



Landfill Project Protocol Version 4.0 ERRATA AND CLARIFICATIONS

The Climate Action Reserve (Reserve) published its Landfill Project Protocol Version 4.0 (LFPP V4.0) in June 2011. While the Reserve intends for the LFPP V4.0 to be a complete, transparent document, it recognizes that correction of errors and clarifications will be necessary as the protocol is implemented and issues are identified. This document is an official record of all errata and clarifications applicable to the LFPP V4.0.¹

Per the Reserve's Program Manual, both errata and clarifications are considered effective on the date they are first posted on the Reserve website. The effective date of each erratum or clarification is clearly designated below. All listed and registered LFPP projects must incorporate and adhere to these errata and clarifications when they undergo verification. The Reserve will incorporate both errata and clarifications into future versions of the LFPP.

All project developers and verification bodies must refer to this document to ensure that the most current guidance is adhered to in project design and verification. Verification bodies shall refer to this document immediately prior to uploading any Verification Statement to assure all issues are properly addressed and incorporated into verification activities.

If you have any questions about the updates or clarifications in this document, please contact Policy at: policy@climateactionreserve.org or (213) 891-1444 x3.

¹ See Section 4.3.4 of the Climate Action Reserve Program Manual for an explanation of the Reserve's policies on protocol errata and clarifications. "Errata" are issued to correct typographical errors. "Clarifications" are issued to ensure consistent interpretation and application of the protocol. For document management and program implementation purposes, both errata and clarifications to the LFPP are contained in this single document.

Errata and Clarifications (arranged by protocol section)

Section 3

1. Legal Requirement Test for Landfills in California (CLARIFICATION – August 16, 2012) 3

Section 5

2. Service Providers for Site-Specific Destruction Efficiency Testing (CLARIFICATION – January 21, 2014)..... 4

Section 6

3. Metering Multiple Destruction Devices (CLARIFICATION – October 26, 2011) 5
4. Monitoring Operational Status (CLARIFICATION – October 8, 2013) 6
5. Verifying Off-Site Destruction in Direct Use Projects (CLARIFICATION – January 14, 2015) 6
6. Meter Field Check Procedures (CLARIFICATION – October 8, 2013) 7
7. Field Check Requirements (CLARIFICATION – October 26, 2011) 8
8. Portable Instruments QA/QC (CLARIFICATION – June 3, 2013) 8

Section 3

1. Legal Requirement Test for Landfills in California (CLARIFICATION – August 16, 2012)

Section: 3.4.2.2 (State and Local Regulations, Ordinances and Permitting Requirements)

Context: Section 3.4.2 of the protocol states that if an eligible project begins operation at a landfill that later becomes subject to a regulation that calls for the installation of a landfill gas control system, GHG reductions may be reported to the Reserve up until the date that installation is legally required to be operational. The second paragraph of Section 3.4.2.2 on page 10 makes reference to the Landfill Methane Control Measure adopted on June 17, 2010 by the California Air Resources Board.² However, this section does not provide guidance on how landfill projects are to determine the status of their eligibility in regards to the Legal Requirement Test for additionality.

Based on the thresholds and timelines contained within the regulation, the Reserve has developed the following guidance for determining the additionality of landfill projects in California, provided that the projects meet all other requirements of the protocol.

Clarification: The California Landfill Methane Control Measure requires an active landfill gas control system (GCCS) to be installed and operated at MSW landfills that exceed the following two thresholds:³

- Size threshold: The regulation only applies to landfills with greater than 450,000 tons waste-in-place (WIP)
- LFG threshold: If a landfill exceeds the size threshold, the regulation only applies if the calculated heat input capacity exceeds 3.0 MMBtu/hr

Landfill projects at active landfills that had exceeded both thresholds and had begun operation of a GCCS prior to June 17, 2010 are eligible to receive CRTs for landfill gas destruction that occurs until December 17, 2012.⁴ If the same is true at a landfill that was closed or inactive as of June 17, 2010, eligibility extends until December 17, 2013.⁵

Landfill projects with a start date after June 17, 2010 must assess their status against the regulatory thresholds on an ongoing basis. Any project with a start date after June 17, 2010, but prior to exceeding both thresholds must report its landfill's WIP to the Climate Action Reserve during each verification, as of the end of the previous calendar year. Once the size threshold has been exceeded, the project must also calculate the landfill's heat input capacity according to the regulation⁶ and report this figure during each verification, as of the end of the previous

² <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/landfills/landfills.htm>

³ If a landfill exceeds both thresholds, there is a third, optional threshold for surface emissions specified in the regulation. For the purposes of this policy, it is conservative to assume that this optional testing and reporting would not have been carried out in the baseline scenario and thus is not included in this guidance.

⁴ In the baseline scenario for these sites, a design plan would have been required to be submitted by June 17, 2011. Upon approval of that design plan, the system would have been required to be operational within 18 months, or by December 17, 2012.

⁵ Closed or inactive landfills are allowed 30 months from the approval of the GCCS design plan before the system must be operational.

⁶ A tool for the annual quantification of landfill gas heat input capacity is available at:
<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/landfills/landfills.htm>

calendar year (beginning the year the size threshold is exceeded). If the LFG threshold is exceeded, the project will remain eligible for a period of 30 months for active landfills and 42 months for closed or inactive landfills following December 31 of the year in which the LFG threshold was exceeded. For example, a landfill project verifying a reporting period covering January 2011 through December 2011 would report its WIP and heat input capacity as of December 31, 2011. A landfill project verifying a reporting period covering June 2011 through June 2012 would report its WIP and heat input capacity as of December 31, 2011.

Any project with a start date that occurs after exceeding both thresholds is not eligible.

In all cases, a project must still meet all other criteria of the Landfill Project Protocol.

Example Scenario	Climate Action Reserve Eligibility Status
A project began operation in 2009, having already exceeded the size and LFG thresholds in the regulation. The landfill remains open and active.	Project is eligible until December 17, 2012.
A project began operation in 2009, having already exceeded the size and LFG thresholds in the regulation. The landfill remains open and active. However, the GCCS does not currently meet the requirements of the regulation and must be modified or upgraded.	Project is eligible until December 17, 2012.
A project began operation in 2009. As of December 31, 2011 the landfill has 400,000 tons of WIP. The landfill continues to receive waste.	Project must monitor and report WIP on a calendar year basis. Once the size threshold is exceeded, project must calculate and report heat input capacity on a calendar year basis. Once the LFG threshold is exceeded, the project is eligible for 30 months if the landfill is active and 42 months if the landfill is closed or inactive.
A project began operation in 2011. As of December 31, 2012, the landfill has exceeded the size and LFG thresholds for the first time. The landfill continues to receive waste.	Project is eligible until June 30, 2014.
A project began operation in 2011. The landfill's report to the ARB for the reporting year 2010 indicated that the site had exceeded both the size and LFG thresholds.	Project is not eligible.
A landfill has exceeded both regulatory thresholds and has submitted a design plan to ARB, but has not yet received approval or begun installation.	Project is not eligible.

Section 5

2. Service Providers for Site-Specific Destruction Efficiency Testing (CLARIFICATION – January 21, 2014)

Section: 5.1 (Quantifying Baseline Emissions)

Context: Footnote 22 on page 23 states that service providers used to determine site-specific values for methane destruction efficiency must be “state or local agency accredited.” It is not clear what specific options are available and permissible to projects located in a state or locality

which does not have an accreditation program for source test service providers. The last paragraph of Section 6.2 on page 33, the comment section of Table 6.1 for Equations 5.4 and 5.12 (DE_i) on page 36, and the first paragraph of page 72 in Appendix C also contain similar language.

Clarification: The intent of this requirement is to ensure that any source testing conducted for the determination of a site specific value for methane destruction efficiency is of a quality that would be acceptable for compliance by a regulatory body. The following text shall be added to the end of footnote 22 on page 23, after the last paragraph of Section 6.2 on page 33, to the end of the comment section of Table 6.1 for Equations 5.4 and 5.12 (DE_i) on page 36, and after the first paragraph of page 72 in Appendix C:

“If neither the state nor locality relevant to the project site offer accreditation for source testing service providers, projects may use an accredited service provider from another U.S. state or domestic locality. Alternatively, projects may choose a non-accredited service provider, under the following conditions: 1) the service provider must provide verifiable evidence of prior testing which was accepted for compliance by a domestic regulatory agency, and 2) the prior testing procedures must be substantially similar to the procedures used for determining methane destruction efficiency for the project destruction device(s).”

Section 6

3. Metering Multiple Destruction Devices (CLARIFICATION – October 26, 2011)

Section: 6.1 (Monitoring Requirements)

Context: Footnote 26 on page 30 states: “A single meter may be used for multiple, identical destruction devices. In this instance, methane destruction in these units will be eligible only if both units are verified to be operational.”

The Reserve has determined that in certain situations it may be acceptable for one flow meter to be used to monitor the flow of gas to multiple destruction devices without fulfilling the requirement that they be identical or that they all be operational. Such an arrangement will require extra steps for verification, depending on the situation and the monitoring data that are available.

Clarification: The following text shall replace footnote 26 on page 30:

“A single flow meter may be used for multiple destruction devices under certain conditions. If all destruction devices are of identical efficiency and verified to be operational, no additional steps are necessary for project registration. Otherwise, the destruction efficiency of the least efficient destruction device shall be used as the destruction efficiency for all destruction devices monitored by this meter.

If there are any periods when not all destruction devices are operational, methane destruction during these periods will be eligible provided that the verifier can confirm all of the following conditions are met:

- a. The destruction efficiency of the least efficient destruction device in operation shall be used as the destruction efficiency for all destruction devices monitored by this meter; and
- b. All devices are either equipped with valves on the input gas line that close automatically if the device becomes non-operational (requiring no manual intervention), or designed in such a manner that it is physically impossible for gas to pass through while the device is non-operational; and
- c. For any period where one or more destruction device within this arrangement is not operational, it must be documented that the remaining operational devices have the capacity to destroy the maximum gas flow recorded during the period. For devices other than flares, it must be shown that the output corresponds to the flow of gas."

4. Monitoring Operational Status (CLARIFICATION – October 8, 2013)

Section: 6.1 (Monitoring Requirements)

Context: The first full paragraph of page 32 in Section 6.1 states that "the operational activity of the landfill gas collection system and the destruction devices shall be monitored and documented at least hourly to ensure actual landfill gas destruction."

Certain types of destruction devices, such as internal combustion engines and most large boiler systems, are designed in such a way that gas may not flow through the device if it is not operational. It has not been clear how the requirements of Section 6.1 apply to these devices. There has been confusion related to the Clarification issued on October 26, 2011 regarding Metering Multiple Destruction Devices.

Clarification: The Clarification regarding Metering Multiple Destruction Devices (October 26, 2011) shall not be construed to relax the requirement for hourly operational data for all destruction devices. Rather, that clarification is allowing a specific metering arrangement during periods when one or more devices are *known* to not be operating. In order to know the operational status of a device, it must be monitored. All destruction devices must have their operational status monitored and recorded at least hourly. In other words, the project dataset will include an indication of operational status corresponding to each hour of landfill gas data. If these data are missing or never recorded for a particular device, that device will be assumed to be not operating and no emission reductions may be claimed for landfill gas destroyed by that device during the period when data are missing.

5. Verifying Off-Site Destruction in Direct Use Projects (CLARIFICATION – January 14, 2015)

Section: 6.1 (Monitoring Requirements)

Context: The protocol requires that "the operational activity of the landfill gas collection system and the destruction devices shall be monitored and documented at least hourly" (Section 6.1, page 32). A clarification issued on October 8, 2013 ("Monitoring Operational Status") reiterates that this requirement applies to all destruction devices.

In scenarios where landfill gas is supplied to a third party end-user via a dedicated pipeline pursuant to a direct use agreement, the project developer may have no management control

over the off-site destruction device. It has been unclear whether the operational status of those destruction devices must be monitored, or what alternative assurance may be given to verifiers to confirm that the destruction device is operational and project biogas is being destroyed.

Clarification: The following text shall be inserted after the last paragraph of Section 6.1 on page 32:

“In scenarios where landfill gas is delivered off-site to a third party end user (not to a commercial natural gas transmission and distribution system or to a facility under management control of the project operator), reasonable efforts must be made to obtain data demonstrating the operational status of the destruction device(s). If it is not possible to obtain such data, the verifier must use their professional judgment to confirm that there has been no significant release of project landfill gas and that the project developer is using the appropriate destruction efficiency value. Evidence that may assist a verifier in making a determination to that effect may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following:

- a signed attestation from the third party operator of the destruction device that no catastrophic failure of destruction or significant release of landfill gas occurred during the reporting period;
- the verifier confirming the same via an interview with the third party operator;
- examination of the safety features and/or design of the destruction equipment, such that the destruction device does not allow landfill gas to pass through it when non-operational and/or that the project developer is able to switch off the flow of landfill gas off-site in the event of emergencies;
- records that can corroborate the type and level of operation of the destruction device during the reporting period, such as engine output data, etc.

If the verifier is reasonably assured that no significant release of landfill gas has occurred off-site during the reporting period, the project can use the destruction efficiency appropriate to that off-site destruction device, despite the lack of hourly data from a monitoring device confirming operational status.”

6. Meter Field Check Procedures (CLARIFICATION – October 8, 2013)

Section: 6.2 (Instrument QA/QC)

Context: The second paragraph below the bulleted list of page 32 in Section 6.2 states that “if the field check on a piece of equipment reveals accuracy outside of a +/- 5% threshold, calibration by the manufacturer or a certified service provider is required for that piece of equipment.”

Certain types of gas flow meters and methane analyzers are susceptible to measurement drift due to buildup of moisture or contaminants on the metering sensor, even if the equipment itself is not out of calibration. If the as-found condition of the meter is outside of the accuracy threshold, but the as-left condition (after cleaning) is within the accuracy threshold, it is not clear whether a full calibration is still required for this piece of equipment. In some cases the manufacturer provides specific guidance to the effect that no further calibration is required if the as-left condition shows the meter to be in calibration.

Clarification: The as-found condition (percent drift) of a field check must always be recorded. If the meter is found to be measuring outside of the +/- 5% threshold for accuracy, the data must be adjusted for the period beginning with the last successful field check or calibration event up until the meter is confirmed to be in calibration (unless the last event occurred during the prior reporting period, in which case adjustment is made back to the beginning of the current reporting period). If, at the time of the failed field check, the meter is cleaned and checked again, with the as-left condition found to be within the accuracy threshold, a full calibration is not required for that piece of equipment. This shall be considered a failed field check, followed by a successful field check. The data adjustment shall be based on the percent drift recorded at the time of the failed field check. However, if the as-left condition remains outside of the +/- 5% accuracy threshold (whether or not additional cleaning and accuracy testing occurs), calibration is required by the manufacturer or a certified service provider for that piece of equipment.

7. Field Check Requirements (CLARIFICATION – October 26, 2011)

Section: 6.2 (Instrument QA/QC)

Context: Section 6.2 sets the minimum field check requirements for flow meters and methane analyzers, but allows project developers to conduct field checks more frequently to minimize the risk of drift-related deductions. The protocol states that the field check at the end of the reporting period must be performed by a third-party technician, but it is not clear if additional field checks carried out at the project developer's discretion must also be performed by third-party technicians. Furthermore, it is not clear what action is required if the discretionary field check reveals accuracy outside of the +/- 5% threshold, or how a verification body should treat field checks not performed by a third party.

Clarification: The field check that is required to occur within the last two months of the reporting period must be carried out by a third-party technician. At other times during the reporting period, field checks are not required to be performed by a third-party technician. However, any field check that is not performed by a third-party technician shall be subject to additional verifier scrutiny, and may be deemed invalid for satisfying the requirements of Section 6.2. The following text shall be added to Section 6.2:

“Additional field checks carried out during the reporting period at the project developer's discretion may be performed by an individual that is not a third-party technician. In this case, the competency of the individual and the accuracy of the field check procedure must be assessed and approved by the verification body. Furthermore, if the field check reveals accuracy outside of the +/- 5% threshold, calibration is required and the data must be scaled as detailed above.”

8. Portable Instruments QA/QC (CLARIFICATION – June 3, 2013)

Section: 6.2 (Instrument QA/QC)

Context: Section 6.2 (page 33) states: “If a portable instrument is used (such as a handheld methane analyzer), the portable instrument shall be maintained and calibrated per the manufacturer's specifications, and calibrated at least annually by the manufacturer, by a laboratory approved by the manufacturer, or at an ISO 17025 accredited laboratory. The portable instrument must also be field calibrated to a known sample gas prior to each use.”

It has been unclear what sort of portable instruments must satisfy this requirement. Some portable pieces of equipment are used in the process of the field check, but are not themselves

instruments that are able to measure and produce data. The Reserve has determined that all portable instruments used for field checks and calibrations that have the ability to measure the parameter that the meter in question would normally measure must themselves be calibrated annually. Some devices however, namely those pieces of equipment that do not produce a data output that could be used in emission reduction calculations, are not considered to be “portable instruments” per the protocol requirement, and must simply be maintained and calibrated according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

In addition, the final sentence of this requirement is only intended to apply to portable methane analyzers, rather than all portable instruments.

Clarification: The following text shall replace the second paragraph (cited above) on page 33:

“If a portable instrument either:

1. acquires project data (e.g. a handheld methane analyzer is used to take weekly methane concentration measurements), or
2. is used to field check the calibration accuracy of equipment that acquires project data and the portable instrument produces a data output that is or could be used in emission reduction calculations (i.e. flow or concentration),

the portable instrument shall be maintained and calibrated per the manufacturer’s specifications, and calibrated at least annually by the manufacturer, by a laboratory approved by the manufacturer, or at an ISO 17025 accredited laboratory. Other pieces of equipment used for QA/QC of monitoring instruments shall be maintained according to the manufacturer’s specifications, including calibration where specified. Portable methane analyzers must also be field calibrated to a known sample gas prior to each use.”