



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLID
WASTES DISPOSED AT TAMAN BERINGIN LANDFILL,
KUALA LUMPUR**

MOHD NAZERI BIN SALLEH

FSAS 2003 9

**PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLID WASTES
DISPOSED AT TAMAN BERINGIN LANDFILL, KUALA LUMPUR**

MOHD NAZERI BIN SALLEH

**MASTER OF SCIENCE
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

2003



**PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLID WASTES
DISPOSED AT TAMAN BERINGIN LANDFILL, KUALA LUMPUR**

By

MOHD NAZERI BIN SALLEH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science**

April 2003



TO MY BELOVED

PARENTS : Hj. Salleh bin Harun
Hjh. Sepiah bt Saamah

WIFE : Wan Fatimah bt. Wan Daud
and

CHILDREN : Muamar Adib Hakimi
Muamar Zul Ikhman
Muamar Zil Haniff
Muamar Aliff Imran

'as a source of inspiration'

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLID WASTES
DISPOSED AT TAMAN BERINGIN LANDFILL,
KUALA LUMPUR**

By

MOHD NAZERI BIN SALLEH

April 2003

Chairman : Associate Professor Mohd Nasir bin Hassan, Ph.D.

Faculty : Science and Environmental Studies

At present, the Kuala Lumpur City Hall (KLCH) is facing problems in the disposal of their solid wastes due to the rapid increase in the amount generated as a result of rapid urbanisation. Existing landfill site at Taman Beringin is already exhausted and should be closed at any time. Due to this problem, there is a move to treat the solid wastes by thermal treatment technologies. Data on the characteristics of the solid waste is lacking and not reliable for the evaluation of these technologies. In addition, models for estimating the heating value based on the characteristics of Kuala Lumpur wastes are not available. This study was carried out to determine the characteristics and consequently develop the models for estimating the heating value of the Kuala Lumpur solid wastes.

The study analyses and evaluates the physical and chemical characteristics of Kuala Lumpur solid wastes. The study was conducted at Taman Beringin Landfill

from Mac 2000 to Jun 2000. A total of 26 samples were obtained from various sources including residential, commercial, institutional, cleansing and light industrial wastes. The truckload method was used for the sampling and characterising the physical components of wastes. The proximate and ultimate analysis of the wastes were also carried out.

The results of the study showed that Kuala Lumpur wastes constitute 56.29 food and putrescible wastes, 8.23 paper, 13.04 plastics, 1.29 textiles, 0.41 rubber and leather, 1.84 wood, 6.90 yard wastes, 1.55 glass, 2.07 ferrous, 0.30 aluminum, 6.41 other inorganics and 1.29 % of oversized bulky wastes (OBW). The results also show that the average bulk density of solid waste was 265.0 kg/m^3 , and contained 54.6 % of moisture, 28.0 volatile matter, 4.9 fixed carbon and 12.5 of ash content. The average higher heating value is 1802 kcal/kg and the lower heating value is 1527 kcal/kg. The average percentage weight of C, H, N and O are 18.62, 2.72, 0.44 and 11.28 %, respectively. The results also shows that sulfur content is less than 0.20 % which contributes minimum error in the heating value estimation.

From this study, three types of models were developed to estimate the heating value of the wastes. Those models are based on composition and moisture content; the second model is based on proximate analysis and third model is based on ultimate analysis. The analyses show that, the model based on waste composition and moisture content is more convenient to use with minimal laboratory works. The best fit model is $\text{HHV}_{\text{wet}} = 1584.337 + 18.644F + 28.796Pa + 54.457Pc -$

$32.596M$ ($R^2 = 0.857$), where HHV_{wet} is Higher Heating Value of wastes in kcal/kg in wet basis, F is percentage weight of food and putrescible wastes, Pa is percentage weight of paper wastes, Pc is percentage weight of plastic wastes and M is the moisture content of the waste. The best fit model based on proximate analysis is $LHV_{wet} = -569.549 + 80.313 (VM)$ ($R^2 = 0.656$) where LHV_{wet} is lower heating value in kcal/kg in wet basis, and (VM) is percentage weight of volatile matter in wet basis. The best fit model based on the ultimate analysis is $LHV_{wet} = -335.460 + 122.526C - 24.737O$ ($R^2 = 0.936$), where LHV_{wet} is lower heating value in kcal/kg in wet basis, C is percentage weight of carbon in wet basis and O is percentage weight of oxygen in wet basis.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**CIRI-CIRI FIZIKAL DAN KIMIA SISA PEPEJAL YANG DILUPUSKAN
DI TAPAK PELUPUSAN TAMAN BERINGIN,
KUALA LUMPUR**

Oleh

MOHD NAZERI BIN SALLEH

April 2003

Pengerusi : Profesor Madya Mohd Nasir bin Hassan, Ph.D.

Fakulti : Sains dan Pengajian Alam Sekitar

Dewan Bandaraya Kuala Lumpur (DBKL) kini menghadapi masalah dalam pelupusan sisa pepejal di sebabkan peningkatan jumlah penjanaan sisa yang mendadak, sejajar dengan kepesatan urbanisasi. Tapak pelupusan sisa pepejal yang sedia ada di Taman Beringin telah sarat dan akan ditutup bila-bila masa. Susulan dari masalah tersebut, satu cadangan telah dibuat untuk merawat sisa pepejal dengan menggunakan teknologi rawatan termal. Data berkaitan dengan sisa pepejal di Kuala Lumpur adalah tidak lengkap dan diragui untuk penilaian teknologi ini. Tambahan pula, model bagi menganggar nilai haba berdasarkan ciri-ciri sisa pepejal Kuala Lumpur masih belum ada. Oleh yang demikian, kajian ini dijalankan untuk menentukan ciri dan selanjutnya membangunkan model untuk membuat anggaran nilai haba bagi sisa pepejal di Kuala Lumpur.

Kajian ini telah menganalisis dan membuat penilaian ke atas ciri fizikal dan kimia sisa pepejal yang dihasilkan di Kuala Lumpur. Kajian telah dijalankan di tapak Pelupusan Taman Beringin selama tiga bulan bermula Mac hingga Jun 2000. Sejumlah 26 sampel telah diambil daripada pelbagai sumber sisa pepejal termasuk dari perumahan, perdagangan, institusi, aktiviti kebersihan dan industri ringan. Persampelen dan pencirian komponen fizikal sisa pepejal telah menggunakan kaedah 'truckload'. Analisa hampiran dan muktamad juga dijalankan.

Keputusan yang diperolehi menunjukkan bahawa kandungan sisa pepejal di Kuala Lumpur terdiri daripada 56.29 sisa makanan, 8.23 kertas, 13.04 plastik, 1.29 kain, 0.41 getah dan kulit, 1.84 kayu, 6.90 sisa kebun, 1.55 kaca, 2.07 logam, 0.30 aluminium, 6.41 lain-lain sisa inorganik dan 1.29 % sisa bersaiz besar. Keputusan juga menunjukkan purata ketumpatan pukal sisa pepejal adalah 265.0 kg/m^3 , dan kandungan kelembapan sebanyak 54.6 %, bahan mudah menguap sebanyak 28.0 %, karbon tetap sebanyak 4.9 % dan kandungan abu sebanyak 12.5 %. Purata nilai haba tinggi and rendah bagi sisa tersebut adalah 1802 kcal/kg dan 1527 kcal/kg. Purata peratus berat bagi C, H, N dan O adalah masing-masing 18.62, 2.72, 0.44 dan 11.28 %. Kajian juga menunjukkan kandungan sulfur adalah kurang dari 0.20 peratus dan memberikan sisihan minimum dalam penganggaran nilai haba.

Dari kajian ini, tiga jenis model telah dibangunkan bagi menganggar nilai haba iaitu model berasaskan komposisi dan kandungan kelembapan, model kedua berasaskan analisis hampiran dan ketiga model berasaskan analisis muktamad.

Kajian telah menunjukkan model berasaskan komposisi dan kandungan kelembapan adalah lebih mudah digunakan serta penggunaan kerja makmal yang minima. Antara model tersebut, model yang terbaik adalah $HHV_{wet} = 1584.337 + 18.644F + 28.796Pa + 54.457Pc - 32.596M$ ($R^2 = 0.857$), dimana HHV_{wet} adalah nilai haba tinggi sisa pepejal dalam keadaan basah (kcal/kg), F adalah peratus berat sisa makanan, Pa adalah peratus berat kertas, Pc adalah peratus berat plastik dan M adalah kandungan kelembapan sisa pepejal. Model yang terbaik berasaskan kepada analisa hampiran adalah $LHV_{wet} = -569.549 + 80.313 (VM)$ ($R^2 = 0.656$), dimana LHV_{wet} adalah nilai haba rendah sisa pepejal dalam keadaan basah (kcal/kg) dan (VM) adalah peratus berat bahan mudah mengwap dalam keadaan basah. Model terbaik berasaskan analisa muktamad adalah $LHV_{wet} = -335.460 + 122.526C - 24.737O$ ($R^2 = 0.936$) dimana LHV_{wet} adalah nilai haba rendah sisa pepejal dalam keadaan basah (kcal/kg), C adalah peratus berat karbon dalam keadaan basah dan O adalah peratus berat oksigen dalam keadaan basah.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Supervisory Committee members Associate Professor Dr. Mohd Nasir Hassan, Associate Professor Dr. Azni Idris, Dr. Muhd Noor Muhd Yunus, Associate Professor Dr. Shaharin Ibrahim and Dr. Ramdzani Abdullah for providing continuous guidance and encouragement and also for bearing with me throughout this study.

The author owe special thanks to MINT, especially Dr. Muhd Noor Muhd Yunus, the Director Technical Services, Dr. Khalid Haji Wood, Dr. Suhaimi, Dr. Mohamad Puad Abu as well as their staff Pn Jamaliah, Nik Marzukee and Ariffin for kind assistance and allowing the author to use the facilities at MINT for the completion of this study. I acknowledge the cooperation received from my colleagues at DBKL, En Ibrahim, staff of CETNaRM, Theng, Nor, Iing and also my good friend En.Khairi.

The author acknowledges the cooperation received from AFSB, especially Mr. Siraj, the CEO of AFSB (Alam Flora Sdn. Bhd.), Ahmad Rusli, Abdul Rashid, Rosli, Nina, Capt Shukri, Asri, Rosli, Karim, Ibrahim, and all KLSA (Kuala Lumpur Service Area) worker's who were the 'backbone' during sampling and sorting activities

Most of all, praise be to the Almighty Allah, any shortcomings is due to my own weakness, and if there is any good in this thesis, it is from Allah S.W.T, Amin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
DEDICATION		ii
ABSTRACT		iii
ABSTRAK		vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ix
APPROVAL SHEETS		x
DECLARATION FORM		xii
LIST OF TABLES		xvii
LIST OF FIGURES		xxiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		xxviii
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1.1
	1.1 Introduction	1.1
	1.2 Statement of Problems	1.3
	1.3 Objectives of the Study	1.5
	1.4 Significance of the Study	1.5
	1.5 Scope of the Study	1.6
	1.6 Study Area	1.6
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	2.1
	2.1 Introduction	2.1
	2.2 Definition of Municipal Solid Waste	2.1
	2.3 Integrated Solid Waste Management in Developing Countries	2.2
	2.4 Solid Waste Management Problems in Developing Countries	2.2
	2.5 Factors Affecting the Selection of Appropriate Technologies for Solid Waste Treatment and Disposal	2.5
	2.6 Solid Waste Characterisation	2.14
	2.7 Procedure for Sampling and Characterisation	2.15
	Direct Waste Analysis	2.15
	Waste Product Analysis	2.21
	Market Product Analysis	2.21
	2.8 Characterisation Parameter	2.23
	2.8.1 Physical Characteristics	2.23
	Bulk density	2.23
	Moisture Content	2.27
	Physical Composition of Solid Waste	2.28
	2.8.2 Chemical Characteristics	2.33
	Proximate Analysis	2.33
	Ultimate Analysis	2.34
	Heating Value	2.36

2.9	Heating Value Determination	2.39
2.9.1	Laboratory Experiment Using Bomb Calorimeter	2.40
2.9.2	Estimating Heating Value Based on Chemical Components of Wastes	2.42
2.9.3	Estimation Based on the Physical Characteristics of Wastes	2.46
2.10	Studies on the Characteristics of Solid Wastes in Malaysia	2.48
2.11	Studies on the Characteristics of Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur	2.49
2.12	Linear Regression Model	2.55
3	METHODOLOGY	3.1
3.1	Introduction	3.1
3.2	Waste Characterisation Study	3.2
3.2.1	Preliminaries Preparation	3.2
	Information about Current Solid Waste Management (SWM) Practices in Kuala Lumpur	3.2
	Sampling Site	3.3
	Sources of Solid Waste in Kuala Lumpur	3.3
	Number of Sample	3.6
	Composition of Solid Wastes by Sources	3.7
	Constituents of Solid Wastes	3.8
	Pre-sampling Work	3.8
3.2.2	Fieldwork – Sampling and Sorting Activities	3.11
	Truckload Sampling	3.11
	Bulk Density	3.14
	Preparation of Samples for Laboratory Tests	3.15
3.3	Laboratory Work	3.17
3.3.1	Moisture Content	3.17
3.3.2	Proximate Analysis	3.18
3.3.3	Determination of the Heating Value or Calorific Value of Solid Waste by Bomb Calorimeter	3.23
	Calibration	3.23
	Procedure	3.23
3.3.4	Ultimate Analysis	3.25
	Blank and Calibration Test	3.26
	Sample Preparation	3.27
3.4	The Regression Analysis	3.28
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	4.1
4.1	Sample Collected	4.1
4.2	Bulk Density	4.1
4.3	Waste Composition	4.6
	Residential Wastes	4.14
	Commercial Wastes	4.15
	Institutional Wastes	4.16
	Waste from Cleansing Activities	4:17
	Light Industrial Area	4.17

	Solid Waste from RORO (Mixed Solid Wastes from Light Industrial and Commercial Wastes)	4.18
	Solid Wastes from River Trapped or 'Log Boom'	4.18
	The Overall Composition of Solid Wastes for Kuala Lumpur	4.18
4.4	Moisture Content	4.28
	Residential Wastes	4.28
	Commercial Wastes	4.28
	Institutional Wastes	4.32
	Cleansing Activities Wastes	4.32
	Light Industrial Wastes	4.32
	Solid Waste from Mixed Light Industrial and Commercial Wastes	4.33
	The Overall Average Moisture content of Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur	4.33
4.5	Results of Proximate Analysis	4.35
	Residential Wastes	4.35
	Commercial Wastes	4.36
	Institutional Wastes	4.45
	Cleansing Activities Wastes	4.46
	Light Industrial Wastes	4.46
	Solid Waste from Mixed Light Industrial and Commercial Wastes	4.47
	Solid Wastes from River Trapped or 'Log Boom'	4.47
	The Overall of Average Proximate Analysis Results for Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur	4.48
4.6	Ultimate Analysis	4.49
	Residential Wastes	4.50
	Commercial Wastes	4.51
	Institutional Wastes	4.51
	Cleansing Activities Wastes	4.51
	Light Industrial Wastes	4.61
	Solid Waste from Mixed Light Industrial and Commercial Wastes	4.61
	Solid Wastes from River Trapped 'Log Boom'	4.61
	The Overall Average Ultimate Analysis of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes	4.61
	Sulfur Content in Kuala Lumpur Wastes	4.63
4.7	Heating Value of Solid Wastes Using Bomb Calorimeter	4.64
	Residential Wastes	4.64
	Commercial Wastes	4.65
	Institutional Wastes	4.65
	Cleansing Activities Wastes	4.65
	Light Industrial Wastes	4.65
	Solid Waste from Mixed Light Industrial and Commercial Wastes	4.68
	Solid Wastes from River Trapped 'Log Boom'	4.69
	The Overall Average Heating Value of Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur	4.69
4.8	Heating Value Based on Ultimate Analysis	4.71
4.9	Heating Value Based on Physical Waste Component	4.71

4.10	The Overall Results of Solid Waste Characteristics for Kuala Lumpur	4.71
4.11	Relationship Between Heating Value and Waste Composition	4.72
4.12	Developing Models for the Heating Value of Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur	4.72
	Heating Value and Physical Characteristics	4.79
	Heating Value and Chemical Characteristics (Proximate Analysis)	4.95
	Heating Value and Chemical Characteristics (Ultimate Analysis)	4.99
	General Discussion on Heating Value Models	4.103
4.13	Implication of Study Results to Solid Waste Management in Kuala Lumpur	4.114
5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5.1
	REFERENCES	R.1
	APPENDICES	A.1
		B.1
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	C.1



LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1.1 Generation of Solid Waste in Kuala Lumpur from the Historical Perspective	1.7
1.2 Composition of Solid Waste Generated in Kuala Lumpur by Source	1.7
1.3 Categories of Premises Generating Solid Waste in Kuala Lumpur	1.8
2.1 Problems in the Management of Solid Waste Services in Developing Countries	2.3
2.2 Criteria for Assessment of Appropriate Technologies for Solid Waste Treatment and Disposal	2.10
2.3 Multi Criteria Assessment of Technologies for Solid Waste Management in Malaysia	2.10
2.4 Combustion Technologies Rated 1 (Best) to 4 (worst)	2.13
2.5 Average Densities of Mixed Solid Wastes and Components	2.24
2.6 Densities of Wastes Components	2.25
2.7 Typical Uncompacted Specific Weight for Municipal Wastes Components	2.26
2.8 Typical Specific Weight Data for Residential and Commercial Wastes	2.26
2.9 The MSW Moisture content in Selected Developed and Developing Countries	2.28
2.10 The Moisture Content in Wastes Components from Developed And Developing Countries	2.28
2.11 Waste Composition in Selected Developing Countries	2.31
2.12 Waste Composition in Selected Developed Countries	2.32

2.13	Proximate Analysis Data for Components of Wastes from Selected Countries	2.33
2.14	Proximate Analysis Data from Selected Developed Countries	2.33
2.15	Elementary Contents in Solid Waste from Selected Countries	2.35
2.16	Ultimate Analysis Data for Components of MSW from Selected Countries	2.35
2.17	Typical Heating Value of Components of Solid Waste from Selected Countries (Dry Basis)	2.39
2.18	Typical Heating Value of Solid Waste from Selected Countries	2.39
2.19	Characteristics and Composition of Solid Waste Generated in Kuala Lumpur	2.51
2.20	Characteristics and Composition of Solid Waste (Dry Basis) as received in Kuala Lumpur (1982)	2.52
2.21	Ultimate Analysis Results on MSW in Kuala Lumpur (1997)	2.52
2.22	The Physical Composition of Solid Waste in Kuala Lumpur (1997) According to Sources	2.53
2.23	The Moisture Contents in Wastes Components in Kuala Lumpur (1997)	2.54
2.24	Proximate Analysis Data for Components of Kuala Lumpur Wastes (1997)	2.54
2.25	The Heating Value of Components of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (1997)	2.54
3.1	Estimate Solid Waste Composition by Source	3.8
3.2	Result of Blank Test	3.27
3.3	Result of Z Test	3.27
4.1	Information About the Sources, Types of Housing, Dates and Weight of Solid Wastes Sampled	4.2
4.2	Bulk Density of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes	4.4

4.3	Bulk Density of Kuala Lumpur by Different Type of Collection Vehicle	4.5
4.4	Bulk Density of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes by Source	4.5
4.5	Composition of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Wet Basis)	4.8
4.6	Composition of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.10
4.7	Average Composition of Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur According to Sources (Wet Basis)	4.12
4.8	Average Composition of Solid Wastes in Kuala Lumpur According to Sources (Dry Basis)	4.13
4.9	Average Composition of Solid Waste from Residential Area by Socio-Economic Level (Percentage by Weight - Wet Basis)	4.14
4.10	Average Composition of Solid Wastes From Residential by Types of Housing (Percentage by Weight – Wet Basis)	4.16
4.11	The Overall Composition of Solid Wastes Disposed of in Kuala Lumpur (Percentage by Weight – Wet Basis)	4.19
4.12	The Overall Composition of Solid Waste Disposed of in Kuala Lumpur (Percentage by Weight –Dry Basis)	4.20
4.13	Main Components of Wastes Generated in MPPJ According to MPPJ (1982) Report	4.22
4.14	Moisture Content of Constituents of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight –Wet Basis)	4.29
4.15	Moisture Content of Constituents of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes by Sources	4.31
4.16	Average Moisture Content of Constituents of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight)	4.34
4.17	Proximate Analysis Results for Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes Samples (Percentage by Weight – Wet Basis)	4.37

4.18	Results of Proximate Analysis Results by to Sources (Percentage by Weight –Wet Basis)	4.38
4.19	Average Proximate Analysis for Constituents in Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight –Wet Basis)	4.40
4.20	Results of Proximate Analysis for Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes Samples (Percentage by Weight –Dry Basis)	4.41
4.21	Details Results of Proximate Analysis by Sources in Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes According to Source (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.42
4.22	Average Proximate Analysis by Sources for Kuala Lumpur Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.43
4.23	Average Results of Proximate Analysis for Constituents of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.44
4.24	The Overall Proximate Analysis Results of Solid Wastes Disposed of in Kuala Lumpur (Percentage by Weight – Wet Basis)	4.48
4.25	The Overall Proximate Analysis of Solid Wastes Disposed of in Kuala Lumpur (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.48
4.26	Ultimate Analysis Results for Individual Constituent from Solid Wastes Samples	4.52
4.27	Ultimate Analysis Results of the Combustible Materials Found In Kuala Lumpur Wastes According to Sources	4.55
4.28	Average Ultimate Analysis Results by Constituents in Kuala Lumpur Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.57
4.29	Ultimate Analysis Results for Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes Samples (Wet Basis)	4.58
4.30	Ultimate Analysis Results for Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes Samples (Dry Basis)	4.59
4.31	Ultimate Analysis Results for Sample According to Sources in Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Wet Basis)	4.60

4.32	Ultimate Analysis Results for Sample According to Sources in Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by Weight – Dry Basis)	4.60
4.33	The Overall Ultimate Analysis Results in Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by weight – Wet Basis)	4.62
4.34	The Overall Ultimate Analysis Results in Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Percentage by weight – Dry Basis)	4.62
4.35	Higher Heating Value of Samples and Constituents for Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Dry Basis)	4.66
4.36	Average Heating Value of Constituents for Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes by Sources (Dry Basis)	4.67
4.37	Heating Values of Samples of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Wet Basis)	4.68
4.38	Average Heating Value and Ranges for Constituents of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes (Dry Basis)	4.70
4.39	Lower Heating Value of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes Based on Ultimate Analysis Results	4.73
4.40	Lower Heating Value of Kuala Lumpur Solid Wastes by Using Existing Estimated Formula Based on Physical and Chemical Characteristics (Proximate Analysis)	4.74
4.41	Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Solid Waste in Kuala Lumpur as Disposed	4.75
4.42	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Higher Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Food Wastes, Mix Paper, Mix Plastics and Moisture) (n=26 – Model 1)	4.79
4.43	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Food Wastes, Mix Paper, Mix Plastics and Moisture) (n=26 – Model 2)	4.81

4.44	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Food Wastes, Mix Paper, Mix Plastics, Other Combustible Material and Moisture Content) (n=26 – Model 3)	4.83
4.45	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Food Wastes, Mix Plastics and Moisture Content) (n=26 – Model 4)	4.85
4.46	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Food Wastes and Mix Plastics) (n=26 – Model 5)	4.87
4.47	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Food Wastes, Mix Paper and Mix Plastics) (n=26 – Model 6)	4.88
4.48	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Mix Plastics) (n=26 – Model 7)	4.90
4.49	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Sum of Food Wastes, Mix Paper and Mix Plastics and Moisture Content) (n=26 – Model 8)	4.91
4.50	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Wastes Characteristics (Mix Plastics, Cellulose Components (Food Wastes, Mix Paper, Yard Wastes and Fines) and Moisture Content) (n=26 – Model 9)	4.93
4.51	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Higher Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Chemical Characteristics of Wastes (Volatile Matter and Moisture Content) (n=26 – Model 10)	4.95
4.52	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Chemical Characteristics of Wastes (Volatile Matter and Moisture Content) (n=26 – Model 11)	4.97
4.53	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Volatile Matter of Wastes (n=26 – Model 12)	4.98
4.54	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Chemical Characteristics of Wastes (Carbon and Oxygen) (n=26 – Model 13)	4.100

4.55	Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Between Lower Heating Value (kcal/kg) and Chemical Characteristics of Waste (Carbon) (n=26 – Model 14)	4.101
------	--	-------