage of CH₄ emissions for active coal mines results in a national
21 emission estimate below 500 kt CO₂ Eq. per year or 0.05 percent of national emissions. Future inventories may quantify
22 these emissions, if it is deemed it will not require a disproportionate amount of effort. While CH₄ recovery projects were
23 operating at surface mines from 2006 to 2010, the avoided emissions were so small that they were not included in the
24 Inventory estimates.

25 **CRF Category 1.B.2.a.3: CO₂ from Fugitive Emissions from the Transport of Oil**

26 Based on a preliminary analysis, EPA determined that CO₂ emissions from the transport of oil are negligible.
27 Assuming the same CO₂ content as gas from post-separator whole crude and applying this to the CH₄ estimates from
28 transport of oil results in a national emission estimate of 1.2 kt, significantly less than 0.05 percent of national emissions.

29 **CRF Category 1.B.2.a.5: CO₂ and CH₄ from Fugitive Emissions from the Distribution of Oil**

30 Emissions from the distribution of oil products are not currently estimated due to lack of available emission factors.

31 **CRF Category 1.B.2.c.2: N₂O from Fugitive Emissions from Venting and Flaring**

32 Data are currently not available to estimate N₂O emissions from venting and flaring from oil production, natural
33 gas production, and combined oil and natural gas production. EPA is assessing whether data may be available to include
34 this in future inventories.

35 **Industrial Processes and Product Use**

36 **CRF Category 2.A.4.a: CO₂ Emissions from Process Uses of Carbonates—Ceramics**

37 Data are not currently available to estimate emissions from this source. During the Expert Review Period of the
38 current Inventory report, EPA sought expert solicitation on data for carbonate consumption in the ceramics industry but has
39 yet to identify data sources to apply Tier 1 methods.

¹¹⁸ Paragraph 37(b) of Decision 24/CP.19 "Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention." See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf>>.

CRF Category 2.A.4.c: CO₂ Emissions from Process Uses of Carbonates–Non-metallurgical Magnesium Production

Data are not currently available to estimate emissions from this source. During the Expert Review Period of the current Inventory report, EPA sought expert solicitation on data for non-metallurgical magnesium production but has yet to identify data sources to apply Tier 1 methods.

CRF Category 2.B.4.b: CO₂ and N₂O Emissions from Glyoxal Production

Current and historical glyoxal production data are not readily available to estimate emissions from this source. EPA is conducting basic outreach to relevant trade associations and reviewing potential databases that can be purchased and contain the necessary data. Progress on outreach will be included in next Inventory (i.e., 1990 through 2017 report).

CRF Category 2.B.4.c: CO₂ and N₂O Emissions from Glyoxylic Acid Production

Current and historical glyoxylic acid production data are currently not available to estimate emissions from this source. EPA is conducting basic outreach to relevant trade associations reviewing potential databases that can be purchased and contain the necessary data. Progress on outreach will be included in next Inventory (i.e., 1990 through 2017 report).

CRF Category 2.C.1.c: CH₄ Emissions from Direct Reduced Iron (DRI) Production

Data on fuel consumption used in the production of DRI are not readily available to apply the IPCC default Tier 1 CH₄ emission factor or develop any proxy analysis. The emissions are assumed to be insignificant but this analysis will be updated in future Inventory submissions to quantitatively justify emissions reporting as “not estimated.” These emissions are not reported to EPA through the facility-level mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP).

CRF Category 2.E.2, 2.E.3, and 2.E.4: Fluorinated Gas Emissions from Electronics Industry—TFT Flat Panel Displays, Photovoltaics, and Heat Transfer Fluid

In addition to requiring reporting of emissions from semiconductor manufacturing, EPA’s GHGRP requires the reporting of emissions from other types of electronics manufacturing, including micro-electro-mechanical systems (MEMs), flat panel displays, and photovoltaic cells. There currently are seven MEMs manufacturers (most of which report emissions for semiconductor and MEMs manufacturing separately), one photovoltaic cell manufacturer, and no flat panel displays manufacturing facilities reporting to EPA’s GHGRP. Emissions from MEMs and photovoltaic cell manufacturing could be included in totals in future Inventory reports – currently they are not represented in inventory emissions totals for electronics manufacturing. These emissions could be estimated for the full time series (including prior to the GHGRP) and for MEMS and photovoltaic cell manufacturers that are not reporting to the GHGRP; however, at this time the contribution to total emissions is not significant enough to warrant the development of the methodologies that would be necessary to backcast these emissions to 1990 and estimate emissions for non-reporters for 2011 through 2016. The emissions reported by facilities manufacturing MEMs ranged from 0.0045 to 0.0185 MMT CO₂ Eq. from 2011 to 2016; they were equivalent to 0.0001 percent to 0.0003 percent of U.S. total emissions in 2011 to 2016. Similarly, emissions from manufacturing of photovoltaic cells were equivalent to only 0.0001 percent and 0.0002 percent of U.S. total emissions in 2015 and 2016, respectively.

Agriculture

CRF Category 3.A.4: CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation—Camels

Enteric fermentation emissions from camels are not estimated because there is no significant population of camels in the United States. A Tier 1 estimate of enteric fermentation CH₄ emissions from camels results in a value of approximately 2.8 kt CO₂ Eq. per year from 1990 to 2016. Due to limited data availability (no population data is available from the Agricultural Census), the estimates are based on use of IPCC defaults and population data from Baum, Doug (2010).¹¹⁹

CRF Category 3.A.4: CH₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation—Poultry

No IPCC method has been developed for determining enteric fermentation CH₄ emissions from poultry. Based on expert input, developing of a country-specific method would require a disproportionate amount of resources given the magnitude of this source category.

¹¹⁹ *The status of the camel in the United States and America*. Available online at: <<https://www.soas.ac.uk/camelconference2011/file84331.pdf>>.

CRF Category 3.B.4: CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Manure Management—Camels

Manure management emissions from camels are not estimated because there is no significant population of camels in the United States.¹²⁰ A Tier 1 estimate of manure management CH₄ and N₂O emissions from camels results in values between approximately 0.14 kt CO₂ Eq. per year from 1990 to 2016. This is significantly less than 0.05 percent of national emissions. Due to limited data availability (i.e., no population data is available from the Agricultural Census), this estimate is based on population data from Baum, Doug (2010).¹²¹

CRF Category 3.F.1.2: CH₄ and N₂O Emissions from Field Burning of Agricultural Residues—Barley, Oats, Rye, Potatoes

There is no significant burning of barley, oats, rye, and potatoes in the United States, based on analysis of remote sensing data, and therefore emissions from field burning of agricultural residues from these crops are not currently estimated. Additional analyses will be conducted to quantitatively justify emissions reporting as “not estimated” and considered insignificant following a new analysis of fire products based on LandSat and MODIS imagery. These analyses are underway and will be completed for the next Inventory.

Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry

CRF Category 4.A.1: Emissions from Rewetted Organic Soils in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*

Emissions from this source will be estimated in future Inventories when data necessary for classifying the area of rewetted organic soils become available. Work is underway to assemble these data in collaboration with the U.S. Geological Survey, which has developed a surface water layer remote sensing product spanning the inventory time series that can be combined with soil maps to identify areas where organic soils have been drained and then rewetted.

CRF Category 4.A.1: Direct N₂O Emissions from N mineralization/immobilization in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*

Direct N₂O emissions from N mineralization/immobilization will be estimated in a future Inventory. They are not estimated currently because resources have limited EPA’s ability to utilize the available data on soil carbon stock changes on forest lands to estimate these emissions.

CRF Category 4.B.1: Carbon Stock Change in Living Biomass in *Cropland Remaining Cropland*

Carbon stock change in living biomass is not estimated because data are currently not available. The impact of management on biomass C is currently under investigation for agroforestry management and will be included in a future Inventory if stock changes are significant and activity data can be compiled for this source.

CRF Category 4.B.2: Carbon Stock Change in Living Biomass in *Grassland Converted to Cropland*

Carbon stock change in living biomass is not estimated because data are currently not available. Similar to CRF Category 4.B.1, the impact of biomass C is under investigation for agroforestry and will be included in a future Inventory if significant and activity data can be compiled.

CRF Category 4.C.1: Carbon Stock Change in Living Biomass in *Grassland Remaining Grassland*

Carbon stock change in living biomass is not estimated because data are currently not available. Woodlands occur in grasslands because these areas do not meet the definition of forest lands. A method is under development to estimate the C stock changes for these areas, particularly in the Western United States, and will be include in a future Inventory (see Planned Improvements of Section 6.6 of *Grassland Remaining Grassland* and Box 6-8).

¹²⁰ Paragraph 37(b) of Decision 24/CP.19 “Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention.” See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf>>.

¹²¹ *The status of the camel in the United States and America*. Available online at: <<https://www.soas.ac.uk/camelconference2011/file84331.pdf>>.

Waste

CRF Category 5.D.2: N₂O Emissions from Wastewater Treatment and Discharge—Industrial Wastewater

Nitrous oxide emissions from stand-alone industrial wastewater treatment are not currently estimated. Per section 6.3.4 of *2006 IPCC Guidelines*: “The methodology does not include N₂O emissions from industrial sources, except for industrial wastewater that is co-discharged with domestic wastewater into the sewer system. The N₂O emissions from industrial sources are believed to be insignificant compared to emissions from domestic wastewater.”

A summary of these exclusions, including the estimated level of emissions where feasible, is included in Table A-266.

Table A-266: Summary of Sources and Sinks Not Included in the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2016 – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

CRF Category Number	Source/Sink Category	Sub-Category	Gas(es)	Estimated 2016 Emissions (kt CO ₂ Eq.)	Reason for Exclusion
Energy					
1.A Fossil Fuel Combustion					
1.A.3.a	Transport	Domestic Aviation-Biomass	CH ₄ and N ₂ O	16.4	Data availability
1.A.3.b	Transport	Motorcycles-Biomass	CH ₄ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
1.A.3.c	Transport	Railways-Biomass	CH ₄ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
1.A.3.d	Transport	Domestic Navigation-Biomass	CH ₄ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
1.A.3.e.i	Other Transportation	Pipeline Transport	CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
1.A.3.e.ii	Other Transportation	Non-Transportation Mobile-Biomass	CH ₄ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
1.A.5.a	Incineration of Waste	Non-Hazardous Industrial Waste Incineration and Medical Waste Incineration	CO ₂	333	Data availability
1.A.5.a	Stationary Fuel Combustion	Biomass in U.S. Territories	CH ₄ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
1.B Fugitive Emissions from Fuels					
1.B.1.a.1	Underground Mines	Fugitive Emissions from Underground Coal Mining Activities and Post-Mining Activities	CO ₂	<500	Emissions negligible
1.B.1.a.1.iii	Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	Fugitive Emissions from Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CO ₂	<500	Emissions negligible
1.B.1.a.2	Surface Mines	Fugitive Emissions from Surface Coal Mining Activities and Post-Mining Activities	CO ₂	<500	Emissions negligible
1.B.2.a.3	Oil and Natural Gas	Fugitive Emissions from the Transport of Oil	CO ₂	1.2	Emissions negligible
1.B.2.a.5	Oil	Distribution of Oil Products	CH ₄	NA	Lack of emission factor data
1.B.2.c.2	Venting and Flaring	Fugitive Emissions from Venting and Flaring from oil production, natural gas production, and combined oil and natural gas production	N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
Industrial Processes and Product Use					
2.A Mineral Industry					
2.A.4.a	Other Process Uses of Carbonates	Ceramics	CO ₂	NA	Data availability
2.A.4.c	Other Process Uses of Carbonates	Non-metallurgical Magnesium Production	CO ₂	NA	Data availability
2.B. Chemical Industry					
2.B.4.b	Glyoxal Production		CO ₂ and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
2.B.4.c	Glyoxylic Acid Production		CO ₂ and CH ₄	NA	Data availability
2.C. Metal Industry					
2.C.1.c	Iron and Steel Production	Direct Reduced Iron (DRI) Production	CH ₄	NA	Data availability

2.E Electronics Industry					
2.E.2	Fluorinated Gas Emissions from Electronics Industry	TFT Flat Panel Displays	HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆ , and NF ₃	NA	Data availability
2.E.3	Fluorinated Gas Emissions from Electronics Industry	Photovoltaics	HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆ , and NF ₃	7	Data availability
2.E.5	Fluorinated Gas Emissions from Electronics Industry	MEMs	HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆ , and NF ₃	19	Data availability
2.G Other					
2.G.2	Other Product Manufacture and Use	SF ₆ and PFCs from Other Product Use	SF ₆ and PFCs	NA	Data availability
Agriculture					
3.A Livestock					
3.A.4	Enteric Fermentation	Camels	CH ₄	<2.8	No significant camel population in U.S. 2006 IPCC Guidelines do not provide a method. No significant camel population in U.S.
3.A.4	Enteric Fermentation	Poultry	CH ₄	NA	
3.B.4	Manure Management	Camels	CH ₄ , N ₂ O	<0.14	
3.F Field Burning of Agricultural Residues					
3.F.1.2	Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	Barley, Oats, Rye, Potatoes	CH ₄ , N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry					
4.A Forest Land					
4.A.1	Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	Emissions from Rewetted Organic Soils	CH ₄	NA	Data availability
4.A.1	Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	N mineralization/immobilization	N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
4.A.2	Land Converted to Forest Land	Carbon Stock Change in Organic Soils	CO ₂	NA	Data availability
4.B Cropland					
4.B.1	Cropland Remaining Cropland	Carbon Stock Change in Living Biomass	CO ₂	NA	Data availability
4.B.2	Grassland Converted to Cropland	Carbon Stock Change in Living Biomass	CO ₂	NA	Data availability
4.C Grassland					
4.C.1	Grassland Remaining Grassland	Biomass Burning: Controlled Burning, Wildfires	CO ₂	NA	Emissions not estimated with the Tier 1 method. Emissions not estimated with the Tier 1 method.
4.C.2	Land Converted to Grassland	Biomass Burning: Controlled Burning, Wildfires	CO ₂	NA	
4.D Wetlands					
4.D.1	Wetlands Remaining Wetlands	Biomass Burning: Controlled Burning, Wildfires	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability

4.D.2	Land Converted to Wetlands	Biomass Burning: Controlled Burning, Wildfires	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
4.E Settlements					
4.E	Settlements	Biomass Burning Settlements	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
4.E.1	Settlements	Settlements Remaining Settlements	CH ₄	NA	Data availability
4.E.1	Settlements Remaining Settlements	Direct N ₂ O Emissions from N Mineralization/Immobilization (Mineral Soils)	N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
4.E.2	Land Converted to Settlements	Direct N ₂ O Emissions from N Mineralization/Immobilization	N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
4.F Other Land					
4.F	Biomass Burning	Other Land	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	NA	Data availability
Waste					
5.D Wastewater Treatment					
5.D.2	Industrial Wastewater	Wastewater Treatment and Discharge	N ₂ O	NA	2006 IPCC Guidelines do not provide a method.

1 NA (Not Available)

ANNEX 6 Additional Information

6.1. Global Warming Potential Values

Global Warming Potential (GWP) is intended as a quantified measure of the globally averaged relative radiative forcing impacts of a particular greenhouse gas. It is defined as the cumulative radiative forcing—both direct and indirect effects—integrated over a specific period of time from the emission of a unit mass of gas relative to some reference gas (IPCC 2007). Carbon dioxide (CO₂) was chosen as this reference gas. Direct effects occur when the gas itself is a greenhouse gas. Indirect radiative forcing occurs when chemical transformations involving the original gas produce a gas or gases that are greenhouse gases, or when a gas influences other radiatively important processes such as the atmospheric lifetimes of other gases. The relationship between kilotons (kt) of a gas and million metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MMT CO₂ Eq.) can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{MMT CO}_2 \text{ Eq.} = (\text{kt of gas}) \times (\text{GWP}) \times \left(\frac{\text{MMT}}{1,000 \text{ kt}} \right)$$

where,

MMT CO ₂ Eq.	=	Million metric tons of CO ₂ equivalent
kt	=	kilotons (equivalent to a thousand metric tons)
GWP	=	Global warming potential
MMT	=	Million metric tons

GWP values allow policy makers to compare the impacts of emissions and reductions of different gases. According to the IPCC, GWP values typically have an uncertainty of ±35 percent, though some GWP values have larger uncertainty than others, especially those in which lifetimes have not yet been ascertained. In the following decision, the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have agreed to use consistent GWP values from the *IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4)*, based upon a 100 year time horizon, although other time horizon values are available (see Table A-267). While this Inventory uses agreed-upon GWP values according to the specific reporting requirements of the UNFCCC, described below, unweighted gas emissions and sinks in kilotons (kt) are provided in the Trends chapter of this report (Table 2-2) and users of the Inventory can apply different metrics and different time horizons to compare the impacts of different greenhouse gases.

*...the global warming potential values used by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Parties) to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases shall be those listed in the column entitled "Global warming potential for given time horizon" in table 2.14 of the errata to the contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, based on the effects of greenhouse gases over a 100-year time horizon...*¹²²

Greenhouse gases with relatively long atmospheric lifetimes (e.g., CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, SF₆, and NF₃) tend to be evenly distributed throughout the atmosphere, and consequently global average concentrations can be determined. However, short-lived gases such as water vapor, carbon monoxide, tropospheric ozone, other indirect greenhouse gases (e.g., NO_x and NMVOCs), and tropospheric aerosols (e.g., SO₂ products and black carbon) vary spatially, and consequently it is difficult to quantify their global radiative forcing impacts. GWP values are generally not attributed to these gases that are short-lived and spatially inhomogeneous in the atmosphere.

Table A-267: IPCC AR4 Global Warming Potentials (GWP) and Atmospheric Lifetimes (Years) of Gases Used in this Report

Gas	Atmospheric Lifetime	100-year GWP ^a	20-year GWP	500-year GWP
Carbon dioxide (CO ₂)	See footnote ^b	1	1	1
Methane (CH ₄) ^c	12 ^d	25	72	7.6
Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)	114 ^d	298	289	153

¹²² United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf>>; 31 January 2014; Report of the Conference of the Parties at its nineteenth session; held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013; Addendum; Part two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its nineteenth session; Decision 24/CP.19; Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention; p. 2. (UNFCCC 2014)

HFC-23	270	14,800	12,000	12,200
HFC-32	4.9	675	2,330	205
HFC-125	29	3,500	6,350	1,100
HFC-134a	14	1,430	3,830	435
HFC-143a	52	4,470	5,890	1,590
HFC-152a	1.4	124	437	38
HFC-227ea	34.2	3,220	5,310	1,040
HFC-236fa	240	9,810	8,100	7,660
HFC-43-10mee	15.9	1,640	4,140	500
CF ₄	50,000 ^d	7,390	5,210	11,200
C ₂ F ₆	10,000	12,200	8,630	18,200
C ₃ F ₈	2,600	8,830	6,310	12,500
C ₄ F ₁₀	2,600	8,860	6,330	12,500
c-C ₄ F ₈	3,200	10,300	7,310	14,700
C ₅ F ₁₂	4,100	9,160	6,510	13,300
C ₆ F ₁₄	3,200	9,300	6,600	13,300
SF ₆	3,200	22,800	16,300	32,600
NF ₃	740	17,200	12,300	20,700

^a GWP values used in this report are calculated over 100 year time horizon.

^b For a given amount of CO₂ emitted, some fraction of the atmospheric increase in concentration is quickly absorbed by the oceans and terrestrial vegetation, some fraction of the atmospheric increase will only slowly decrease over a number of years, and a small portion of the increase will remain for many centuries or more.

^c The methane GWP includes the direct effects and those indirect effects due to the production of tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor. The indirect effect due to the production of CO₂ is not included.

^d Methane and N₂O have chemical feedback systems that can alter the length of the atmospheric response, in these cases, global mean atmospheric lifetime (LT) is given first, followed by perturbation time (PT), but only the perturbation time is listed here and not the atmospheric residence time.

Source: IPCC (2007)

Table A-268 presents direct GWP values for ozone depleting substances (ODSs). Ozone depleting substances directly absorb infrared radiation and contribute to positive radiative forcing; however, their effect as ozone-depleters also leads to a negative radiative forcing because ozone itself is a potent greenhouse gas. There is considerable uncertainty regarding this indirect effect; direct GWP values are shown, but AR4 does provide a range of net GWP values for ozone depleting substances. The IPCC Guidelines and the UNFCCC do not include reporting instructions for estimating emissions of ODSs because their use is being phased out under the Montreal Protocol (see note below Table A-268). The effects of these compounds on radiative forcing are not addressed in this report.

Table A-268: 100-year Direct Global Warming Potentials for Select Ozone Depleting Substances

Gas	Direct GWP
CFC-11	4,750
CFC-12	10,900
CFC-113	6,130
HCFC-22	1,810
HCFC-123	77
HCFC-124	609
HCFC-141b	725
HCFC-142b	2,310
CH ₃ CCl ₃	146
CCl ₄	1,400
CH ₃ Br	5
Halon-1211	1,890
Halon-1301	7,140

Note: Because these compounds have been shown to deplete stratospheric ozone, they are typically referred to as ODSs. However, they are also potent greenhouse gases. Recognizing the harmful effects of these compounds on the ozone layer, in 1987 many governments signed the *Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer* to limit the production and importation of a number of CFCs and other halogenated compounds. The United States furthered its commitment to phase-out ODSs by signing and ratifying the Copenhagen Amendments to the Montreal Protocol in 1992. Under these amendments, the United States committed to ending the production and importation of halons by 1994, and CFCs by 1996.

Source: IPCC (2007)

The IPCC published its *Fifth Assessment Report* (AR5) in 2013, providing the most current and comprehensive scientific assessment of climate change (IPCC 2013). Within this report, the GWP values were revised relative to the IPCC's *Fourth Assessment Report* (AR4) (IPCC 2007). Although the AR4 GWP values are used throughout this Inventory report in

line with UNFCCC inventory reporting guidelines, it is informative to review the changes to the 100-year GWP values and the impact they have on the total GWP-weighted emissions of the United States. All GWP values use CO₂ as a reference gas; a change in the radiative efficiency of CO₂ thus impacts the GWP of all other greenhouse gases. Since the *Second Assessment Report* (SAR) and *Third Assessment Report* (TAR), the IPCC has applied an improved calculation of CO₂ radiative forcing and an improved CO₂ response function. The GWP values are drawn from IPCC (2007), with updates for those cases where new laboratory or radiative transfer results have been published. Additionally, the atmospheric lifetimes of some gases have been recalculated, and updated background concentrations were used. Table A-269 shows how the GWP values of the other gases relative to CO₂ tend to be larger in AR4 and AR5 because the revised radiative forcing of CO₂ is lower than in earlier assessments, taking into account revisions in lifetimes. Comparisons of GWP values are based on the 100-year time horizon required for UNFCCC inventory reporting. However, there were some instances in which other variables, such as the radiative efficiency or the chemical lifetime, were altered that resulted in further increases or decreases in particular GWP values in AR5. In addition, the values for radiative forcing and lifetimes have been calculated for a variety of halocarbons. Updates in some well-mixed HFC compounds (including HFC-23, HFC-32, HFC-134a, and HFC-227ea) for AR4 result from investigation into radiative efficiencies in these compounds, with some GWP values changing by up to 40 percent; with this change, the uncertainties associated with these well-mixed HFCs are thought to be approximately 12 percent.

It should be noted that the use of IPCC AR4 GWP values for the current Inventory applies across the entire time series of the Inventory (i.e., from 1990 to 2017). As such, GWP comparisons throughout this chapter are presented relative to AR4 GWPs.

1 **Table A-269: Comparison of GWP values and Lifetimes Used in the SAR, AR4, and AR5**

Gas	Lifetime (years)			GWP (100 year)				Difference in GWP (Relative to AR4)					
	SAR	AR4	AR5	SAR	AR4	AR5 ^a	AR5 with feedbacks ^b	SAR	SAR (%)	AR5 ^a	AR5 (%)	AR5 with feedbacks ^b	AR5 with feedbacks ^b (%)
Carbon dioxide (CO ₂)	^c	^d	^d	1	1	1	1	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
Methane (CH ₄) ^e	12±3	8.7/12 ^f	12.4	21	25	28	34	(4)	(16%)	3	12%	9	36%
Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)	120	120/114 ^f	121	310	298	265	298	12	4%	(33)	(11%)	0	0%
Hydrofluorocarbons													
HFC-23	264	270	222	11,700	14,800	12,400	13,856	(3,100)	(21%)	(2,400)	(16%)	(944)	(6)%
HFC-32	5.6	4.9	5.2	650	675	677	817	(25)	(4%)	2	+	142	21%
HFC-125	32.6	29	28.2	2,800	3,500	3,170	3,691	(700)	(20%)	(330)	(9%)	191	5%
HFC-134a	14.6	14	13.4	1,300	1,430	1,300	1,549	(130)	(9%)	(130)	(9%)	119	8%
HFC-143a	48.3	52	47.1	3,800	4,470	4,800	5,508	(670)	(15%)	330	7%	1,038	23%
HFC-152a	1.5	1.4	1.5	140	124	138	167	16	13%	14	11%	43	35%
HFC-227ea	36.5	34.2	38.9	2,900	3,220	3,350	3,860	(320)	(10%)	130	4%	640	20%
HFC-236fa	209	240	242	6,300	9,810	8,060	8,998	(3,510)	(36%)	(1,750)	(18%)	(812)	(8)%
HFC-245fa	NA	7.6	7.7	NA	1,030	858	1032	NA	NA	(172)	(17%)	2	+
HFC-365mfc	NA	6.6	8.7	NA	794	804	966	NA	NA	10	1%	172	22%
HFC-43-10mee	17.1	15.9	16.1	1,300	1,640	1,650	1,952	(340)	(21%)	10	1%	312	19%
Fully Fluorinated Species													
SF ₆	3,200	3,200	3,200	23,900	22,800	23,500	26,087	1,100	5%	700	3%	3,287	14%
CF ₄	50,000	50,000	50,000	6,500	7,390	6,630	7,349	(890)	(12%)	(760)	(10%)	(41)	(1)%
C ₂ F ₆	10,000	10,000	10,000	9,200	12,200	11,100	12,340	(3,000)	(25%)	(1,100)	(9%)	140	1%
C ₃ F ₈	2,600	2,600	2,600	7,000	8,830	8,900	9,878	(1,830)	(21%)	70	1%	1,048	12%
C ₄ F ₁₀	2,600	2,600	2,600	7,000	8,860	9,200	10,213	(1,860)	(21%)	340	4%	1,353	15%
c-C ₄ F ₈	3,200	3,200	3,200	8,700	10,300	9,540	10,592	(1,600)	(16%)	(760)	(7%)	292	3%
C ₅ F ₁₂	4,100	4,100	4,100	7,500	9,160	8,550	9,484	(1,660)	(18%)	(610)	(7%)	324	4%
C ₆ F ₁₄	3,200	3,200	3,100	7,400	9,300	7,910	8,780	(1,900)	(20%)	(1,390)	(15%)	(520)	(6)%
NF ₃	NA	740	500	NA	17,200	16,100	17,885	NA	NA	(1,100)	(6%)	685	4%

2 + Does not exceed 0.05 or 0.05 percent.

3 NC (No Change)

4 NA (Not Applicable)

5 ^a The GWP values presented here are the ones most consistent with the methodology used in the AR4 report.

6 ^b The GWP values presented here from the AR5 report include climate-carbon feedbacks for the non-CO₂ gases in order to be consistent with the approach used in calculating the CO₂ lifetime.

7 ^c For a given amount of CO₂ emitted, some fraction of the atmospheric increase in concentration is quickly absorbed by the oceans and terrestrial vegetation, some fraction of the atmospheric increase will only slowly decrease over a number of years, and a small portion of the increase will remain for many centuries or more.

9 ^d No single lifetime can be determined for CO₂ (see IPCC 2007).

10 ^e The methane GWP includes the direct effects and those indirect effects due to the production of tropospheric ozone and stratospheric water vapor. Additionally, the AR5 reported separate values for fossil versus biogenic methane in order to account for the CO₂ oxidation product.

12 ^f Methane and N₂O have chemical feedback systems that can alter the length of the atmospheric response, in these cases, global mean residence time is given first, followed by perturbation time.

13 Note: Parentheses indicate negative values. Source: IPCC (2013), IPCC (2007), IPCC (1996).

The choice of GWP values between the SAR, AR4, and AR5 with or without climate-carbon feedbacks has an impact on both the overall emissions estimated by the Inventory, as well as the trend in emissions over time. To summarize, Table A-270 shows the overall trend in U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, by gas, from 1990 through 2017 using the four GWP sets. The table also presents the impact of SAR and AR5 GWP values with or without feedbacks on the total emissions for 1990 and for 2017.

Table A-270: Effects on U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using SAR, AR4, and AR5 GWP values (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Gas	Difference in Emissions Between 1990 and 2017 (Relative to 1990)				Revisions to Annual Emission Estimates (Relative to AR4)					
					SAR	AR5 ^a	AR5 ^b	SAR	AR5 ^a	AR5 ^b
	SAR	AR4	AR5 ^a	AR5 ^b	1990			2017		
CO ₂	157.8	157.8	157.8	157.8	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
CH ₄	(98.7)	(117.5)	(131.6)	(159.8)	(124.9)	93.7	281.1	(106.1)	79.6	238.8
N ₂ O	(10.1)	(9.7)	(8.7)	(9.7)	14.9	(41.0)	NC	14.5	(39.9)	NC
HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆ , and NF ₃	58.2	68.9	68.3	84.7	(11.9)	(9.0)	1.3	(22.7)	(9.7)	17.0
Total	107.1	99.5	85.8	73.0	(121.9)	43.7	282.4	(114.3)	30.0	255.8
Percent Change	1.7%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	-1.9%	0.7%	4.4%	-1.8%	0.5%	4.0%

NC (No Change)

^a The GWP values presented here are the ones most consistent with the methodology used in the AR4 report.

^b The GWP values presented here from the AR5 report include climate-carbon feedbacks for the non-CO₂ gases in order to be consistent with the approach used in calculating the CO₂ lifetime. Additionally, the AR5 reported separate values for fossil versus biogenic methane in order to account for the CO₂ oxidation product.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Excludes sinks. Parentheses indicate negative values.

When the GWP values from the SAR are applied to the emission estimates presented in this report, total emissions for the year 2017 are 6,358.0 MMT CO₂ Eq., as compared to the official emission estimate of 6,472.3 MMT CO₂ Eq. using AR4 GWP values (i.e., the use of SAR GWPs results in a 1.8 percent decrease relative to emissions estimated using AR4 GWPs). Table A-271 provides a detailed summary of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks for 1990 through 2017, using the GWP values from the SAR. The percent change in emissions for a given gas resulting from using different GWPs is equal to the percent change in the GWP; however, in cases where emissions of multiple gases are combined, as with HFCs or PFCs, the percent change will be a function of the relative quantity of the individual gases. Table A-272 summarizes the resulting change in emissions from using SAR GWP values relative to emissions using AR4 values for 1990 through 2017, including the percent change for 2017.

Table A-271: Recent Trends in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks using the SAR GWP values (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Gas/Source	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO₂	5,122.0	6,131.5	5,524.0	5,574.9	5,427.0	5,310.5	5,279.7
Fossil Fuel Combustion	4,739.5	5,745.5	5,158.4	5,202.0	5,051.2	4,966.0	4,920.5
Transportation	1,469.1	1,857.0	1,682.7	1,721.6	1,734.0	1,779.1	1,794.2
Electric Power Sector	1,820.8	2,400.9	2,039.6	2,039.1	1,903.0	1,811.2	1,734.0
Industrial	857.4	853.4	839.9	819.9	808.8	808.5	817.6
Residential	338.1	357.8	329.2	347.0	318.3	293.3	298.5
Commercial	226.5	226.7	224.6	233.0	245.8	232.4	234.8
U.S. Territories	27.6	49.7	42.5	41.4	41.4	41.4	41.4
Non-Energy Use of Fuels	119.5	139.6	123.5	119.9	127.0	113.7	124.6
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	101.6	68.2	53.5	58.4	47.8	42.3	41.8
Cement Production	33.5	46.2	36.4	39.4	39.9	39.4	39.4
Petrochemical Production	21.3	26.9	26.4	26.5	28.1	28.1	28.2
Natural Gas Systems	30.0	22.6	25.1	25.5	25.1	25.5	26.3
Petroleum Systems	8.9	11.6	25.2	29.7	31.7	22.2	23.3
Ammonia Production	13.0	9.2	10.0	9.6	10.9	11.4	13.8
Lime Production	11.7	14.6	14.0	14.2	13.3	12.9	13.2
Incineration of Waste	8.0	12.5	10.3	10.4	10.7	10.8	10.8
Other Process Uses of Carbonates	6.3	7.6	11.5	13.0	12.2	11.0	10.1
Urea Fertilization	2.4	3.5	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.9	5.1
Carbon Dioxide Consumption	1.5	1.4	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Urea Consumption for Non-Agricultural Purposes	3.8	3.7	4.1	1.5	4.2	4.3	4.3

Liming	4.7	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.2
Ferroalloy Production	2.2	1.4	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.8	2.0
Soda Ash Production	1.4	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8
Titanium Dioxide Production	1.2	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7
Glass Production	1.5	1.9	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3
Aluminum Production	6.8	4.1	3.3	2.8	2.8	1.3	1.2
Phosphoric Acid Production	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Zinc Production	0.6	1.0	1.4	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0
Lead Production	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Magnesium Production and Processing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>Wood Biomass, Ethanol, and Biodiesel Consumption^a</i>	219.4	230.7	316.4	324.1	309.8	307.0	308.3
<i>International Bunker Fuels^b</i>	103.5	113.1	99.8	103.4	110.9	116.6	116.4
CH₄^c	655.9	581.4	557.7	557.0	555.9	548.9	557.2
Enteric Fermentation	137.9	141.8	139.0	137.9	139.9	144.4	147.4
Natural Gas Systems	162.9	144.4	139.7	139.2	141.0	138.4	139.6
Landfills	150.8	110.4	94.9	94.5	93.4	90.7	90.5
Coal Mining	81.1	53.9	54.3	54.2	51.4	45.2	52.6
Manure Management	31.2	45.1	48.8	48.5	51.1	51.7	51.8
Petroleum Systems	35.3	30.9	35.0	35.3	33.2	32.1	31.6
Wastewater Treatment	12.9	13.0	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.0	12.0
Rice Cultivation	13.5	14.0	9.7	10.7	10.3	11.5	9.5
Stationary Combustion	7.2	6.6	7.4	7.5	6.7	6.1	5.9
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	5.5	5.8	5.9	5.9	6.0	6.1	5.8
Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	6.0	5.5	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.6	5.4
Mobile Combustion	10.9	8.1	3.8	3.4	3.0	2.8	2.7
Composting	0.3	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Petrochemical Production	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Ferroalloy Production	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Incineration of Waste	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>International Bunker Fuels^b</i>	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
N₂O^c	385.2	390.9	379.4	376.6	388.5	378.5	375.1
Agricultural Soil Management	261.8	264.8	275.9	272.8	288.9	278.4	277.1
Stationary Combustion	26.1	35.7	33.4	33.6	31.1	30.6	29.3
Manure Management	14.6	17.1	18.1	18.1	18.3	18.9	19.5
Mobile Combustion	43.7	40.5	23.0	21.0	19.6	18.6	17.7
Nitric Acid Production	12.6	11.8	11.1	11.4	12.0	10.5	10.5
Adipic Acid Production	15.8	7.4	4.1	5.7	4.4	7.3	7.3
Wastewater Treatment	3.5	4.6	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.2
N ₂ O from Product Uses	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Composting	0.4	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0
Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	1.7	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.5
Incineration of Waste	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Semiconductor Manufacture	+	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Petroleum Systems	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Natural Gas Systems	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>International Bunker Fuels^b</i>	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
HFCs	36.9	107.2	126.6	130.2	132.8	133.6	136.1

Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	0.3	91.2	123.1	125.9	129.1	131.0	131.7
HCFC-22 Production	36.4	15.8	3.2	4.0	3.4	2.2	4.1
Semiconductor Manufacture	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3
Magnesium Production and Processing	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
PFCs	20.6	5.6	4.9	4.7	4.3	3.6	3.4
Semiconductor Manufacture	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5
Aluminum Production	18.4	3.0	2.5	2.1	1.7	1.1	0.9
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances ^d	0.0	+	+	+	+	+	+
SF₆	30.2	12.3	6.7	6.5	6.0	6.6	6.4
Electrical Transmission and Distribution	24.2	8.7	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.6	4.5
Magnesium Production and Processing	5.4	2.9	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.1
Semiconductor Manufacture	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8
NF₃	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Semiconductor Manufacture	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	6,250.8	7,228.8	6,599.4	6,650.0	6,514.4	6,381.7	6,358.0
LULUCF Emissions^c	7.1	14.9	16.2	16.5	26.2	14.3	14.3
LULUCF CH ₄ Emissions	4.2	7.6	8.3	8.4	13.8	7.4	7.4
LULUCF N ₂ O Emissions	2.9	7.3	7.9	8.0	12.3	7.0	6.9
LULUCF Carbon Stock Change^e	(823.3)	(756.1)	(731.0)	(687.8)	(739.4)	(738.1)	(728.8)
LULUCF Sector Net Total^f	(816.2)	(741.2)	(714.7)	(671.3)	(713.2)	(723.7)	(714.5)
Net Emissions (Sources and Sinks)	5,434.6	6,487.6	5,884.6	5,978.7	5,801.2	5,657.9	5,643.5

Notes: Total emissions presented without LULUCF. Net emissions presented with LULUCF. Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Parentheses indicate net sequestration.

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Emissions from Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption are not included specifically in summing energy sector totals. Net carbon fluxes from changes in biogenic carbon reservoirs are accounted for in the estimates for LULUCF.

^b Emissions from International Bunker Fuels are not included in totals.

^c LULUCF emissions of CH₄ and N₂O are reported separately from gross emissions totals. LULUCF emissions include the CH₄ and N₂O emissions reported for *Peatlands Remaining Peatlands*, *Forest Fires*, *Drained Organic Soils*, *Grassland Fires*, and *Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands*; CH₄ emissions from *Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands*; and N₂O emissions from *Forest Soils* and *Settlement Soils*.

^d Small amounts of PFC emissions also result from this source.

^e LULUCF Carbon Stock Change is the net C stock change from the following categories: *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*, *Land Converted to Forest Land*, *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, *Land Converted to Grassland*, *Wetlands Remaining Wetlands*, *Land Converted to Wetlands*, *Settlements Remaining Settlements*, and *Land Converted to Settlements*.

^f The LULUCF Sector Net Total is the net sum of all CH₄ and N₂O emissions to the atmosphere plus net carbon stock changes.

Table A-272: Change in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using SAR GWP values relative to AR4 GWP values (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Gas/Source	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Percent Change in 2017
CO ₂	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NA
CH ₄	(124.9)	(110.7)	(106.2)	(106.1)	(105.9)	(104.5)	(106.1)	(16%)
Enteric Fermentation	(26.3)	(27.0)	(26.5)	(26.3)	(26.6)	(27.5)	(28.1)	(16%)
Natural Gas Systems	(31.0)	(27.5)	(26.6)	(26.5)	(26.9)	(26.4)	(26.6)	(16%)
Landfills	(28.7)	(21.0)	(18.1)	(18.0)	(17.8)	(17.3)	(17.2)	(16%)
Coal Mining	(15.4)	(10.3)	(10.3)	(10.3)	(9.8)	(8.6)	(10.0)	(16%)
Manure Management	(5.9)	(8.6)	(9.3)	(9.2)	(9.7)	(9.8)	(9.9)	(16%)
Petroleum Systems	(6.7)	(5.9)	(6.7)	(6.7)	(6.3)	(6.1)	(6.0)	(16%)
Wastewater Treatment	(2.4)	(2.5)	(2.3)	(2.3)	(2.3)	(2.3)	(2.3)	(16%)
Rice Cultivation	(2.6)	(2.7)	(1.8)	(2.0)	(2.0)	(2.2)	(1.8)	(16%)
Stationary Combustion	(1.4)	(1.3)	(1.4)	(1.4)	(1.3)	(1.2)	(1.1)	(16%)
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.2)	(1.1)	(16%)
Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	(1.2)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(16%)
Mobile Combustion	(2.1)	(1.5)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(0.6)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(16%)
Composting	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(16%)
Petrochemical Production	(0.1)	(+)	(+)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(16%)

Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(16%)
Ferroalloy Production	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(16%)
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(16%)
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(16%)
Incineration of Waste	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(16%)
International Bunker Fuels ^a	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(16%)
N₂O	14.9	15.1	14.7	14.6	15.0	14.7	14.5	4%
Agricultural Soil Management	10.1	10.3	10.7	10.6	11.2	10.8	10.7	4%
Stationary Combustion	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	4%
Manure Management	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	4%
Mobile Combustion	1.7	1.6	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	4%
Nitric Acid Production	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	4%
Adipic Acid Production	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	4%
Wastewater Treatment	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	4%
N ₂ O from Product Uses	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	4%
Composting	+	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	4%
Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	4%
Incineration of Waste	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4%
Semiconductor Manufacture	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4%
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4%
Petroleum Systems	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4%
Natural Gas Systems	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4%
International Bunker Fuels ^b	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4%
HFCs	(9.7)	(15.0)	(19.1)	(20.0)	(20.5)	(20.8)	(21.6)	(14%)
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances ^b	+	(10.8)	(18.1)	(18.9)	(19.6)	(20.1)	(20.5)	(13%)
HCFC-22 Production	(9.7)	(4.2)	(0.9)	(1.1)	(0.9)	(0.6)	(1.1)	(21%)
Semiconductor Manufacture	(+)	(+)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(21%)
Magnesium Production and Processing	0.0	0.0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(9%)
PFCs	(3.6)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(0.9)	(0.9)	(0.7)	(0.7)	(17%)
Semiconductor Manufacture	(+)	(0.6)	(0.6)	(0.6)	(0.6)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(17%)
Aluminum Production	(3.0)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(16%)
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	0.0	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(12%)
SF₆	1.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	5%
Electrical Transmission and Distribution	1.1	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	5%
Magnesium Production and Processing	0.3	0.1	0.1	+	+	0.1	0.1	5%
Semiconductor Manufacture	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	5%
NF₃	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Semiconductor Manufacture	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	(121.9)	(111.7)	(111.8)	(112.7)	(112.5)	(111.7)	(114.3)	(1.8%)

1 NC (No Change)

2 NA (Not Applicable)

3 + Absolute value does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

4 ^a Emissions from International Bunker Fuels are not included in totals.

5 ^b Small amounts of PFC emissions also result from this source.

6 Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

7
8 Table A-273 below shows a comparison of total emissions estimates by sector using both the IPCC SAR and AR4
9 GWP values. For most sectors, the change in emissions that result from using SAR relative to AR4 GWP values was
10 minimal. The effect on emissions from waste was by far the greatest (14.9 percent decrease in 2017 using SAR GWP values,
11 relative to emissions using AR4 GWP values), due the predominance of CH₄ emissions in this sector. Emissions from all
12 other sectors were comprised of mainly CO₂ or a mix of gases, which moderated the effect of the changes.

Table A-273: Comparison of Emissions by Sector using IPCC AR4 and SAR GWP Values (MMT CO₂Eq.)

Sector	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Energy							
AR4 GWP, Used In Inventory	5,341.3	6,309.2	5,696.2	5,739.3	5,588.3	5,467.0	5,441.1
SAR GWP	5,285.2	6,263.6	5,650.5	5,693.6	5,543.3	5,423.9	5,396.6
Difference (%)	(1.1%)	(0.7%)	(0.8%)	(0.8%)	(0.8%)	(0.8%)	(0.8%)
Industrial Processes and Product Use							
AR4 GWP, Used In Inventory	342.2	358.1	352.8	365.0	360.3	353.9	358.0
SAR GWP	331.6	343.0	333.4	344.7	339.4	333.0	336.2
Difference (%)	(3.1%)	(4.2%)	(5.5%)	(5.6%)	(5.8%)	(5.9%)	(6.1%)
Agriculture							
AR4 GWP, Used In Inventory	490.2	518.4	526.3	522.8	543.8	541.2	542.1
SAR GWP	466.2	491.0	500.1	496.5	517.3	513.2	513.8
Difference (%)	(4.9%)	(5.3%)	(5.0%)	(5.0%)	(4.9%)	(5.2%)	(5.2%)
LULUCF							
AR4 GWP, Used In Inventory	(815.5)	(740)	(713.5)	(670)	(711.1)	(722.6)	(713.3)
SAR GWP	(816.2)	(741.2)	(714.7)	(671.3)	(713.2)	(723.7)	(714.5)
Difference (%)	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Waste							
AR4 GWP, Used In Inventory	199.0	154.8	135.8	135.6	134.5	131.2	131.0
SAR GWP	167.9	131.2	115.4	115.3	114.4	111.5	111.4
Difference (%)	(15.6%)	(15.2%)	(15.0%)	(15.0%)	(15.0%)	(15.0%)	(14.9%)
Net Emissions							
AR4 GWP, Used In Inventory	5,557.3	6,600.5	5,997.7	6,092.7	5,915.9	5,770.8	5,758.9
SAR GWP	5,434.6	6,487.6	5,884.6	5,978.7	5,801.2	5,657.9	5,643.5
Difference (%)	-2.2%	-1.7%	-1.9%	-1.9%	-1.9%	-2.0%	-2.0%

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

Further, Table A-274 and Table A-275 show the comparison of emission estimates using AR5 GWP values relative to AR4 GWP values without climate-carbon feedbacks for the non-CO₂ gases, on an emissions and percent change basis. Table A-276 and Table A-277 show the comparison of emission estimates using AR5 GWP values with climate-carbon feedbacks. The use of AR5 GWP values without climate-carbon feedbacks¹²³ results in an increase in emissions of CH₄ and SF₆ relative to AR4 GWP values, but a decrease in emissions of other gases. The use of AR5 GWP values with climate-carbon feedbacks does not impact CO₂ and N₂O emissions; however, it results in an increase in emissions of CH₄, SF₆, and NF₃ relative to AR4 GWP values, and has mixed impacts on emissions of other gases. Overall, these comparisons of AR4 and AR5 GWP values do not have a significant effect on calculated U.S. emissions, resulting in an increase in emissions of less than 1 percent using AR5 GWP values, or approximately 4 percent when using AR5 GWP values with climate-carbon feedbacks. As with the comparison of SAR and AR4 GWP values presented above, the percent change in emissions is equal to the percent change in the GWP for each gas; however, in cases where multiple gases are emitted in varying amounts the percent change is variable over the years, such as with Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances.

Table A-274: Change in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using AR5^a without Climate-Carbon Feedbacks Relative to AR4 GWP Values (MMT CO₂Eq.)

Gas	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO ₂	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
CH ₄	93.7	83.1	79.7	79.6	79.4	78.4	79.6
N ₂ O	(41.0)	(41.6)	(40.4)	(40.1)	(41.4)	(40.3)	(39.9)
HFCs	(7.5)	(10.6)	(8.7)	(8.9)	(9.0)	(8.9)	(9.4)
PFCS	(2.4)	(0.6)	(0.6)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.4)
SF ₆	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
NF ₃	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Total	43.7	30.6	30.2	30.2	28.7	28.9	30.0

^a Absolute value does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NC (No Change)

¹²³ The IPCC AR5 report provides additional information on emission metrics. See <https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/wg1/WG1AR5_Chapter08_FINAL.pdf>.

^a The GWP values presented here are the ones most consistent with the methodology used in the AR4 report. The AR5 report has also calculated GWP values (shown in Table A-276) where climate-carbon feedbacks have been included for the non-CO₂ gases in order to be consistent with the approach used in calculating the CO₂ lifetime. Additionally, the AR5 reported separate values for fossil versus biogenic methane in order to account for the CO₂ oxidation product.

Notes: Total emissions presented without LULUCF. Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-275: Change in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using AR5^a without Climate-Carbon Feedbacks Relative to AR4 GWP Values (Percent)

Gas/Source	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO ₂	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
CH ₄	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%
N ₂ O	(11%)	(11%)	(11%)	(11%)	(11%)	(11%)	(11%)
SF ₆	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%
NF ₃	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)
HFCs	(16.0%)	(8.6%)	(6.0%)	(5.9%)	(5.9%)	(5.8%)	(6.0%)
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	11.3%	(7.1%)	(5.6%)	(5.6%)	(5.6%)	(5.6%)	(5.6%)
HCFC-22 Production ^b	(16.2%)	(16.2%)	(16.2%)	(16.2%)	(16.2%)	(16.2%)	(16.2%)
Semiconductor Manufacture ^c	(16.2%)	(16.4%)	(16.0%)	(16.5%)	(16.1%)	(16.4%)	(16.4%)
Magnesium Production and Processing ^d	0.0%	0.0%	(9.1%)	(9.1%)	(9.1%)	(9.1%)	(9.1%)
PFCs	(10.0%)	(9.6%)	(9.6%)	(9.5%)	(9.5%)	(9.4%)	(9.5%)
Semiconductor Manufacture ^c	(9.4%)	(9.1%)	(9.1%)	(9.1%)	(9.2%)	(9.2%)	(9.4%)
Aluminum Production ^e	(10.1%)	(10.1%)	(10.0%)	(10.0%)	(10.0%)	(9.9%)	(9.9%)
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances ^{d,f}	0.0%	(10.3%)	(10.3%)	(10.3%)	(10.3%)	(10.3%)	(10.3%)
Total	0.7%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%

NC (No Change)

^a The GWP values presented here are the ones most consistent with the methodology used in the AR4 report. The AR5 report has also calculated GWP values (shown in Table A-277) where climate-carbon feedbacks have been included for the non-CO₂ gases in order to be consistent with the approach used in calculating the CO₂ lifetime. Additionally, the AR5 reported separate values for fossil versus biogenic methane in order to account for the CO₂ oxidation product.

^b HFC-23 emitted.

^c Emissions from HFC-23, CF₄, C₂F₆, C₃F₈, C₄F₈, SF₆, as well as other HFCs and PFCs used as heat transfer fluids.

^d Zero change in beginning of time series since emissions were zero.

^e PFC emissions from CF₄ and C₂F₆.

^f PFC emissions from CF₄.

Note: Total emissions presented without LULUCF. Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-276: Change in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using AR5 with Climate-Carbon Feedbacks^a Relative to AR4 GWP Values (MMT CO₂ Eq.)

Gas	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO ₂	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
CH ₄	281.1	249.2	239.0	238.7	238.2	235.2	238.8
N ₂ O	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
HFCs	(2.9)	8.8	15.2	15.5	16.0	16.3	16.1
PFCs	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+
SF ₆	4.2	1.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9
NF ₃	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Total	282.4	259.7	255.1	255.2	255.1	252.5	255.8

+ Absolute value does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NC (No Change)

^a The GWP values presented here from the AR5 report include climate-carbon feedbacks for the non-CO₂ gases in order to be consistent with the approach used in calculating the CO₂ lifetime. Additionally, the AR5 reported separate values for fossil versus biogenic methane in order to account for the CO₂ oxidation product.

Notes: Total emissions presented without LULUCF. Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate negative values.

Table A-277: Change in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using AR5 with Climate-Carbon Feedbacks^a Relative to AR4 GWP Values (Percent)

Gas/Source	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CO ₂	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
CH ₄	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%
N ₂ O	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
SF ₆	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%
NF ₃	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
HFCs	(6.1%)	7.2%	10.4%	10.3%	10.4%	10.5%	10.2%
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	34.7%	9.9%	10.9%	11.0%	10.9%	10.9%	10.8%
HCFC-22 Production ^b	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)	(6.4%)
Semiconductor Manufacture ^c	(6.4%)	(6.6%)	(6.1%)	(6.7%)	(6.3%)	(6.6%)	(6.6%)
Magnesium Production and Processing ^d	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%
PFCs	(0.2%)	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Semiconductor Manufacture ^c	0.6%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%
Aluminum Production ^e	(0.3%)	(0.3%)	(0.2%)	(0.1%)	(0.1%)	0.0%	0.0%
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances ^{d,f}	0.0%	(0.6%)	(0.6%)	(0.6%)	(0.6%)	(0.6%)	(0.6%)
Total	4.4%	3.5%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.9%	4.0%

NC (No Change)

+ Does not exceed 0.05 percent.

^a The GWP values presented here from the AR5 report include climate-carbon feedbacks for the non-CO₂ gases in order to be consistent with the approach used in calculating the CO₂ lifetime. Additionally, the AR5 reported separate values for fossil versus biogenic methane in order to account for the CO₂ oxidation product.

^b HFC-23 emitted.

^c Emissions from HFC-23, CF₄, C₂F₆, C₃F₈, C₄F₈, SF₆, as well as other HFCs and PFCs used as heat transfer fluids.

^d Zero change in beginning of time series since emissions were zero.

^e PFC emissions from CF₄ and C₂F₆.

^f PFC emissions from CF₄.

Notes: Total emissions presented without LULUCF. Parentheses indicate negative values. Excludes Sinks.

6.2. Ozone Depleting Substance Emissions

Ozone is present in both the stratosphere,¹²⁴ where it shields the earth from harmful levels of ultraviolet radiation, and at lower concentrations in the troposphere,¹²⁵ where it is the main component of anthropogenic photochemical “smog.” Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, carbon tetrachloride, methyl chloroform, and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), along with certain other chlorine and bromine containing compounds, have been found to deplete the ozone levels in the stratosphere. These compounds are commonly referred to as ozone depleting substances (ODSs). If left unchecked, stratospheric ozone depletion could result in a dangerous increase of ultraviolet radiation reaching the earth’s surface. In 1987, nations around the world signed the *Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer*. This landmark agreement created an international framework for limiting, and ultimately eliminating, the production of most ozone depleting substances. ODSs have historically been used in a variety of industrial applications, including refrigeration and air conditioning, foam blowing, fire extinguishing, sterilization, solvent cleaning, and as an aerosol propellant.

In the United States, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 provide the legal instrument for implementation of the *Montreal Protocol* controls. The Clean Air Act classifies ozone depleting substances as either Class I or Class II, depending upon the ozone depletion potential (ODP) of the compound.¹²⁶ The production of CFCs, halons, carbon tetrachloride, and methyl chloroform—all Class I substances—has already ended in the United States. However, large amounts of these chemicals remain in existing equipment,¹²⁷ and stockpiles of the ODSs, as well as material recovered from equipment being decommissioned, are used for maintaining the existing equipment. As a result, emissions of Class I compounds will continue, albeit generally in decreasing amounts, for many more years. Class II designated substances, all of which are HCFCs, have been, or are being, phased out at later dates than Class I compounds because they have lower ODPs. These compounds served, and in some cases continue to serve, as interim replacements for Class I compounds in many industrial applications. The use and emissions of HCFCs in the United States is anticipated to continue for several decades as equipment that use Class II substances are retired from use. Under current *Montreal Protocol* controls, however, the production for domestic use of all HCFCs in the United States must end by the year 2030.

In addition to contributing to ozone depletion, CFCs, halons, carbon tetrachloride, methyl chloroform, and HCFCs are also potent greenhouse gases. However, the depletion of the ozone layer has a cooling effect on the climate that counteracts the direct warming from tropospheric emissions of ODSs. Stratospheric ozone influences the earth’s radiative balance by absorption and emission of longwave radiation from the troposphere as well as absorption of shortwave radiation from the sun; overall, stratospheric ozone has a warming effect.

The IPCC has prepared both direct GWP values and net (combined direct warming and indirect cooling) GWP ranges for some of the most common ozone depleting substances (IPCC 2007). See Annex 6.1, Global Warming Potential Values, for a listing of the direct GWP values for ODS.

Although the IPCC emission inventory guidelines do not require the reporting of emissions of ozone depleting substances, the United States believes that the inventory presents a more complete picture of climate impacts when we include these compounds. Emission estimates for several ozone depleting substances are provided in Table A-278.

Table A-278: Emissions of Ozone Depleting Substances (kt)

Compound	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Class I							
CFC-11	29	12	24	24	25	25	25
CFC-12	132	22	5	4	4	3	2
CFC-113	59	17	0	0	0	0	0
CFC-114	4	1	+	0	0	0	0
CFC-115	8	2	+	+	+	+	+

¹²⁴ The stratosphere is the layer from the top of the troposphere up to about 50 kilometers. Approximately 90 percent of atmospheric ozone is within the stratosphere. The greatest concentration of ozone occurs in the middle of the stratosphere, in a region commonly called the ozone layer.

¹²⁵ The troposphere is the layer from the ground up to about 11 kilometers near the poles and 16 kilometers in equatorial regions (i.e., the lowest layer of the atmosphere, where humans live). It contains roughly 80 percent of the mass of all gases in the atmosphere and is the site for weather processes including most of the water vapor and clouds.

¹²⁶ Substances with an ozone depletion potential of 0.2 or greater are designated as Class I. All other designated substances that deplete stratospheric ozone but which have an ODP of less than 0.2 are Class II.

¹²⁷ Older refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment, fire extinguishing systems, and foam products blown with CFCs/HCFCs may still contain Class I ODS.

Carbon Tetrachloride	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Methyl Chloroform	223	0	0	0	0	0	0
Halon-1211	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Halon-1301	2	+	+	+	+	+	+
Class II							
HCFC-22	30	72	64	60	56	53	50
HCFC-123	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
HCFC-124	0	2	1	1	+	+	+
HCFC-141b	1	4	10	10	9	9	8
HCFC-142b	1	4	1	2	2	3	4
HCFC-225ca/cb	+	3	10	11	12	13	14

+ Does not exceed 0.5 kt.

Methodology and Data Sources

Emissions of ozone depleting substances were estimated using the EPA's Vintaging Model. The model, named for its method of tracking the emissions of annual "vintages" of new equipment that enter into service, is a "bottom-up" model. It models the consumption of chemicals based on estimates of the quantity of equipment or products sold, serviced, and retired each year, and the amount of the chemical required to manufacture and/or maintain the equipment. The Vintaging Model makes use of this market information to build an inventory of the in-use stocks of the equipment in each of the end-uses. Emissions are estimated by applying annual leak rates, service emission rates, and disposal emission rates to each population of equipment. By aggregating the emission and consumption output from the different end-uses, the model produces estimates of total annual use and emissions of each chemical. Please see Annex 3.9, Methodology for Estimating HFC and PFC Emissions from Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances, of this Inventory for a more detailed discussion of the Vintaging Model.

Uncertainties

Uncertainties exist with regard to the levels of chemical production, equipment sales, equipment characteristics, and end-use emissions profiles that are used by these models. Please see the Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances section of this report for a more detailed description of the uncertainties that exist in the Vintaging Model.

6.3. Sulfur Dioxide Emissions

Sulfur dioxide (SO₂), emitted into the atmosphere through natural and anthropogenic processes, affects the Earth's radiative budget through photochemical transformation into sulfate aerosols that can (1) scatter sunlight back to space, thereby reducing the radiation reaching the Earth's surface; (2) affect cloud formation; and (3) affect atmospheric chemical composition (e.g., stratospheric ozone, by providing surfaces for heterogeneous chemical reactions). The overall effect of SO₂-derived aerosols on radiative forcing is believed to be negative (IPCC 2007). However, because SO₂ is short-lived and unevenly distributed through the atmosphere, its radiative forcing impacts are highly uncertain. Sulfur dioxide emissions have been provided below in Table A-279.

The major source of SO₂ emissions in the United States is the burning of sulfur containing fuels, mainly coal. Metal smelting and other industrial processes also release significant quantities of SO₂. The largest contributor to U.S. emissions of SO₂ is electricity generation, accounting for 49.2 percent of total SO₂ emissions in 2017 (see Table A-280); coal combustion accounted for approximately 92.0 percent of that total. The second largest source was industrial fuel combustion, which produced 19.5 percent of 2017 SO₂ emissions. Overall, SO₂ emissions in the United States decreased by 87.8 percent from 1990 to 2017. The majority of this decline came from reductions from electricity generation, primarily due to increased consumption of low sulfur coal from surface mines in western states.

Sulfur dioxide is important for reasons other than its effect on radiative forcing. It is a major contributor to the formation of urban smog and acid rain. As a contributor to urban smog, high concentrations of SO₂ can cause significant increases in acute and chronic respiratory diseases. In addition, once SO₂ is emitted, it is chemically transformed in the atmosphere and returns to earth as the primary contributor to acid deposition, or acid rain. Acid rain has been found to accelerate the decay of building materials and paints, cause the acidification of lakes and streams, and damage trees. As a result of these harmful effects, the United States has regulated the emissions of SO₂ under the Clean Air Act. The EPA has also developed a strategy to control these emissions via four programs: (1) the National Ambient Air Quality Standards program,¹²⁸ (2) New Source Performance Standards,¹²⁹ (3) the New Source Review/Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program,¹³⁰ and (4) the Sulfur Dioxide Allowance Program.¹³¹

Table A-279: SO₂ Emissions (kt)

Sector/Source	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Energy	19,628	12,364	3,872	3,742	2,844	2,187	2,055
Stationary Sources	18,407	11,541	3,644	3,532	2,635	1,978	1,846
Oil and Gas Activities	390	180	99	94	94	94	94
Mobile Sources	793	619	106	88	87	87	87
Waste Combustion	38	25	23	27	27	27	27
Industrial Processes and Product Use	1,307	831	548	498	498	498	498
Other Industrial Processes	362	327	158	151	151	151	151
Miscellaneous ^a	11	114	166	137	137	137	137
Chemical and Allied Product Manufacturing	269	228	113	112	112	112	112
Metals Processing	659	158	107	95	95	95	95
Storage and Transport	6	2	5	3	3	3	3
Solvent Use	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
Degreasing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graphic Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dry Cleaning	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surface Coating	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Industrial	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
Nonindustrial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Agriculture	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Agricultural Burning	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Waste	+	1	1	1	1	1	1

¹²⁸ [42 U.S.C § 7409, CAA § 109]

¹²⁹ [42 U.S.C § 7411, CAA § 111]

¹³⁰ [42 U.S.C § 7473, CAA § 163]

¹³¹ [42 U.S.C § 7651, CAA § 401]

Landfills	+	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wastewater Treatment	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous ^a	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		20,935	13,196	4,421	4,241	3,343	2,553

+ Does not exceed 0.5 kt

NA (Not Applicable)

^a Miscellaneous includes other combustion and fugitive dust categories.

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Source: Data taken from EPA (2018) and disaggregated based on EPA (2003).

Table A-280: SO₂ Emissions from Electricity Generation (kt)

Fuel Type	1990	2005	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Coal	13,808	8,680	2,741	2,706	1,881	1,277	1,156
Oil	580	458	145	143	99	67	61
Gas	1	174	55	54	38	26	23
Internal Combustion	45	57	18	18	12	8	8
Other	NA	71	22	22	15	10	9
Total	14,433	9,439	2,981	2,943	2,046	1,388	1,257

NA (Not Applicable)

Note: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding.

Source: Data taken from EPA (2018) and disaggregated based on EPA (2003).

1 6.4. Complete List of Source Categories

Chapter/Source	Gas(es)
Energy	
Fossil Fuel Combustion	CO ₂
Non-Energy Use of Fossil Fuels	CO ₂
Stationary Combustion (excluding CO ₂)	CH ₄ , N ₂ O, CO, NO _x , NMVOC
Mobile Combustion (excluding CO ₂)	CH ₄ , N ₂ O, CO, NO _x , NMVOC
Coal Mining	CH ₄
Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	CH ₄
Petroleum Systems	CH ₄ , N ₂ O
Natural Gas Systems	CH ₄ , N ₂ O
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	CO ₂ , CH ₄
Incineration of Waste	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, NO _x , CO, NMVOC
Industrial Processes and Product Use	
Cement Production	CO ₂
Lime Production	CO ₂
Glass Production	CO ₂
Other Process Uses of Carbonates	CO ₂
Ammonia Production	CO ₂
Urea Consumption for Non-Agricultural Purposes	CO ₂
Nitric Acid Production	N ₂ O
Adipic Acid Production	N ₂ O
Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Production	N ₂ O
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	CO ₂ , CH ₄
Titanium Dioxide Production	CO ₂
Soda Ash Production	CO ₂
Petrochemical Production	CO ₂ , CH ₄
HCFC-22 Production	HFC-23
Carbon Dioxide Consumption	CO ₂
Phosphoric Acid Production	CO ₂
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	CO ₂ , CH ₄
Ferroalloy Production	CO ₂ , CH ₄
Aluminum Production	CO ₂ , CF ₄ , C ₂ F ₆
Magnesium Production and Processing	CO ₂ , HFCs, SF ₆
Lead Production	CO ₂
Zinc Production	CO ₂
Semiconductor Manufacture	N ₂ O, HFCs, PFCs, ^a SF ₆ , NF ₃
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	HFCs, PFCs ^b
Electrical Transmission and Distributing	SF ₆
N ₂ O from Product Uses	N ₂ O
Agriculture	
Enteric Fermentation	CH ₄
Manure Management	CH ₄ , N ₂ O
Rice Cultivation	CH ₄
Liming	CO ₂
Urea Fertilization	CO ₂
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	CH ₄ , N ₂ O, NO _x , CO
Agricultural Soil Management	N ₂ O
Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry^c	
Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, NO _x , CO
Land Converted to Forest Land	CO ₂
Cropland Remaining Cropland	CO ₂
Land Converted to Cropland	CO ₂
Grassland Remaining Grassland	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, NO _x , CO
Land Converted to Grassland	CO ₂
Wetlands Remaining Wetlands	CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O
Land Converted to Wetlands	CO ₂ , CH ₄

Settlements Remaining Settlements	CO ₂ , N ₂ O
Land Converted to Settlements	CO ₂
Waste	
Landfills	CH ₄ , NO _x , CO, NMVOC
Wastewater Treatment	CH ₄ , N ₂ O, NO _x , CO, NMVOC
Composting	CH ₄ , N ₂ O

^a Includes HFC-23, CF₄, C₂F₆, as well as other HFCs and PFCs used as heat transfer fluids.

^b Includes HFC-23, HFC-32, HFC-125, HFC-134a, HFC-143a, HFC-236fa, CF₄, HFC-152a, HFC-227ea, HFC-245fa, HFC-4310mee, and PFC/PFPEs.

^c The LULUCF Sector includes CH₄ and N₂O emissions to the atmosphere and net carbon stock changes. The term "flux" is used to describe the net emissions of greenhouse gases accounting for both the emissions of CO₂ to and the removals of CO₂ from the atmosphere. Removal of CO₂ from the atmosphere is also referred to as "carbon sequestration."

6.5. Constants, Units, and Conversions

Metric Prefixes

Although most activity data for the United States is gathered in customary U.S. units, these units are converted into metric units per international reporting guidelines. Table A-281 provides a guide for determining the magnitude of metric units.

Table A-281: Guide to Metric Unit Prefixes

Prefix/Symbol	Factor
atto (a)	10^{-18}
femto (f)	10^{-15}
pico (p)	10^{-12}
nano (n)	10^{-9}
micro (μ)	10^{-6}
milli (m)	10^{-3}
centi (c)	10^{-2}
deci (d)	10^{-1}
deca (da)	10
hecto (h)	10^2
kilo (k)	10^3
mega (M)	10^6
giga (G)	10^9
tera (T)	10^{12}
peta (P)	10^{15}
exa (E)	10^{18}

Unit Conversions

1 kilogram	=	2.205 pounds		
1 pound	=	0.454 kilograms		
1 short ton	=	2,000 pounds	=	0.9072 metric tons
1 metric ton	=	1,000 kilograms	=	1.1023 short tons

1 cubic meter	=	35.315 cubic feet
1 cubic foot	=	0.02832 cubic meters
1 U.S. gallon	=	3.785412 liters
1 barrel (bbl)	=	0.159 cubic meters
1 barrel (bbl)	=	42 U.S. gallons
1 liter	=	0.001 cubic meters

1 foot	=	0.3048 meters
1 meter	=	3.28 feet
1 mile	=	1.609 kilometers
1 kilometer	=	0.622 miles

1 acre	=	43,560 square feet	=	0.4047 hectares	=	4,047 square meters
1 square mile	=	2.589988 square kilometers				

Degrees Celsius	=	(Degrees Fahrenheit – 32)*5/9
Degrees Kelvin	=	Degrees Celsius + 273.15

Density Conversions¹³²

Methane	1 cubic meter	=	0.67606 kilograms
Carbon dioxide	1 cubic meter	=	1.85387 kilograms
Natural gas liquids	1 metric ton	=	11.6 barrels = 1,844.2 liters
Unfinished oils	1 metric ton	=	7.46 barrels = 1,186.04 liters
Alcohol	1 metric ton	=	7.94 barrels = 1,262.36 liters
Liquefied petroleum gas	1 metric ton	=	11.6 barrels = 1,844.2 liters
Aviation gasoline	1 metric ton	=	8.9 barrels = 1,415.0 liters
Naphtha jet fuel	1 metric ton	=	8.27 barrels = 1,314.82 liters
Kerosene jet fuel	1 metric ton	=	7.93 barrels = 1,260.72 liters
Motor gasoline	1 metric ton	=	8.53 barrels = 1,356.16 liters
Kerosene	1 metric ton	=	7.73 barrels = 1,228.97 liters
Naphtha	1 metric ton	=	8.22 barrels = 1,306.87 liters
Distillate	1 metric ton	=	7.46 barrels = 1,186.04 liters
Residual oil	1 metric ton	=	6.66 barrels = 1,058.85 liters
Lubricants	1 metric ton	=	7.06 barrels = 1,122.45 liters
Bitumen	1 metric ton	=	6.06 barrels = 963.46 liters
Waxes	1 metric ton	=	7.87 barrels = 1,251.23 liters
Petroleum coke	1 metric ton	=	5.51 barrels = 876.02 liters
Petrochemical feedstocks	1 metric ton	=	7.46 barrels = 1,186.04 liters
Special naphtha	1 metric ton	=	8.53 barrels = 1,356.16 liters
Miscellaneous products	1 metric ton	=	8.00 barrels = 1,271.90 liters

Energy Conversions

Converting Various Energy Units to Joules

The common energy unit used in international reports of greenhouse gas emissions is the joule. A joule is the energy required to push with a force of one Newton for one meter. A terajoule (TJ) is one trillion (10^{12}) joules. A British thermal unit (Btu, the customary U.S. energy unit) is the quantity of heat required to raise the temperature of one pound of water one degree Fahrenheit at or near 39.2 degrees Fahrenheit.

$$1 \text{ TJ} = \begin{array}{l} 2.388 \times 10^{11} \text{ calories} \\ 23.88 \text{ metric tons of crude oil equivalent} \\ 947.8 \text{ million Btus} \\ 277,800 \text{ kilowatt-hours} \end{array}$$

Converting Various Physical Units to Energy Units

Data on the production and consumption of fuels are first gathered in physical units. These units must be converted to their energy equivalents. The conversion factors in Table A-282 can be used as default factors, if local data are not available. See Appendix A of EIA's *Monthly Energy Review, October 2018* (EIA 2018) for more detailed information on the energy content of various fuels.

¹³² Reference: EIA (2007)

1 **Table A-282: Conversion Factors to Energy Units (Heat Equivalents)**

Fuel Type (Units)	Factor
Solid Fuels (Million Btu/Short ton)	
Anthracite coal	22.57
Bituminous coal	23.89
Sub-bituminous coal	17.14
Lignite	12.87
Coke	21.480
Natural Gas (Btu/Cubic foot)	1,036
Liquid Fuels (Million Btu/Barrel)	
Motor gasoline	5.055
Aviation gasoline	5.048
Kerosene	5.670
Jet fuel, kerosene-type	5.670
Distillate fuel	5.825
Residual oil	6.287
Naphtha for petrochemicals	5.248
Petroleum coke	6.024
Other oil for petrochemicals	5.825
Special naphthas	5.248
Lubricants	6.065
Waxes	5.537
Asphalt	6.636
Still gas	6.000
Misc. products	5.796

2 Note: For petroleum and natural gas, *Monthly Energy*
3 *Review, October 2018* (EIA 2018). For coal ranks, *State*
4 *Energy Data Report 1992* (EIA 1993). All values are given in
5 higher heating values (gross calorific values).
6
7

1 6.6. Abbreviations

ABS	Acrylonitrile butadiene styrene
AC	Air conditioner
ACC	American Chemistry Council
AEDT	FAA Aviation Environmental Design Tool
AEO	Annual Energy Outlook
AER	All-electric range
AF&PA	American Forest and Paper Association
AFEAS	Alternative Fluorocarbon Environmental Acceptability Study
AFOLU	Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use
AFV	Alternative fuel vehicle
AGA	American Gas Association
AGR	Acid gas removal
AHEF	Atmospheric and Health Effect Framework
AHRI	Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute
AISI	American Iron and Steel Institute
ALU	Agriculture and Land Use
ANGA	American Natural Gas Alliance
ANL	Argonne National Laboratory
APC	American Plastics Council
API	American Petroleum Institute
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
AR4	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report
AR5	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report
ARI	Advanced Resources International
ARMA	Autoregressive moving-average
ARMS	Agricultural Resource Management Surveys
ASAE	American Society of Agricultural Engineers
ASLRRRA	American Short-line and Regional Railroad Association
ASR	Annual Statistical Report
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
AZR	American Zinc Recycling
BCEF	Biomass conversion and expansion factors
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce
BIER	Beverage Industry Environmental Roundtable
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BoC	Bureau of Census
BOD	Biological oxygen demand
BOD5	Biochemical oxygen demand over a 5-day period
BOEM	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
BOEMRE	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement
BOF	Basic oxygen furnace
BRS	Biennial Reporting System
BTS	Bureau of Transportation Statistics, U.S. Department of Transportation
Btu	British thermal unit
C	Carbon
C&D	Construction and demolition waste
C&EN	Chemical and Engineering News
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CaO	Calcium Oxide
CAPP	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBI	Confidential business information
C-CAP	Coastal Change Analysis Program
CDAT	Chemical Data Access Tool
CEAP	USDA-NRCS Conservation Effects Assessment Program
CEFM	Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model

CEMS	Continuous emission monitoring system
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbon
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGA	Compressed Gas Association
CH ₄	Methane
CHP	Combined heat and power
CI	Confidence interval
CIGRE	International Council on Large Electric Systems
CKD	Cement kiln dust
CLE	Crown Light Exposure
CMA	Chemical Manufacturer's Association
CMM	Coal mine methane
CMOP	Coalbed Methane Outreach Program
CMR	Chemical Market Reporter
CNG	Compressed natural gas
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
COGCC	Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission
CONUS	Continental United States
CRF	Common Reporting Format
CRM	Component ratio method
CRP	Conservation Reserve Program
CSRA	Carbon Sequestration Rural Appraisals
CTIC	Conservation Technology Information Center
CVD	Chemical vapor deposition
CWNS	Clean Watershed Needs Survey
d.b.h	Diameter breast height
DE	Digestible energy
DESC	Defense Energy Support Center-DoD's Defense Logistics Agency
DFAMS	Defense Fuels Automated Management System
DGGS	Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DLA	DoD's Defense Logistics Agency
DM	Dry matter
DOC	Degradable organic carbon
DOC	U.S. Department of Commerce
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DOM	Dead organic matter
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
DRE	Destruction or removal efficiencies
DRI	Direct Reduced Iron
EAF	Electric arc furnace
EDB	Aircraft Engine Emissions Databank
EDF	Environmental Defense Fund
EER	Energy economy ratio
EF	Emission factor
EFMA	European Fertilizer Manufacturers Association
EJ	Exajoule
EGR	Exhaust gas recirculation
EGU	Electric generating unit
EIA	Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy
EIIP	Emissions Inventory Improvement Program
EOR	Enhanced oil recovery
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EREF	Environment Research & Education Foundation
ERS	Economic Research Service

ETMS	Enhanced Traffic Management System
EV	Electric vehicle
EVI	Enhanced Vegetation Index
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FAOSTAT	Food and Agricultural Organization database
FAS	Fuels Automated System
FCCC	Framework Convention on Climate Change
FEB	Fiber Economics Bureau
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FGD	Flue gas desulfurization
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis
FIADB	Forest Inventory and Analysis Database
FIPR	Florida Institute of Phosphate Research
FOD	First order decay
FQSV	First-quarter of silicon volume
FSA	Farm Service Agency
FTP	Federal Test Procedure
g	Gram
G&B	Gathering and boosting
GaAs	Gallium Arsenide
GCV	Gross calorific value
GDP	Gross domestic product
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GHGRP	EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GJ	Gigajoule
GOADS	Gulf Offshore Activity Data System
GPG	Good Practice Guidance
GRI	Gas Research Institute
GSAM	Gas Systems Analysis Model
GTI	Gas Technology Institute
GWP	Global warming potential
ha	Hectare
HBFC	Hydrobromofluorocarbon
HC	Hydrocarbon
HCFC	Hydrochlorofluorocarbon
HCFO	Hydrochlorofluoroolefin
HDDV	Heavy duty diesel vehicle
HDGV	Heavy duty gas vehicle
HDPE	High density polyethylene
HF	Hydraulically fractured
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbon
HFO	Hydrofluoroolefin
HFE	Hydrofluoroethers
HHV	Higher Heating Value
HMA	Hot Mix Asphalt
HMIWI	Hospital/medical/infectious waste incinerator
HTF	Heat Transfer Fluid
HTS	Harmonized Tariff Schedule
HWP	Harvested wood product
IBF	International bunker fuels
IC	Integrated Circuit
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICBA	International Carbon Black Association
ICE	Internal combustion engine
ICR	Information Collection Request
IEA	International Energy Agency

IFO	Intermediate Fuel Oil
IGES	Institute of Global Environmental Strategies
IISRP	International Institute of Synthetic Rubber Products
ILENR	Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPAA	Independent Petroleum Association of America
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPPU	Industrial Processes and Product Use
ITC	U.S. International Trade Commission
ITRS	International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors
JWR	Jim Walters Resources
KCA	Key category analysis
kg	Kilogram
kt	Kiloton
kWh	Kilowatt hour
LDPE	Low density polyethylene
LDT	Light-duty truck
LDV	Light-duty vehicle
LEV	Low emission vehicles
LFG	Landfill gas
LFGTE	Landfill gas-to-energy
LHV	Lower Heating Value
LKD	Lime kiln dust
LLDPE	Linear low density polyethylene
LMOP	EPA's Landfill Methane Outreach Program
LNG	Liquefied natural gas
LPG	Liquefied petroleum gas(es)
LTO	Landing and take-off
LULUCF	Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry
M&R	Metering and regulating
MARPOL	International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships
MC	Motorcycle
MCF	Methane conversion factor
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Levels
MCFD	Thousand cubic feet per day
MDI	Metered dose inhalers
MDP	Management and design practices
MECS	EIA Manufacturer's Energy Consumption Survey
MEMS	Micro-electromechanical systems
MER	Monthly Energy Review
MGO	Marine gas oil
MgO	Magnesium Oxide
MJ	Megajoule
MLRA	Major Land Resource Area
mm	Millimeter
MMBtu	Million British thermal units
MMCF	Million cubic feet
MMCFD	Million cubic feet per day
MMS	Minerals Management Service
MMT	Million metric tons
MMTCE	Million metric tons carbon equivalent
MMT CO ₂ Eq.	Million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent
MODIS	Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOVES	U.S. EPA's Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator model
MPG	Miles per gallon
MRLC	Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium
MRV	Monitoring, reporting, and verification
MSHA	Mine Safety and Health Administration

MSW	Municipal solid waste
MT	Metric ton
MTBE	Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether
MTBS	Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity
MVAC	Motor vehicle air conditioning
MY	Model year
N ₂ O	Nitrous oxide
NA	Not applicable; Not available
NACWA	National Association of Clean Water Agencies
NAHMS	National Animal Health Monitoring System
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
NAPAP	National Acid Precipitation and Assessment Program
NARR	North American Regional Reanalysis Product
NAS	National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NASF	National Association of State Foresters
NASS	USDA's National Agriculture Statistics Service
NC	No change
NCASI	National Council of Air and Stream Improvement
NCV	Net calorific value
NE	Not estimated
NEI	National Emissions Inventory
NEMA	National Electrical Manufacturers Association
NEMS	National Energy Modeling System
NESHAP	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NEU	Non-Energy Use
NEV	Neighborhood Electric Vehicle
NF ₃	Nitrogen trifluoride
NFI	National forest inventory
NGL	Natural gas liquids
NIR	National Inventory Report
NLA	National Lime Association
NLCD	National Land Cover Dataset
NMOC	Non-methane organic compounds
NMVOC	Non-methane volatile organic compound
NMOG	Non-methane organic gas
NO	Nitric oxide
NO	Not occurring
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NO _x	Nitrogen oxides
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOF	Not on feed
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPP	Net primary productivity
NPRA	National Petroleum and Refiners Association
NRC	National Research Council
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
NRI	National Resources Inventory
NSCEP	National Service Center for Environmental Publications
NSCR	Non-selective catalytic reduction
NSPS	New source performance standards
NWS	National Weather Service
OAG	Official Airline Guide
OAP	EPA Office of Atmospheric Programs
OAQPS	EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
ODP	Ozone depleting potential
ODS	Ozone depleting substances
OECD	Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development

OEM	Original equipment manufacturers
OGJ	Oil & Gas Journal
OH	Hydroxyl radical
OMS	EPA Office of Mobile Sources
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OTA	Office of Technology Assessment
OTAQ	EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality
OVS	Offset verification statement
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PCA	Portland Cement Association
PCC	Precipitate calcium carbonate
PDF	Probability Density Function
PECVD	Plasma enhanced chemical vapor deposition
PET	Polyethylene terephthalate
PET	Potential evapotranspiration
PEVM	PFC Emissions Vintage Model
PFC	Perfluorocarbon
PFPE	Perfluoropolyether
PHEV	Plug-in hybrid vehicles
PHMSA	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
PI	Productivity index
PLS	Pregnant liquor solution
POTW	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
ppbv	Parts per billion (10 ⁹) by volume
ppm	Parts per million
ppmv	Parts per million (10 ⁶) by volume
pptv	Parts per trillion (10 ¹²) by volume
PRCI	Pipeline Research Council International
PRP	Pasture/Range/Paddock
PS	Polystyrene
PSU	Primary Sample Unit
PU	Polyurethane
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
PV	Photovoltaic
QA/QC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
QBtu	Quadrillion Btu
R&D	Research and Development
RECs	Reduced Emissions Completions
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RFS	Renewable Fuel Standard
RMA	Rubber Manufacturers' Association
RPA	Resources Planning Act
RTO	Regression-through-the-origin
SAE	Society of Automotive Engineers
SAGE	System for assessing Aviation's Global Emissions
SAN	Styrene Acrylonitrile
SAR	IPCC Second Assessment Report
SCR	Selective catalytic reduction
SCSE	South central and southeastern coastal
SDR	Steel dust recycling
SEC	Securities and Exchange Commission
SEMI	Semiconductor Equipment and Materials Industry
SF ₆	Sulfur hexafluoride
SiC	Silicon Carbide
SICAS	Semiconductor International Capacity Statistics
SNAP	Significant New Alternative Policy Program
SNG	Synthetic natural gas
SO ₂	Sulfur dioxide

SOC	Soil Organic Carbon
SOG	State of Garbage survey
SOHIO	Standard Oil Company of Ohio
SSURGO	Soil Survey Geographic Database
STMC	Scrap Tire Management Council
SULEV	Super Ultra Low Emissions Vehicle
SWANA	Solid Waste Association of North America
SWDS	Solid waste disposal sites
TA	Treated anaerobically (wastewater)
TAM	Typical animal mass
TAME	Tertiary amyl methyl ether
TAR	IPCC Third Assessment Report
TBtu	Trillion Btu
TDN	Total digestible nutrients
TEDB	Transportation Energy Data Book
TFI	The Fertilizer Institute
TIGER	Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing survey
TJ	Terajoule
TLEV	Traditional low emissions vehicle
TMLA	Total Manufactured Layer Area
TRI	Toxic Release Inventory
TSDF	Hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facility
TTB	Tax and Trade Bureau
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority
UAN	Urea ammonium nitrate
UDI	Utility Data Institute
UFORE	U.S. Forest Service's Urban Forest Effects model
UG	Underground (coal mining)
U.S.	United States
U.S. ITC	United States International Trade Commission
UEP	United Egg Producers
ULEV	Ultra low emission vehicle
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAA	U.S. Aluminum Association
USAF	United States Air Force
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFS	United States Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
USITC	U.S. International Trade Commission
VAIP	EPA's Voluntary Aluminum Industrial Partnership
VAM	Ventilation air methane
VKT	Vehicle kilometers traveled
VMT	Vehicle miles traveled
VOCs	Volatile organic compounds
VS	Volatile solids
WBJ	Waste Business Journal
WERF	Water Environment Research Federation
WFF	World Fab Forecast (previously WFW, World Fab Watch)
WGC	World Gas Conference
WIP	Waste in place
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WMS	Waste management systems
WTE	Waste-to-energy
WW	Wastewater
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant
ZEVs	Zero emissions vehicles

6.7. Chemical Formulas

Table A-283: Guide to Chemical Formulas

Symbol	Name
Al	Aluminum
Al ₂ O ₃	Aluminum Oxide
Br	Bromine
C	Carbon
CH ₄	Methane
C ₂ H ₆	Ethane
C ₃ H ₈	Propane
CF ₄	Perfluoromethane
C ₂ F ₆	Perfluoroethane, hexafluoroethane
c-C ₃ F ₆	Perfluorocyclopropane
C ₃ F ₈	Perfluoropropane
c-C ₄ F ₈	Perfluorocyclobutane
C ₄ F ₁₀	Perfluorobutane
C ₅ F ₁₂	Perfluoropentane
C ₆ F ₁₄	Perfluorohexane
CF ₃ I	Trifluoroiodomethane
CFCl ₃	Trichlorofluoromethane (CFC-11)
CF ₂ Cl ₂	Dichlorodifluoromethane (CFC-12)
CF ₃ Cl	Chlorotrifluoromethane (CFC-13)
C ₂ F ₃ Cl ₃	Trichlorotrifluoroethane (CFC-113)*
CCl ₃ CF ₃	CFC-113a*
C ₂ F ₄ Cl ₂	Dichlorotetrafluoroethane (CFC-114)
C ₂ F ₅ Cl	Chloropentafluoroethane (CFC-115)
CHCl ₂ F	HCFC-21
CHF ₂ Cl	Chlorodifluoromethane (HCFC-22)
C ₂ F ₃ HCl ₂	HCFC-123
C ₂ F ₄ HCl	HCFC-124
C ₂ FH ₃ Cl ₂	HCFC-141b
C ₂ H ₃ F ₂ Cl	HCFC-142b
CF ₃ CF ₂ CHCl ₂	HCFC-225ca
CClF ₂ CF ₂ CHClF	HCFC-225cb
CCl ₄	Carbon tetrachloride
CHClCCl ₂	Trichloroethylene
CCl ₂ CCl ₂	Perchloroethylene, tetrachloroethene
CH ₃ Cl	Methylchloride
CH ₃ CCl ₃	Methylchloroform
CH ₂ Cl ₂	Methylenechloride
CHCl ₃	Chloroform, trichloromethane
CHF ₃	HFC-23
CH ₂ F ₂	HFC-32
CH ₃ F	HFC-41
C ₂ HF ₅	HFC-125
C ₂ H ₂ F ₄	HFC-134
CH ₂ FCF ₃	HFC-134a
C ₂ H ₃ F ₃	HFC-143*
C ₂ H ₃ F ₃	HFC-143a*
CH ₂ FCH ₂ F	HFC-152*
C ₂ H ₄ F ₂	HFC-152a*
CH ₃ CH ₂ F	HFC-161
C ₃ HF ₇	HFC-227ea
CF ₃ CF ₂ CH ₂ F	HFC-236cb
CF ₃ CHFCHF ₂	HFC-236ea
C ₃ H ₂ F ₆	HFC-236fa
C ₃ H ₃ F ₅	HFC-245ca

CHF ₂ CH ₂ CF ₃	HFC-245fa
CF ₃ CH ₂ CF ₂ CH ₃	HFC-365mfc
C ₅ H ₂ F ₁₀	HFC-43-10mee
CF ₃ OCHF ₂	HFE-125
CF ₂ HOCHF ₂ H	HFE-134
CH ₃ OCF ₃	HFE-143a
CF ₃ CHFOCF ₃	HFE-227ea
CF ₃ CHClOCHF ₂	HCFE-235da2
CF ₃ CHFOCHF ₂	HFE-236ea2
CF ₃ CH ₂ OCF ₃	HFE-236fa
CF ₃ CF ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-245cb2
CHF ₂ CH ₂ OCF ₃	HFE-245fa1
CF ₃ CH ₂ OCHF ₂	HFE-245fa2
CHF ₂ CF ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-254cb2
CF ₃ CH ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-263fb2
CF ₃ CF ₂ OCF ₂ CHF ₂	HFE-329mcc2
CF ₃ CF ₂ OCH ₂ CF ₃	HFE-338mcf2
CF ₃ CF ₂ CF ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-347mcc3
CF ₃ CF ₂ OCH ₂ CHF ₂	HFE-347mcf2
CF ₃ CHFCF ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-356mec3
CHF ₂ CF ₂ CF ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-356pcc3
CHF ₂ CF ₂ OCH ₂ CHF ₂	HFE-356pcf2
CHF ₂ CF ₂ CH ₂ OCHF ₂	HFE-356pcf3
CF ₃ CF ₂ CH ₂ OCH ₃	HFE-365mcf3
CHF ₂ CF ₂ OCH ₂ CH ₃	HFE-374pcf2
C ₄ F ₉ OCH ₃	HFE-7100
C ₄ F ₉ OC ₂ H ₅	HFE-7200
CH ₂ CFCF ₃	HFO-1234yf
CHFCHCF ₃	HFO-1234ze(E)
CF ₃ CHCHCF ₃	HFO-1336mzz(Z)
C ₃ H ₂ ClF ₃	HCFO-1233zd(E)
CHF ₂ OCF ₂ OC ₂ F ₄ OCHF ₂	H-Galden 1040x
CHF ₂ OCF ₂ OCHF ₂	HG-10
CHF ₂ OCF ₂ CF ₂ OCHF ₂	HG-01
CH ₃ OCH ₃	Dimethyl ether
CH ₂ Br ₂	Dibromomethane
CH ₂ BrCl	Dibromochloromethane
CHBr ₃	Tribromomethane
CHBrF ₂	Bromodifluoromethane
CH ₃ Br	Methylbromide
CF ₂ BrCl	Bromodichloromethane (Halon 1211)
CF ₃ Br(CBrF ₃)	Bromotrifluoromethane (Halon 1301)
CF ₃ I	FIC-1311
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CaCO ₃	Calcium carbonate, Limestone
CaMg(CO ₃) ₂	Dolomite
CaO	Calcium oxide, Lime
Cl	atomic Chlorine
F	Fluorine
Fe	Iron
Fe ₂ O ₃	Ferric oxide
FeSi	Ferrosilicon
GaAs	Gallium Arsenide
H, H ₂	atomic Hydrogen, molecular Hydrogen
H ₂ O	Water
H ₂ O ₂	Hydrogen peroxide
OH	Hydroxyl
N, N ₂	atomic Nitrogen, molecular Nitrogen

NH ₃	Ammonia
NH ₄ ⁺	Ammonium ion
HNO ₃	Nitric acid
MgO	Magnesium oxide
NF ₃	Nitrogen trifluoride
N ₂ O	Nitrous oxide
NO	Nitric oxide
NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
NO ₃	Nitrate radical
NO _x	Nitrogen oxides
Na	Sodium
Na ₂ CO ₃	Sodium carbonate, soda ash
Na ₃ AlF ₆	Synthetic cryolite
O, O ₂	atomic Oxygen, molecular Oxygen
O ₃	Ozone
S	atomic Sulfur
H ₂ SO ₄	Sulfuric acid
SF ₆	Sulfur hexafluoride
SF ₅ CF ₃	Trifluoromethylsulphur pentafluoride
SO ₂	Sulfur dioxide
Si	Silicon
SiC	Silicon carbide
SiO ₂	Quartz

* Distinct isomers.

References

- EIA (2018) *Monthly Energy Review, October 2018*. Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE/EIA-0035(2018/10). October 2018.
- EIA (2007) *Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 2006, Draft Report*. Office of Integrated Analysis and Forecasting, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. DOE-EIA-0573(2006).
- EIA (1993) *State Energy Data Report 1992*, DOE/EIA-0214(93), Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, DC. December.
- EPA (2018) “1970-2017 Average annual emissions, all criteria pollutants in MS Excel.” National Emissions Inventory (NEI) Air Pollutant Emissions Trends Data. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Last Modified March 2018. Available online at: <<https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/air-pollutant-emissions-trends-data>>.
- EPA (2003) E-mail correspondence. Air pollutant data. Office of Air Pollution to the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). December 22, 2003.
- IPCC (2013) *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp.
- IPCC (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*. S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom 996 pp.
- IPCC (1996) *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, J.T. Houghton, L.G. Meira Filho, B.A. Callander, N. Harris, A. Kattenberg, and K. Maskell (eds.). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom.

ANNEX 7 Uncertainty

The annual U.S. Inventory presents the best effort to produce estimates for greenhouse gas source and sink categories in the United States. These estimates were generated according to the UNFCCC reporting guidelines, following the recommendations set forth in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (IPCC 2006). This Annex provides an overview of the uncertainty analysis conducted to support the U.S. Inventory, describes the sources of uncertainty characterized throughout the Inventory associated with various source categories (including emissions and sinks), and describes the methods through which uncertainty information was collected, quantified, and presented. An Addendum to Annex 7 is provided separately which includes additional information related to the characteristics of input variables used in the development of the uncertainty estimates reported in the Inventory.

7.1. Overview

The primary purpose of the uncertainty analysis conducted in support of the U.S. Inventory is (1) to determine the quantitative uncertainty associated with the emission (and removal) estimates presented in the main body of this report based on the uncertainty associated with the input parameters used in the emission (and removal) estimation methodologies and (2) to evaluate the relative importance of the input parameters in contributing to uncertainty in the associated source or sink category inventory estimate and in the overall inventory estimate. Thus, the U.S. Inventory uncertainty analysis provides a strong foundation for developing future improvements to the inventory estimation process. For each source or sink category, the analysis highlights opportunities for changes to data measurement, data collection, and calculation methodologies. These are presented in the “Planned Improvements” sections of each source or sink category’s discussion in the main body of the report.

For some of the current estimates, such as CO₂ emissions from energy-related combustion activities, the impact of uncertainties on overall emission estimates is believed to be relatively small. For some other limited categories of emissions, uncertainties could have a larger impact on the estimates presented (i.e. storage factors of non-energy uses of fossil fuels). As noted, for all source categories, the inventory emission estimates include “Uncertainty and Time-Series Consistency” sections that consider both quantitative and qualitative assessments of uncertainty, considering factors consistent with good practices noted in Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (i.e., completeness of data, representativeness of data and models, sampling errors, measurement errors, etc.). The two major types of uncertainty associated with these emission estimates are (1) model uncertainty, which arises when the emission and/or removal estimation models used in developing the Inventory estimates do not fully and accurately characterize the respective emission and/or removal processes (due to a lack of technical details or other resources), resulting in the use of incorrect or incomplete estimation methodologies, and (2) parameter uncertainty, which arises due to a lack of precise input data such as emission factors and activity data.

The model uncertainty can be partially analyzed by comparing the model results with those of other models developed to characterize the same emission (or removal) process, after taking into account the differences in their conceptual framework, capabilities, data, and assumptions. However, it would be very difficult—if not impossible—to quantify the model uncertainty associated with the emission estimates (primarily because, in most cases, only a single model has been developed to estimate emissions from any one source). Therefore, model uncertainty was not quantified in this report. Nonetheless, it has been discussed qualitatively, where appropriate, along with the individual source or sink category description and inventory estimation methodology.

Parameter uncertainty encompasses several causes such as lack of completeness, lack of data or representative data, sampling error, random or systematic measurement error, misreporting or misclassification, or missing data. Parameter uncertainty is, therefore, the principal type and source of uncertainty associated with the national Inventory emission estimates and is the main focus of the quantitative uncertainty analyses in this report. Parameter uncertainty has been quantified for all of the emission sources and sinks included in the U.S. Inventory totals, with the exception of one very small emission source category, CH₄ emissions from Incineration of Waste, given the very low emissions for CH₄ from Incineration of Waste, no uncertainty estimate was derived. Uncertainty associated with three other source categories (International Bunker Fuels, Energy Sources of Indirect Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and CO₂ emissions from Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption) whose emissions are not included in the Inventory totals is discussed qualitatively in their respective sections in the main body of the report.

7.2. Methodology and Results

The United States has developed a quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) and uncertainty management plan (EPA 2002). Like the QA/QC plan, the uncertainty management plan is part of a continually evolving process. The

uncertainty management plan provides for a quantitative assessment of the Inventory analysis itself, thereby contributing to continuing efforts to understand both what causes uncertainty and how to improve Inventory quality. Although the plan provides both general and specific guidelines for implementing quantitative uncertainty analysis, its components are intended to evolve over time, consistent with the inventory estimation process. The U.S. plan includes procedures and guidelines, and forms and templates, for developing quantitative assessments of uncertainty in the national Inventory estimates (EPA 2002). For the 1990 through 2017 Inventory, EPA has used the uncertainty management plan as well as the methodology presented in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* recommends two methods—Approach 1 and Approach 2—for developing quantitative estimates of uncertainty in the inventory estimate of individual source categories and the overall Inventory. Of these, the Approach 2 method is both more flexible and reliable than Approach 1; both approaches are described in the next section. The United States is in the process of implementing a multi-year strategy to develop quantitative estimates of uncertainty for all source categories using the Approach 2. In following the UNFCCC requirement under Article 4.1, emissions from International Bunker Fuels, Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption, and Indirect Greenhouse Gas Emissions are not included in the total emissions estimated for the U.S. Inventory; therefore, no quantitative uncertainty estimates have been developed for these source categories.¹³³ CO₂ Emissions from Biomass and Biofuel Consumption are accounted for implicitly in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) chapter through the calculation of changes in carbon stocks. The Energy sector does provide an estimate of CO₂ emissions from Biomass and Biofuel Consumption provided as a memo item for informational purposes consistent with the UNFCCC reporting requirements.

Approach 1 and Approach 2 Methods

The Approach 1 method for estimating uncertainty is based on the error propagation equation. This equation combines the uncertainty associated with the activity data and the uncertainty associated with the emission (or the other) factors. The Approach 1 method is applicable where emissions (or removals) are usually estimated as the product of an activity value and an emission factor or as the sum of individual sub-source or sink category values. Inherent in employing the Approach 1 method are the assumptions that, for each source and sink category, (i) both the activity data and the emission factor values are approximately normally distributed, (ii) the coefficient of variation (i.e., the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean) associated with each input variable is less than 30 percent, and (iii) the input variables within and across sub-source categories are not correlated (i.e., value of each variable is independent of the values of other variables).

The Approach 2 method is preferred (i) if the uncertainty associated with the input variables is significantly large, (ii) if the distributions underlying the input variables are not normal, (iii) if the estimates of uncertainty associated with the input variables are correlated, and/or (iv) if a sophisticated estimation methodology and/or several input variables are used to characterize the emission (or removal) process correctly. In practice, the Approach 2 is the preferred method of uncertainty analysis for all source categories where sufficient and reliable data are available to characterize the uncertainty of the input variables.

The Approach 2 method employs the Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation technique (also referred to as the Monte Carlo method). Under this method, estimates of emissions (or removals) for a particular source or sink category are generated many times (equal to the number of simulations specified) using an uncertainty model, which is an emission (or removal) estimation equation that imitates or is the same as the inventory estimation model for a particular source or sink category. These estimates are generated using the respective, randomly-selected values for the constituent input variables using commercially available simulation software such as @RISK.

Characterization of Uncertainty in Input Variables

Both Approach 1 and Approach 2 uncertainty analyses require that all the input variables are well-characterized in terms of their Probability Density Functions (PDFs). In the absence of particularly convincing data measurements, sufficient data samples, or expert judgments that determined otherwise, the PDFs incorporated in the current source or sink category uncertainty analyses were limited to normal, lognormal, uniform, triangular, and beta distributions. The choice among these five PDFs depended largely on the observed or measured data and expert judgment.

Source and Sink Category Inventory Uncertainty Estimates

Discussion surrounding the input parameters and sources of uncertainty for each source and sink category appears in the body of this report. Table A-284 summarizes results based on assessments of source and sink category-level

¹³³ However, because the input variables that determine the emissions from the Fossil Fuel Combustion and the International Bunker Fuels source categories are correlated, uncertainty associated with the activity variables in the International Bunker Fuels was taken into account in estimating the uncertainty associated with the Fossil Fuel Combustion.

uncertainty. The table presents base year (1990 or 1995) and current year (2017) emissions for each source and sink category. The combined uncertainty (at the 95 percent confidence interval) for each source and category is expressed as the percentage deviation above and below the total 2017 emissions estimated for that source and category. Source or sink category trend uncertainty is described subsequently in this Appendix.

Table A-284: Summary Results of Source and Sink Category Uncertainty Analyses- TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

Source or Sink Category	Base Year Emissions ^a	2016 Emissions ^b	2016 Uncertainty ^b	
	MMT CO ₂ Eq.	MMT CO ₂ Eq.	Low	High
CO₂	5,121.3	5,310.9	-2%	5%
Fossil Fuel Combustion	4,740.3	4,966.0	-2%	5%
Non-Energy Use of Fuels	119.5	112.2	-19%	39%
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	101.6	42.3	-17%	17%
Cement Production	33.5	39.4	-6%	6%
Petrochemical Production	21.2	28.1	-5%	5%
Natural Gas Systems	29.8	25.5	-16%	17%
Petroleum Systems	7.7	22.8	-30%	34%
Lime Production	11.7	12.9	-2%	2%
Ammonia Production	13.0	12.2	-7%	7%
Other Process Uses of Carbonates	6.3	11.0	-12%	15%
Incineration of Waste	8.0	10.7	-22%	26%
Urea Fertilization	2.4	5.1	-43%	3%
Carbon Dioxide Consumption	1.5	4.5	-5%	5%
Urea Consumption for Non-Agricultural Purposes	3.8	4.0	-12%	12%
Liming	4.7	3.9	-111%	88%
Ferroalloy Production	2.2	1.8	-12%	12%
Soda Ash Production	1.4	1.7	-9%	8%
Titanium Dioxide Production	1.2	1.6	-12%	13%
Aluminum Production	6.8	1.3	-3%	2%
Glass Production	1.5	1.2	-4%	4%
Phosphoric Acid Production	1.5	1.0	-19%	21%
Zinc Production	0.6	0.9	-16%	16%
Lead Production	0.5	0.5	-14%	15%
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	0.4	0.2	-9%	9%
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	+	+	-83%	215%
Magnesium Production and Processing	+	+	-2%	2%
Wood Biomass, Ethanol, and Biodiesel Consumption ^c	219.4	309.3	NE	NE
International Bunker Fuels ^d	103.5	116.6	NE	NE
CH₄	779.9	657.4	-3%	19%
Enteric Fermentation	164.2	170.1	-11%	18%
Natural Gas Systems	195.2	163.5	-16%	17%
Landfills	179.6	107.7	-23%	23%
Manure Management	37.2	67.7	-18%	20%
Coal Mining	96.5	53.8	-12%	14%
Petroleum Systems	39.8	38.6	-30%	34%
Wastewater Treatment	15.7	14.8	-27%	23%
Rice Cultivation	16.0	13.7	-32%	64%
Stationary Combustion	8.6	7.3	-30%	114%
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	6.5	7.1	-83%	215%
Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	7.2	6.7	-18%	22%
Mobile Combustion	12.7	3.64	-7%	26%
Composting	0.4	2.1	-50%	50%
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	0.2	0.3	-14%	14%
Petrochemical Production	0.2	0.2	-57%	46%
Ferroalloy Production	+	+	-12%	12%
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	+	+	-9%	10%
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	+	+	-20%	20%
Incineration of Waste	+	+	NE	NE

<i>International Bunker Fuels^d</i>	0.2	0.1	NE	NE
N₂O	354.8	369.5	-13%	22%
Agricultural Soil Management	250.5	283.6	-24%	39%
<i>Direct</i>	212.0	237.6	-16%	16%
<i>Indirect</i>	38.5	45.9	-65%	154%
Stationary Combustion	11.1	18.6	-22%	52%
Mobile Combustion	41.7	18.4	-9%	14%
Manure Management	14.0	18.1	-16%	24%
Nitric Acid Production	12.1	10.2	-5%	5%
Adipic Acid Production	15.2	7.0	-5%	5%
Wastewater Treatment	3.4	5.0	-75%	112%
N ₂ O from Product Uses	4.2	4.2	-24%	24%
Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	1.7	2.0	-31%	31%
Composting	0.3	1.9	-50%	50%
Incineration of Waste	0.5	0.3	-51%	327%
Semiconductor Manufacture	+	0.2	-12%	12%
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	0.1	0.1	-14%	14%
<i>International Bunker Fuels^d</i>	0.9	1.0	NE	NE
HFCs, PFCs, SF₆ and NF₃	130.8	173.5	-3%	11%
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	31.4	159.1	-3%	12%
Semiconductor Manufacture	3.6	4.7	-6%	6%
Electrical Transmission and Distribution	23.1	4.3	-13%	14%
HCFC-22 Production	46.1	2.8	-7%	10%
Aluminum Production	21.5	1.4	-8%	8%
Magnesium Production and Processing	5.2	1.1	-5%	5%
Total Emissions^a	6,355.6	6,511.3	-1%	5%
LULUCF Emissions^f	10.6	38.1	-40%	73%
LULUCF Carbon Stock Change^g	(830.2)	(754.9)	-21%	30%
LULUCF Sector Net Total^h	(819.6)	(716.8)	-22%	31%
Net Emissions (Sources and Sinks)	5,536.0	5,794.5	-3%	6%

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NE (Not Estimated)

^a Base Year is 1990 for all sources except Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances, for which the United States has chosen 1995.

^b The uncertainty estimates correspond to a 95 percent confidence interval, with the lower bound corresponding to 2.5th percentile and the upper bound corresponding to 97.5th percentile.

^c Emissions from Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption are not included in summing energy sector totals.

^d Emissions from International Bunker Fuels are not included in the totals.

^e Totals exclude emissions for which uncertainty was not quantified.

^f LULUCF emissions include the CH₄ and N₂O emissions reported for *Peatlands Remaining Peatlands*, *Forest Fires*, *Drained Organic Soils*, *Grassland Fires*, and *Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands*; CH₄ emissions from *Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands*; and N₂O emissions from *Forest Soils* and *Settlement Soils*.

^g LULUCF Carbon Stock Change is the net C stock change from the following categories: *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*, *Land Converted to Forest Land*, *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, *Land Converted to Grassland*, *Wetlands Remaining Wetlands*, *Land Converted to Wetlands*, *Settlements Remaining Settlements*, and *Land Converted to Settlements*.

^h The LULUCF Sector Net Total is the net sum of all CH₄ and N₂O emissions to the atmosphere plus net carbon stock changes.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate net sequestration. Total emissions (excluding emissions for which uncertainty was not quantified) is presented without LULUCF. Net emissions is presented with LULUCF.

Overall (Aggregate) Inventory Level Uncertainty Estimates

The overall level uncertainty estimate for the U.S. Inventory was developed using the IPCC Approach 2 uncertainty estimation methodology. The uncertainty models of all the emission source categories could not be directly integrated to develop the overall uncertainty estimates due to software constraints in integrating multiple, large uncertainty models. Therefore, an alternative approach was adopted to develop the overall uncertainty estimates. The Monte Carlo simulation output data for each emission source or sink category uncertainty analysis were combined by type of gas and the probability distributions were fitted to the combined simulation output data, where such simulated output data were available. If such detailed output data were not available for particular emissions sources, individual probability distributions were assigned to those source or sink category emission estimates based on the most detailed data available from the quantitative uncertainty analysis performed.

For Composting and parts of Agricultural Soil Management source categories, Approach 1 uncertainty results were used in the overall uncertainty analysis estimation. However, for all other emission sources (excluding international bunker

fuels, CO₂ from biomass and biofuel combustion, and CH₄ from incineration of waste), Approach 2 uncertainty results were used in the overall uncertainty estimation.

The overall uncertainty model results indicate that the 2016 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions are estimated to be within the range of approximately 6,439.6 to 6,835.2 MMT CO₂ Eq., reflecting a relative 95 percent confidence interval uncertainty range of -1 percent to 5 percent with respect to the total U.S. greenhouse gas emission estimate of approximately 6,511.3 MMT CO₂ Eq. The uncertainty interval associated with total CO₂ emissions, which constitute about 82 percent of the total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions in 2016, ranges from -2 percent to 5 percent of total CO₂ emissions estimated. The results indicate that the uncertainty associated with the inventory estimate of the total CH₄ emissions ranges from -3 percent to 19 percent, uncertainty associated with the total inventory N₂O emission estimate ranges from -13 percent to 22 percent, and uncertainty associated with fluorinated greenhouse gas (F-GHG) emissions ranges from -3 percent to 11 percent.

A summary of the overall quantitative uncertainty estimates is shown below.

Table A-285: Quantitative Uncertainty Assessment of Overall National Inventory Emissions (MMT CO₂ Eq. and Percent)- TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

2016 Emission		Uncertainty Range Relative to Emission Estimate ^a				Mean ^b	Standard Deviation ^b
Gas	Estimate (MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	(MMT CO ₂ Eq.)		(%)		(MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	
		Lower Bound ^c	Upper Bound ^c	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
CO ₂	5,310.9	5,211.4	5,555.2	-2%	5%	5,379.4	88.4
CH ₄ ^d	657.4	637.0	780.8	-3%	19%	699.0	36.3
N ₂ O ^d	369.5	321.7	451.8	-13%	22%	375.1	33.4
PFC, HFC, SF ₆ , and NF ₃ ^d	173.5	168.4	192.1	-3%	11%	180.3	6.1
Total Emissions	6511.3	6,439.6	6,835.2	-1%	5%	6,633.8	101.2
LULUCF Emissions^e	38.1	22.8	65.7	-40%	73%	38.4	11.2
LULUCF Carbon Stock Change Flux^f	(754.9)	(979.5)	-598.2	-21%	30%	(790.5)	96.9
LULUCF Sector Net Total^g	(716.8)	(940.3)	-560.5	-22%	31%	(752.0)	97.4
Net Emissions (Sources and Sinks)	5,794.5	5,607.0	6,155.0	-3%	6%	5,881.8	140.9

^a The lower and upper bounds for emission estimates correspond to a 95 percent confidence interval, with the lower bound corresponding to 2.5th percentile and the upper bound corresponding to 97.5th percentile.

^b Mean value indicates the arithmetic average of the simulated emission estimates; standard deviation indicates the extent of deviation of the simulated values from the mean.

^c The lower and upper bound emission estimates for the sub-source categories do not sum to total emissions because the low and high estimates for total emissions were calculated separately through simulations.

^d The overall uncertainty estimates did not take into account the uncertainty in the GWP values for CH₄, N₂O and high GWP gases used in the inventory emission calculations for 2016.

^e LULUCF emissions include the CH₄ and N₂O emissions reported for *Peatlands Remaining Peatlands*, *Forest Fires*, *Drained Organic Soils*, *Grassland Fires*, and *Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands*; CH₄ emissions from *Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands*; and N₂O emissions from *Forest Soils* and *Settlement Soils*.

^f LULUCF Carbon Stock Change is the net C stock change from the following categories: *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*, *Land Converted to Forest Land*, *Cropland Remaining Cropland*, *Land Converted to Cropland*, *Grassland Remaining Grassland*, *Land Converted to Grassland*, *Wetlands Remaining Wetlands*, *Land Converted to Wetlands*, *Settlements Remaining Settlements*, and *Land Converted to Settlements*.

^g The LULUCF Sector Net Total is the net sum of all CH₄ and N₂O emissions to the atmosphere plus net carbon stock changes.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate net sequestration. Total emissions (excluding emissions for which uncertainty was not quantified) is presented without LULUCF. Net emissions is presented with LULUCF.

Trend Uncertainty

In addition to the estimates of uncertainty associated with the current year's emission estimates, this Annex also presents the estimates of trend uncertainty. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines defines trend as the difference in emissions between the base year (i.e., 1990) and the current year (i.e., 2017) Inventory estimates. However, for purposes of understanding the concept of trend uncertainty, the emission trend is defined in this Inventory as the percentage change in the emissions (or removal) estimated for the current year, relative to the emission (or removal) estimated for the base year. The uncertainty associated with this emission trend is referred to as trend uncertainty.

Under the Approach 1 method, the trend uncertainty for a source and sink category is estimated using the sensitivity of the calculated difference between the base year and the current year (i.e., 2017) emissions to an incremental (i.e., 1 percent) increase in one or both of these values for that source and sink category. The two sensitivities are expressed as percentages: Type A sensitivity highlights the effect on the difference between the base and the current year emissions

caused by a 1 percent change in both, while Type B sensitivity highlights the effect caused by a change to only the current year's emissions. Both sensitivities are simplifications introduced in order to analyze the correlation between the base and the current year estimates. Once calculated, the two sensitivities are combined using the error propagation equation to estimate the overall trend uncertainty.

Under the Approach 2 method, the trend uncertainty is estimated using the Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation technique. The trend uncertainty analysis takes into account the fact that the base and the current year estimates often share input variables. For purposes of the current Inventory, a simple approach has been adopted, under which the base year source or sink category emissions are assumed to exhibit the same uncertainty characteristics as the current year emissions (or removals). Source and sink category-specific PDFs for base year estimates were developed using current year (i.e., 2017) uncertainty output data. These were adjusted to account for differences in magnitude between the two years' inventory estimates. Then, for each source and sink category, a trend uncertainty estimate was developed using the Monte Carlo method. The overall inventory trend uncertainty estimate was developed by combining all source and sink category-specific trend uncertainty estimates. These trend uncertainty estimates present the range of likely change from base year to 2017, and are shown in Table A-286.

Table A-286: Quantitative Assessment of Trend Uncertainty (MMT CO₂ Eq. and Percent)-TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

Gas/Source	Base Year	2016	Emissions	Trend Range ^b	
	Emissions ^a	Emissions	Trend	Trend Range ^b	
	(MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	(MMT CO ₂ Eq.)	(%)	(%)	(%)
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
CO₂	5,121.3	5,310.9	4%	-1%	9%
Fossil Fuel Combustion	4,740.3	4,966.0	5%	0%	10%
Non-Energy Use of Fuels	119.5	112.2	-6%	-36%	40%
Natural Gas Systems	29.8	25.5	-14%	-40%	21%
Cement Production	33.5	39.4	18%	8%	29%
Lime Production	11.7	12.9	11%	8%	14%
Other Process Uses of Carbonates	6.3	11.0	74%	45%	111%
Soda Ash Production	1.4	1.7	20%	6%	37%
Carbon Dioxide Consumption	1.5	4.5	204%	183%	226%
Incineration of Waste	8.0	10.7	34%	-5%	89%
Titanium Dioxide Production	1.2	1.6	35%	12%	61%
Aluminum Production	6.8	1.3	-80%	-81%	-80%
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	101.6	42.3	-58%	-68%	-47%
Ferroalloy Production	2.2	1.8	-17%	-30%	-1%
Glass Production	1.5	1.2	-19%	-24%	-14%
Ammonia Production	13.0	12.2	-7%	-16%	4%
Urea Consumption for Non-Agricultural Purposes	3.8	4.0	5%	-13%	24%
Phosphoric Acid Production	1.5	1.0	-35%	-52%	-13%
Petrochemical Production	21.2	28.1	33%	23%	43%
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	0.4	0.2	-54%	-59%	-47%
Lead Production	0.5	0.5	-7%	-25%	15%
Zinc Production	0.6	0.9	46%	16%	84%
Liming	4.7	3.9	-17%	-105%	342%
Urea Fertilization	2.4	5.1	111%	39%	222%
Petroleum Systems	7.7	22.8	196%	28%	577%
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	+	+	15%	-110%	521%
Magnesium Production and Processing	+	+	95%	89%	102%
Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption ^c	219.4	309.3	41%	NE	NE
International Bunker Fuel ^d	103.5	116.6	13%	NE	NE
CH₄	779.9	657.4	-16%	-27%	-4%
Stationary Combustion	8.6	7.3	-15%	-63%	98%
Mobile Combustion	12.7	3.6	-71%	-77%	-64%
Coal Mining	96.5	53.8	-44%	-66%	-48%
Abandoned Underground Coal Mines	7.2	6.7	-7%	-38%	32%
Natural Gas Systems	195.2	163.5	-16%	-41%	19%
Petroleum Systems	39.8	38.6	-3%	-58%	119%
Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells	6.5	7.1	9%	-82%	254%
Petrochemical Production	0.2	0.2	12%	-55%	172%
Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption	+	+	-67%	-71%	-62%
Iron and Steel Production & Metallurgical Coke Production	+	+	-65%	-74%	-54%
Ferroalloy Production	+	+	-26%	-38%	-12%

Enteric Fermentation	164.2	170.1	4%	-15%	28%
Manure Management	37.2	67.7	82%	23%	156%
Rice Cultivation	16.0	13.7	-14%	-67%	119%
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	0.2	0.3	20%	-36%	121%
Landfills	179.6	107.7	-40%	-57%	-17%
Wastewater Treatment	15.7	14.8	-5%	-35%	38%
Composting	0.4	2.1	455%	147%	1157%
Incineration of Waste	+	+	-32%	NE	NE
<i>International Bunker Fuels^d</i>	0.2	0.1	-43%	NE	NE
N₂O	354.8	369.5	4%	-25%	55%
Stationary Combustion	11.1	18.6	68%	3%	177%
Mobile Combustion	41.7	18.4	-56%	-62%	-48%
Adipic Acid Production	15.2	7.0	-54%	-57%	-51%
Nitric Acid Production	12.1	10.2	-16%	-22%	-10%
Manure Management	14.0	18.1	30%	-1%	71%
Agricultural Soil Management	250.5	283.6	13%	-31%	85%
Field Burning of Agricultural Residues	0.1	0.1	21%	-23%	88%
Wastewater Treatment	3.4	5.0	46%	-68%	533%
N ₂ O from Product Uses	4.2	4.2	0%	-33%	46%
Caprolactam, Glyoxal, and Glyoxylic Acid Production	1.7	2.0	21%	-25%	94%
Incineration of Waste	0.5	0.3	-32%	-85%	227%
Settlement Soils	1.4	2.5	75%	-3%	215%
Composting	0.3	1.9	455%	148%	1128%
Semiconductor Manufacture	+	0.2	555%	453%	673%
<i>International Bunker Fuels^d</i>	0.9	1.0	15%	NE	NE
HFCs, PFCs, SF₆, and NF₃	130.3	184.7	42%	36%	56%
Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances	31.4	159.1	406%	357%	461%
HCFC-22 Production	46.1	2.8	-94%	-95%	-93%
Semiconductor Manufacture	3.6	4.7	33%	23%	44%
Aluminum Production	21.5	1.4	-94%	-94%	-93%
Electrical Transmission and Distribution	23.1	4.3	-81%	-84%	-78%
Magnesium Production and Processing	5.2	1.1	-78%	-82%	-79%
Total Emissions^e	6,386.8	6,511.3	2%	-2%	7%
LULUCF Emissions^f	10.6	38.1	258%	92%	684%
LULUCF Carbon Stock Change^g	(830.2)	(754.9)	-9%	-36%	28%
LULUCF Sector Net Total^h	(819.6)	(716.8)	-13%	-39%	25%
Net Emissions (Sources and Sinks)	5,567.2	5,794.5	4%	-3%	12%

+ Does not exceed 0.05 MMT CO₂ Eq.

NE (Not Estimated)

^a Base Year is 1990 for all sources except Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances, for which the United States has chosen 1995.

^b The trend range represents a 95 percent confidence interval for the emission trend, with the lower bound corresponding to 2.5th percentile value and the upper bound corresponding to 97.5th percentile value.

^c Emissions from Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption are not included specifically in summing energy sector totals.

^d Emissions from International Bunker Fuels are not included in the totals.

^e Totals exclude emissions for which uncertainty was not quantified.

^f LULUCF emissions include the CH₄ and N₂O emissions reported for Peatlands Remaining Peatlands, Forest Fires, Drained Organic Soils, Grassland Fires, and Coastal Wetlands Remaining Coastal Wetlands; CH₄ emissions from Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands; and N₂O emissions from Forest Soils and Settlement Soils.

^g LULUCF Carbon Stock Change is the net C stock change from the following categories: *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, Land Converted to Forest Land, Cropland Remaining Cropland, Land Converted to Cropland, Grassland Remaining Grassland, Land Converted to Grassland, Wetlands Remaining Wetlands, Land Converted to Wetlands, Settlements Remaining Settlements, and Land Converted to Settlements.*

^h The LULUCF Sector Net Total is the net sum of all CH₄ and N₂O emissions to the atmosphere plus net carbon stock changes.

Notes: Totals may not sum due to independent rounding. Parentheses indicate net sequestration. Total emissions (excluding emissions for which uncertainty was not quantified) is presented without LULUCF. Net emissions is presented with LULUCF.

7.3. Reducing Uncertainty

There have been many improvements in reducing uncertainties across source and sink categories over the last several years. These improvements are result of new data sources that provide more accurate data or more coverage, as well as methodological improvements. Several source categories now use the U.S. EPA's GHGRP reported data, which is an improvement over prior methods using default emission factors and provides more country-specific data for inventory calculations. EPA's GHGRP relies on facility-level data which undergoes a multi-step verification process, including automated data checks to ensure consistency, comparison against expected ranges for similar facilities and industries, and statistical analysis.

For example, the use of EPA's GHGRP reported data to estimate CH₄ emissions from Coal Mining resulted in the uncertainty bounds of -12 to 14 percent in the 1990 to 2016 Inventory, which was an improvement over the uncertainty bounds in the 1990 to 2011 Inventory of -15 to 18 percent. Prior to 2012, Coal Mining emissions were estimated using an array of emission factor estimations with higher assumed uncertainty. Estimates of CH₄ emissions from MSW landfills were also revised with the availability of GHGRP reported data resulting in methodological and data quality improvements that reduced uncertainty. Previously, MSW landfill emissions estimates were calculated using a model and default factors with higher assumed uncertainty.

Due to the availability of GHGRP reported data, Semiconductor Manufacturing emissions methodology as well as the uncertainty model was revised for the 1990 to 2012 Inventory. The revised model to estimate uncertainty relies on analysis conducted during the development of the EPA's GHGRP Subpart I rulemaking to estimate uncertainty associated with facility-reported emissions. These results were applied to the GHGRP-reported data as well as to the non-reported emissions. An improved methodology to estimate non-reported emissions along with improved methodology to estimate uncertainty of these non-reported emissions led to a reduced overall uncertainty of -6 to 6 percent in the 1990 to 2016 Inventory compared against a range of -8 to 9 percent in the 1990 to 2011 Inventory for the emissions of F-GHGs from the Semiconductor Manufacturing source category.

7.4. Planned Improvements

Identifying the sources of uncertainty in the emission and removal estimates of the Inventory and quantifying the magnitude of the associated uncertainty is the crucial first step towards improving those estimates. Quantitative assessment of the parameter uncertainty may also provide information about the relative importance of input parameters (such as activity data and emission factors), based on their relative contribution to the uncertainty within the source or sink category estimates. Such information can be used to prioritize resources with a goal of reducing uncertainty over time within or among inventory source categories and their input parameters. In the current Inventory, potential sources of model uncertainty have been identified for some emission source categories, and uncertainty estimates based on their parameters' uncertainty have been developed for all the emission source categories, with the exception of CH₄ from Incineration of Waste, and the International Bunker Fuels, CO₂ from Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption, and Indirect Greenhouse Gas Emissions source categories, which are not included in the energy sector totals. CO₂ Emissions from Wood Biofuel and Ethanol Consumption, however, are accounted for implicitly in the Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) chapter through the calculation of changes in carbon stocks. The Energy sector does provide an estimate of CO₂ emissions from Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption, but rather provided as a memo item for informational purposes.

Specific areas that require further research to reduce uncertainties and improve the quality of uncertainty estimates include:

- *Improving conceptualization.* Improving the inclusiveness of the structural assumptions chosen can reduce uncertainties. An example is better treatment of seasonality effects that leads to more accurate annual estimates of emissions or removals for the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Sector.
- *Incorporating excluded emission sources.* Quantitative estimates for some of the sources and sinks of greenhouse gas emissions, such as from some land-use activities, industrial processes, and parts of mobile sources, could not be developed at this time either because data are incomplete or because methodologies do not exist for estimating emissions from these source categories. See Annex 5 of this report for a discussion of the sources of greenhouse gas emissions and sinks excluded from this report. In the future, consistent with IPCC good practice principles, efforts will focus on estimating emissions from excluded emission sources and developing uncertainty estimates for all source categories for which emissions are estimated.
- *Improving the accuracy of emission factors.* Further research is needed in some cases to improve the accuracy of emission factors used to calculate emissions from a variety of sources. For example, the accuracy of current emission factors applied to CH₄ and N₂O emissions from stationary and mobile combustion are highly uncertain, and research is underway to improve these emission factors.
- *Collecting detailed activity data.* Although methodologies exist for estimating emissions for some sources, problems arise in obtaining activity data at a level of detail in which aggregate emission factors can be applied.
- *Improving models:* Improving model structure and parameterization can lead to better understanding and characterization of the systematic and random errors, as well as reductions in these causes of uncertainty.
- *Collecting more measured data and using more precise measurement methods.* Uncertainty associated with bias and random sampling error can be reducing by increasing the sample size and filling in data gaps. Measurement

error can be reduced by using more precise measurement methods, avoiding simplifying assumption, and ensuring that measurement technologies are appropriately used and calibrated.

- *Refine Source and Sink Category and Overall Uncertainty Estimates.* For many individual source categories, further research is needed to more accurately characterize PDFs that surround emissions modeling input variables. This might involve using measured or published statistics or implementing rigorous elicitation protocol to elicit expert judgments, if published or measured data are not available. For example, activity data provided by EPA's GHGRP are used to develop estimates for several source categories—including but not limited to Magnesium Production and Processing, Semiconductor Manufacturing, and Electrical Transmission and Distribution—and could potentially be implemented for additional source categories to improve uncertainty results, where appropriate.
- *Improve characterization of trend uncertainty associated with base year Inventory estimates.* The characterization of base year uncertainty estimates could be improved, by developing explicit uncertainty models for the base year. This would then improve the analysis of trend uncertainty. However, not all of the simplifying assumptions described in the "Trend Uncertainty" section above may be eliminated through this process due to a lack of availability of more appropriate data.
- *Improving state of knowledge and eliminating known risk of bias.* Use expert judgment to improve the understanding of categories and processes leading to emissions and removals. Ensure methodologies, models, and estimation procedures are used appropriately and as advised by 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

7.5. Summary Information on Uncertainty Analyses by Source and Sink Category

The quantitative uncertainty estimates associated with each emission and removal category are reported within sectoral chapters of this Inventory following the discussions of inventory estimates and their estimation methodology. This section provides summary descriptions of the uncertainty analyses performed for some of the source and sink categories, including the models and methods used to calculate the emission estimates and the potential sources of uncertainty surrounding them. These source or sink categories are organized below in the same order as the categories in each chapter of the main section of this Inventory. To avoid repetition, the following uncertainty analysis discussions of individual source categories do not include descriptions of these source categories. Hence, to better understand the details provided below, refer to the respective chapters and sections in the main section of this Inventory, as needed. All uncertainty estimates are reported relative to the current Inventory estimates for the 95 percent confidence interval, unless otherwise specified.

Energy

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the Energy chapter of the Inventory. For additional information on uncertainty for Energy sources, refer to Section 3.2.

CO₂ from Fossil Fuel Combustion

For estimates of CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion, the amount of CO₂ emitted is directly related to the amount of fuel consumed, the fraction of the fuel that is oxidized, and the carbon content of the fuel. Therefore, a careful accounting of fossil fuel consumption by fuel type, average carbon contents of fossil fuels consumed, and production of fossil fuel-based products with long-term carbon storage should yield an accurate estimate of CO₂ emissions.

Although statistics of total fossil fuel and other energy consumption are relatively accurate, the allocation of this consumption to individual end-use sectors (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation) is less certain. For example, for some fuels the sectoral allocations are based on price rates (i.e., tariffs), but a commercial establishment may be able to negotiate an industrial rate or a small industrial establishment may end up paying an industrial rate, leading to a misallocation of emissions. Also, the deregulation of the natural gas industry and the more recent deregulation of the electric power industry have likely led to some minor problems in collecting accurate energy statistics as firms in these industries have undergone significant restructuring.

For this uncertainty estimation, the inventory estimation model for CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion was integrated with the relevant variables from the inventory estimation model for International Bunker Fuels, to realistically characterize the interaction (or endogenous correlation) between the variables of these two models.

1 In developing the uncertainty estimation model, uniform distributions were assumed for all activity-related input
2 variables and emission factors, based on the SAIC/EIA (2001) report.¹³⁴ Triangular distributions were assigned for the
3 oxidization factors (or combustion efficiencies). The uncertainty ranges were assigned to the input variables based on the
4 data reported in SAIC/EIA (2001) and on conversations with various agency personnel.¹³⁵

5 The uncertainty ranges for the activity-related input variables were typically asymmetric around their inventory
6 estimates; the uncertainty ranges for the emissions factors were symmetric. Bias (or systematic uncertainties) associated
7 with these variables accounted for much of the uncertainties associated with these variables (SAIC/EIA 2001).¹³⁶ For
8 purposes of this uncertainty analysis, each input variable was simulated 10,000 times through Monte Carlo sampling.

9 **CH₄ and N₂O from Stationary Combustion**

10 The uncertainty estimation model for this source category was developed by integrating the CH₄ and N₂O stationary
11 source inventory estimation models with the model for CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion to realistically characterize the
12 interaction (or endogenous correlation) between the variables of these three models. About 55 input variables were simulated
13 for the uncertainty analysis of this source category (about 20 from the CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion inventory
14 estimation model and about 35 from the stationary source inventory models).

15 In developing the uncertainty estimation model, uniform distribution was assumed for all activity-related input
16 variables and N₂O emission factors, based on the SAIC/EIA (2001) report. For these variables, the uncertainty ranges were
17 assigned to the input variables based on the data reported in SAIC/EIA (2001). However, the CH₄ emission factors differ
18 from those used by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA). These factors and uncertainty ranges are based on
19 IPCC default uncertainty estimates (IPCC 2006).

20 **CH₄ and N₂O from Mobile Combustion**

21 The uncertainty analysis was performed on 2017 estimates of CH₄ and N₂O emissions, incorporating probability
22 distribution functions associated with the major input variables. For the purposes of this analysis, the uncertainty was
23 modeled for the following four major sets of input variables: (1) VMT data, by on-road vehicle and fuel type and (2) emission
24 factor data, by on-road vehicle, fuel, and control technology type, (3) fuel consumption, data, by non-road vehicle and
25 equipment type, and (4) emission factor data, by non-road vehicle and equipment type.

26 **Carbon Emitted from Non-Energy Uses of Fossil Fuels**

27 An uncertainty analysis was conducted to quantify the uncertainty surrounding the estimates of emissions and
28 storage factors from non-energy uses. This analysis, performed using @RISK software and the IPCC-recommended
29 Approach 2 methodology (Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation technique), provides for the specification of probability
30 density functions for key variables within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the inventory estimate.
31 The results presented below provide the 95 percent confidence interval, the range of values within which emissions are likely
32 to fall, for this source category.

33 The non-energy use analysis is based on U.S.-specific storage factors for (1) feedstock materials (natural gas, LPG,
34 pentanes plus, naphthas, other oils, still gas, special naphthas, and other industrial coal), (2) asphalt, (3) lubricants, and (4)
35 waxes. For the remaining fuel types (the “other” category in Table 3-20 and Table 3-21 in the NIR), the storage factors were
36 taken directly from IPCC (2006), where available, and otherwise assumptions were made based on the potential fate of
37 carbon in the respective NEU products. To characterize uncertainty, five separate analyses were conducted, corresponding
38 to each of the five categories. In all cases, statistical analyses or expert judgments of uncertainty were not available directly
39 from the information sources for all the activity variables; thus, uncertainty estimates were determined using assumptions
40 based on source category knowledge.

¹³⁴ SAIC/EIA (2001) characterizes the underlying probability density function for the input variables as a combination of uniform and normal distributions (the former to represent the bias component and the latter to represent the random component). However, for purposes of the current uncertainty analysis, it was determined that uniform distribution was more appropriate to characterize the probability density function underlying each of these variables.

¹³⁵ In the SAIC/EIA (2001) report, the quantitative uncertainty estimates were developed for each of the three major fossil fuels used within each end-use sector; the variations within the sub-fuel types within each end-use sector were not modeled. However, for purposes of assigning uncertainty estimates to the sub-fuel type categories within each end-use sector in the current uncertainty analysis, SAIC/EIA (2001)-reported uncertainty estimates were extrapolated.

¹³⁶ Although, in general, random uncertainties are the main focus of statistical uncertainty analysis, when the uncertainty estimates are elicited from experts, their estimates include both random and systematic uncertainties. Hence, both these types of uncertainties are represented in this uncertainty analysis.

Incineration of Waste

The uncertainties in the waste incineration emission estimates arise from both the assumptions applied to the data and from the quality of the data. Key factors include MSW incineration rate; fraction oxidized; missing data on waste composition; average C content of waste components; assumptions on the synthetic/biogenic C ratio; and combustion conditions affecting N₂O emissions. The highest levels of uncertainty surround the variables that are based on assumptions (e.g., percent of clothing and footwear composed of synthetic rubber); the lowest levels of uncertainty surround variables that were determined by quantitative measurements (e.g., combustion efficiency, C content of C black).

Coal Mining—TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

A quantitative uncertainty analysis was conducted for the coal mining source category using the IPCC-recommended Approach 2 uncertainty estimation methodology. Because emission estimates from underground ventilation systems were based on actual measurement data from EPA's GHGRP or from MSHA, uncertainty is relatively low.

Estimates of CH₄ recovered by degasification systems are relatively certain for utilized CH₄ because of the availability of EPA's GHGRP data and gas sales information. Many of the recovery estimates use data on wells within 100 feet of a mined area. However, uncertainty exists concerning the radius of influence of each well. The number of wells counted, and thus the avoided emissions, may vary if the drainage area is found to be larger or smaller than estimated.

In 2015 and 2016, a small level of uncertainty was introduced with using estimated rather than measured values of recovered methane from two of the mines with degasification systems. An increased level of uncertainty was applied to these two subsources, but the change had little impact on the overall uncertainty.

Surface mining and post-mining emissions are associated with considerably more uncertainty than underground mines, because of the difficulty in developing accurate emission factors from field measurements. However, since underground emissions constitute the majority of total coal mining emissions, the uncertainty associated with underground emissions is the primary factor that determines overall uncertainty.

Abandoned Underground Coal Mines—TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

A quantitative uncertainty analysis was conducted to estimate the uncertainty surrounding the estimates of emissions from abandoned underground coal mines. The uncertainty analysis described below provides for the specification of probability density functions for key variables within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the inventory estimate. The results provide the range within which, with 95 percent certainty, emissions from this source category are likely to fall.

A quantitative uncertainty analysis was conducted to estimate the uncertainty surrounding the estimates of emissions from abandoned underground coal mines using probability density functions for key variables within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the inventory estimate. The results provide the range within which, with 95 percent certainty, emissions from this source category are likely to fall.

As discussed above, the low, mid and high model generated decline curves for each basin were fitted to a hyperbolic decline curve. The decline curve parameters, D_i and b , for the low, mid and high decline curves were then used to define a triangular distribution and together with the initial rate value of a mine's emissions and time from abandonment, a probability density function for each mine in the coal basin was generated.

Petroleum Systems—TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

In recent years, EPA has made significant revisions to the Inventory methodology to use updated activity and emissions data. To update its characterization of uncertainty, EPA has conducted a quantitative uncertainty analysis using the IPCC Approach 2 methodology (Monte Carlo Simulation technique). For more information, please see the 2018 Uncertainty Memo. EPA used Microsoft Excel's @RISK add-in tool to estimate the 95 percent confidence bound around methane emissions from petroleum systems for the current Inventory, then applied the calculated bounds to both CH₄ and CO₂ emissions estimates. For the analysis, EPA focused on the five highest methane-emitting sources for the year 2016, which together emitted 78 percent of methane from petroleum systems in 2016, and extrapolated the estimated uncertainty for the remaining sources. The @RISK add-in provides for the specification of probability density functions (PDFs) for key variables within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the inventory estimate. The IPCC guidance notes that in using this method, "some uncertainties that are not addressed by statistical means may exist, including those arising from omissions or double counting, or other conceptual errors, or from incomplete understanding of the processes that may lead to inaccuracies in estimates developed from models." As a result, the understanding of the uncertainty of emission estimates for this category evolves and improves as the underlying methodologies and datasets improve. The uncertainty bounds reported below only reflect those uncertainties that EPA has been able to quantify and do not incorporate considerations such as modeling uncertainty, data representativeness, measurement errors, misreporting or misclassification.

Natural Gas Systems—TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

In recent years, EPA has made significant revisions to the Inventory methodology to use updated activity and emissions data. To update its characterization of uncertainty, EPA has conducted a quantitative uncertainty analysis using the IPCC Approach 2 methodology (Monte Carlo Simulation technique). For more information, please see the 2018 Uncertainty Memo. EPA used Microsoft Excel's @RISK add-in tool to estimate the 95 percent confidence bound around CH₄ emissions from natural gas systems for the current Inventory, then applied the calculated bounds to both CH₄ and CO₂ emissions estimates. For the analysis, EPA focused on the 16 highest-emitting sources for the year 2016, which together emitted 78 percent of methane from natural gas systems in 2016, and extrapolated the estimated uncertainty for the remaining sources. The @RISK add-in provides for the specification of probability density functions (PDFs) for key variables within a computational structure that mirrors the calculation of the inventory estimate. The IPCC guidance notes that in using this method, "some uncertainties that are not addressed by statistical means may exist, including those arising from omissions or double counting, or other conceptual errors, or from incomplete understanding of the processes that may lead to inaccuracies in estimates developed from models." The uncertainty bounds reported below only reflect those uncertainties that EPA has been able to quantify and do not incorporate considerations such as modeling uncertainty, data representativeness, measurement errors, misreporting or misclassification. The understanding of the uncertainty of emission estimates for this category evolves and improves as the underlying methodologies and datasets improve.

Abandoned Oil and Gas Wells

To characterize uncertainty surrounding estimates of abandoned well emissions, EPA conducted a quantitative uncertainty analysis using the IPCC Approach 2 methodology (Monte Carlo simulation technique) for year 2016 for total abandoned oil and gas well CH₄ emissions in the previous Inventory, and has applied the calculated uncertainty ranges to the 2017 estimates. See the *2018 Abandoned Wells Memo*¹³⁷ for details of the uncertainty analysis methods. EPA used measurement data from the Kang et al. (2016) and Townsend-Small et al. (2016) studies to characterize the CH₄ emission factor PDFs. For activity data inputs (e.g., total count of abandoned wells, split between plugged and unplugged), EPA assigned default uncertainty bounds of +/- 10 percent based on expert judgment.

Energy Sources of Precursor Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Uncertainties in these estimates are partly due to the accuracy of the emission factors used and accurate estimates of activity data. A quantitative uncertainty analysis was not performed.

International Bunker Fuels

Emission estimates related to the consumption of international bunker fuels are subject to the same uncertainties as those from domestic aviation and marine mobile combustion emissions; however, additional uncertainties result from the difficulty in collecting accurate fuel consumption activity data for international transport activities separate from domestic transport activities. Uncertainties exist with regard to the total fuel used by military aircraft and ships, and in the activity data on military operations and training that were used to estimate percentages of total fuel use reported as bunker fuel emissions. There are uncertainties in aircraft operations and training activity data. There is uncertainty associated with ground fuel estimates for 1997 through 2001. Small fuel quantities may have been used in vehicles or equipment other than that which was assumed for each fuel type. There are also uncertainties in fuel end-uses by fuel type, emissions factors, fuel densities, diesel fuel sulfur content, aircraft and vessel engine characteristics and fuel efficiencies, and the methodology used to back-calculate the data set to 1990 using the original set from 1995.

There is also concern regarding the reliability of the existing DOC (1991 through 2018) data on marine vessel fuel consumption reported at U.S. customs stations due to the significant degree of inter-annual variation.

Wood Biomass and Biofuel Consumption

It is assumed that the combustion efficiency for woody biomass is 100 percent, which is believed to be an overestimate of the efficiency of wood combustion processes in the United States. Decreasing the combustion efficiency would decrease emission estimates for CO₂. Additionally, the heat content applied to the consumption of woody biomass in the residential, commercial, and electric power sectors is unlikely to be a completely accurate representation of the heat content for all the different types of woody biomass consumed within these sectors. Emission estimates from ethanol and biodiesel production are more certain than estimates from woody biomass consumption due to better activity data collection methods and uniform combustion techniques.

¹³⁷ See <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-04/documents/ghgemissions_abandoned_wells.pdf>

Industrial Processes and Product Use

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the Industrial Processes and Product Use chapter of the Inventory.

Cement Production

The uncertainties contained in these estimates are primarily due to uncertainties in the lime content of clinker and in the percentage of CKD recycled inside the cement kiln. Uncertainty is also associated with the assumption that all calcium-containing raw materials are CaCO_3 , when a small percentage likely consists of other carbonate and non-carbonate raw materials.

Lime Production

The uncertainties contained in these estimates can be attributed to slight differences in the chemical composition of lime products and CO_2 recovery rates for on-site process use over the time series. Although the methodology accounts for various formulations of lime, it does not account for the trace impurities found in lime, such as iron oxide, alumina, and silica. In addition, a portion of the CO_2 emitted during lime production will actually be reabsorbed when the lime is consumed, especially at captive lime production facilities. Another uncertainty is the assumption that calcination emissions for LKD are around 2 percent. Publicly available on LKD generation rates, total quantities not used in cement production, and types of other byproducts/wastes produced at lime facilities is limited.

Glass Production

The uncertainty levels presented in this section arise in part due to variations in the chemical composition of limestone used in glass production. In addition to calcium carbonate, limestone may contain smaller amounts of magnesia, silica, and sulfur, among other minerals (potassium carbonate, strontium carbonate and barium carbonate, and dead burned dolomite). Similarly, the quality of the limestone (and mix of carbonates) used for glass manufacturing will depend on the type of glass being manufactured.

The estimates below also account for uncertainty associated with activity data. Large fluctuations in reported consumption exist, reflecting year-to-year changes in the number of survey responders. The uncertainty resulting from a shifting survey population is exacerbated by the gaps in the time series of reports. The accuracy of distribution by end use is also uncertain because this value is reported by the manufacturer of the input carbonates (limestone, dolomite and soda ash) and not the end user.

There is a high uncertainty associated with this estimate, as dolomite is a major raw material consumed in glass production. Additionally, there is significant inherent uncertainty associated with estimating withheld data points for specific end uses of limestone and dolomite. The uncertainty of the estimates for limestone and dolomite used in glass making is especially high. Lastly, much of the limestone consumed in the United States is reported as “other unspecified uses;” therefore, it is difficult to accurately allocate this unspecified quantity to the correct end-uses.

Other Process Uses of Carbonates

The uncertainty levels presented in this section account for uncertainty associated with activity data. Data on limestone and dolomite consumption are collected by USGS through voluntary national surveys. The uncertainty resulting from a shifting survey population is exacerbated by the gaps in the time series of reports. The accuracy of distribution by end use is also uncertain because this value is reported by the producer/mines and not the end user. Additionally, there is significant inherent uncertainty associated with estimating withheld data points for specific end uses of limestone and dolomite. Lastly, much of the limestone consumed in the United States is reported as “other unspecified uses;” therefore, it is difficult to accurately allocate this unspecified quantity to the correct end-uses.

Uncertainty in the estimates also arises in part due to variations in the chemical composition of limestone. In addition to calcium carbonate, limestone may contain smaller amounts of magnesia, silica, and sulfur, among other minerals. The exact specifications for limestone or dolomite used as flux stone vary with the pyrometallurgical process and the kind of ore processed.

For emissions from soda ash consumption, the primary source of uncertainty, results from the fact that these emissions are dependent upon the type of processing employed by each end-use. Specific emission factors for each end-use are not available, so a Tier 1 default emission factor is used for all end uses.

Ammonia Production

The uncertainties presented in this section are primarily due to how accurately the emission factor used represents an average across all ammonia plants using natural gas feedstock. Uncertainties are also associated with ammonia production estimates and the assumption that all ammonia production and subsequent urea production was from the same process—conventional catalytic reforming of natural gas feedstock, with the exception of one ammonia production plant located in

Kansas that is manufacturing ammonia from petroleum coke feedstock. Uncertainty is also associated with the representativeness of the emission factor used for the petroleum coke-based ammonia process. It is also assumed that ammonia and urea are produced at collocated plants from the same natural gas raw material. The uncertainty of the total urea production activity data, based on USGS Minerals Yearbook: Nitrogen data, is a function of the reliability of reported production data and is influenced by the completeness of the survey responses. In addition, due to the fact that 2017 nitrogen data has yet to be published, 2016 is used as a proxy which may result in greater uncertainty.

Urea Consumption for Non-Agricultural Purposes

The primary uncertainties associated with this source category are associated with the accuracy of these estimates as well as the fact that each estimate is obtained from a different data source. Because urea production estimates are no longer available from the USGS, there is additional uncertainty associated with urea produced beginning in 2011. There is also uncertainty associated with the assumption that all of the carbon in urea is released into the environment as CO₂ during use.

Nitric Acid Production

Uncertainty associated with the parameters used to estimate N₂O emissions includes the share of U.S. nitric acid production attributable to each emission abatement technology over the time series (especially prior to 2010), and the associated emission factors applied to each abatement technology type.

Adipic Acid Production

Uncertainty associated with N₂O emission estimates includes the methods used by companies to monitor and estimate emissions. While some information has been obtained through outreach with facilities, limited information is available over the time series on these methods, abatement technology destruction and removal efficiency rates and plant specific production levels.

Caprolactam, Glyoxal and Glyoxylic Acid Production

Estimation of emissions of N₂O from caprolactam production can be treated as analogous to estimation of emissions of N₂O from nitric acid production. Both production processes involve an initial step of NH₃ oxidation which is the source of N₂O formation and emissions (IPCC 2006). Therefore, uncertainties for the default values in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is an estimate based on default values for nitric acid plants. In general, default emission factors for gaseous substances have higher uncertainties because mass values for gaseous substances are influenced by temperature and pressure variations and gases are more easily lost through process leaks. The default values for caprolactam production have a relatively high level of uncertainty due to the limited information available (IPCC 2006).

Silicon Carbide Production and Consumption

There is uncertainty associated with the emission factors used because they are based on stoichiometry as opposed to monitoring of actual SiC production plants. For CH₄, there is also uncertainty associated with the hydrogen-containing volatile compounds in the petroleum coke (IPCC 2006). There is also uncertainty associated with the use or destruction of methane generated from the process in addition to uncertainty associated with levels of production, net imports, consumption levels, and the percent of total consumption that is attributed to metallurgical and other non-abrasive uses.

Titanium Dioxide Production

Each year, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) collects titanium industry data for titanium mineral and pigment production operations. If TiO₂ pigment plants do not respond, production from the operations is estimated based on prior year production levels and industry trends. Variability in response rates varies from 67 to 100 percent of TiO₂ pigment plants over the time series.

Although some TiO₂ may be produced using graphite or other carbon inputs, information and data regarding these practices were not available. Titanium dioxide produced using graphite inputs, for example, may generate differing amounts of CO₂ per unit of TiO₂ produced as compared to that generated using petroleum coke in production. While the most accurate method to estimate emissions would be to base calculations on the amount of reducing agent used in each process rather than on the amount of TiO₂ produced, sufficient data were not available to do so.

Soda Ash Production

Emission estimates from soda ash production have relatively low associated uncertainty levels in that reliable and accurate data sources are available for the emission factor and activity data for trona-based soda ash production. Soda ash production data was collected by the USGS from voluntary surveys. One source of uncertainty is the purity of the trona ore used for manufacturing soda ash. The emission factor used for this estimate assumes the ore is 100 percent pure, and likely overestimates the emissions from soda ash manufacture.

Petrochemical Production

The CH₄ and CO₂ emission factors used for acrylonitrile and methanol production are based on a limited number of studies. Using plant-specific factors instead of default or average factors could increase the accuracy of the emission estimates; however, such data were not available for the current Inventory report. There is some uncertainty in the applicability of the average emission factors for each petrochemical type across all prior years. While petrochemical production processes in the United States have not changed significantly since 1990, some operational efficiencies have been implemented at facilities over the time series.

HCFC-22 Production

The uncertainty analysis presented in this section was based on a plant-level Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation for 2006. A normal probability density function was assumed for all measurements and biases except the equipment leak estimates for one plant; a log-normal probability density function was used for this plant's equipment leak estimates. The simulation for 2006 yielded a 95-percent confidence interval for U.S. emissions of 6.8 percent below to 9.6 percent above the reported total.

The relative errors yielded by the Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation for 2006 were applied to the U.S. emission estimate for 2017. The resulting estimates of absolute uncertainty are likely to be reasonably accurate because (1) the methods used by the two remaining plants to estimate their emissions are not believed to have changed significantly since 2006, and (2) although the distribution of emissions among the plants has changed between 2006 and 2017 (because one plant has closed), the plant that currently accounts for most emissions had a relative uncertainty in its 2006 (as well as 2005) emissions estimate that was similar to the relative uncertainty for total U.S. emissions. Thus, the closure of one plant is not likely to have a large impact on the uncertainty of the national emission estimate.

Carbon Dioxide Consumption There is uncertainty associated with the data reported through EPA's GHGRP. Specifically, there is uncertainty associated with the amount of CO₂ consumed for food and beverage applications given a threshold for reporting under GHGRP applicable to those reporting under Subpart PP, in addition to the exclusion of the amount of CO₂ transferred to all other end-use categories. Second, uncertainty is associated with the exclusion of imports/exports data for CO₂ suppliers.

Phosphoric Acid Production

Regional production for 2017 was estimated based on regional production data from previous years and multiplied by regionally-specific emission factors. There is uncertainty associated with the degree to which the estimated 2017 regional production data represents actual production in those regions. Total U.S. phosphate rock production data are not considered to be a significant source of uncertainty because all the domestic phosphate rock producers report their annual production to the USGS.

An additional source of uncertainty in the calculation of CO₂ emissions from phosphoric acid production is the carbonate composition of phosphate rock; the composition of phosphate rock varies depending upon where the material is mined, and may also vary over time. Another source of uncertainty is the disposition of the organic carbon content of the phosphate rock. A third source of uncertainty is the assumption that all domestically-produced phosphate rock is used in phosphoric acid production and used without first being calcined.

Iron and Steel Production and Metallurgical Coke Production

Uncertainty is associated with the total U.S. coking coal consumption, total U.S. coke production and materials consumed during this process. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, uncertainty parameters are applied to primary data inputs to the calculation (i.e., coking coal consumption and metallurgical coke production) only.

There is uncertainty associated with the assumption that all coal used for purposes other than coking coal is for direct injection coal. There is also uncertainty associated with the C contents for pellets, sinter, and natural ore, which are assumed to equal the C contents of direct reduced iron, when consumed in the blast furnace. There is uncertainty associated with the consumption of natural ore under current industry practices. For EAF steel production, there is uncertainty associated with the amount of EAF anode and charge carbon consumed due to inconsistent data throughout the time series. Also for EAF steel production, there is uncertainty associated with the assumption that 100 percent of the natural gas attributed to "steelmaking furnaces" by AISI is process-related and nothing is combusted for energy purposes. Uncertainty is also associated with the use of process gases such as blast furnace gas and coke oven gas.

Ferroalloy Production

Annual ferroalloy production was reported by the USGS in three broad categories until the 2010 publication: ferroalloys containing 25 to 55 percent silicon (including miscellaneous alloys), ferroalloys containing 56 to 95 percent silicon, and silicon metal (through 2005 only, 2005 value used as proxy for 2005 through 2010). Starting with the 2011 Minerals Yearbook, USGS started reporting all the ferroalloy production under a single category: total silicon materials

production. The total silicon materials quantity was allocated across the three categories based on the 2010 production shares for the three categories. Refer to the Methodology section for further details. Additionally, production data for silvery pig iron (alloys containing less than 25 percent silicon) are not reported by the USGS to avoid disclosing proprietary company data. Emissions from this production category, therefore, were not estimated.

Also, some ferroalloys may be produced using wood or other biomass as a primary or secondary carbon source (carbonaceous reductants), however information and data regarding these practices were not available. Emissions from ferroalloys produced with wood or other biomass would not be counted under this source because wood-based carbon is of biogenic origin.¹³⁸ Even though emissions from ferroalloys produced with coking coal or graphite inputs would be counted in national trends, they may be generated with varying amounts of CO₂ per unit of ferroalloy produced. The most accurate method for these estimates would be to base calculations on the amount of reducing agent used in the process, rather than the amount of ferroalloys produced. These data, however, were not available, and are also often considered confidential business information.

Aluminum Production

Uncertainty was assigned to the CO₂, CF₄, and C₂F₆ emission values reported by each individual facility to EPA's GHGRP. Uncertainty surrounding the reported CO₂, CF₄, and C₂F₆ emission values were determined to have a normal distribution with uncertainty ranges of ±6, ±16, and ±20 percent, respectively.

Magnesium Production- TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

Uncertainty surrounding the total estimated emissions in 2016 is attributed to the uncertainties around SF₆, HFC-134a, and CO₂ emission estimates. To estimate the uncertainty surrounding the estimated 2016 SF₆ emissions from magnesium production and processing, the uncertainties associated with three variables were estimated: (1) emissions reported by magnesium producers and processors for 2016 through EPA's GHGRP, (2) emissions estimated for magnesium producers and processors that reported via the Partnership in prior years but did not report 2016 emissions through EPA's GHGRP, and (3) emissions estimated for magnesium producers and processors that did not participate in the Partnership or report through EPA's GHGRP. Additional uncertainties exist in these estimates that are not addressed in this methodology, such as the basic assumption that SF₆ neither reacts nor decomposes during use.

Lead Production

Uncertainty associated with lead production relates to the emission factors and activity data used. The direct smelting emission factor used in primary production is taken from Sjardin (2003) who averaged the values provided by three other studies (Dutrizac et al. 2000; Morris et al. 1983; Ullman 1997). For secondary production, Sjardin (2003) added a CO₂ emission factor associated with battery treatment. The applicability of these emission factors to plants in the United States is uncertain. There is also a smaller level of uncertainty associated with the accuracy of primary and secondary production data provided by the USGS which is collected via voluntary surveys; the uncertainty of the activity data is a function of the reliability of reported plant-level production data and the completeness of the survey response.

Zinc Production

The uncertainty associated with these estimates is two-fold, relating to activity data and emission factors used. First, there is uncertainty associated with the amount of EAF dust consumed in the United States to produce secondary zinc using emission-intensive Waelz kilns. Second, there is uncertainty associated with the emission factors used to estimate CO₂ emissions from secondary zinc production processes.

Semiconductor Manufacturing

The equation used to estimate uncertainty is:

Total Emissions (E_T) = GHGRP Reported F-GHG Emissions (E_{R,F-GHG}) + Non-Reporters' Estimated F-GHG Emissions (E_{NR,F-GHG}) + GHGRP Reported N₂O Emissions (E_{R,N₂O}) + Non-Reporters' Estimated N₂O Emissions (E_{NR,N₂O})

where E_R and E_{NR} denote totals for the indicated subcategories of emissions for F-GHG and N₂O, respectively.

The uncertainty in E_T presented in Table 4-98 of the Inventory results from the convolution of four distributions of emissions, each reflecting separate estimates of possible values of E_{R,F-GHG}, E_{R,N₂O}, E_{NR,F-GHG}, and E_{NR,N₂O}. The approach and methods for estimating each distribution and combining them to arrive at the reported 95 percent confidence interval (CI) are described in the remainder of this section.

The uncertainty estimate of E_{R,F-GHG}, or GHGRP-reported F-GHG emissions, is developed based on gas-specific uncertainty estimates of emissions for two industry segments, one processing 200 mm wafers and one processing 300 mm

¹³⁸ Emissions and sinks of biogenic carbon are accounted for in the Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter.

1 wafers. Uncertainties in emissions for each gas and industry segment were developed during the assessment of emission
2 estimation methods for the subpart I GHGRP rulemaking in 2012 (see *Technical Support for Modifications to the*
3 *Fluorinated Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimation Method Option for Semiconductor Facilities under Subpart I*, docket
4 EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0028).¹³⁹ The 2012 analysis did not take into account the use of abatement. For the industry segment
5 that processed 200 mm wafers, estimates of uncertainties at a 95 percent CI ranged from ± 29 percent for C_3F_8 to ± 10 percent
6 for CF_4 . For the corresponding 300 mm industry segment, estimates of the 95 percent CI ranged from ± 36 percent for C_4F_8
7 to ± 16 percent for CF_4 . These gas and wafer-specific uncertainty estimates are applied to the total emissions of the facilities
8 that did not abate emissions as reported under EPA's GHGRP.

9 For those facilities reporting abatement of emissions under EPA's GHGRP, estimates of uncertainties for the no
10 abatement industry segments are modified to reflect the use of full abatement (abatement of *all* gases from *all* cleaning and
11 etching equipment) and partial abatement. These assumptions used to develop uncertainties for the partial and full abatement
12 facilities are identical for 200 mm and 300 mm wafer processing facilities. For all facilities reporting gas abatement, a
13 triangular distribution of destruction or removal efficiency is assumed for each gas. The triangular distributions range from
14 an asymmetric and highly uncertain distribution of zero percent minimum to 90 percent maximum with 70 percent most
15 likely value for CF_4 to a symmetric and less uncertain distribution of 85 percent minimum to 95 percent maximum with 90
16 percent most likely value for C_4F_8 , NF_3 , and SF_6 . For facilities reporting partial abatement, the distribution of fraction of the
17 gas fed through the abatement device, for each gas, is assumed to be triangularly distributed as well. It is assumed that no
18 more than 50 percent of the gases are abated (i.e., the maximum value) and that 50 percent is the most likely value and the
19 minimum is zero percent. Consideration of abatement then resulted in four additional industry segments, two 200-mm wafer-
20 processing segments (one fully and one partially abating each gas) and two 300-mm wafer-processing segment (one fully
21 and the other partially abating each gas). Gas-specific emission uncertainties were estimated by convolving the distributions
22 of unabated emissions with the appropriate distribution of abatement efficiency for fully and partially abated facilities using
23 a Montel Carlo simulation.

24 The uncertainty in $E_{R,F-GHG}$ is obtained by allocating the estimates of uncertainties to the total GHGRP-reported
25 emissions from each of the six industry segments, and then running a Monte Carlo simulation which results in the 95 percent
26 CI for emissions from GHGRP reporting facilities ($E_{R,F-GHG}$).

27 The uncertainty in E_{R,N_2O} is obtained by assuming that the uncertainty in the emissions reported by each of the
28 GHGRP reporting facilities results from the uncertainty in quantity of N_2O consumed and the N_2O emission factor (or
29 utilization). Similar to analyses completed for subpart I (see *Technical Support for Modifications to the Fluorinated*
30 *Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimation Method Option for Semiconductor Facilities under Subpart I*, docket EPA-HQ-OAR-
31 2011-0028), the uncertainty of N_2O consumed was assumed to be 20 percent. Consumption of N_2O for GHGRP reporting
32 facilities was estimated by back-calculating from emissions reported and assuming no abatement. The quantity of N_2O
33 utilized (the complement of the emission factor) was assumed to have a triangular distribution with a minimum value of
34 zero percent, mode of 20 percent and maximum value of 84 percent. The minimum was selected based on physical
35 limitations, the mode was set equivalent to the subpart I default N_2O utilization rate for chemical vapor deposition, and the
36 maximum was set equal to the maximum utilization rate found in ISMI Analysis of Nitrous Oxide Survey Data (ISMI, 2009).
37 The inputs were used to simulate emissions for each of the GHGRP reporting, N_2O -emitting facilities. The uncertainty for
38 the total reported N_2O emissions was then estimated by combining the uncertainties of each of the facilities reported
39 emissions using Monte Carlo simulation.

40 **Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances- TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY** 41 **REPORT**

42 Given that emissions of ODS substitutes occur from thousands of different kinds of equipment and from millions
43 of point and mobile sources throughout the United States, emission estimates must be made using analytical tools such as
44 the Vintaging Model or the methods outlined in IPCC (2006). Though the model is more comprehensive than the IPCC

¹³⁹ On November 13, 2013, EPA published a final rule revising subpart I (Electronics Manufacturing) of the GHGRP (78 FR 68162). The revised rule includes updated default emission factors and updated default destruction and removal efficiencies that are slightly different from those that semiconductor manufacturers were required to use to report their 2012 emissions. The uncertainty analyses that were performed during the development of the revised rule focused on these updated defaults, but are expected to be reasonably representative of the uncertainties associated with the older defaults, particularly for estimates at the country level. (They may somewhat underestimate the uncertainties associated with the older defaults at the facility level.) For simplicity, the 2012 estimates are assumed to be unbiased although in some cases, the updated (and therefore more representative) defaults are higher or lower than the older defaults. Multiple models and sensitivity scenarios were run for the subpart I analysis. The uncertainty analysis presented here made use of the Input gas and wafer size model (Model 1) under the following conditions: Year = 2010, f = 20, n = SIA3.

default methodology, significant uncertainties still exist with regard to the levels of equipment sales, equipment characteristics, and end-use emissions profiles that were used to estimate annual emissions for the various compounds.

The uncertainty analysis quantifies the level of uncertainty associated with the aggregate emissions across the 67 end-uses in the Vintaging Model. In order to calculate uncertainty, functional forms were developed to simplify some of the complex “vintaging” aspects of some end-use sectors, especially with respect to refrigeration and air-conditioning, and to a lesser degree, fire extinguishing. These sectors calculate emissions based on the entire lifetime of equipment, not just equipment put into commission in the current year, thereby necessitating simplifying equations. The functional forms used variables that included growth rates, emission factors, transition from ODSs, change in charge size as a result of the transition, disposal quantities, disposal emission rates, and either stock for the current year or original ODS consumption. Uncertainty was estimated around each variable within the functional forms based on expert judgment, and a Monte Carlo analysis was performed. The most significant sources of uncertainty for this source category include the emission factors for residential unitary air-conditioners, as well as the percent of non-MDI aerosol propellant that is HFC-152a.

Electrical Transmission and Distribution

To estimate the uncertainty associated with emissions of SF₆ from Electrical Transmission and Distribution, uncertainties associated with four quantities were estimated: (1) emissions from Partners, (2) emissions from GHGRP-Only Reporters, (3) emissions from Non-Reporters, and (4) emissions from manufacturers of electrical equipment.

Nitrous Oxide from Product Uses

The overall uncertainty associated with the 2017 N₂O emission estimate from N₂O product usage was calculated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (2006) Approach 2 methodology. Uncertainty associated with the parameters used to estimate N₂O emissions include production data, total market share of each end use, and the emission factors applied to each end use, respectively.

Agriculture

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to some source categories included in the Agriculture chapter of the Inventory.

Enteric Fermentation

A quantitative uncertainty analysis for this source category was performed using the IPCC-recommended Approach 2 uncertainty estimation methodology based on a Monte Carlo Stochastic Simulation technique as described in ICF (2003). These uncertainty estimates were developed for the 1990 through 2001 Inventory (i.e., 2003 submission to the UNFCCC). There have been no significant changes to the methodology since that time; consequently, these uncertainty estimates were directly applied to the 2017 emission estimates in this Inventory.

A total of 185 primary input variables (177 for cattle and 8 for non-cattle) were identified as key input variables for the uncertainty analysis. A normal distribution was assumed for almost all activity- and emission factor-related input variables. Triangular distributions were assigned to three input variables (specifically, cow-birth ratios for the three most recent years included in the 2001 model run) to ensure only positive values would be simulated.

Manure Management

An analysis (ERG 2003) was conducted for the manure management emission estimates presented in the 1990 through 2001 Inventory (i.e., 2003 submission to the UNFCCC) to determine the uncertainty associated with estimating CH₄ and N₂O emissions from livestock manure management. These uncertainty estimates were directly applied to the 2017 emission estimates as there have not been significant changes in the methodology since that time.

Rice Cultivation

Sources of uncertainty in the Tier 3 method include management practices, uncertainties in model structure (i.e., algorithms and parameterization), and variance associated with the NRI sample. Sources of uncertainty in the IPCC (2006) Tier 1 method include the emission factors, management practices, and variance associated with the NRI sample. A Monte Carlo analysis was used to propagate uncertainties in the Tier 1 and 3 methods. The uncertainties from the Tier 1 and 3 approaches are combined to produce the final CH₄ emissions estimate using simple error propagation (IPCC 2006).

Agricultural Soil Management

Uncertainty is estimated for each of the following five components of N₂O emissions from agricultural soil management: (1) direct emissions simulated by DAYCENT; (2) the components of indirect emissions (N volatilized and leached or runoff) simulated by DAYCENT; (3) direct emissions calculated with the IPCC (2006) Tier 1 method; (4) the components of indirect emissions (N volatilized and leached or runoff) calculated with the IPCC (2006) Tier 1 method; and (5) indirect emissions estimated with the IPCC (2006) Tier 1 method.

Liming

Uncertainty regarding the amount of limestone and dolomite applied to soils was estimated at ± 15 percent with normal densities (Tepordei 2003; Willett 2013b). Analysis of the uncertainty associated with the emission factors included the fraction of lime dissolved by nitric acid versus the fraction that reacts with carbonic acid, and the portion of bicarbonate that leaches through the soil and is transported to the ocean. The probability distribution functions for the fraction of lime dissolved by nitric acid and the portion of bicarbonate that leaches through the soil were represented as triangular distributions between ranges of zero and 100 percent of the estimates.

Urea Fertilization

The largest source of uncertainty was the default emission factor, which assumes that 100 percent of the C in $\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$ applied to soils is ultimately emitted into the environment as CO_2 . In addition, urea consumption data also have uncertainty that is propagated through the emission calculation using a Monte Carlo simulation approach as described by the IPCC (2006).

Field Burning of Agricultural Residues

Emissions are estimated using a linear regression model with autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) errors for 2017. Due to data limitations, there are additional uncertainties in agricultural residue burning, particularly the omission of burning associated with Kentucky bluegrass and “other crop” residues.

Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter of the Inventory.

Forest Land Remaining Forest Land

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* sub-chapter of Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter of the Inventory.

Changes in Forest Carbon Stocks

A quantitative uncertainty analysis placed bounds on current flux for forest ecosystems through a combination of sample-based and model-based approaches to uncertainty for forest ecosystem CO_2 flux (IPCC Approach 1).

Non- CO_2 Emissions from Forest Fires

In order to quantify the uncertainties for non- CO_2 emissions from wildfires and prescribed burns, a Monte Carlo (IPCC Approach 2) sampling approach was employed to propagate uncertainty based on the model and data applied for U.S. forest land. See IPCC (2006) and Annex 3.13 for the quantities and assumptions employed to define and propagate uncertainty.

N_2O Emissions from N Additions to Forest Soils

The amount of N_2O emitted from forests depends not only on N inputs and fertilized area, but also on a large number of variables, including organic C availability, oxygen gas partial pressure, soil moisture content, pH, temperature, and tree planting/harvesting cycles. The effect of the combined interaction of these variables on N_2O flux is complex and highly uncertain.

Uncertainties exist in the fertilization rates, annual area of forest lands receiving fertilizer, and the emission factors. The uncertainty ranges around the 2004 activity data and emission factor input variables are directly applied to the 2017 emission estimates. IPCC (2006) provided estimates for the uncertainty associated with direct and indirect N_2O emission factor for synthetic N fertilizer application to soils.

Drained Organic Soils

Uncertainties are based on the sampling error associated with forest area and the uncertainties provided in the Chapter 2 (IPCC 2013) emissions factors.

Land Converted to Forest Land

Uncertainty estimates for forest pool C stock changes were developed using the same methodologies as described in the Forest Land Remaining Forest Land section for aboveground and belowground biomass, dead wood, and litter. The exception was when IPCC default estimates were used for reference C stocks in certain conversion categories (i.e., Cropland Converted to Forest Land and Grassland Converted to Forest Land). In those cases, the uncertainties associated with the IPCC (2006) defaults were included in the uncertainty calculations.

Cropland Remaining Cropland

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* sub-chapter of Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter of the Inventory.

Mineral and Organic Soil Carbon Stock Change

Uncertainty is associated with lack of reporting of agricultural woody biomass and dead organic matter C stock changes. The IPCC (2006) does not recommend reporting of annual crop biomass in *Cropland Remaining Cropland* because all of the biomass senesces each year and so there is no long-term storage of C in this pool. For woody plants, biomass C stock changes are likely minor in perennial crops, such as orchards and nut plantations. There will be some removal and replanting of tree crops each year, but the net effect on biomass C stock changes is probably minor because the overall area and tree density is relatively constant across time series. In contrast, agroforestry practices, such as shelterbelts, riparian forests and intercropping with trees, may be significantly changing biomass C stocks over the Inventory time series, at least in some regions of the United States, but there are currently no datasets to evaluate the trends. Changes in litter C stocks are also assumed to be negligible in croplands over annual time frames, although there are certainly significant changes at sub-annual time scales across seasons. However, this trend may change in the future, particularly if crop residue becomes a viable feedstock for bioenergy production.

Land Converted to Cropland

The uncertainty analysis for biomass, dead wood and litter C losses with *Forest Land Converted to Cropland* is conducted in the same way as the uncertainty assessment for forest ecosystem C flux in the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* category.

Uncertainty is also associated with lack of reporting of agricultural biomass and dead organic matter C stock changes. Biomass C stock changes are likely minor in perennial crops, such as orchards and nut plantations, given the small amount of change in land used to produce these commodities in the United States. In contrast, agroforestry practices, such as shelterbelts, riparian forests and intercropping with trees, may have led to significant changes in biomass C stocks, at least in some regions of the United States. However, there are currently no datasets to evaluate the trends. Changes in dead organic matter C stocks are assumed to be negligible with conversion of land to croplands with the exception of forest lands, which are included in this analysis. This assumption will be further explored in a future analysis.

Grassland Remaining Grassland

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the *Grassland Remaining Grassland* sub-chapter of Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter of the Inventory.

Soil Carbon Stock Changes

Uncertainty is associated with a lack of reporting on biomass and litter C stock changes. Biomass C stock changes may be significant for managed grasslands with woody encroachment despite not having attained enough tree cover to be considered forest lands. Changes in dead organic matter C stocks are assumed to be negligible in grasslands on an annual basis, although there are certainly significant changes at sub-annual time scales across seasons.

Non-CO₂ Emissions from Grassland Fires

Uncertainty is associated with lack of reporting of emissions from biomass burning in grassland of Alaska. There is also uncertainty due to lack of reporting combustion of woody biomass, and this is another planned improvement.

Land Converted to Grassland

The uncertainty analysis for biomass, dead wood and litter C losses with *Forest Land Converted to Grassland* is conducted in the same way as the uncertainty assessment for forest ecosystem C flux in the *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* category.

Wetlands Remaining Wetlands

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the *Wetlands Remaining Wetlands* sub-chapter of Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter of the Inventory.

Peatlands Remaining Peatlands

The uncertainty associated with peat production data was estimated to be ± 25 percent (Apodaca 2008) and assumed to be normally distributed. The uncertainty associated with peat production data stems from the fact that the USGS receives data from the smaller peat producers but estimates production from some larger peat

distributors. The peat type production percentages were assumed to have the same uncertainty values and distribution as the peat production data (i.e., ± 25 percent with a normal distribution). The uncertainty associated with the reported production data for Alaska was assumed to be the same as for the lower 48 states, or ± 25 percent with a normal distribution. It should be noted that the DGGS estimates that around half of producers do not respond to their survey with peat production data; therefore, the production numbers reported are likely to underestimate Alaska peat production (Szumigala 2008). The uncertainty associated with the average bulk density values was estimated to be ± 25 percent with a normal distribution (Apodaca 2008). IPCC (2006 and 2013) gives uncertainty values for the emissions factors for the area of peat deposits managed for peat extraction based on the range of underlying data used to determine the emission factors. The uncertainty associated with the emission factors was assumed to be triangularly distributed. The uncertainty values surrounding the C fractions were based on IPCC (2006) and the uncertainty was assumed to be uniformly distributed. The uncertainty values associated with the fraction of peatland covered by ditches was assumed to be ± 100 percent with a normal distribution based on the assumption that greater than 10 percent coverage, the upper uncertainty bound, is not typical of drained organic soils outside of The Netherlands (IPCC 2013).

Coastal Wetlands

Underlying uncertainties in estimates of soil C stock changes and methane emissions include error in uncertainties associated with Tier 2 literature values of soil C stocks and methane flux and assumptions that underlie the methodological approaches applied and uncertainties linked to interpretation of remote sensing data. Uncertainty specific to coastal wetlands include differentiation of palustrine and estuarine community classes which determines the soil C stock and methane flux applied. Soil C stocks and methane fluxes applied are determined from vegetation community classes across the coastal zone and identified by NOAA C-CAP. Community classes are further subcategorized by climate zones and growth form (forest, shrub-scrub, marsh). Soil C stock data for all subcategories are not available and thus assumptions were applied using expert judgement about the most appropriate assignment of a soil C stock to a disaggregation of a community class.

Uncertainties in N₂O emissions from aquaculture are based on expert judgement for the NOAA *Fisheries of the United States* fisheries production data (± 100 percent) multiplied by default uncertainty level for N₂O emissions found in Table 4.15, chapter 4 of the *Wetlands Supplement*.

Land Converted to Coastal Wetlands

Underlying uncertainties in estimates of soil C removal factors and CH₄ include error in uncertainties associated with Tier 2 literature values of soil C removal estimates and CH₄ flux, assumptions that underlie the methodological approaches applied and uncertainties linked to interpretation of remote sensing data.

Settlements Remaining Settlements

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the *Settlements Remaining Settlements* sub-chapter of the Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry chapter of the Inventory.

Soil Carbon Stock Changes

Uncertainty of soil carbon stock changes is a result of soil C losses from drained organic soils in *Settlements Remaining Settlements*.

Changes in Carbon Stocks in Settlement Trees

Uncertainty associated with changes in C stocks in settlement trees includes the uncertainty associated with settlement area, percent urban tree coverage in developed land and how well it represents percent tree cover in settlement areas, and estimates of gross and net C sequestration for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A 10 percent uncertainty was associated with settlement area estimates based on expert judgment. Uncertainty associated with estimates of percent settlement tree coverage for each of the 50 states was based on standard error associated with the photo-interpretation of national tree cover in developed lands. Uncertainty associated with estimates of gross and net C sequestration for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia was based on standard error estimates for each of the state-level sequestration estimates (Table 6-74 of Section 6.10, *Changes in Carbon Stocks in Settlement Trees*). These estimates are based on field data collected in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, and uncertainty in these estimates increases as they are scaled up to the national level.

Additional uncertainty is associated with the biomass equations, conversion factors, and decomposition assumptions used to calculate C sequestration and emission estimates (Nowak et al. 2002). These results also exclude changes in soil C stocks, and there is likely some overlap between the settlement tree C estimates and the forest tree C estimates (e.g., Nowak et al. 2013).

N₂O Fluxes from Settlement Soils

The amount of N₂O emitted from settlement soils depends not only on N inputs and area of drained organic soils, but also on a large number of variables that can influence rates of nitrification and denitrification, including organic C availability; rate, application method, and timing of N input; oxygen gas partial pressure; soil moisture content; pH; temperature; and irrigation/watering practices. The effect of the combined interaction of these variables on N₂O emissions is complex and highly uncertain. The IPCC default methodology does not explicitly incorporate any of these variables, except variations in the total amount of fertilizer N and biosolids applications. All settlement soils are treated equivalently under this methodology.

Uncertainties exist in both the fertilizer N and biosolids application rates in addition to the emission factors. Uncertainty in fertilizer N application is assigned a default level of ± 50 percent.¹⁴⁰ Uncertainty in drained organic soils is based on the estimated variance from the NRI survey (USDA-NRCS 2015). For 2013 to 20176, there is also additional uncertainty associated with the surrogate data method. Uncertainty in the amounts of biosolids applied to non-agricultural lands and used in surface disposal is derived from variability in several factors, including: (1) N content of biosolids; (2) total sludge applied in 2000; (3) wastewater existing flow in 1996 and 2000; and (4) the biosolids disposal practice distributions to non-agricultural land application and surface disposal. Uncertainty in the direct and indirect emission factors is provided by IPCC (2006).

Changes in Yard Trimming and Food Scrap Carbon Stocks in Landfills

The uncertainty analysis for landfilled yard trimmings and food scraps includes an evaluation of the effects of uncertainty for the following data and factors: disposal in landfills per year (tons of C), initial C content, moisture content, decay rate, and proportion of C stored. The C storage landfill estimates are also a function of the composition of the yard trimmings (i.e., the proportions of grass, leaves and branches in the yard trimmings mixture). There are respective uncertainties associated with each of these factors.

Waste

The uncertainty analysis descriptions in this section correspond to source categories included in the Waste chapter of the Inventory.

Landfills

Several types of uncertainty are associated with the estimates of CH₄ emissions from MSW and industrial waste landfills when the FOD method is applied directly for 1990 to 2004 in the Waste Model and, to some extent, in the GHGRP methodology. The approach used in the MSW emission estimates assumes that the CH₄ generation potential (L₀) and the rate of decay that produces CH₄ from MSW, as determined from several studies of CH₄ recovery at MSW landfills, are representative of conditions at U.S. MSW landfills. When this top-down approach is applied at the nationwide level, the uncertainties are assumed to be less than when applying this approach to individual landfills and then aggregating the results to the national level. In other words, the FOD method as applied in this Inventory is not facility-specific modeling and while this approach may over- or under-estimate CH₄ generation at some landfills if used at the facility-level, the result is expected to balance out because it is being applied nationwide. There is also a high degree of uncertainty and variability associated with the FOD model, particularly when a homogeneous waste composition and hypothetical decomposition rates are applied to heterogeneous landfills (IPCC 2006). There is less uncertainty in the GHGRP data because this methodology is facility-specific, uses directly measured CH₄ recovery data (when applicable), and allows for a variety of landfill gas collection efficiencies, destruction efficiencies, and/or oxidation factors to be used.

Uncertainty also exists in the scale-up factor applied for years 2005 to 2009 and in the back-casted emissions estimates for 2005 to 2009. Limited information is available for landfills that do not report to the GHGRP and assumptions were made for many landfills in order to estimate the scale-up factor. Additionally, a simple methodology was used to back-cast emissions for 2005 to 2009 using the GHGRP emissions from 2010 to 2017. This methodology does not factor in annual landfill to landfill changes in landfill CH₄ generation and recovery.

Aside from the uncertainty in estimating landfill CH₄ generation, uncertainty also exists in the estimates of the landfill gas oxidized. Another significant source of uncertainty lies with the estimates of CH₄ recovered by flaring and gas-to-energy projects at MSW landfills that are sourced from the Inventory's CH₄ recovery databases (used for years 1990 to 2004). The lack of landfill-specific information regarding the number and type of industrial waste landfills in the United States is a primary source of uncertainty with respect to the industrial waste generation and emission estimates.

¹⁴⁰ No uncertainty is provided with the USGS fertilizer consumption data (Ruddy et al. 2006) so a conservative ± 50 percent is used in the analysis. Biosolids data are also assumed to have an uncertainty of ± 50 percent.

Wastewater Treatment

The overall uncertainty associated with both the 2017 CH₄ and N₂O emission estimates from wastewater treatment and discharge was calculated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Approach 2 methodology (IPCC 2006). Uncertainty associated with the parameters used to estimate CH₄ emissions include that of numerous input variables used to model emissions from domestic wastewater, and wastewater from pulp and paper manufacturing, meat and poultry processing, fruits and vegetable processing, ethanol production, and petroleum refining.

Uncertainty associated with the parameters used to estimate N₂O emissions include that of biosolids disposal, total U.S. population, average protein consumed per person, fraction of N in protein, non-consumption nitrogen factor, emission factors per capita and per mass of sewage-N, and for the percentage of total population using centralized wastewater treatment plants.

Uncertainty associated with constructed wetlands parameters including U.S. population served by constructed wetlands, and emission and conversion factors are from IPCC (2013), whereas uncertainty associated with POTW flow to constructed wetlands and influent BOD and nitrogen concentrations were based on expert judgment.

Composting

The estimated uncertainty from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is ±50 percent for the Approach 1 methodology.

References

- Apodaca, L. (2008) E-mail correspondence. Lori Apodaca, Peat Commodity Specialist, USGS and Emily Rowan, ICF International. October and November.
- EPA (2002) *Quality Assurance/Quality Control and Uncertainty Management Plan for the U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory: Procedures Manual for Quality Assurance/Quality Control and Uncertainty Analysis*, U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory Program, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Atmospheric Programs, EPA 430-R-02-007B, June 2002.
- ERG (2003) "Methodology for Estimating Uncertainty for Manure Management Greenhouse Gas Inventory." Contract No. GS-10F-0036, Task Order 005. Memorandum to EPA from ERG, Lexington, MA. September 26, 2003.
- Dutrizac, J.E., V. Ramachandran, and J.A. Gonzalez (2000) Lead-Zinc 2000. The Minerals, Metals, and Materials Society.
- ICF (2003) Uncertainty Analysis of 2001 Inventory Estimates of Methane Emissions from Livestock Enteric Fermentation in the U.S. Memorandum from ICF International to the Environmental Protection Agency. May 2003.
- IPCC (2013) *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands*. Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Tanabe, K., Srivastava, N., Baasansuren, J., Fukuda, M. and Troxler, T.G. (eds.). Published: IPCC, Switzerland.
- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. The National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [H.S. Eggleston, L. Buendia, K. Miwa, T. Ngara, and K. Tanabe (eds.)]. Hayama, Kanagawa, Japan.
- ISMI (2009) Analysis of Nitrous Oxide Survey Data. Walter Worth. June 8, 2009. Available online at: <<http://sematech.org/docubase/document/5015atr.pdf>>.
- Kang, et al. (2016) "Identification and characterization of high methane-emitting abandoned oil and gas wells." PNAS, vol. 113 no. 48, 13636–13641, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1605913113.
- Morris, D., F.R. Steward, and P. Evans (1983) Energy Efficiency of a Lead Smelter. *Energy* 8(5):337-349.
- Nowak, D.J., E.J. Greenfield, R.E. Hoehn, and E. Lapoint (2013) Carbon storage and sequestration by trees in urban and community areas of the United States." *Environmental Pollution* 178: 229-236.
- Nowak, D.J., D.E. Crane, J.C. Stevens, and M. Ibarra (2002) Brooklyn's Urban Forest. General Technical Report NE-290. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Newtown Square, PA.
- Ruddy B.C., D.L. Lorenz, and D.K. Mueller (2006) County-level estimates of nutrient inputs to the land surface of the conterminous United States, 1982-2001. Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5012. U.S. Department of the Interior.
- SAIC/EIA (2001) Monte Carlo Simulations of Uncertainty in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimates. Final Report. Prepared by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) for Office of Integrated Analysis and Forecasting, Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. Washington, D.C. June 22, 2001.

- 1 Sjardin, M. (2003) CO₂ Emission Factors for Non-Energy Use in the Non-Ferrous Metal, Ferroalloys and Inorganics
2 Industry. Copernicus Institute. Utrecht, the Netherlands.
- 3 Szumigala, D.J. (2008) Phone conversation. Dr. David Szumigala, Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys,
4 Alaska Department of Natural Resources and Emily Rowan, ICF International. October 17, 2008.
- 5 Tepordei, V.V. (2003) Personal communication. Valentin Tepordei, U.S. Geological Survey and ICF Consulting, August
6 18, 2003.
- 7 Townsend-Small, et al. (2016) "Emissions of coalbed and natural gas methane from abandoned oil and gas wells in the
8 United States." Geophysical Research Letters, Vol. 43, 1789–1792.
- 9 Ullman (1997) Ullman's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry: Fifth Edition. Volume A5. John Wiley and Sons.
- 10 USDA-NRCS (2015) Summary Report: 2012 National Resources Inventory, Natural Resources Conservation Service,
11 Washington, D.C., and Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
12 <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcseprd396218.pdf>.
- 13 Willett, J.C. (2013) Personal Communication. Jason Willet, U.S. Geological Survey and ICF International. September 9,
14 2013.

ANNEX 8 QA/QC Procedures

8.1. Background

The purpose of this annex is to describe the Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) procedures and information quality considerations that are used throughout the process of creating and compiling the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*. This includes the evaluation of the quality and relevance of data and models used as inputs into the Inventory; proper management, incorporation, and aggregation of data; and review of the numbers and estimates to ensure that they are as accurate and transparent as possible. Quality control—in the form of both good practices (such as documentation procedures) and checks on whether good practices and procedures are being followed—is applied at every stage of inventory development and document preparation. In addition, quality assurance occurs at two stages—an expert review and a public review. While both phases can significantly contribute to the quality of the Inventory, the public review phase is also essential for promoting the openness of the Inventory development process and the transparency of the inventory data and methods. As described in respective source category text, comments received from these reviews may also result in updates or changes to continue to improve inventory quality.

8.2. Purpose


The *Quality Assurance/Quality Control and Uncertainty Management Plan for the U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory* (QA/QC Management Plan) guides the process of ensuring the quality of the Inventory. The QA/QC Management Plan describes data and methodology checks, develops processes governing peer review and public comments, and provides guidance on conducting an analysis of the uncertainty surrounding the emission estimates. The QA/QC Management Plan procedures also stress continual improvement, providing for corrective actions that are designed to improve the inventory estimates over time.

Key attributes of the QA/QC Management Plan are summarized in Figure A-19. These attributes include:

- *Procedures and Forms*: detailed and specific systems that serve to standardize the process of documenting and archiving information, as well as to guide the implementation of QA/QC and the analysis of uncertainty.
- *Implementation of Procedures*: application of QA/QC procedures throughout the whole Inventory development process from initial data collection, through preparation of the emission estimates, to publication of the Inventory.
- *Quality Assurance*: expert and public reviews for both the Inventory estimates and the report (which is the primary vehicle for disseminating the results of the Inventory development process). The expert technical review conducted by the UNFCCC supplements these QA processes, consistent with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (IPCC 2006).
- *Quality Control*: consideration of secondary data and category-specific checks (Tier 2 QC) in parallel, and coordination with the uncertainty assessment; the development of protocols and templates, which provide for more structured communication and integration with the suppliers of secondary information.
- *General (Tier 1) and category-specific (Tier 2) Checks*: quality controls and checks, as recommended by the *IPCC Good Practice Guidance and 2006 IPCC Guidelines* (IPCC 2006).
- *Record Keeping*: provisions to track which procedures have been followed, the results of the QA/QC process, uncertainty analysis, and feedback mechanisms for corrective action based on the results of the investigations, which provide for continual data quality improvement and guided research efforts.
- *Multi-Year Implementation*: a schedule for coordinating the application of QA/QC procedures across multiple years, especially for category-specific QC, focusing on key categories.
- *Interaction and Coordination*: promoting communication within the EPA, across Federal agencies and departments, state government programs, and research institutions and consulting firms involved in supplying data or preparing estimates for the Inventory. The QA/QC Management Plan itself is intended to be revised to reflect new information that becomes available as the program develops, methods are improved, or additional supporting documents become necessary.

In addition, based on the national QA/QC Management Plan for the Inventory, source and sink-specific QA/QC plans have been developed for a number of sources and sinks. These plans follow the procedures outlined in the national QA/QC plan, tailoring the procedures to the specific text and spreadsheets of the individual sources. For each greenhouse gas emissions source or sink included in this Inventory, minimum general QA/QC analysis consistent with Vol. 1, Chapter 6 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* has been undertaken. Where QA/QC activities for a particular source go beyond the general level, and include category-specific checks, further explanation is provided within the respective source category text. Similarly, responses or updates based on comments from the expert, public and the international technical expert reviews (e.g., UNFCCC) are also addressed within the respective source or sink category text. For transparency, responses to public and expert review comments are also posted on the EPA website with the final report.

Figure A-19: U.S. QA/QC Plan Summary



8.3. Assessment Factors

The *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks* development process follows guidance outlined in EPA's *Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity, of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency*¹⁴¹ and *A Summary of General Assessment Factors for Evaluating the Quality of Scientific and Technical Information*.¹⁴² This includes evaluating the data and models used as inputs into the

¹⁴¹ EPA report #260R-02-008, October 2002, Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/quality/guidelines-ensuring-and-maximizing-quality-objectivity-utility-and-integrity-information>>.

¹⁴² EPA report #100/B-03/001, June 2003, Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/risk/guidance-evaluating-and-documenting-quality-existing-scientific-and-technical-information>>, and Addendum to: *A Summary of General Assessment Factors for*

Inventory against the five general assessment factors: soundness, applicability and utility, clarity and completeness, uncertainty and variability, evaluation and review. Table A-287 defines each factor and explains how it was considered during the process of creating the current Inventory.

Table A-287: Assessment Factors and Definitions¹⁴³

General Assessment Factor	Definition	How the Factor was Considered
Soundness (AF1)	The extent to which the scientific and technical procedures, measures, methods or models employed to generate the information are reasonable for, and consistent with their intended application.	The underlying data, methodologies, and models used to generate the <i>Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks</i> are reasonable for and consistent with their intended application, to provide information regarding all sources and sinks of greenhouse gases in the United States for the Inventory year, as required per UNFCCC Annex I country reporting requirements. The U.S. emissions calculations follow the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> developed specifically for UNFCCC inventory reporting. They are based on the best available, peer-reviewed scientific information, and have been used by the international community for over 20 years. When possible, Tier 2 and Tier 3 methodologies from the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> are applied to calculate U.S. emissions more accurately.
Applicability and Utility (AF2)	The extent to which the information is relevant for the Agency's intended use.	The Inventory's underlying data, methodology, and models are relevant for their intended application because they generate the sector-specific greenhouse gas emissions trends necessary for assessing and understanding all sources and sinks of greenhouse gases in the United States for the Inventory year. They are relevant for communicating U.S. emissions information to domestic audiences, and they are consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> developed specifically for UNFCCC reporting purposes of international greenhouse gas inventories.
Clarity and Completeness (AF3)	The degree of clarity and completeness with which the data, assumptions, methods, quality assurance, sponsoring organizations and analyzes employed to generate the information are documented.	The methodological and calculation approaches applied to generate the <i>Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks</i> are extensively documented in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> . The Inventory report describes its adherence to the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> , and the U.S. Government agencies provide data to implement the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> approaches. Any changes made to calculations, due to updated data and methods, are explained and documented in the report consistent with UNFCCC reporting guidelines.
Uncertainty and Variability (AF4)	The extent to which the variability and uncertainty (quantitative and qualitative) in the information or in the procedures, measures, methods or models are evaluated and characterized.	The evaluation of uncertainties for underlying data is documented in the Uncertainty section of the Annex to the <i>Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks</i> . In accordance with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> , the uncertainty associated with the Inventory's underlying data, methodology, and models was evaluated by running a Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis on source category emissions data to produce a 95 percent confidence interval for the annual greenhouse gas emissions for that source. To develop overall uncertainty estimates, the Monte Carlo simulation output data for each emission source category uncertainty analysis were combined by type of gas,

¹⁴³ Evaluating the Quality of Scientific and Technical Information, December 2012, Available online at <<http://www.epa.gov/risk/summary-general-assessment-factors-evaluating-quality-scientific-and-technical-information>>.

		and the probability distributions were fitted to the combined simulation output data where such simulated output data were available.
Evaluation and Review (AF5)	The extent of independent verification, validation and peer review of the information or of the procedures, measures, methods or models.	The majority of the underlying methodology, calculations, and models used to generate the <i>Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks</i> have been independently verified and peer reviewed as part of their publication in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>. In cases where the methodology differs slightly from the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>, these were independently verified and validated by technical experts during the annual expert review phase of the Inventory development process. For the data used in calculating greenhouse gas emissions for each source, multiple levels of evaluation and review occur. Data are compared to results from previous years, and calculations and equations are continually evaluated and updated as appropriate. Throughout the process, inventory data and methodological improvements are planned and incorporated. The Inventory undergoes annual cycles of expert and public review before publication. This process ensures that both experts and the general public can review each category of emissions and sinks, and have an extended opportunity to provide feedback on the methodologies used, calculations, data sources, and presentation of information.

8.4. Responses During the Review Process – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

During the annual preparation of the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*, EPA receives comments and implements methodological improvements to the U.S. Inventory to improve the transparency, accuracy, completeness, comparability, and consistency of emission estimates. EPA reviews the significance of the improvement, QC, and uncertainty assessments when considering improvements to the Inventory. Planned improvements are documented within each source and sink category's Planned Improvements section, as well as the Recalculations and Improvements chapter. Additionally, the Executive Summary, also highlights key changes in methodologies from previous Inventory reports.

EPA is continually working to improve the Inventory in response to the feedback received during the Expert, Public, and UNFCCC Review periods, as well as stakeholder outreach. For instance, as mentioned in the Planned Improvements section of the Landfills source category (Section 7.1), EPA has engaged in stakeholder outreach to increase the transparency in the Inventory methodology and to identify supplemental data sources that can lead to methodological improvements.

As noted in the previous section, for transparency, responses to comments received while developing the annual estimates from Public Review and Expert Review are posted on the EPA website with the final Inventory.¹⁴⁴

As noted above in section 8.2 the expert technical review conducted by the UNFCCC supplements these QA processes. This review by an international expert review team (ERT) occurs after submission of the final report to the UNFCCC and assesses consistency with UNFCCC reporting guidelines. More information on the UNFCCC reporting guidelines and the review process can be found here:

- UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines for annual national greenhouse gas inventories:
<https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a03.pdf#page=2>

¹⁴⁴ See <<https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-sinks>>.

1	• UNFCCC Review Process and Guidelines for annual national greenhouse gas inventories:
2	https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/cop20/eng/10a03.pdf#page=3
3	• Inventory Review reports of annual submissions (latest reviews):
4	https://unfccc.int/process/transparency-and-reporting/reporting-and-review-under-the-convention/greenhouse-gas-inventories-annex-i-parties/inventory-review-reports-2016
5	
6	Table A-288 summarizes the areas of improvement identified through UN review and the response column
7	provides a status of the findings.

Table A-288: Response to UN Review of the 2016 Inventory Submission – TO BE UPDATED FOR FINAL INVENTORY REPORT

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
1.	(G.1)	General	NA	Improve the completeness of the inventory, in particular for those categories for which there are methodologies in IPCC guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories. A number of categories are reported as “NE” because no data are available (as reported in Common Reporting Format (CRF) table 9) for which methodologies are available in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.	Addressing. See updated explanations in Annex 5 and CRF Table 9 of the current Inventory.
2.	(G.2)	General	NA	Ensure time-series consistency when using Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) data directly in the national GHG inventory. The United States reported that EPA will continue to assess GHGRP data to improve the inventory.	Completed. When GHGRP data are used, respective categories address time-series consistency in accordance with IPCC’s technical bulletin on use of facility-specific data in national greenhouse gas inventories and Vol. 1, Chapter 5 on Time Series Consistency from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
3.	(G.5)	General	NA – Multiple categories	Use the plant-specific emissions from GHGRP to improve the disaggregation of combustion and industrial process emissions. In the section on planned improvements in the national inventory report (NIR) (1.B.2.c Venting and flaring – oil and natural gas –CO ₂ and CH ₄), the United States includes the investigation into the appropriateness of using associated gas venting and flaring data from GHGRP.	See Introduction to IPPU chapter of current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). The U.S. has integrated GHGRP or other appropriate data where feasible to improve disaggregation of combustion and industrial process emissions and also indicated under category-level planned improvement discussions where further work is being considered while also avoiding double counting of emissions. See Response in Energy, rows 9 and 11.
Energy					
4.	(E.1)	Energy	NA	Include information on the progress made in the plan to use GHGRP data to: develop more accurate national emission factors (EFs) based on plant-specific measurements; estimate emissions for more detailed categories and subcategories; disaggregate energy consumption data based on the facility-level reporting, and indicate which data have been sourced from GHGRP and which from other sources. The United States stated in the NIR 2016 (pp. 3 and 4) that the “GHGRP dataset and the data presented in this inventory report are complementary and, as indicated in the respective planned improvements sections for categories in this chapter, EPA is analyzing how to use facility-level GHGRP data to improve the national estimates presented in this inventory.”	Completed. For the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission), EPA clarified how GHGRP data are used as applicable, for example estimating emissions from more detailed categories, and for the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission), EPA will update the status of its approach. EPA continues to assess how to use facility-level GHGRP data to improve the national estimates.
5.	(E.2)	Energy	1.A. Fuel combustion – sectoral approach – all fuels – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and	Collect the necessary activity data (AD) and EFs to prepare emission estimates for the combustion of biomass and other fuels for these categories, including those used in the United States territories, focusing resources, as appropriate, on improvements in	Addressing. The CRF Tables document accounting for emissions from these

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
			N ₂ O (29, 2013) (32 and 51, 2012)	line with the <i>Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines</i> and the <i>IPCC Good Practice Guidance</i> , and report the corresponding emissions. The United States still has subcategories for which estimates have not been prepared, for example: biomass consumption under the category other (1.A.5.a); gaseous fuels for railways (1.A.3.c) and domestic navigation (1.A.3.d) under the category transport; AD for exploration of oil (1.B.2.a) and exploration and processing (1.B.2.b) under the category oil, natural gas and other emissions from energy production; and AD of CO ₂ transport and storage (1.C).	sources, including if they are Included Elsewhere (IE) or Not Estimated (NE).
6.	(E.4)	Energy	NA – Multiple categories	Report emissions from all categories and for the full time series at the most disaggregated level, in line with the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines, in particular for manufacturing industries and construction and fugitive emissions. The Expert Review Team (ERT) noted that the situation has been gradually improving since the 2013 submission and that individualized emission estimates for petroleum refining (1.A.1.b) and subcategories under manufacturing industries and construction (1.A.2) are now reported for all fuels excluding biomass and other fuels. However, the lack of disaggregation remains in some categories, in particular agriculture/forestry/fisheries (1.A.4.c) under other sectors, venting and flaring under fugitive emissions (1.B.2.c), heavy-duty trucks and buses (1.A.3.b.iii) under the category transport, and commercial and institutional (1.A.4.a) under the category other sectors.	Addressing. Some emissions previously not estimated (1.B.2.a and 1.B.2.b, exploration in oil and gas systems) have been included in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). Emissions are reported to the disaggregated level available with the data and the CRF Tables document accounting for emissions from all applicable sources, including if they are Included Elsewhere (IE) or Not Estimated (NE).
7.	(E.5)	Energy	Fuel combustion – reference approach – all fuels – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O (32, 2013) (41, 2012)	Provide a more transparent clarification of how the difference in emissions between the reference and the sectoral approaches is determined and which fuels are subtracted as non-energy use (NEU) and feedstocks. The United States provided a theoretical explanation of the reference approach, and also indicated in the NIR (p. A-431, Annex 4) that “Bunker fuels and feedstocks accounted for in the IPPU chapter are subtracted from these estimates, while fuel consumption in U.S. Territories is added”. The ERT notes that transparency is not fully achieved in the information provided for some categories, especially for NEU of fuels in the iron and steel category.	Completed. More information on the Iron and Steel adjustment for NEU of fuels is included in Annex 2 of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
8.	(E.6)	Energy	International aviation – liquid fuels– CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O (35, 2013)	Harmonize and reconcile the data between the reference and the sectoral approach or furnish an adequate explanation of these inconsistencies, where appropriate. The United States indicated in the NIR (p. 3-90) that “the feasibility of including data from a broader range of domestic and international sources for bunker fuels, including data from studies such as the Third IMO GHG Study 2014, is being considered”.	Addressing. EPA continues to evaluate the feasibility of using data from other sources for the reference approach and will update as appropriate in the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission).
9.	(E.7, G.6)	Energy	Feedstocks, reductants and other NEU of fuels – all fuels – CO ₂ , CH ₄	Allocate emissions from NEU of fuels reported under the energy sector to the correct categories in accordance with the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines and the <i>Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines</i> .	Completed. The United States has improved the explanation of its country-specific approach to the allocation of

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
			and N ₂ O (38, 2013) (47, 2012)	Report only emissions from fuels combusted for the use of energy under fuel combustion, and reallocate the relevant emissions currently reported under the subcategory NEU (other) and part of the fuel used under the subcategory United States territories (other). In CRF table 1.A.4, the United States reported aggregated data and emissions from liquid fuels, solid fuels and gaseous fuels under the subcategory NEU (other). During the review, the United States explained that it uses a country-specific methodology for the non-energy use of fuels in line with paragraph 10 of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines to most accurately portray emissions from this category for the United States and reported in line with paragraph 35 of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines. However, noting that paragraph 35 refers to the requirement to report on “how feedstocks and non-energy use of fuels have been accounted for in the inventory, under the energy or industrial processes sector, in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and noting that the 2006 IPCC Guidelines”, and also noting that this indicates that the reporting of emissions from NEU under the IPPU sector and the emissions of combustion is under the energy sector, with specific exception, e.g., the coke making, the ERT is of the view that the issue identified in paragraph 38 of the ARR2014 and paragraph 47 in ARR2012 is not yet resolved.¹⁴⁵	NEU of fuels in the introduction of the IPPU chapter and Annex 2. The United States uses a country-specific methodology for non-energy use of fuels in line with para. 10, Decision 24/CP.19 to most accurately portray U.S. emissions from NEU. The United States continues to evaluate ways to update this approach and provides more clarification as applicable in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
10.	(E.8)	Energy	1.A. Fuel combustion – sectoral approach – solid, liquid and gaseous fuels – CO ₂ , N ₂ O and CH ₄ (39, 2013)	Complete the collection of AD for the consumption of biomass and other fuels for the years 2010 and 2011. Consumption of biomass in the subcategory industries (1.A.1c.i) and consumption of liquid, solid, gaseous and biomass fuels in the subcategory other energy industries (1.A.1ciii) under manufacture of solid fuels and other energy industries are reported as “IE”, and the United States explained that data are not available to estimate fuel consumption separately from those for the category public electricity and heat production (1.A.1.a). The United States indicated in the NIR 2016 (p.3-32) that “In examining data from EPA’s GHGRP that would be useful to improve the emission estimates for the CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion category, particular attention will also be made to ensure time-series consistency, as the facility-level reporting data from EPA’s GHGRP are not available for all inventory years as reported in this Inventory”. The United States further explained that in the NIR, “analyses will be conducted to align reported facility-level fuel types and IPCC fuel types per the national energy statistics. Additional work will commence to ensure CO₂ emissions from biomass are separated in the facility-level reported data, and maintaining consistency with national energy statistics provided by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)”.	Addressing. EPA continues to examine the use of GHGRP data for disaggregation of emission estimates. Further clarification is planned for the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission).

¹⁴⁵ The UNFCCC ERT also raised a similar comment on emissions from NEU under the General section. To streamline the review, both comments are consolidated here.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
11.	(E.11)	Energy	1.B.2.c Venting and flaring – oil and natural gas – CO ₂ and CH ₄ (44, 2013)	Make efforts to use GHGRP data to improve the resolution and disaggregation of fugitive emissions from flaring and venting. In the section on planned improvements in the NIR (p.3-66), the United States includes the investigation into the appropriateness of using associated gas venting and flaring data from GHGRP.	Completed. In this year's inventory, EPA has included improved estimates for associated gas venting and flaring CO ₂ and CH ₄ emissions using GHGRP data. However, based on available U.S. data and methods, the United States cannot accurately develop an estimate of vented versus flaring versus leak emissions consistently across natural gas and petroleum systems.
12.	(E.13)	Energy	1.A. Fuel combustion – sectoral approach – all fuels – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	Previous review reports have noted that the inventory for the energy sector of the United States is not sufficiently transparent, given that emissions from consumption of all fuel types for some categories were aggregated and reported under the subcategory other, under manufacturing industries and construction. During the review, the United States pointed out that it has reported disaggregated emissions to the extent possible given the break in data collection by industrial classification with currently available data. The Party also indicated that some of the emissions under transport (1.A.3), for example emissions from heavy-duty trucks and buses, are disaggregated in the CRF tables of the Party's 2016 submission. Referring to the recommendation in previous review reports that the Party estimate emissions from all categories and for the full time series at the most disaggregated level, in line with the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines, the ERT recommends that the Party report disaggregated categories to the level where the EFs are distinguished (e.g. heavy-duty trucks and buses under road transport and also the categories and subcategories referred to in E.18 below).	Completed. Emissions are reported to the disaggregated level available with the data and the CRF tables document accounting for emissions from all applicable sources including if they are Included Elsewhere (IE) or Not Estimated (NE). Annex 5 includes further information on NE sources.
13.	(E.14)	Energy	1.A.3.b Road transportation – liquid fuels – CO ₂	The NIR states that the number of vehicle miles travelled by light-duty motor vehicles (passenger cars and light-duty trucks) increased by 37 percent from 1990 to 2014 as a result of a confluence of factors, including population growth, economic growth, urban sprawl and periods of low fuel prices. However, the CO₂ emissions from light-duty trucks have remained almost the same during this period. One of the reasons provided by the Party in response to a question raised by the ERT during the review is an increased share of new vehicles in the respective total stocks, resulting in better fuel economy of the respective vehicular stock. However, these details are not provided in the NIR. During the review, the United States also provided additional information on penetration, sales and fuel efficiency of new road vehicles over the years. The ERT considered that this helps to clarify the downward trends to a certain extent. The ERT recommends that the United States reference data provided in Annex 3.2 to the NIR when discussing trends in CO₂ emissions from road transportation by vehicle mode and provide more information on the national average fuel economy for each major road transport mode at a disaggregated level where the EFs (e.g. passenger	Completed. For the current inventory (i.e., 2018 submission) when discussing trends in the transportation sector, the United States references Annex 3.2 data by vehicle mode and provides transparent information on vehicle miles travelled and the share of new vehicles (in vehicle miles travelled) where possible.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				cars, light-duty trucks, heavy-duty trucks, buses) are distinguished for each inventory year.	
14.	(E.15)	Energy	1.A.3.b Road transportation – liquid fuels – CH ₄ and N ₂ O	N₂O emissions from road transport are a key category for the United States in 2014. The ERT noted that the implied emission factors (IEFs) for N₂O emissions from gasoline have consistently declined from 8.78 kg/TJ in 1990 to 2.55 kg/TJ in 2014. Similarly, the IEFs for CH₄ emissions have consistently declined from 14.55 kg/TJ in 1990 to 3.57 kg/TJ in 2014. The reasons for this are not transparently explained in the NIR. During the review, the Party provided additional information on penetration, sales and fuel efficiency of new road vehicles over the years of the inventory. The ERT considered that this helps to clarify the downward trends to a certain extent. The ERT recommends that, in order to improve the transparency of its reporting, the Party reference data in Annex 3.2 when discussing trends in CH₄ and N₂O emissions from road transportation by vehicle mode and provide information on penetration, sales and fuel efficiency of new road vehicles over the years of the inventory in its NIR to demonstrate the decrease in CH₄ and N₂O emissions is due to an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) percentage by vehicles with lower emission factors (i.e. Low emission vehicles (LEV) and EPA Tier 2).	Completed. For the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission), the United States references and discusses updates to the CH ₄ and N ₂ O EFs for mobile sources and explains impacts on emission trends.
15.	(E.16, E.17)	Energy	1.A.3.c Railways – gaseous fuels – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O 1.A.3.d Domestic navigation – gaseous fuels – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	In CRF table 9, the United States has used the notation key “NE” with the explanation: “It is unlikely that gaseous fuels are used by railways [or by shipping], but if small uses occur this fuel use is reported under the aggregated commercial category”. The ERT noted that, in the absence of any further information, this explanation is not sufficiently transparent to allow the ERT to consider whether the Party should be using the notation key “NE” or “IE” (i.e. included in the subcategory commercial/institutional under other sectors, as reported in CRF table 9). The ERT recommends that the Party provide an explanation as to why CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O emissions from gaseous fuels used in railways and by shipping have not been estimated in both the NIR and CRF table 9, in accordance with paragraph 37 of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines and in a transparent manner. Further, the ERT recommends that, if the emissions from the small uses of gaseous fuels are considered to be insignificant, the Party provide in the NIR justification for the exclusion in terms of the likely level of emissions, in accordance with paragraph 37(b) of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines.¹⁴⁶	Completed: This emission source was changed to Included Elsewhere (IE) in the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) and CRF with a discussion of how that was determined.
16.	(E.18)	Energy	1.A.5. Other (not specified elsewhere) – liquid, solid and gaseous fuels – CO ₂	The United States reported aggregated data and emissions from NEU of liquid fuels, solid fuels and gaseous fuels under Other (1.A.5). In the NIR, the Party explains that the consumption data of fuels have been adjusted to subtract those relating to industrial processes and product use, which are reported under the IPPU sector, and NEU which are reported under Other (1.A.5). The ERT noted that, in a footnote in the	Completed. The United States uses a country-specific methodology for non-energy use of fuels in line with para. 10, Decision 24/CP.19 to most accurately

¹⁴⁶ The UNFCCC ERT also raised a similar comment on 1.A.3.d Domestic navigation – gaseous fuels. To streamline review, both comments are consolidated here.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				NIR, the Party explained “some degree of double counting may occur between these estimates of NEU of fuels and process emissions from petrochemical production presented in the IPPU sector”. Further, the Party explained, in the same footnote, “data integration is not feasible at this time as feedstock data from EIA used to estimate NEU of fuels are aggregated by fuel type, rather than disaggregated by both fuel type and particular industries (e.g. petrochemical production), as currently collected through GHGRP and used for the petrochemical production category”. Noting that, according to the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>, only emissions from fuels combusted for the use of their energy should be reported under fuel combustion, the ERT recommends that the Party reallocate the emissions from NEU of fuels and process emissions currently reported under the subcategory NEU (other) under the energy sector to the relevant categories under the energy and IPPU sectors in order to avoid underestimation or overestimation of emissions.	portray U.S. emissions from NEU. See row 9. EPA continues to evaluate ways to update this approach including use of GHGRP data and provides more clarification as applicable in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
17.	(E.19)	Energy	1.B Fugitive emissions from fuels – CO ₂	The United States reported CO₂ fugitive emissions from coal mining and natural gas exploration as “NE”, and “IE” is reported for oil exploration, in CRF tables 1.B.1 and 1.B.2. In CRF table 9, the Party indicated that emissions from these categories are not estimated because of difficulties in obtaining data, and the inclusion of emissions from these categories will be investigated for future inventories. During the review, the Party further informed the ERT that CO₂ emissions from exploration is included in production emissions, and due to overlap in exploration and production data and emissions sources, these emissions will continue to be reported in production. The ERT recommends that the Party correct the notation key for CO₂ emissions from the natural gas exploration (from “NE” to “IE”) to reflect that those emissions are included in the CO₂ from natural gas production.	Completed. In the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission), the exploration emissions are reported separately from production segment emissions.
18.	(E.20)	Energy	1.B.2.c Venting and flaring – CO ₂ and CH ₄	The United States used the notation key “IE” for CO₂ and CH₄ emissions from venting and flaring activities under the category venting and flaring (1.B.2.c), and included the emissions under the fugitive subcategories of oil (1.B.2.a) and gas (1.B.2.b). However, the ERT noted that, in the NIR, the Party reports that the vented CH₄ and CO₂ emissions account for a large portion of the emissions from production operations. For example, it is indicated in the NIR that the flare emissions from crude oil refining accounts for slightly more than 94 percent of the total CO₂ emissions in petroleum systems. NIR tables 3-36 to 3-39 present the values for CO₂ and CH₄ emissions from various venting operations in petroleum systems. During the review, the Party explained that data are unavailable to estimate the split between venting, flaring and fugitives for these sources. Noting that the Party indicates that CH₄ emissions from petroleum systems is a key category, the ERT recommends that the United States enhance the transparency in reporting these emissions in accordance with the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines.	Completed: See row 11. Based on available U.S. data and methods, the United States cannot accurately develop an estimate of vented versus flaring versus leak emissions consistently across natural gas and petroleum systems.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
19.	(E.21)	Energy	1.C Carbon dioxide transport and storage – CO ₂	In the NIR (p. 3-67), the Party explained that facilities conducting geologic sequestration of CO₂ are required to develop and implement an EPA-approved site-specific monitoring, reporting and verification plan, and to report the amount of CO₂ sequestered using a mass balance approach. The Party further explains that available GHGRP data relevant for this inventory estimate consists of national-level annual quantities of CO₂ captured and extracted for enhanced oil recovery (EOR) applications for 2010 to 2014. Table 3-44 in the NIR provide the amount of potential emissions from CO₂ capture and extraction for EOR operations. However, the United States reported CO₂ emissions from CO₂ transport, injection and storage as “NE”, explaining that preliminary data were used to develop an estimate of potential emissions from this category, and that the availability of data to estimate emissions from this category continues to be evaluated for inclusion in future inventories. During the review, the United States explained that CO₂ emissions are currently included in the sections on natural gas systems and ammonia production of the NIR. The ERT recommends that the United States update the notation key from “NE” to “IE” to address how emissions from CO₂ transport injection and storage are estimated.	Completed. The United States implemented this recommendation in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
Industrial Processes and Product Use					
20.	(I.1)	IPPU	2. General (IPPU) – CO ₂ and CH ₄ (46, 2013) (62 and 75, 2012)	Improve the completeness of the inventory, in particular for CO₂ emissions from calcium carbide production and CH₄ emissions from styrene. The United States has improved the completeness of IPPU estimates, for example, a new vending machine end-use of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) is included within the EPA's Vintaging Model. However, several sources in the IPPU sector are reported as “NE”, including CO₂ from calcium carbide production. The ERT note that <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> do not provide a methodology for styrene production.	During the Expert Review phase of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission), EPA sought expert solicitation on data for calcium carbide industry. See Annex 5 of the 2018 submission for more information on calcium carbide. Reporting of CO ₂ emissions from calcium carbide has been changed from “NE” to “IE”.
21.	(I.7)	IPPU	2.B.9 Fluorochemical production – HFC-23 (57, 2013)	Ensure that the necessary QA/QC and verification measures are implemented at the plant level to ensure that continuous monitoring results in more accurate estimates. The NIR does not describe the QA/QC measures (e.g. QA processes within the GHGRP reporting system) or verification measures at the plant-specific (or source-specific) level.	Completed. Discussion on QA/QC and Verification is included in Chapter 4.13 HCFC-22 Production (IPCC Source Category 2B9a).
22.	(I.9)	IPPU	2.C.1 Iron and steel production – CO ₂ (54, 2013) (69, 2012)	Include a clear explanation of how natural gas used as fuel in coke plants in the iron and steel production process is reflected in the emission estimates within the inventory and in the carbon balance for activities related to iron and steel production. The NIR contains several clarifications of the reporting of natural gas in this category, including where there are gaps in data yet to be addressed. No carbon balance for iron and steel production is provided.	Addressing. To improve transparency, EPA will work to incorporate a carbon balance to demonstrate how emission estimates avoid the risks of gaps and double counting in line with guidance provided in the reporting <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> in Vol. 3, Ch. 4, sections 4.2.2.5 and 4.2.4.2 (Reporting and

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
					documentation). This improvement is noted in the Planned Improvements section of the Iron and Steel Production chapter of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission), but implementation may take additional time pending available resources.
23.	(I.12)	IPPU	2.F. Product uses as substitutes for ozone depleting substances – HFCs and SF ₆ (58, 2013)	Provide further information on the EPA Vintaging model, and the assumptions and factors used in the model to calculate equipment disposal quantities and equipment disposal emission rates. The NIR Annex 3.9 provides some insight into the methods used to estimate disposal emissions. However, the ERT noted that the explanatory text provided to the previous ERT is not included.	Completed. Emissions at disposal are calculated as explained in Annex 3.9. Disposal emission rates and equipment lifetimes (i.e., the time after placed into service that equipment is disposed of) are also shown. A footnote has been added to explain the calculation. The number of products and hence the amount of chemical placed into service in each year, and hence the emissions at disposal, rely on confidential business information that EPA may not publish under U.S. regulations.
24.	(I.13)	IPPU	2. General (IPPU) – all gases	The ERT noted that the information provided in the CRF tables and the NIR on recalculations was inconsistent. Data presented in the NIR (table 9-1) did not match the data presented within the CRF tables (e.g. table 8.s.1 and 8.s.4) for several IPPU categories. For example, CRF table 8.s.4 reports 2013 recalculations for HFC emissions from 2.F.4 aerosols, and recalculations from an unspecified mix of HFCs and perfluorocarbons (PFCs) from 2.F.6 other applications, but neither of these recalculations is referenced in NIR table 9-1. The ERT also noted typographical errors in the recalculations table (table 9.1) in the NIR and also in the completion of CRF table 2(I).A-Hs1 (interchanging of rows of production data in 2.B). During the review, the United States indicated that it has experienced multiple problems in importing data into the new CRF Reporter software. However, the United States did not respond to questions regarding the errors in the NIR and a request for revised recalculations data. As a result, the ERT was not provided with a full and transparent description of the recalculations in the 2016 submission, and hence was unable to review the rationale and accuracy of recalculations in the IPPU sector. The ERT recommends that the United States report full and detailed explanations of all recalculations to IPPU categories in the NIR, and provide information on changes to methods, assumptions, AD and EFs across all years as well as the rationale for the recalculations.	Completed. The United States provided full and detailed explanations of recalculations to IPPU categories in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). For example, the Recalculations Discussion in Section 4.24 - Substitution of Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) includes a description of updates to assumptions in EPA's Vintaging Model, which is used to estimate the actual—versus potential—emissions of various ODS substitutes. The Vintaging Model was revised in response to a peer review conducted on end uses within the Refrigeration/Air Conditioning and Fire Protection sectors.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
25.	(I.14)	IPPU	2. General (IPPU) – CO ₂	Annex 2 to the NIR (p. A-31) describes the derivation of petroleum coke energy and NEU allocations; petroleum coke use in the IPPU sector is subtracted from the overall energy balance, based on reported AD estimates for five IPPU categories. However, in CRF tables 1.A(b) and 1.A(d) the “carbon excluded” for petroleum coke is reported as “NO”. This is not consistent with the information in Annex 2 to the NIR and within the IPPU chapter, which indicate that petroleum coke is used in several emissive non-energy applications. During the review, the United States provided a time series of the adjustments made to the energy data for petroleum coke use in the production of titanium dioxide, silicon carbide, aluminium, ferroalloys and ammonia. The United States also noted that it had experienced multiple problems importing data into the new CRF Reporter software. The ERT recommends that the United States correct the reference approach calculations for petroleum coke in accordance with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>, and report the relevant information in a consistent way in the energy and IPPU chapters of the NIR and in the CRF tables. The ERT also recommends that, to improve the transparency of the data sources and data checks conducted, the United States include the information provided to the ERT during the review week, including the adjustments made to the energy data for petroleum coke use in the production of titanium dioxide, silicon carbide, aluminium, ferroalloys and ammonia, in future submissions.	Completed. See CRF Tables 1.A(b) and 1.A(d) of the previous Inventory and CRF submission (i.e., 2017 submission). Additional information regarding the adjustments made to the Energy chapter were included in the previous and current Inventories (see Annex 2 of 2018 submission). More information on adjustments for IPPU categories will be updated in future inventories consistent with methodological improvements.
26.	(I.15)	IPPU	2. General (IPPU) – all gases	The ERT noted that the inventory of the United States is not complete, because there are categories that are not estimated and the NIR referred to gaps in the inventory. The ERT also noted that the list of sources “not included” in the inventory for the IPPU sector presented in Annex 5 to the NIR is inconsistent with the information presented in CRF table 9. For example, CRF table 9 lists categories that are not mentioned in Annex 5 to the NIR, in particular: CO₂ from iron and steel pellet production; CO₂ from ceramics production; CO₂ from non-metallurgical magnesium production; SF₆ from other product use; HFCs and SF₆ from photovoltaics and heat transfer fluids; and PFCs from other product use. Furthermore, the ERT notes that the NIR does not include the justification required by paragraph 37(b) of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines for the following categories that are reported as “NE”: CH₄ from direct reduced iron; CO₂ from ceramics and non-metallurgical magnesium production; CO₂ from iron and steel pellet production; and N₂O from glyoxal and glyoxylic acid production. The ERT further noted that, in the NIR, the United States indicates the estimation of F-gases from heat transfer fluids and the GHG emissions from pellet production as the priorities of the planned improvements. The ERT recommends that the United States estimate and report emissions from those categories currently reported as “NE” in the next submission to improve completeness and consistency of the inventory.	Completed. Within the previous and current Inventory (i.e., 2017 and 2018 submissions), the United States updated Annex 5 of the NIR to reflect the IPPU source categories listed as “NE” within CRF table 9 and Annex 5. In addition, Annex 5 has been updated to include justification for reporting categories as “NE”, consistent with UNFCCC reporting guidelines.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
27.	(I.17)	IPPU	2.A.4 Other process uses of carbonates – CO ₂	The ERT noted that the NIR describes several difficulties in accessing accurate and complete AD for this key category, primarily from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) statistical publications, including: extensive reporting of “unspecified uses” for crushed stone (limestone and dolomite); suppression of confidential data on limestone and dolomite end uses; and no data available for limestone and dolomite use in production of ceramics and non-metallurgical magnesium. As a result, the ERT notes that: (1) emissions from ceramics and non-metallurgical magnesium production are reported as “NE”; and (2) the derivation of complete and accurate AD for other emissive uses of limestone and dolomite is subject to considerable uncertainty, as evidenced by the large recalculation of 2013 data. For example, the estimated AD for total limestone and dolomite use in this category in 2013 reported in the 2016 submission are 220 percent higher than those in the 2015 submission, and the emissions for this category for 2013 are 235 percent higher in the 2016 submission than in the 2015 submission. During the review, the United States stated that EPA has assessed data availability but has not found alternative sources of data for carbonate consumption in the country. The United States also stated that GHGRP data at the facility level are incomplete and rarely include carbonate consumption by type, and that EPA will continue its efforts to work with USGS on opportunities to improve existing surveys and to seek alternative data sources. The ERT recommends that the United States conduct further research and consultation with industry, state-level regulators and/or statistical agencies to access additional AD and EFs and/or to seek verification of the current method and assumptions, and report on progress in the NIR.	Addressing. Data on ceramics and non-metallurgical magnesium has yet to be identified. The United States will continue its efforts to work with USGS to help resolve/describe uncertainties and assess reporting possibilities of “other” emissive uses of limestone and dolomite. These improvements may take time given the need to coordinate with appropriate technical staff at various agencies and available resources to implement updates.
28.	(I.18)	IPPU	2.B.1 Ammonia production – CO ₂	The ERT noted that in the NIR, the United States indicates that all emissions from fuels consumed for energy purposes during ammonia production are accounted for in the energy sector. During the review, the United States explained that it uses a country-specific approach to estimate the CO₂ emissions from ammonia production to avoid double counting, consistent with paragraphs 10 and 11 of UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines. The ERT also noted that this is not consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>, which state, “in the case of ammonia production no distinction is made between fuel and feedstock emissions with all emissions accounted for in the IPPU sector” (volume 3, Chapter 3, section 3.2.2). The ERT further noted that the IEF for ammonia production (0.90 t/t) is one of the lowest of all reporting Parties (range: 0.06–3.27 t/t). The ERT is of the view that it is likely that this category will be identified as key by a level assessment, if the allocation of emissions is performed in accordance with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>. The ERT noted that the NIR indicates planned work to determine which EFs to include in both fuel and feedstock CO₂ emissions, and to improve the accuracy of the emission estimates based on the enhanced use of the GHGRP data.	Completed. The United States has addressed this comment within the Ammonia Production chapter of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission) to increase transparency. CO₂ emissions from production of synthetic ammonia from natural gas feedstock are estimated using a country-specific approach modified from the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (IPCC 2006) Tier 1 and 2 methods. In the country-specific approach, to avoid double counting, emissions are not based on total fuel requirement per the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> due to data disaggregation limitations of energy statistics provided by the EIA. A country-specific emission factor is developed and applied to

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				The ERT recommends that the United States provide the information, in both IPPU and energy chapters, on the country-specific approach used to estimate CO ₂ emissions from ammonia production, justify the reason for its methodological choice and explain why it is unable to implement the estimates following the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> as outlined in paragraph 11 of UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines.	national ammonia production to estimate emissions from feedstock consumption, excluding consumption of fuel for energy purposes to avoid double counting. The IEF is based on current IPCC methods and is thus appropriate for the country-specific method.
29.	(I.19)	IPPU	2.B.1 Ammonia production – CO ₂	The ERT noted that, during the review, the United States indicated that it is working with appropriate energy data (EIA) institutions and GHGRP to obtain the necessary data to improve the country-specific approach and enhance its consistency with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> . The ERT commends the United States for the planned improvements and recommends that the United States allocate emissions from all fossil fuel uses (i.e. fuel and feedstock use) for ammonia production under subcategory 2.B.1 of the IPPU sector in accordance with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .	Addressing. The United States is continuing this work of allocating all fossil fuel uses for ammonia production to the IPPU chapter. To increase transparency, additional information has been included in the Ammonia Production chapter of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). For the current Inventory, national circumstances regarding the aggregation and reporting of national energy statistics have not allowed EPA to allocate and report these emissions within the Ammonia Production category without double counting of emissions from fuel use.
30.	(I.20)	IPPU	2.B.4 Caprolactam, glyoxal and glyoxylic acid production – CO ₂ and N ₂ O	The ERT noted that all subcategories under this category are reported as “NE”. However, international statistical data ¹⁴⁷ indicate that the United States is potentially one of the largest producing countries for caprolactam. During the review, the United States indicated that the EPA has reviewed data availability and obtained annual production data on caprolactam for 2004 to 2015 from the American Chemistry Council. The ERT recommends that the United States estimate emissions from caprolactam production in accordance with the method provided in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> and with the use of available AD, and report on the emissions from this category in its next inventory submission.	Partially completed. The United States has included the emissions estimate for caprolactam production in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). Data on glyoxal and glyoxylic acid has yet to be identified. See Annex 5 for additional information.
31.	(I.21)	IPPU	2.B.5 Carbide production – CO ₂ and CH ₄	The ERT noted that emissions from calcium carbide production are reported as “NE”, although the lack of emission estimates for this category has been the subject of recommendations in all review reports since 2008. During the review, the ERT provided information on calcium carbide production plants in the United States based	Addressing. The United States has begun reporting the CO ₂ emissions from carbide production as “IE”, as these emissions are implicitly accounted for in

¹⁴⁷ See <<http://www.fibre2fashion.com/industry-article/6/global-caprolactam-production-capacity?page=2>>.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				on public domain data from the United States Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board report of February 2013. The United States stated that the existing statistical and trade publications do not include national time-series data on calcium carbide production, however, some recent literature references were identified during the compilation of the 2015 NIR that provide some information on potential calcium carbide production at specific facilities in the country (including information cited by the ERT and information on associated facilities that had closed). The ERT recommends that the United States progress with research and consultation (e.g. with regulators, plant operators, statistical agencies) to obtain AD (e.g. based on reported production capacities for the known operating plant) and report emission estimates based on methods consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> across the time series.	the storage factor calculation for the non-energy use of petroleum coke in the Energy chapter. CH ₄ emissions from calcium carbide production are reported as "NA" because the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> only provide information on a Tier 3 CH ₄ approach for calcium carbide production.
32.	(I.22)	IPPU	2.B.8 Petrochemical and carbon black production – CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The ERT noted that the NIR 2016 (chapter 4.12) indicates that a subset of facilities reporting under GHGRP use alternative methods to the carbon balance approach (e.g. Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems or other engineering approaches) to monitor CO₂ emissions, and that these facilities are required to report CH₄ and N₂O emissions as well. However, the ERT noted that CH₄ and N₂O from combustion and flaring are currently not included in the national inventory estimates. During the review, the United States explained that the EPA coordinator for the IPPU inventory has requested the provision of aggregated and quality-checked data on CH₄ and N₂O emissions where reported from the GHGRP coordinator, with a view to integrating these data in future submissions to improve the completeness of national inventory estimates. The ERT recommends that the United States progress its plans to analyse GHGRP data and include emissions from those installations not currently included in the inventory.	Addressing. The United States would like to clarify that the subset of GHGRP facilities using alternative methods are only required to report CH₄ and N₂O emissions from combustion of process off-gas, rather than complete CH₄ and N₂O emissions. This clarification is included in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). In addition, the United States plans to begin work with industry experts to assess GHGRP data to improve completeness of the petrochemical production inventory, as noted in the Planned Improvements section.
33.	(I.24)	IPPU	2.B.8 Petrochemical and carbon black production – CO ₂ and CH ₄	The ERT noted that the NIR 2016 (chapters 3.2 and 4.12) highlights that the United States inventory currently may include double counting of emissions between NEU of fuels in the energy sector and petrochemical production in the IPPU sector. The NIR (p. 3-40) transparently states that data integration (i.e. between the energy balance, GHGRP data and the GHG inventory) is not feasible because the EIA data on feedstock (i.e. NEU data) within the energy balance are presented by commodity only, with no resolution of data by industry sector (such as petrochemical production), whereas GHGRP data provide feedstock type for each installation only, and not the AD that underpin reported emissions. The ERT noted that emissions from fuels and feedstocks used for energy purposes are accounted for in the energy sector (NIR p. 4-42), which is not consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (volume 3, chapter 3, section 3.9.1, "allocation and reporting"), and therefore that the estimates for	Addressing. The United States is addressing this comment by providing additional information within the Energy and IPPU chapters of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission) to improve the explanation and justification of using a country-specific approach to estimate CO ₂ emissions from petrochemical production. See Annex 2.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				petrochemical production emissions are not comparable with those of other reporting Parties. The ERT recommends that, in both the IPPU and energy chapters of the NIR, the United States provide information on the country-specific approach used to estimate CO₂ emissions from petrochemical production, justify the reason for its methodological choice and explain why it was unable to implement the estimates following the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> as outlined in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines.	
34.	(I.25)	IPPU	2.B.8 Petrochemical and carbon black production – CO ₂ and CH ₄	In addition to the recommendation above, the ERT further recommends that the United States develop a methodology that is consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> as soon as is practicable, allocating all relevant fuel and feedstock emissions within the IPPU sector.	Addressing. The United States will work to address this comment to improve the comparability of petrochemical production estimates with other Parties, consistent with <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> , noting that an improvement may take time to implement.
35.	(I.26)	IPPU	2.B.8 Petrochemical and carbon black production – CO ₂	The ERT noted that the country-specific EF for ethylene production that is derived from GHGRP data and applied to AD from 1990 to 2009 is among the lowest of all reporting Parties. The ERT also noted that the IEFs derived from GHGRP data decline from 0.84 t CO₂/t ethylene in 2010 to 0.74 t CO₂/t ethylene in 2014. During the review, the United States provided additional information on the category-specific QC, including the consultation with the industry experts that indicates that there have been no significant changes to the processes over time and hence the IEFs derived from GHGRP are the best available for the whole time series, and that the GHGRP reporting provides a largely complete picture of emissions and production information. The ERT further notes that the United States' approach in using IEFs derived from a country-specific method (e.g. GHGRP data for the feedstock component) across the time series appears to be justified. The ERT recommends that the United States provide an explanation for its country-specific approaches using the EFs derived from GHGRP data, including the outcome of consultation with industry experts, and the results of the quality checks between GHGRP production estimates and data from trade association membership surveys.	Partially completed. The United States has added additional explanation to the current Inventory to improve transparency of the country-specific methodology. The United States has completed an initial comparison of industry data to data from the EPA GHGRP but additional time is needed to conduct further analysis of the most up-to-date data and report these results. Additional explanation on the outcome of consultation with industry experts, the country-specific quality checks and uncertainties, and results of these quality checks will be included in future Inventory submissions, as additional time is needed to complete this review.
36.	(I.27)	IPPU	2.C.1 Iron and steel production – CO ₂	In addition to the issues noted above, the ERT noted that the NIR (p. 4-60) indicates that data on natural gas consumption and coke oven gas production at merchant coke plants are not available and are therefore omitted from the inventory emission estimates. The ERT considers that, because the United States did not provide a carbon balance for coke production and iron and steel production within the NIR and did not respond to the ERT's request for further information during the review, it is not feasible for the ERT to fully assess the completeness and comparability of the United	Addressing. The United States has identified this as a planned improvement within the NIR. The U.S. has initiated review of the available EPA GHGRP data for information on consumption and production from merchant coke plants. As indicated in the NIR, due to resource

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				States' submission; for example, regarding the allocation of emissions across categories in the energy sector and the IPPU sector. The ERT recommends that the United States conduct further research and consultation with industry, regulators and statistical agencies as necessary in order to access complete AD on natural gas consumption and coke oven gas production at merchant coke plants, and obtain EFs and/or emission estimates.	and timing constraints, this improvement is taking more time to implement.
37.	(I.28)	IPPU	2.C.1 Iron and steel production – CO ₂	The ERT noted that the IPPU chapter of the NIR indicates that CO₂ emissions from coke production are allocated in the IPPU sector together with iron and steel production emissions instead of the energy sector as outlined in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>. The NIR provides a transparent explanation of the country-specific approach used for the allocation of these emissions. However, the ERT noted that the NIR is unclear about the fate of other by-product emissions from coke production and iron and steel production such as secondary gases (notably blast furnace gas) that may be used to provide process heat or for power generation at integrated iron and steel facilities. According to the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (sections 4.2.2.5 and 4.2.4.2), the relationship between the emissions reported under the energy and IPPU sectors are to be clearly managed and reported to avoid the risks of gaps and double counting, and “a clear explanation of the linkage with the source category 1A (Fuel Combustion) estimate for integrated coke production emissions” has to be provided “to demonstrate that double counting or missing emissions have not occurred”, if the tier 2 method was used. In order to improve the transparency of the reporting in the NIR and the CRF tables, the ERT recommends that the United States explain the allocation of the emissions from coke production and iron and steel production across both the energy and IPPU sectors, including the amount of carbon stored in the products of iron and steel production. This could be done, for example, through the provision of a quantitative summary of the carbon balance that the United States uses to compile and quality check the inventory estimates.	Completed. The United States incorporated additional information to improve the transparency of other by-product emissions within the Iron and Steel Production chapter of the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). See Annex 2. As noted in response to comment above, the United States will work to incorporate information to explain allocation of emissions from coke production and iron and steel across Energy and IPPU categories, including carbon stored in iron and steel production products potentially through a summary of the carbon balance within the Iron and Steel chapter, which has been noted in the Iron and Steel Production Planned Improvements section.
38.	(I.29)	IPPU	2.F. Product uses as substitutes for ozone depleting substances – HFCs and PFCs	The ERT noted that the NIR (Annex 3.9) provides a wealth of useful information on the models used to estimate emissions from this category, including the Refrigeration and Air-Con model, but that other key information to ensure transparency of the method and model assumptions is missing. For example, the chemical recovery rates applied in the calculations for disposal emissions in the Refrigeration and Air-Con model are not detailed, and although tables A-169 and A-170 provide a lot of detailed data, the explanation of the estimation methodologies and the application of the tabulated data within the model calculations is not clear. During the review, the United States provided many detailed clarifications on the model calculations, references and the application of data from the tables in the NIR.	Completed. Two footnotes have been added to the table, one to indicate the linear substitution between “start” and “full penetration” dates, and another to explain Growth Rate. EPA does not refer to the introduction of substitutes as “overlapping equipment technology substitutions.” Instead, a specific portion of each end-use will have a specific chemical (or blend, e.g., in the case of many refrigeration and air-

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				The ERT recommends that the United States improve the documentation of the Refrigeration and Air-Con model by including the clarifications on model assumptions, data sources and calculation methodologies provided to the ERT during the review, including: the assumed linear substitution trend between “start” and “full penetration” dates for substitution gases; the information on the annual growth rates cited in the NIR are the average annual growth rate for individual market sectors from the base year to 2030 that are applied within the model; the model calculation approach for overlapping equipment technology substitutions; details of country-specific circumstances and key references for the annual emission rates for servicing and leaks applied; and assumed recovery, re-use and recycling of fluids at end of life (e.g. for fire extinguishers).	conditioning end-uses) and these vary by year as a substitute is introduced over time (linearly as stated by the response above). This is stated under Step 2 under “Methodology” at the beginning of Annex 3.9 where it says “As part of this simulation, the ODS substitutes are introduced in each of the end-uses over time.”
39.	(I.30)	IPPU	2.F.1 Refrigeration and air conditioning – HFCs and PFCs	The ERT noted that there is no methodological information in the NIR to explain the derivation of emission estimates from the manufacture of new products for sectors including refrigeration and air conditioning, although emissions are reported in CRF table 2(II).B-Hs2. During the review, the United States clarified that it considers that there should not be any emissions from the manufacture of new refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment, based on the assumption that emissions during equipment manufacture are essentially negligible. The United States explained that the values in the CRF table are incorrect owing to a spreadsheet formula error when the foam sector was disaggregated into closed-cell and open-cell foams in the model that converts outputs from the EPA’s Vintaging Model to the CRF Reporter software. In this case, the emissions estimated for servicing activities for commercial refrigeration and domestic refrigeration were attributed to “Actual emissions from manufacturing” rather than a component of “Actual emissions from stocks”. The ERT notes that the assumption that there are no emissions in the product manufacture stage for refrigeration and air-conditioning sources is not consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (volume 2, chapter 7, section 7.5.2.1). Furthermore, the ERT notes that the United States also highlighted that many cold storage and retail food units in the United States are large systems with kilometres of piping and hundreds of joints and component connections that are prone to leakage; therefore, the ERT considers that initial charging losses are highly likely to occur where new industrial units are charged in situ. The ERT recommends that the United States either review and update its assumptions regarding product manufacture losses or provide information in the NIR to justify the assumption that all such losses are “negligible” and accurately reflect country-specific circumstances.	Addressing. EPA is researching and gathering data so that emissions from manufacturing / first-fill operations can be accurately assessed. The error in converting model results to the CRF table was addressed. EPA initiated a peer review of the model and has incorporated results in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). EPA will continue to incorporate peer review results, including any related to the assumption that there are no emissions in the product manufacture stage, as we further review the information provided.
40.	(I.31)	IPPU	2.F.2 Foam blowing agents – HFCs and PFCs	The ERT noted that in the NIR (table A-175), the sum of model losses for extruded polystyrene sheet foam totals 90 percent, whereas for all other foams (with the exception of insulation that is assumed to be landfilled) 100 percent leakage is estimated. Further, the ERT noted that the model assumes that no foam products are collected at the end of their use and the F-gases are either recovered or destroyed to	Completed. Additional information has been obtained and implemented regarding extruded polystyrene sheet foam. Losses now total 100 percent.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				avoid release. During the review, the United States clarified that the reason for the extruded polystyrene sheet foam total of 90 percent is not known, and confirmed that the model does not take into account the recovery or destruction of blowing agents at end of life, because this is not required by federal regulations and because, at end of life, foam insulation is removed from decommissioned buildings and typically landfilled. The United States further noted that there are several incentive schemes to promote the recovery of HFC blowing agents in building insulation foams, and destruction facilities that recover blowing agents from domestic refrigeration foam, for example through the EPA's voluntary Responsible Appliance Disposal Program. The model does not account for these activities as they are not regarded as widespread in the United States. The ERT recommends that the United States review the model assumptions and QA/QC of the model to eliminate the unexplained inconsistencies regarding the fate of foam blowing agents, and update assumptions to reflect national practices (e.g. to recover or destroy foam blowing agents). Furthermore, the ERT recommends that the United States include in the NIR clarifications regarding how the model accounts for end-of-life practices for foam blowing agents.	Data provided under the Responsible Appliance Disposal Program were reviewed and support the simplifying assumption that HFC foam blowing agent recovery and destruction is negligible. Annex 3.9 indicates how the model accounts for end-of-life emissions from the foams sector. See for instance Steps 3 and 4 in the Foam Blowing methodology and the information contained in Table A-151.
41.	(I.32)	IPPU	2.F.5 Solvents – HFCs and PFCs	The ERT noted that, in the method description for emissions from solvents provided in Annex 3.9 (p. A-247) to the NIR, the United States applies an assumption that only 90 percent of solvents are emitted. This is not consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (section 7.2.2, chapter 7), which indicate that emissions from solvent applications are typically 100 percent emitted within two years of initial use. In order to estimate emissions in such cases, it is necessary to determine the total amount of each HFC or PFC chemical sold in solvent. Furthermore, the ERT noted that the use of the notation key "NA" to report emissions from solvents in the CRF tables is not correct. The ERT recommends that the United States either review and update its assumptions regarding solvent emissions or provide country-specific information to justify the assumption that only 90 percent of solvents are emitted, and revise the reporting of emissions from solvents within the CRF tables.	Completed. The 90 percent assumption has been reviewed and confirmed. The Inventory indicates that the other 10 percent become entrained in waste products that are then destroyed.
42.	(I.33)	IPPU	2.F.6 Other applications (product uses as substitutes for ozone depleting substances) – HFCs and PFCs	The ERT noted that CRF table 2(I) of the 2016 submission reports emissions from an unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs in the subcategory other applications (2.F.6) under the category product uses as substitutes for ODS (2.F.6) for which no details are provided in the NIR, and that these emissions constitute about 5.8 percent of the total for the highest-emitting key category in the IPPU sector in 2013. Furthermore, the ERT noted that the emissions data presented for each of the subcategories under product uses as substitutes for ODS (2.F) in CRF table 2(I)s2 are not consistent with the subtotals presented in table 4-96 of the NIR, and that this inconsistency appears to be caused (at least in part) by the reporting of the "unspecified mix" of gases in the CRF table. During the review, the United States clarified that the "unspecified mix" of gases are aggregated and treated as confidential information because they are produced or	Completed. Certain gases within the unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs are only used in one particular sector or subcategory; and, therefore, publishing the unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs at the subcategory level would reveal confidential business information.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				imported by a small number of chemical providers and in such small quantities or for such discrete applications that reporting national data would result in disclosure of confidential information. The ERT recommends that the United States provide in the NIR detailed information including the, quality checks for all gases and sources included in the unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs in the subcategory other applications under the category product uses as substitutes for ODS.	
43.	(I.34)	IPPU	2.F.6 Other applications (product uses as substitutes for ozone depleting substances) – HFCs and PFCs	The ERT recommends that the United States improve the consistency between its NIR and CRF tables for the reporting of subcategories of product uses as substitutes for ODS.	See row 42.
Agriculture					
44.	(A.2)	Agriculture	3.B Manure management – CH ₄ and N ₂ O	Investigate the reasons for the differences between the trends of volatile solid (VS) daily excretion and nitrogen excretion (Nex) rates per animal type for sheep and swine. This information was not provided in the 2016 submission. During the review, the United States explained that the manure management inventory team obtains its data from the Cattle Enteric Fermentation Model (CEFM), and that the team will work with the enteric fermentation inventory team to clarify the reasons for the different trends of VS values and Nex rates for sheep and swine.	Completed. The United States added additional text to Annex 3.11 (Methodology for Estimating CH ₄ and N ₂ O Emissions from Manure Management) of the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) to clarify this trend.
45.	(A.3)	Agriculture	3.B.1 Cattle – CH ₄ and N ₂ O (71, 2013)	Include explanations for the trends of VS daily excretion and Nex rates per animal for dairy cattle. This information was not provided in the 2016 submission. During the review, the United States explained that the manure management inventory team obtains its data from the CEFM, and that the team will work with the enteric fermentation inventory team to clarify the reasons for the different trends of VS values and Nex rates of dairy cattle.	Completed. The difference in the VS daily excretion and Nex rate trends between dairy cattle animal types is due to milk production. Milk production by cow varies from state to state and is used in calculating net energy for lactating, which is used to calculate VS and Nex for dairy cows. Milk production is zero for dairy heifers (dairy heifers do not produce milk since they have not yet had a calf). Over time, the differences in milk production are also a big driver for the higher variability of VS and Nex rates in dairy cows. This trend explanation has been added to Annex 3.11 for the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
46.	(A.4)	Agriculture	3.D.a.6 Cultivation of organic soils (i.e. histosols) – N ₂ O (74, 2013)	Revise the AD and emission estimates for cultivation of histosols in agricultural soils and revise the QC process in order to ensure consistency in the inventory, and provide information on these improvements. The United States did not provide information on the revision or the recalculation to address the recommendation, and the ERT noted that an inconsistency in the area of cultivated organic soil between CRF table 3.D (1,352,082.22 ha) and the NIR (1.21 million ha) (annex p. A-332) still exists in the 2016 submission. During the review, the United States explained that it has experienced multiple problems importing data from its country-specific methods into the new CRF Reporter agriculture modules. The United States indicated that it is investigating options to solve the problems.	Completed. The United States addressed this issue in the CRF tables for the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
47.	(A.8)	Agriculture	3.D.a.3 Urine and dung deposited by grazing animals – N ₂ O (77, 2013) (92, 2012)	Resolve the inconsistency in the total N excretion on pasture, range and paddock between CRF table 4.B(b), N₂O emissions from manure management, and CRF table 4.D, agricultural soils. The total N excretion on pasture, range and paddock reported in CRF table 3.B(b) and in CRF table 3.D are inconsistent. In addition, the ERT noted that the total N excretion on pasture, range and paddock was reported as 4,265,716,593.73 kg/year in CRF table 3.D, while 3,672 kt N was provided in the NIR (annex table A-223). During the review, the United States explained that it had experienced problems in importing data from its country-specific methods in to the new CRF Reporter agriculture modules, and it was investigating options to solve the problems that it continues to experience with CRF Reporter.	Completed. The discrepancy between the total N excretion on pasture, range and paddock reported in CRF tables 3.D and in the NIR has been resolved. The United States addressed the discrepancy between CRF tables 4.B(b) and 4.D in the CRF tables in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
48.	(A.9)	Agriculture	3.D.a.3 Urine and dung deposited by grazing animals – N ₂ O (77, 2013) (92, 2012)	Improve QC procedures to avoid inconsistencies in the total N excretion on pasture, range and paddock between CRF tables 4.B(b) and 4.D and provide information on these improvements. There is some information on QC improvement in the NIR, but inconsistencies in the total N excretion on pasture, range and paddock between CRF table 3.B(b) and CRF table 3.D still exist. During the review, the United States explained that it had experienced problems in importing data from its country-specific methods in to the new CRF Reporter agriculture modules, and it was investigating options to solve the problems that it continues to experience with CRF Reporter.	Completed. See response to the comment above. The United States is improving QC procedures to resolve many issues experienced with the CRF Reporter.
49.	(A.11, A.15)	Agriculture	3.A.1 Cattle – CH ₄ 3.B.1 Cattle – CH ₄	In CRF table 3.As1 of the 2016 submission, the United States chose option C for reporting CH ₄ emissions under enteric fermentation. As for enteric fermentation, the United States chose option C for reporting CH ₄ emissions from cattle manure management in CRF tables 3.B(a)s1 and 3.B(a)s2. According to footnote 4 of CRF table 3.As1, 3.B(a)s1, and 3.B(a)s2, option C should be used when Parties want to report a more disaggregate livestock categorization compared with option A and option B. However, the United States reported only dairy cattle and non-dairy cattle emissions under option C, and the cells for all other subcategories of cattle were reported as “IE”.	Completed. The United States addressed this issue in the CRF tables in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission) to reflect the previous recommendations made by the ERT. The United States is reporting more disaggregated data, where available and applicable, within the CRF tables.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				except for location in warm regions, which was reported as "NO". Further, the ERT noted that, in CRF table 9 in which emissions reported as "IE" are allocated should be explained by the United States, information is not complete. During the review, the United States stated that it can investigate updating the information provided in the CRF tables. The United States also explained that it had made attempts to present disaggregated data during the initial CRF input phase of the 2016 submission. However, since it experienced problems in data input, it took the approach of previous years of inputting those data as "IE". If the United States does not use more disaggregate livestock categorization in estimating emissions, the ERT recommends the United States use option A in reporting data and emissions for cattle.¹⁴⁸	
50.	(A.12)	Agriculture	3.A.1 Cattle – CH ₄	The United States applied a tier 2 methodology with regional feed digestibility and Y_m to estimate enteric CH₄ from dairy cattle and beef cattle, and in the NIR 2015 (p. A-255), it stated that daily EFs were estimated for each animal type and state regions. Information such as cattle population, typical animal mass, weight gain at country level, dairy lactation rates, feed digestibility and Y_m at state level and regional level was included in the NIR and/or its annexes. However, the ERT considers that the transparency could be further improved by including the average gross energy intake and EFs for each animal type, by state. In addition, in the NIR (pp. A-266–A-267) the United States explained that Y_m values were determined for 1990 using the Donovan and Baldwin model (1999), and the values for 1990 were used as the baseline to estimate for 1991 and beyond by scaling Y_m values for each diets with the COWPOLL model. The scaling factor is shown as $Y_m = Y_m(1990) \text{EXP}[1.22/(\text{YEAR} - 1980)] / \text{EXP}[1.22/(1990 - 1980)]$, but the NIR does not provide information on the development of the scaling factor equation and related verification. During the review, the United States stated that it will include in the NIR population, average gross energy intake and EFs for each animal type, by state, and provide information on Y_m, which will include detailed procedures for and verification of the development of Y_m. The ERT recommends that the United States include in the NIR the values of population, average gross energy intake and EFs for each animal type, by state, as well as information on the procedure.	Completed. In Annex 3.10 (beginning on page A-239) of the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission), cattle population, gross energy intake and emission factors by animal type, by state were provided. In addition, additional information on Y_m was included.
51.	(A.13)	Agriculture	3.A.1 Cattle – CH ₄	In the NIR (p. 5-4), the United States stated that the CEFM was used to estimate CH₄ emissions from cattle enteric fermentation. It also indicated that significant scientific literature exists and, in its emission estimations, the United States incorporated information and analyses of livestock population, feeding practices and production characteristics. In Annex 3 to the NIR 2016, the United States explained that the CEFM was developed based on recommendations provided in the 2006 IPCC	Completed. The CEFM uses the methods in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines to estimate enteric emissions. The CEFM then tracks the populations and weights of these animals more accurately through a transition matrix, so the

¹⁴⁸ The UNFCCC ERT also raised a similar comment on 3.B.1 Cattle – CH₄. To streamline review, both comments are consolidated here.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				<i>Guidelines</i>. However, the NIR does not provide information that explains how the CEFM is compatible with the methodologies in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>, as required by paragraph 10 of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines. During the review, the United States stated that it will provide information on the compatibility of the CEFM with the methodologies provided by the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>. The ERT recommends that the United States report in its NIR on the compatibility of estimates obtained using the CEFM with estimates obtained using methodologies from the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>.	United States can develop more refined estimates based on the methods in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> . More information on CEFM is provided in Annex 3.
52.	(A.14)	Agriculture	3.B Manure management – CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The ERT noted that in the NIR (p. 5-11) and its Annex 3.11 (pp. A.286–A.288), the amount of manure management system (MMS) usage has not been updated for several years (e.g. the most recent data for cattle are from a publication dated 2000, and those for swine are dated 2007). In the NIR 2015 (p. 5-15) the United States stated that the 2012 Agricultural Census data will be incorporated into the inventory and will be used to update county-level animal population and MMS estimates. During the review, the United States stated that it plans to update the MMS data in future inventories, and that EPA is working with the United States Department of Agriculture to obtain updated data. The ERT recommends that the United States obtain updated MMS data and estimate emissions using the updated MMS usage data in its submission. If this is not possible, the ERT recommends that the United States report on progress in its effort to update the MMS data.	Completed. The United States updated the waste management system (WMS) data within the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) with data from the 2012 U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Census. These updated data are noted in the chapter and annex of the 2017 submission.
53.	(A.17)	Agriculture	3.D.a.3 Urine and dung deposited by grazing animals – N ₂ O	The ERT noted an inconsistency between CRF table 3.D and the NIR regarding the N input from manure applied to soils (table A-223) and N input from sewage sludge applied to soils (table A-227). During the review, the United States explained that it has experienced multiple problems importing data derived from its country-specific methods into the new CRF Reporter agriculture modules. The United States also indicated that it is investigating options to solve the problems. The ERT recommends that the United States ensure consistency between the data provided in CRF table 3.D and the data provided in the NIR regarding the N input from manure applied to soils and N input from sewage sludge applied to soils.	Completed. The United States has resolved the issue of consistency between N input from manure applied to soils and N input from sewage sludge applied to soils reported in the NIR and CRF table 3.D in the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission).
54.	(A.18)	Agriculture	3.D.b Indirect N ₂ O emissions from managed soils – N ₂ O	The ERT noted that the United States, in response to a previous recommendation to include weighted national averages for the fractions listed in CRF table 4.D, corrected the AD and provided a documentation box in CRF table 3.D in the 2016 submission, explaining in the NIR that “N fixation, volatilized N, and N leached and run-off do not strictly represent AD because they are calculated by the process-based model (DAYCENT). Fractions were not used because a process-based model was used to calculate emissions.” During the review, the United States explained that it estimated the N volatilized and N lost through leaching and run-off using the DAYCENT model, and it reported these values in the inventory worksheets, which could be made	Addressing. The DAYCENT model is a Tier 3 approach, consistent with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> and the NIR/annex provides a very detailed explanation of how the DAYCENT model works and cites further literature that can be reviewed if the ERT would like more detail. The United States will continue efforts to improve the

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				available to the ERT during an in-country review, and that these values can be included in the next NIR in Annex 3.12 (methodology for estimating N₂O emissions). In addition, the United States stated that indirect soil N₂O emissions are estimated using a tier 1 method for a small percentage of the N inputs, such as fertilization and organic amendments to vegetable and perennial crops, as well as federal grasslands. The ERT recommends that the United States provide an explanation of how its methodology and the use of the DAYCENT model to estimate N volatilized and N loss is both compatible with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> and based on science.	transparency of the NIR in future submissions, specifically, the Annex will be revised for the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission) to improve transparency.
55.	(A.19)	Agriculture	3.J Other (CO ₂ emissions from liming, urea application and other carbon-containing fertilizers) – CO ₂	In CRF table 3G-I, the United States reported CO₂ emissions from liming and urea application as "IE", and information on CO₂ emissions from liming and urea application was included under the LULUCF sector in the NIR. During the review, the United States stated that emissions from liming and urea fertilization will be reported under the agriculture sector in the 2017 submission. The ERT recommends that the United States report CO₂ emissions from liming and urea fertilization under the agriculture sector.	Completed. For the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission), the United States began reporting emissions from liming and urea fertilization under the Agriculture chapter.
Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry					
56.	(L.1)	LULUCF	4. General (LULUCF) – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O (80, 2013) (103, 107, 109, 2012)	Estimate emissions from the carbon stock changes from mineral soils under forest land, living biomass under cropland and grassland, dead organic matter (DOM) under land converted to cropland and land converted to grassland, land converted to wetlands, soil organic carbon (SOC) under land converted to settlements and land converted to other land; N₂O emissions from disturbance associated with land-use conversion to cropland; CH₄ and N₂O emissions from biomass burning (land converted to forest land, cropland, grassland and wetlands); and CO₂ emissions from biomass burning (excluding forest land remaining forest land). The United States has newly included, in CRF 2016, estimates for mineral soils under lands converted to forest land and living biomass for forest land converted to non-forest land. However, emissions from living biomass have only been estimated for forest land converted to grassland and cropland. In addition, the following are reported as "NE": estimates of DOM under land converted to cropland, grassland, wetlands, settlements and other land; SOC for land converted to settlements and other lands; and CO₂, N₂O and CH₄ associated with biomass burning in land converted to forest land, cropland, grassland and wetlands.	Addressing. The United States is continuing to address these missing carbon stock changes and non-CO ₂ emissions by accessing additional data sources and incorporating them into our methods. Additional refinements will be provided in the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission).
57.	(L.2)	LULUCF	4. General (LULUCF) – CO ₂ (81, 2013)	Conclude the technical work under way to be able to provide estimates for the carbon stock changes in the living biomass and DOM pools for each conversion category from forest land to any other land use for each year based on a reliable Land-Use Change (LUC) matrix, and report on the achievements made. The United States has made considerable progress towards a reliable land tracking system and has provided a complete description of the underlying accounting	See response above.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				framework in the NIR (chapter 6.1). However, emissions from DOM have not been estimated, except for forest land remaining forest land. Further improvements regarding the implementation of the new accounting framework for land use are necessary.	
58.	(L.3)	LULUCF	4. General (LULUCF) – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O (82, 2013) (97, 2012)	Include all managed federal lands in the inventory and improve the consistency of the time series of national areas and report on the achievements made. Not all managed federal lands are included in the inventory. The ERT notes that in document FCCC/ARR/2013/USA the United States explained that the inconsistencies arose as a portion of the managed land not included in the CRF tables, although it was reported in the NIR. The ERT notes that the total area reported in the CRF tables in the 2016 submission for all land uses (4.A to 4.E) still fluctuates throughout the period, and an explanation for this has not been provided in the NIR.	Addressing. The United States is continuing to improve our ability to estimate emissions/removals from all federal lands through collection of additional data. The major missing component of federal land is in Alaska where data are sparse. The United States will ensure future submissions have consistent areas reported in the NIR and CRF, or an explanation will be provided to explain why there is a difference.
59.	(L.5)	LULUCF	Land representation – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O (84, 2013) (97 and 98, 2012)	Check the coherence of reported data on land-use areas reported in the NIR and those reported in the CRF tables, applying the appropriate QC checks. The lack of consistency between the NIR (table 6-6) and CRF table 4.E remains in the 2016 submission.	The United States will ensure future submissions have consistent areas reported in the NIR and CRF, or an explanation will be provided to explain why there is a difference.
60.	(L.10)	LULUCF	4.A.1 Forest land remaining forest land – CO ₂ (90, 2013)	Make every effort to report the carbon stock changes in the mineral soils and organic soils pools separately. During the review, the United States stated that this issue has not yet been addressed. However, the United States expects that organic soil emissions will be minimal in forest land remaining forest land.	Completed. In the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission), the United States reports mineral and organics soil pools separately for <i>Forest Land Remaining Forest Land</i> .
61.	(L.14)	LULUCF	4.B.1 Cropland remaining cropland – CO ₂ (93, 2013) (107, 2012)	Estimate the carbon stock changes in living biomass in perennial crops for all years in the time series. Living biomass has not yet been estimated in cropland remaining cropland. During the review, the United States explained that it plans to include herbaceous and perennial cropland biomass using the IPCC default carbon stock values and, depending on resources, it will develop country-specific carbon stock values in the next two to three years.	Addressing. The United States has identified this as an improvement but due to other major ongoing improvements identified in the Planned Improvement section, the United States will not have the resources to implement it for several years.
62.	(L.15)	LULUCF	4.E. Settlements – CO ₂ (94, 2013)	Eliminate the overlap between the urban forest inventory and the forest inventory. The United States explained this problem in the improvement plan in the NIR (p.6-84).	Addressing. The United States intends to utilize Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) plots on Urban lands to resolve the overlap problem between forest lands

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
					and urban forests. This will take place over the next 2 to 3 years.
63.	(L.17)	LULUCF	4.H Other (LULUCF) – CO ₂ (96, 2013) (112, 2012)	Reflect the intersectoral linkages and document the differences in the decay values for yard trimmings and food scraps. The United States provided information on decay factors in the NIR and also introduced correction factors. However, it remains unclear to the ERT how the correction factors apply to the decay factors and, as such, how consistency with the waste sector is ensured.	Partially completed. The United States has provided detailed information on how the correction factor relates to the decay factors in the Methodology section of Landfilled Yard Trimmings and Food Scraps as well as how the decay rate relates to the Landfills in the Waste sector. The United States will continue to work towards developing greater consistency with the Waste sector over the next several years as resources allow.
64.	(L.21)	LULUCF	4. General (LULUCF) – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The ERT noted discrepancies between land-use areas in the time series reported in the CRF tables. For instance, in CRF table 4.1, the final area at the end of year and the initial area on the subsequent year are different for all land categories except for unmanaged forest land. The ERT also noted that in the 2016 submission the United States introduced a new Forest Carbon Accounting Framework (FCAF) (Woodall et al., 2015d) for land tracking of areas of land use and land-use change for the entire time series. Further, the ERT noted that in the NIR (chapter 6.1), the United States stated that approximately 46,213 kha are considered unmanaged, whereas in CRF table 4.1, the total unmanaged land (46,213.27 kha) does not match the sum of unmanaged forest land (9,634.34 kha), grassland (25,782.12 kha) and wetlands ("IE"). During the review, the United States explained that this problem would be resolved and clarified in the 2017 submission. The ERT recommends that the United States resolve the inconsistencies in land-use areas in the time series reported in the CRF tables and the inconsistencies in information on land-use areas between the NIR and CRF table 4.1 by subcategorizing the managed lands for which estimates are calculated in order to separate them from those for which there are currently no methodologies available, noting that the United States can use the notation keys "NE" or "NA" for the latter subcategory.	The United States is implementing additional QA/QC checks to ensure consistency between the NIR and CRF. Explanations have been updated where CRF structure is inconsistent with format of U.S. data. This is reflected in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
65.	(L.22)	LULUCF	Land representation – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The United States in the NIR that the total area of forest land remaining forest land in table 6-12 (271,719 kha) does not correspond with the total area reported in chapter 6.1 (table 6-7) (294,051 kha for 2014) under the land representation for forest land, explaining that this is due to the fact that a part of the managed land of Alaska (interior of Alaska) and all of Hawaii's forest lands have not been estimated owing to limited data on land management in the interior of Alaska and on all of Hawaii's forests. In CRF table 4.A, the reported area is 271,719 kha. The ERT considers that this discrepancy could be prevented in the future by including the different territories (49	Completed. The United States corrected this for the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) by providing additional explanation in the NIR and CRF.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				states, Hawaii and Alaska) and by using the notation keys "NA" or "NE" for carbon fluxes for Alaska and for all of Hawaii's forests in CRF table 4.A. The ERT recommends that the United States augment the transparency of the NIR and CRF table 4.A by reporting the territories not included separately as "NA" or if it is not possible, provide the additional documentation to explain why there is a discrepancy between the areas shown in CRF table 4.A and NIR table 6-12.	
66.	(L.23)	LULUCF	Land representation – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The ERT noted that the total national area, as reported in CRF table 4.1 for all land uses, is not constant in the period 1990–2014, fluctuating between 719,564.15 kha (1990) and 714,948.55 kha (2010), which is a variation of 5,227.59 kha (7 percent). As identified in document FCCC/ARR/2011/USA, the United States used several data sources to construct the land area representation: a National Resources Inventory (NRI) survey for 1998 data; available data from FIA (years of which are different for the various states, ranging from 2002 to 2012); and the National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD), a land cover classification scheme, with data available for 1992, 2001 and 2006. The United States explains in the NIR 2016 that the NRI and FIA have different criteria for classifying forest land in addition to different sampling designs, leading to discrepancies in the resulting estimates of land area for non-federal land. Similarly, there are discrepancies between the NLCD and the FIA data for defining and classifying forest land on federal lands. FIA has the main database for forest statistics, and data from the NRI and NLCD are adjusted to achieve consistency with FIA estimates of forest land. In the NIR 2016 the United States specified that, for harmonization purposes, the non-forest land-use area had been updated in proportion to the total forest land area from FIA. However, the ERT noted that the information is not sufficient for it to understand how the data referring to various years, coverage and resolution, with different classification systems, have been harmonized and used to classify the territory according to the IPCC land-use categories. During the review, the United States explained that cropland areas were based solely on the NRI data for non-federal lands, on NLCD data for federal lands, and that cropland areas were not adjusted in the harmonization process. The ERT recommends that the United States, when providing detailed information in the NIR on how the different data sources were harmonized, provide explicit information on how the model ensures consistent integration of the three data sources; for example, by including a visual flow chart of data processing during the harmonization process.	Addressing. The United States is in the process of updating the land representation analysis to incorporate new datasets. This work will be completed in time for the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission). As a part of this process the United States will provide additional explanation in the NIR on how the different databases are combined to create the U.S. land representation matrix. This will be incorporated into the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission).

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
67.	(L.24)	LULUCF	4. General (LULUCF) – CO ₂	The United States introduced the new FCAF¹⁴⁹ to estimate consistent and reliable land-use change in the 2016 inventory submission. The United States mentioned in the annex 8 to the NIR (table A-304) that verification measurements have been implemented for the majority of the underlying methodology, calculations and models that are contained in the NIR. During the review, the United States explained that the FCAF has been previously used for a regional analysis, and provided the reference to the peer reviewed paper (Coulston et al., 2015¹⁵⁰) of that regional analysis. Furthermore, the United States explained that the model used for the FCAF has not been compared with similar models used by other countries. During the review, the ERT did not receive information on the type of verification measures that have been implemented (e.g. information on peer reviews or sensitivity analysis of the model implemented on a national scale). The ERT recommends that the United States include the information on the use of the model for the regional analysis in the QA/QC and verification section of chapter 6.1 of the NIR.	Addressing. The United States is working to implement a new system for estimating C stock changes on forest lands that will replace the FCAF (see Planned Improvements section for <i>Forest Land Remaining Forest Land</i>). As part of this effort, the United States will incorporate available information on verification into the NIR. The new forest accounting system will be implemented in the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission).
68.	(L.25)	LULUCF	4. General (LULUCF) – CO ₂	The ERT noted that, in the NIR (p.6-57), the United States reported the difference between the stocks reported as the stock change under the assumption that the change occurred in the year of the conversion, and those areas are also reflected in CRF tables 4.B and 4.C. However, the area in CRF tables 4.B and 4.C and NIR table 6 should cover the entire area lost from forest land conversion to cropland or forest land conversion to grassland over a 20-year timespan according to footnote 2 of CRF table 4.B, which indicates that areas for land converted to cropland shall be reported as the cumulative area (over 20 years) remaining in the category in the reporting year. In response to a question raised by the ERT, the United States explained that because the 2016 submission was the first to include forest land conversions, many of the noted issues were identified at a point where it was not possible to correct them. The United States indicated that these issues have been addressed and the corrections will be applied in the 2017 submission. The ERT recommends that the United States estimate emissions from forest land converted to another land use over a 20-year timespan by subdividing the conversion category into area actually converted and area converted during the past 19 years. The ERT also recommends that the United States ensure consistency in reporting of land area between the NIR and CRF tables 4.B and 4.C.	The U.S. Inventory does include the cumulative area of forest conversion to cropland and forest conversion to grassland over a 20-year time span. However, EPA assumes all losses of biomass and dead organic matter occur in the first year of the conversion. However, there is a small difference in the area between Table 6-7 in the Land Representation section and CRF. This difference is because croplands in Alaska and federally-managed lands are not included in the inventory, and grasslands in Alaska are not included in the inventory. The EPA is working to compile the activity data and address C stock changes for these areas as part of a future submission.

¹⁴⁹ Woodall CW, Coulston JW, Domke GM, Walters BF, Wear DN, Smith JE, Andersen H-E, Clough BJ, Cohen WB, Griffith DM, Hagen SC, Hanou IS, Nichols MC, Perry CH, Russell MB, Westfall J and Wilson BT. 2015. *The US Forest Carbon Accounting Framework: Stocks and Stock change 1990–2016*. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-154. Newtown Square, PA: United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station.

¹⁵⁰ Coulston JW, Wear DN and Vose JM. 2015. Complex forest dynamics indicate potential for slowing carbon accumulation in the southeastern United States. *Scientific Reports*. 5: p.8002.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
69.	(L.26)	LULUCF	4.A.1 Forest land remaining forest land – CO ₂	The United States explained in the NIR that the FCAF is fundamentally driven by the annual forest inventory system conducted by FIA programme, and the FCAF system comprises a forest dynamics module and a land-use dynamics module. The forest dynamics module assesses forest sequestration, forest ageing and disturbance effects. The land-use dynamics module assesses carbon stock transfers associated with afforestation and deforestation. The required inputs are estimated from more than 625,000 forest and non-forest observations in the FIA national database. Model predictions for before or after the annual inventory period are constructed from the FCAF system using the annual observations. However, since carbon density estimations (tonnes per hectare) for live trees, by type and by region, are not explicitly mentioned in the NIR, the ERT was not able to verify the accuracy of the estimations for carbon stocks and CO₂ fluxes. During the review, the United States provided the ERT with background information on the FIA survey methods, specifically on age classes, classification, and classification by forest and non-forest for the sample plots. The ERT recommends that the United States include in the NIR the background information provided to the ERT on the FIA survey methods, specifically on age classes, classification, and classification by forest and non-forest for the sample plots, in order to allow the ERT verify the accuracy of the estimations for carbon stocks and CO₂ fluxes. The ERT also recommends that the United States annex to the NIR detailed tables on average carbon fluxes by region and type (e.g. the region and forest type classifications described in Smith et al. (2006)¹⁵¹ and used for estimates for downed deadwood and understory, which might better reflect the diversity of forest types and age classes). Furthermore, the ERT recommends that the United States disaggregate the carbon fluxes by region and type in the CRF tables, which will ensure transparency and repeatability of methods.	The United States will include in the NIR the background information provided to the ERT on the FIA methods, specifically on age classes, classification, and classification by forest and non-forest for the sample plots. All FIA data used to compile estimates in the NIR are publicly available and were specifically referenced in the NIR (Table A-236). Detailed tables on average carbon fluxes by region and forest type, and carbon pool will be included in forthcoming U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service publications and referenced in the NIR. The United States is currently working on a compilation system that will provide more spatially and temporally resolved estimates for the NIR. Once completed and vetted this system will be used to produce state-level estimates for inclusion in the NIR (see Planned Improvements in the <i>Forest Land Remaining Forest Land</i> section).
70.	(L.27)	LULUCF	4.A.2 Land converted to forest land – CO ₂	The United States has not estimated removals in the biomass pool from regrowth (reforestation/afforestation) in CRF table 4.A and states in its NIR that research is under way to include those removals. The United States also clarifies the need to revise the length of time a land remains in a conversion category after change. The ERT noted that the calculation of carbon stock change in living biomass in land converted to forest land is mandatory under the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>. In the NIR (p.6-27), the United States explained that the forest dynamics module assesses carbon stock transfers (removals) associated with afforestation. However, during the review, the United States clarified that those removals from afforestation have not been reported in forest land remaining forest land, and in CRF table 4.A, “NA” is reported under all land converted to forest land.	Completed. The United States has reported the net change in biomass in CRF Table 4.A in the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission).

¹⁵¹ Smith JE, Heath LS, Skog KE and Birdsey RA. 2006. *Methods for Calculating Forest Ecosystem and Harvested Carbon with Standard Estimates for Forest Types of the United States*. Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-343. Newtown Square, PA: United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				The ERT recommends that the United States complete the emission estimates of living biomass for land converted to forest land in accordance with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .	
71.	(L.28)	LULUCF	4.A.2 Land converted to forest land – CO ₂	The ERT noted that the United States reported “NA” for deadwood and litter in its reporting for land converted to forest land. These pools are mandatory under the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>. During the review, the United States explained that it elected to remove the estimates from the submission because of a problem identified shortly before submission. Emissions and removals for all carbon pools in the category land converted to forest land will be included in the 2017 submission and will be based on a 20-year default using a conversion matrix. The ERT recommends that the United States estimate carbon stock change for deadwood and litter in land converted to forest land in accordance with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>.	Completed. Emissions and removals for all carbon pools in the category <i>Land Converted to Forest Land</i> are included in the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission).
72.	(L.29)	LULUCF	4.B Cropland – CO ₂	In the NIR (table 6-23), the United States clarifies in a footnote that estimates after 2010 are based on projections using NRI data for 2010 and therefore may not fully reflect changes occurring in the latter part of the time series. The United States explained that more recent information is currently available but data were not available in time to incorporate them into the 2016 inventory submission. The ERT recommends that the United States apply the most recent information and data obtained since 2010 for the emission estimates under this category.	Completed. The previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) utilized the NRI with data through 2012. An updated NRI will be available in Spring of 2018 that will be used for the 2020 or 2012 submission as resources allow.
73.	(L.30)	LULUCF	4.B.1 Cropland remaining cropland – CO ₂	In the NIR (p.6-43), the United States explains that NRI survey locations are classified according to land-use histories starting in 1979; consequently, the classifications are based on fewer than 20 years from 1990 to 1998, and this may have led to an overestimation of the area of cropland remaining cropland. The ERT considers that this is not in line with the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>, which indicate the default land transition value to be 20 years. Further, the ERT notes that an overestimation of cropland in the remaining class may underestimate emissions if higher carbon stocks occurred in the previous land use before 1979. During the review, the United States explained that additional carbon losses would likely be minimal because cropland area has been declining over the past three decades owing to the expansion of forests and urban areas. During the review, the United States further informed the ERT of the on-going effort to develop a land representation dataset from early generation Landsat imagery to investigate the possibility of extending the time series for the land use data from 1979 to 1970. The United States also indicated alternative options for extrapolating the trends in land use back to the 1970s using agricultural and forestry statistics or other relevant information. Noting that it is important to avoid potential overestimation or underestimation of estimates in all IPCC categories, the ERT recommends that the United States progress its efforts to obtain data of land-use histories starting from 1971 or earlier for	Addressing. The United States intends to utilize the Landsat imagery to inform the land use data prior to 1979. This will be a multi-year process that will be implemented in a future Inventory submission.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				input to the land-use change matrices for cropland, and apply those data for the emission estimates.	
74.	(L.31)	LULUCF	4.B.1 Cropland remaining cropland – CO ₂	The ERT noted that the areas of mineral and organic soils reported in CRF table 4.B (616.61 kha and 151,388.48 kha, respectively) have been interchanged for cropland remaining cropland (a total of 152,005.09 kha) compared with the areas reported in the NIR (Annex 3.12, table A-217) (151.39 Mha for mineral soils and 0.62 Mha for organic soils). In response to a question raised by the ERT, the United States acknowledged the error and stated that QC measures are in place but had not been completed prior to the submission of the CRF tables. The ERT recommends that the United States apply the appropriate QC check to ensure consistency of the areas of mineral and organic soils reported in CRF table 4.B and the NIR.	Completed. The United States has modified the compilation schedule of the Inventory in order to allow more time to perform QC measures on the CRF tables. This has been implemented for the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
75.	(L.32)	LULUCF	4.B.2.1 Forest land converted to cropland – CO ₂	The ERT noted that in CRF table 4.B the implied carbon stock change factor for 2014 for living biomass for forest land converted to cropland (–65.53 t C/ha) is high compared with other implied carbon stock change factors from neighbouring countries. For instance, Canada has reported –0.95 t C/ha, which is 50 times lower than the factor reported by the United States. The ERT also noted that, in the NIR (p.6-57), the United States explained that it calculates the difference between the stocks reported as the stock change under the assumption that the change occurred in the year of the conversion. The ERT recommends that the United States include a transparent explanation of how the losses (–3,129 kt C in CRF table 4.B for forest land converted to cropland) have been calculated based on carbon densities in forest land, and amend the information on biomass carbon stock changes in the NIR (p.6-57).	First, the estimates from Canada may not be comparable to those in the United States given markedly different climates, forest types, compilation methods, and management systems. That said, the Canadian estimates seem unrealistically low given that conversions for Forest Land to Cropland (at least in the United States) are typically on productive sites that would support crop production and warrant the cost of conversion from forest land. These sites typically had or have the potential to support high tree biomass. In the United States the implied carbon stock change factor for 2014 for living biomass for forest land converted to cropland was estimated directly from FIA plots that were Forest land at the measurement period prior to 2014 and classified as cropland at the subsequent measurement period; these are based on actual field observations. Additionally, the implied carbon stock change factor for 2014 for living biomass for forest land converted to cropland was -12.90 t C/ha not -65.53t

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
					C/ha as suggested in the ERT description.
76.	(L.33)	LULUCF	4.C.2 Land converted to grassland – CO ₂	The ERT noted, in CRF table 4.C, an implied carbon stock change factor for mineral soils under forest land converted to grasslands of 0.13 t C/ha in 2013. For the conversion from grasslands to forest land an implied carbon stock change factor for mineral soils increases annually by 0.10 t C/ha. Both conversions would lead to an increase in carbon stock. In the planned improvements provided in the NIR, the United States explains that different tier level methods are used for estimating carbon stock changes in forest land, grassland and cropland. The ERT noted that this could result in inconsistent implied carbon stock factors for mineral soils for those categories. Recognizing this, the United States indicates in the NIR that it plans to update and revise the estimates of emissions and removals from mineral soils in conversions from forest land to grasslands. The ERT recommends that the United States revise the estimates for carbon stock change in mineral soils under forest land converted to grasslands using the updated data for mineral soils and report the result in the NIR.	The United States does apply a consistent method to all lands that are undergoing land use change (using a Tier 2 method). The differences between forest land converted to grassland and grassland converted to forest land is the management on the grassland. For example, improved grassland will have a larger stock than an unimproved grassland. Regardless, the United States plans to update and revise the estimates of emissions and removals from mineral soils in conversions from forest land to grasslands in subsequent NIRs with the goal of providing more accurate results with the latest experimental results.
77.	(L.34)	LULUCF	4.D.1 Wetlands remaining wetlands – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The United States reported an area of peatland remaining peatland in CRF table 4.D for 2014 of 5.31 kha. The ERT notes that the United States reported the data for peat production in Alaska separately from the data for the other 48 states reporting areas of peatland in the NIR, due to methodological differences in data collection and calculation. The areas of peatland are not reported separately in the NIR and CRF table 4.D, with only the national total being reported. The ERT also noted that in CRF table 4(II), "NE" is reported for the areas of peat extraction lands, although N₂O and CH₄ emissions from drained organic soils are reported, for which the ERT considers that the same area should be used for on-site CO₂ and estimating CO₂ emissions during peat extraction, according to information in the NIR (p.6-76). The ERT recommends that the United States provide consistent information on the calculation of the total managed peatland and on how the calculation relates to the extracted area in the CRF tables and in the NIR. Noting that the United States is aware of the need for determining the quantity of peat harvested per hectare and the total area undergoing peat extraction, the ERT recommends that the United States provide the respective AD and IEFs for on-site CH₄ and N₂O emission estimates in CRF table 4(II) for organic soils under peat extraction.	Completed. The United States reports peat production data for Alaska separately from other states in the NIR because of a difference in calculation methodology between Alaska and the remainder of the United States. Alaska conducts its own mineral survey and reports peat production by volume, rather than by weight. Volume production data are used to calculate off-site CO₂ emissions from Alaska applying the same methodology but with volume-specific C fraction conversion factors from 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The United States reports total U.S. peat production in the CRF tables, instead of reporting Alaska separately. This is also the case for peat area and emissions. Reporting Alaska separately from the rest of the United States seems to be inconsistent, as most sources

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
					present total U.S. values in the CRF tables. CRF table 4(II) is updated for the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission) to include CO₂ values for areas of peat extraction lands instead of "NE".
78.	(L.35)	LULUCF	4.D.2.3 Land converted to wetlands – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The United States has not estimated emissions for wetlands remaining wetlands separately from land converted to wetlands. The United States explained in the NIR that it was not able to separate CH₄, CO₂ and N₂O emissions for wetlands remaining wetlands and land converted to wetlands. The United States also explained in the NIR that research to track GHG fluxes across wetlands remaining wetlands and land converted to wetlands is ongoing, and until such time that reliable and comprehensive estimates of GHG fluxes across these LULUCF categories can be produced, it is not possible to separate CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O fluxes on land converted to wetlands from fluxes on wetlands remaining wetlands. The ERT recommends that the United States use the AD reported in table 6-7 of the NIR to separate CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O emissions from land converted to wetlands and wetlands remaining wetlands.	Addressing. In the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission), the United States has improved on the reporting of emissions for wetland remaining wetlands and land converted to wetlands and will continue to refine the estimates for future Inventory submissions.
79.	(L.38)	LULUCF	4.E.1 Settlements remaining settlements – CO ₂	The United States reported changes in the carbon stocks in landfills relating to yard trimming and food scraps under settlements remaining settlements in CRF table 4.E. In the NIR (chapter 6.14, "Other (IPCC Source category 4.H)"), the United States included details on which methodologies were used for these subcategories, but no reference is given in chapter 6.10 ("Settlements remaining settlements"). During the review, the United States explained that, for its next submission, it will report the information for carbon stocks in landfills relating to yard trimming and food scraps under the section on settlements in the NIR. The ERT recommends that the United States check the coherence of reported data, applying the appropriate QC checks, in order to ensure consistency between the CRF tables and the NIR.	Completed. The United States began reporting the carbon stock changes from Landfilled Yard Trimmings and Food Scraps in the Settlements sections of both the NIR and CRF in the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission).
80.	(L.39)	LULUCF	4.E.2.5 Other land converted to settlements – CO ₂	The United States reports carbon stock changes as "NE" for all pools under land converted to settlements, and explains in the NIR that, given the lack of available information, it is not possible to separate CO₂ or N₂O fluxes on land converted to settlements from fluxes on settlements remaining settlements at this time. Noting that CO₂ from landfilled yard trimming and food scraps and urban tree soils under settlements remaining settlements is a key category, the ERT finds that land converted to settlements might become a key category if the United States were to estimate these emissions because according to the NIR (p.6-86), land under a number of uses undergoes urbanization in the United States each year.	Partially completed. In the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) the United States reports carbon stock changes for <i>Land Converted to Settlements</i> separately from <i>Settlements Remaining Settlements</i> . However, at this time it is not possible to report the N ₂ O fluxes in this way due to lack of activity data. The United States will also apply the notation key IE for

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				The ERT recommends that the United States estimate carbon stock changes in living biomass and dead organic matter. If this is not possible, the ERT recommends that the United States use the notation key "IE" for area under land converted to settlements in order to be consistent with the information in the NIR stating that other lands converted to settlements cannot be separated from settlements remaining settlements.	those situations where it is not possible to separate the emissions into land use and land use conversion categories.
81.	(L.40)	LULUCF	4(I) Direct N ₂ O emissions from nitrogen inputs to managed soils – N ₂ O	In CRF table 4(I), the United States reports, for the entire time series, N₂O emissions from land converted to forest land as "IE" and "NA", from wetlands as "NA", and from land converted to settlements as "NA". However, the ERT noted that the direct and indirect N₂O emissions from managed soils under land converted to forest land have been included in forest land remaining forest land (NIR, table 6-19). Similarly, the NIR states that N₂O fluxes for lands converted to settlements are reported under settlements remaining settlements. Under flooded wetlands, N₂O emissions have not been estimated. The United States provided, during the review, information showing that it avoids double counting for N in peat that is used as fertilizer in horticulture peat (applied to agricultural soils). The ERT recommends that the United States use the notation key "NE" and/or "IE" in reporting AD and N₂O emissions from land converted to forest land, wetlands, and land converted to settlements, as appropriate, in order to be consistent with the explanation provided in the NIR, and provide information showing how it avoids double counting for N, without omitting N input in peat.	Completed. In the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission) the United States has modified the use of notation keys in Table 4(I) to better reflect how the emissions are reported in the NIR.
82.	(L.41)	LULUCF	4 (III) Direct N ₂ O emissions from N mineralization/immobilization – N ₂ O	The ERT noted that in CRF table 4(III) the United States reported direct N₂O emissions from mineralization/immobilization for all land categories as "NA", but the LULUCF chapter of the NIR does not include a section that provides information on the use of the notation key "NA" for reporting the direct N₂O emissions resulting from land use or management of mineral soils The ERT recommends that the United States include an explanation in the NIR for the reporting of "NA" for all land categories for direct N₂O emissions from mineralization/immobilization.	Addressing. Direct N ₂ O emissions from mineralization/immobilization are reported from croplands and grasslands in agricultural soil management, and therefore the notation key should be "IE". Direct N ₂ O emissions from mineralization/immobilization are not reported for other land uses, but will be investigated and reported in a future submission based on the recommendation of the ERT.
83.	(L.42)	LULUCF	4 (V) Biomass burning – CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O	The ERT noted that the United States has provided CH ₄ and N ₂ O emissions from forest fires in forest land remaining forest land only. Emissions from biomass burning under other land categories are reported as "NE" or "NA", except for N ₂ O emissions from cropland remaining cropland and from grassland, which are reported as "IE". For the category forest land remaining forest land, the United States has mentioned in the improvement plan the use of country-specific combustion factors to calculate emissions from burning and stated that the information is provided by the Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity data summaries. Currently those data are unused for the emission estimates for this category. During the review, the United States stated that it	Partially complete. In the previous Inventory (i.e., 2017 submission), the United States began reporting biomass burning for forestland and grassland. In both cases, it is not possible to separate emissions by conversion categories.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				is working on research for country-specific factors and the work will be used as it matures. Noting that CH₄ and N₂O emissions from forest fires are key categories, the ERT recommends that the United States estimate CH₄ and N₂O emissions from biomass burning in land converted to forest land, land converted to wetlands, cropland, grassland, and settlements, and populate CRF table 4(V) to improve completeness.	
84.	(L.43)	LULUCF	4.G Harvested wood products (HWP) – CO ₂	The United States used the production accounting approach to report CO₂ emissions relating to HWP. Under the production approach, carbon in exported wood was estimated as if it remains in the United States, and carbon in imported wood was not included in the estimates. A tier 3 approach based on the use of country-specific data and methods to estimate HWP variables was used for the emission estimates. During the review, the United States explained that the criteria in the WOODCARB II model that were used to estimate the HWP contribution to forest carbon sinks and emissions are fixed and were developed using country-specific data. The United States also stated that exports represent an estimated 9 percent of total production in the United States. The ERT noted that the United States has not provided the AD on production, imports and exports of wood needed to estimate the HWP variables (i.e. HWP in products in use – domestic consumption (1.A), HWP in products in use – domestic harvest (2.A), carbon in annual imports of HWP (PIM), carbon in annual exports of HWP (P_{EX}) and carbon in annual harvest of roundwood (H)) for 1961 to the present, which is not in line with the good practice in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which require this information to be provided in CRF table 4.Gs2. The ERT recommends that the United States provide in the NIR information showing that data on the life cycle of exported HWP for those countries to which most of its products are exported are comparable with country-specific data, or adjust the data accordingly.	Completed. These data are available for the United States and are included in the CRF tables for the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission).
Waste					
85.	(W.2)	Waste	5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH ₄	Report on the trend of total waste generated, provide explanations, and revise the data, if necessary. Some information is provided in the NIR.	Completed. The methodology is based on national waste generation from 1990 to 2004 and then switches to directly reported net emissions for 2005 to 2016, meaning we are no longer using national waste generation data as the basis for emissions. We include details on the national waste generation data in the Methodology portion of Section 7.1 in the NIR and explain year-to-year variations.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
86.	(W.3)	Waste	5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH ₄	Revise the estimates of emissions from solid waste disposal on land by incorporating the revised degradable organic carbon (DOC) values into the emission estimation. The United States reports some effort to address the issue in the NIR (e.g. revision of the DOC value for landfilled pulp and paper on p. 7-11). However, during the review, the United States confirmed that the constant value is used in the entire time series. The ERT considers that if a constant value is used, the emission estimation does not capture the changing waste composition over the time series.	Addressing. The DOC value applied to industrial waste landfills is constant for the entire time series. The United States is investigating facility-specific DOC data reported under Subpart TT (Industrial Waste Landfills) of EPA's GHGRP to determine whether the pulp and paper and food and beverage waste composition has changed in recent years. Industrial waste composition tends to remain consistent from year to year when looking at single industries. The industrial waste composition and consequently DOC will change when the input material changes, or when a process changes. With regard to municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills, the United States has collected all publicly available and online MSW characterization study data since 1990 and is reviewing them to determine the impact of a changing waste composition. The level of detail in individual waste composition studies varies significantly. If applicable, EPA may revise the DOC value from 1990 to 2004. The methodology for 2005 to 2016 uses directly reported methane emissions to the GHGRP, a regulation that defines DOC values that can be applied. Updates to DOC value(s) for 2005 to 2016 must be considered in context of updates to methods in the GHGRP.
87.	(W.4)	Waste	5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH ₄	Report the composition of waste landfilled, with the amounts/shares and corresponding coefficients, including DOC. No relevant information on the composition of waste landfilled is provided in the NIR. In the NIR (p.7-8), the United States explains that the information on the amount and composition of waste placed in every MSW and industrial waste landfill for each year of a landfill's operation is not available. In the NIR (p.7-9), the United States also reports that it is currently compiling the waste composition studies and data that have been performed in the past decade and may	Addressing. See comment above; the United States is investigating waste characterization studies completed across the United States since 1990 to better define the composition over the time series.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				revise the default waste composition applied to MSW landfilled in the first order decay (FOD) model in future inventory estimates.	The current Inventory includes a national estimate of waste composition at the end of Section 7.1 – Landfills. The United States can include more detail on the waste composition applied by the Waste Model in the 1990 through 2017 NIR. The composition of MSW landfilled is generally not available for many of the 1,500 active MSW landfills in the United States, which is why the composition is estimated at a national level. The United States is investigating variations from the national composition to landfill-specific waste composition studies and will summarize this information in a future Inventory submissions.
88.	(W.5)	Waste	5.D.2 Industrial wastewater – CH ₄	Include information on the non-estimation of CH ₄ emissions from sludge under industrial wastewater. No information is provided in the NIR. During the review, the United States explained that continuous efforts are under way to ensure the completeness of the United States inventory.	Addressing. Efforts are continuing to ensure completeness of the United States inventory.
89.	(W.8)	Waste	5.C.1 Waste incineration – CH ₄ and N ₂ O	Make efforts to collect the necessary AD for the emission estimation of CH ₄ and N ₂ O from non-hazardous industrial waste and medical waste incineration, and to include these estimates in future inventory submissions, providing all necessary explanations in the NIR. In the NIR (p.7-32) the United States indicated that data are not readily available to estimate emissions from incineration of non-hazardous industrial waste, while annual emissions from medical waste incineration would be below 500 kt CO ₂ eq. During the review, no justification was provided for the insignificance of emissions from medical waste.	Completed. See Annex 5.
90.	(W.9)	Waste	5. General (waste) – CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	In previous review reports the ERTs recommended that the United States provide descriptions of the waste management practices used in the country. During the current review the United States explained that boxes 7-3, 7-4 and 7-5 of the NIR with accompanying tables, graphs and charts describe and depict the waste management practices in the United States. The ERT commends the United States for its efforts. The ERT noted that, as described in the NIR (Box 7-3), the United States uses two sources of data on solid waste management: BioCycle and Earth Engineering Center of Columbia University's State of Garbage in America surveys and the EPA's Municipal Solid Waste in the United States Facts and Figures. The United States indicates that the data on waste management, waste composition and the recovery of degradable waste presented in the NIR (Box 7-4) are taken from an EPA Facts and Figures report that is not consistent with the State of Garbage surveys, which the United States indicates in the NIR is the preferred data source for estimating waste generation and	Addressing. The United States understands this comment and is working to rectify the inconsistency between the two data sources. Since this comment was made, the United States has transitioned away from the BioCycle data and is now using facility-specific, directly reported information. The United States is also investigating facility-specific waste composition studies and trends and will investigate differences between facility-specific data and the MSW Facts and Figures data

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				disposal amounts in the inventory. The ERT considers that this has created an inconsistency issue within the NIR. For example, the United States reported in chapter 7 of the NIR that landfilling accounts for 53 percent of total waste management practices while in Annex 3.14 to the NIR the same information is reported as 63 percent. The reported trend for landfilled waste from 1990 to 2013 is also different. The ERT recommends that the United States provide background information that is consistent with the data actually used for the emission estimates, including the waste management practices, in a clear manner.	(now called Sustainable Materials Management Report).
91.	(W.10)	Waste	5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH ₄	The United States provided in its NIR some information explaining the trend of total waste generated. In response to a question from the ERT during the review, the United States also provided a memorandum, “Review of State of Garbage data used in the U.S. Non-CO ₂ Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Landfills”, which helped the ERT to review the trend of generated waste. The ERT recommends that the United States include in the NIR a summary of information on the actual trend of total waste generated as contained in the memorandum “Review of State of Garbage data used in the U.S. Non-CO ₂ Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Landfills”, which was provided to the ERT during the review.	Completed. The United States has included this information in the Methodology section of Section 7.1 in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). Please note that the information included in the memorandum (“Review of State of Garbage data used in the U.S. Non-CO ₂ Greenhouse Gas Inventory for Landfills”) only applies to a portion of the time series (1990 to 2004) due to a methodological / activity data change for 2005 to 2016.
92.	(W.11)	Waste	5.A.1.a Anaerobic – CH ₄	The ERT identified that the United States reported total MSW generated and not total waste landfilled in CRF table 5.A. During the review, the United States explained that issues with data import to the CRF Reporter software are under investigation in order to improve the consistency of the CRF tables. The ERT recommends that the United States strengthen its QA/QC procedures related to consistency checks between information reported in CRF table 5.A on AD and the NIR, in order to avoid similar errors in future submissions.	Addressing. The information presented in the Landfills workbook CRF Table 5A in the previous NIR was solid waste generated. This has been changed to MSW landfilled in the current Inventory (i.e., 2018 submission). The solid waste disposed by year is also presented in the “Inv Tables” worksheet in row 48. The main Landfills chapter presents emissions and recovery estimates only, while the Annex presents the activity data, including the amount of MSW landfilled by year. Note that the data sources have changed for the time series and the United States is no longer relying on the BioCycle State of Garbage reports to estimate the amount of MSW generated and landfilled. The United States is still

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
					presenting estimates of MSW generated and landfilled in the NIR, but the United States does not directly use this information to estimate net emissions. In the next Inventory (i.e., 2019 submission), the United States will attempt to address this inconsistency so that the data used for waste disposal amounts reflects the source used for the emissions estimates.
93.	(W.12)	Waste	5.A.1.a Anaerobic – CH ₄	The NIR states that the United States assumes over 99 percent of the organic waste placed in industrial waste landfills originates from the food processing (meat, vegetables, fruits) and pulp and paper industries (EPA, 1993), and therefore estimates of industrial landfill emissions focused on these two industries. The ERT noted that in the section on planned improvements in the NIR (p.7-12), the United States includes a possible revision to the waste disposal factor currently used for the pulp and paper industry to use production data from pulp and paper facilities obtained from GHGRP, and the possible addition of other industries (e.g. metal foundries, petroleum refineries and chemical manufacturing facilities). The ERT considers that the share of organic waste placed in industrial landfills may be different from that assumed in 1993. Therefore, the ERT recommends that the United States obtain up-to-date data on the type and fractions of organic waste placed in industrial waste landfills and revise the CH ₄ estimates from all major industrial waste landfills.	Addressing. EPA plans to document the assumptions regarding the percentage and composition of industrial waste landfilled and compare this information to that reported to the EPA's GHGRP in a technical memorandum. The GHGRP data contains the most up-to-date and comprehensive information available about industrial waste.
94.	(W.14)	Waste	5.B.2 Anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities – CH ₄	The United States reports the notation key "IE" for CH ₄ emissions from anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities. During the review, the United States explained that disaggregated data are not available and it is assumed that CH ₄ emissions are included in the aggregated data reported under the category managed waste disposal sites (5.A.1). The ERT noted that, according to the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (volume 5, chapter 5, section 4.1), the emissions from unintentional leakages during anaerobic digestion should be reported in the waste sector and, also according to the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> , in the absence of further information, it is recommended to use a default value of 5 percent. The ERT recommends that the United States estimate and report CH ₄ emissions from unintentional leakages using the default value of 5 percent provided by the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .	Addressing. The United States will investigate the data sources and practices of anaerobic digestion in more detail and will assess the addition of a 5 percent factor to account for unintentional leakages in a future Inventory (targeting the 1990 through 2017 Inventory).
95.	(W.15)	Waste	5.C.1 Waste incineration – CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	The ERT identified a few inconsistencies within the NIR. For example, the United States reported in figure 7-2 of the NIR that 13 percent of waste was incinerated in 2013 while NIR tables 3-26s and A-272 of the NIR both report 7.6 percent for the same year. During the review, the United States explained that multiple references were utilized to estimate CO ₂ emissions from waste incineration (focused on fossil-derived waste) and then for	Addressing. The United States is investigating additional sources of information on waste incineration including the GHGRP and plans to

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				CH ₄ and N ₂ O emissions from waste incineration (based on total mass). The United States stated that steps will be taken to better coordinate waste references across all categories in the next inventory submission. The ERT recommends that the United States provide in the NIR consistent information on the data that are used for the estimation of emissions from waste incineration.	update waste references (targeting the 1990 through 2017 Inventory).
96.	(W.16)	Waste	5.C.1 Waste incineration – CO ₂ , CH ₄ , and N ₂ O	In the previous review report the ERT recommended that the United States estimate emissions from the incineration of non-hazardous industrial waste and medical waste. In the current NIR, the United States indicated that data are not readily available to estimate emissions from the incineration of non-hazardous industrial waste and that, based on a report from RTI, medical waste incineration would be below 500 kt CO ₂ eq per year, which the United States considered to be insignificant for the purpose of inventory reporting. The ERT recommends that the United States provide in Annex 5 to the NIR a specific reference to the RTI report justifying the insignificance of the emissions from the incineration of medical waste, in accordance with paragraph 37(b) of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines.	Completed. See Annex 5.
97.	(W.17)	Waste	5.D Wastewater treatment and discharge – CH ₄	The United States reports the notation key “IE” for CH ₄ flared from domestic wastewater (5.D.1) and other (5.D.3). During the review, the United States explained that aggregated data were reported under “amount of CH ₄ for energy recovery”. The ERT recommends that the United States provide information in CRF table 9 to indicate where all emissions reported as “IE” are included.	Completed. The United States has clarified that the notation key for CH ₄ flared from domestic wastewater is IE because CH ₄ flared values are not directly estimated, rather combined with CH ₄ energy recovery, due to a lack of available activity data.
98.	(W.18)	Waste	5.D.1 Domestic wastewater – N ₂ O	The ERT noted that the equation used to estimate N _{EFFLUENT} explained in the NIR is not consistent with the method provided in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> (volume 5, chapter 5, box 6.1) for estimating emissions from advanced centralized wastewater treatment plants. During the review, the United States explained that it uses the equation to estimate emissions from domestic wastewater effluent (equation 6.7) with the total annual amount of N in the wastewater effluent estimated using equation 6.8 provided in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> . To reflect the N ₂ O emissions from domestic wastewater treated in the centralized treatment plant prior to discharge as effluent, the United States subtracted the N associated with such plant emissions from the total N ₂ O _{EFFLUENT} which was estimated using equation 6.8. During the review, the United States agreed that, in applying equation 6.8 provided in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> , an adjustment should be made to the N ₂ O _{EFFLUENT} equation used to estimate emissions so as to properly back-calculate and subtract N associated with N ₂ O emissions from centralized treatment plants, and suggested a revised equation which considers the underestimation of N treated by biological denitrification. Further, the United States explained that the revised equation, which adjusts the over-deduction of N treated by biological denitrification, still does not consider N discharge from the percentage of the population which uses a septic system because the septic systems in the United States do not discharge to aquatic environments. The ERT recommends that the United States estimate the N ₂ O emissions	Completed. Beginning with the previous inventory (i.e., 2017 submission), the United States implemented revisions to the calculation of N _{EFFLUENT} that subtracts N associated with N ₂ O emissions from centralized treatment plants.

No.	ID	Sector	Source/Sink Category	Comment	U.S. Response
				using the revised equations and report the emissions with the background information in the next submission.	
1	NA (Not Applicable)				
2					
3					