

Review

Policy and Regulations for Mobile Biochar Production in the United States of America

Carlos Rodriguez Franco ^{1,*} , Deborah S. Page-Dumroese ² , Derek Pierson ² , Margaret Miller ³ and Thomas Miles ⁴

¹ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office, Research and Development 201, 14th Street, S.W., 2 NW, Washington, DC 20250, USA

² U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, 1221 S. Main, Moscow, ID 83843, USA; debbie.dumroese@usda.gov (D.S.P.-D.); derek.pierson@usda.gov (D.P.)

³ Oregon Department of Environmental Quality—Air Quality Division Smoke Management, 700 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 600, Portland, OR 97232-4100, USA; margaret.miller@deq.oregon.gov

⁴ U.S. Biochar Initiative, 5475 SW Arrow-Wood Ln, Portland, OR 97225, USA; tmiles@trmiles.com

* Correspondence: carlos.rodriguez-franco@usda.gov

Abstract: Pyrolysis is a combustion process of woody biomass conducted under low or no oxygen conditions. It converts any kind of biomass into biochar, bio-oil, or biogas. Hence plants' woody material can also be converted into bioenergy products. Valorization of woody biomass in the form of energy-rich compound biochar is a more sustainable technique as compared to conventional burning which leads to toxicity to the environment. Innovations and the need to limit open burning have resulted in numerous mobile and fixed plant pyrolysis methods that burn a variety of woody residues. Production technologies that reduce the need for open burning, the main source of potential pollutants, fall under the regulations in the Clean Air Act of 1990. This Act is the legal instrument to regulate air pollution at its source across the United States of America and it is implemented and enforced through the Environmental Protection Agency, in coordination with sister agencies. One newer innovation for reducing wood residues and emissions is an air curtain incinerator. Currently, the Clean Air Act regulates stationary solid waste incinerators, and this is also applied to mobile air curtain incinerators burning woody biomass. However, other woody biochar production methods (e.g., flame cap kilns) are not subjected to these regulations. Discrepancies in the interpretation of definitions related to incineration and pyrolysis and the myriad of differences related to stationary and mobile air curtain incinerators, type of waste wood from construction activities, forest residues, and other types of clean wood make the permit regulations confusing as permits can vary by jurisdiction. This review summarizes the current policies, regulations, and directives related to in-woods biochar production and the required permits.

Keywords: biochar; pyrolysis; Clean Air Act; emissions; pollutants; mobile biochar production systems



Citation: Rodriguez Franco, C.; Page-Dumroese, D.S.; Pierson, D.; Miller, M.; Miles, T. Policy and Regulations for Mobile Biochar Production in the United States of America. *Forests* **2024**, *15*, 192. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f15010192>

Academic Editor: Gloria Oporto

Received: 20 November 2023

Revised: 8 January 2024

Accepted: 10 January 2024

Published: 18 January 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In the United States of America (USA), woody biomass biochar is an emerging industry product with high potential for a wide variety of applications. Biochar is made from non-merchantable wood residues which presents an option to decrease the risk of wildland fire in rural communities and helps to promote sustainable forest management by providing alternative silvicultural systems to manage fuels and conduct salvage practices or thinnings that will increase the resilience of standing trees and contribute to using and developing smart climate forest operation tools.

At current forest management levels in the USA, the potential for biochar production derived from woody biomass residues is described in the Billion Ton report [1] which indicates the potential availability of 334 million dry metric tons of forest wastes and

residues that could be sustainably produced each year in the USA. This opportunity allows forest managers to create biochar in-woods and uses it for restoration to work with industry partners to increase the production of biochar, bioenergy, or wood chips from slash piles that consist of small-diameter trees, branches, shrubs, and twigs that are created when forests are thinned to reduce excess fuel and lower fire danger and during conventional harvest operations.

Biochar made from woody residues can improve both forest conditions (e.g., reduced wildfire threat) and ecosystem services (e.g., water quality, nutrient retention, reduced compaction) when applied back to forest soils. On-site biochar production is a very good alternative to utilizing low-cost, low-quality raw material to provide an important economic source for jobs and rural development, decrease the intensity of wildland fires, promote forest productivity, and enhance carbon sequestration by sequestering carbon in the soil and in increasing growth efficiency of the remaining trees. Currently, there is an emphasis on increasing forest management activities to decrease the amount of biomass that fuels wildland fires. With a reduced risk of wildfire comes the additional benefits of decreased greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions, global warming potential (GWP), and air pollutants. Biochar production can be an attractive option when conducted in the woods with mobile pyrolysis systems. Using portable biochar production systems and applying the biochar on-site reduces the need for long haul distances of raw material which can lower costs, but these methods also can reduce the GWP by 2–40 times net CO₂e as compared with open slash pile burning [2].

Despite these advantages, the use of mobile pyrolysis equipment in the woods can be limited in some states because of the complexity and cost of obtaining air quality permits. To develop sustainable forest operations that facilitate forest residue utilization, develop new markets, sequester carbon, promote innovation, and support resilient forests, there is a need to develop consistent air quality permitting policies, regulations, and directives at national, state, and local government levels with streamlined administrative processes specific to in-woods biochar production using a variety of techniques (e.g., kilns, air curtain burners, portable pyrolysis).

The short-term goal of reduced wildfire risk must dovetail with the long-term goal of increasing carbon sequestration in forest soils and improving forest resilience to a changing climate. Given this challenge, this article describes the current policies, regulations, and directives related to in-woods biochar production and the required permits. This analysis recognizes that long-term healthy forests are essential for promoting sustainable forest management across the USA.

2. The Clean Air Act Scope

The Clean Air Act (CAA) is the primary federal law that regulates air emissions from stationary and mobile sources. Congress enacted air pollution legislation in 1963 and amended it in 1970 establishing the (42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq. (1970)) Clean Air Act (U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2010), and it was revised in 1977 and 1990 to improve its efficacy targeting new air pollution problems including acid rain and damage to the stratospheric ozone layer [3].

The CAA provides national standards for a wide range of air pollutants and sources through different mechanisms (e.g., power plants, incinerators, mobile burners) [4]. Since its inception, the CAA has had a large impact on the lives of Americans and is the sole federal authority for regulating GHG emissions [5].

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was given authority to set and change regulations to enforce compliance with the CAA through the establishment of national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for six common pollutants known as “criteria pollutants” (particulate matter (PM), ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), and lead (Pb)) that can cause damage to human health, environment, and property [6].

The NAAQS involve a science assessment, risk/exposure and policy assessments, and rulemaking. Rulemaking requires (1) the EPA to develop and publish a notice of proposed rulemaking that communicates the Administrator’s proposed decisions regarding the review of the NAAQS; (2) a public comment period, with public hearings; (3) a publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking; (4) review and consideration of received comments; and (5) the EPA to issue a final rule [7].

After the EPA has issued a final rule, states and tribes then assess their areas to determine whether it is in attainment with the standard. States and tribes use available air quality data collected from approved monitors, emissions inventory data, and modeling to measure compliance. Based on those results, states and tribes then submit recommendations to the EPA of those areas that are not in compliance with the standard, and the EPA will “designate” an area based on whether or not it is meeting the standard. Exceptional event demonstrations can also be submitted to the EPA to remove certain air quality data from having regulatory implications. Exceptional events (EE) are unusual or naturally occurring events that can affect air quality, such as wildfires, volcanic eruptions, dust storms, and certain types of emissions that are not typically included in regulatory assessments.

State and tribal areas that meet or are cleaner than the national standard are areas designated as “attainment areas”. Areas that do not meet the national standard are designated as “nonattainment areas”, and when the EPA is not able to define the designation status for an area, based on the available information, that area is designated as “unclassifiable”. Following EPA’s designations, the states have to develop state implementation plans (SIPs), indicating how areas will attain and maintain the standards by reducing air pollutant emissions. Although the Tribes are not required to develop an implementation plan, they could decide if they want to do it [8].

State implementation plans (SIPs) are developed to bring areas under their jurisdiction into attainment of the NAAQS. These plans are developed by state and local air quality management agencies and proposed to the EPA for approval. The main SIP objectives are to make sure that the state has a well-established air quality program and that they are capable of implementing a new or revised NAAQS for emissions control. Table 1 presents the main highlights to develop a SIP [8].

Table 1. Main highlights for state implementation plans *.

SIP Process	State Role	EPA Role
In a period of two years after the EPA has set a new NAAQS or an existing standard.	States and tribes must provide input.	EPA based on the newest set of air monitoring or modeling data must designate attainment areas or not nonattainment areas.
In a period of three years after the EPA has set a new NAAQS or an existing standard.	States must submit SIPs to implement, maintain, and enforce a new or revised national ambient air quality standard as specified in Clean Air Act Code §7410 sections (a)(1) and (a)(2). These SIPs are known as infrastructure SIPs.	When the state air agency has submitted to the EPA one or more infrastructure SIP submissions, EPA will evaluate the submission(s) for completeness. The EPA’s criteria for determining completeness of a SIP submission are codified at 40 CFR Part 51 appendix (https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-51/appendix-Appendix%20V%20to%20Part%2051 (accessed on 17 July 2023)).

Table 1. Cont.

SIP Process	State Role	EPA Role
In a period of 18 to 24 months after EPA designation.	Nonattainment area SIPs are due based on the designation date and vary by pollutant and area classification. A period of 18 months is given for nonattainment areas for sulfur dioxide (SO ₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂), coarse particle pollution (PM ₁₀), fine particle pollution (PM _{2.5}), and lead (Pb) for sulfur dioxide (SO ₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂), coarse particle pollution (PM ₁₀), fine particle pollution (PM _{2.5}), and lead (Pb). A period of 24 months is for ozone (O ₃) and carbon monoxide (CO) nonattainment areas which must outline the strategies and emissions control measures that show how the area will improve air quality and meet the NAAQS. In addition, the Clean Air Act mandates that areas adopt certain specified control requirements.	EPA must make a final decision within 1 year after the submission is determined to be complete. When the EPA decides an affirmative finding that the SIP submission is complete, the date of the finding establishes the completion date. This decision does not indicate that the submission has been approved. It only indicates that the air agency has provided information sufficient to commence a formal EPA review for approval. When the EPA makes no affirmative completeness finding, then the submission is deemed complete by operation of law on the date 6 months after the state's submission date. A finding that an infrastructure SIP submission is complete does not necessarily mean that the submission is approvable; the completeness review only addresses whether the air agency has provided information sufficient to commence a formal EPA review for approvability.
The SIP implementation process may apply under the Tribal Authority Rule in 40 CFR Part 49 to an Indian Tribe that has received delegation of federal authority by the EPA to administer CAA programs in the same manner as states and overall air resources within the exterior boundaries of a reservation for such programs (Federal Register, 1998).	Tribes, when opting to implement their air permitting programs, should follow up with the same process and periods to submit their tribal implementation plans.	When the tribe opts not to implement their own CCA programs, the EPA has promulgated regulations establishing permit requirements for major sources in attainment areas and issued Prevention of Significant Deterioration permits to new or modifying major sources (40 CFR 52.21). Nevertheless, the EPA has not promulgated regulations for a permitting program in Indian country for either minor or major sources of air pollution emissions in nonattainment areas (https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/1998/02/12/98-3451/indian-tribes-air-quality-planning-and-management Accessed on 17 July 2023).
SIPs approval or disapproval.	SIPs must be developed with public input and formally adopted into state law as well as being submitted to the EPA by the Governor's designee.	EPA reviews the SIP submission and proposes to approve or disapprove all or part of each plan, then proceeds to have a public consultation. The public has an available period for submission of comments on EPA's proposed action. EPA considers public input before taking final action on a state's plan. If EPA approves all or part of a SIP, those control measures are enforceable in federal court.
State fails to submit an approvable plan or EPA disapproves a plan.		EPA is required to develop a federal implementation plan (FIP).

* Based on information from the following sources: [8–10].

2.1. Solid Waste Incineration and Biochar Production

One of the amendments to the CAA was to facilitate the implementation of sound solid waste management systems. The CAA regulates emissions from municipal waste incinerators and landfills. High CAA standards for monitoring, controlling, and reporting emissions made waste incineration highly specialized and expensive [11]. Although the CAA was meant to deal with municipal solid waste, it also applies to mobile incinerator units.

In the case of biochar production from mobile air curtain incinerators, emissions are regulated under the category covered by solid waste incinerator units in Section 7429 of the CAA and directs the EPA Administrator to develop regulations for each category of solid waste incineration units. The standards must include emissions limitations and other requirements applicable to new units and guidelines under CAA Section 7411(d) and other requirements applicable to existing units, and Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 60, Subpart B-Adoption and Submittal of State Plans for Designated Facilities [12].

The CAA Section 7411(d) prescribes regulations that must establish a procedure similar to those under the CAA Section 7410 and each state submits a plan that establishes performance standards for any existing source of air pollution.

The new source performance standards (NSPS) and emission guidelines (EG) to reduce air pollution from commercial and industrial solid waste incineration (CISWI) units, for Subparts CCCC, DDDD, EEEE, and FFFF of Part 60 were developed under Sections 7411(d) and 7429 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and applied to incinerators burning solid waste.

The limiting emissions are for nine air pollutants (i.e., particulate matter, CO, dioxins/furans, SO₂, NO_x, HCl, Pb, Hg, and Cd) from four categories of solid waste incineration units: municipal solid waste; hospital, medical and infectious solid waste; commercial and industrial solid waste; and other solid waste. The NSPS and EG were designed to significantly reduce emissions of several harmful air pollutants such as lead, cadmium, mercury, and dioxins/furans, which are suspected of causing adverse health and environmental damages [13].

This is very important to be considered, because of the definition of “solid waste”, for example, wood appears both in the definition of woody waste and solid waste in Subpart EEEE. Some districts have interpreted wood pyrolysis as solid waste which requires that a small pyrolyzer for converting clean wood waste to biochar is classified as a solid waste incinerator.

Regarding the woody biomass biochar production and the biochar production systems, the main regulated pollutants by the EPA are those classified as criteria pollutants and hazardous pollutants.

The EPA has developed the NAAQS for the group of six common pollutants known also as criteria pollutants in outdoor air. NAAQS are designed for PM, O₃, SO₂, NO₂, CO, and Pb based on characterizations from the latest scientific information regarding their effects on health or welfare. Particulate matter and ground-level ozone pollution are considered by the EPA as the most widespread health threats. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon-containing compounds involved in ozone formation, are also under regulation [14].

Another set of regulated contaminants are those named hazardous pollutants, also known as toxic air pollutants, that are suspected to cause cancer or other serious health effects, such as reproductive effects, or adverse environmental effects. The EPA has classified 188 toxic air pollutants, among those are metals such as cadmium (Cd), mercury (Hg), chromium (Cr), and lead (Pb) compounds [15].

2.2. Air Pollutants

Several authors agreed that air pollution is caused by a complex mixture of gaseous and particulate components from varied amounts of sources [16–20]. Those components are the main cause of detrimental effects on human health. One of the modifiable components of air pollution is PM, which is classified according to its origin and components. When PM is directly emitted into the air, it is classified as primary, and when it is formed indirectly from emissions from fuel combustion and other sources it is classified as secondary. Primary

pollutants include carbonaceous materials such as soot and organic particles, and elemental carbon, which according to Middlebrook et al. [21] is a PM from a petroleum oil fire that is composed of small elemental carbon particles that, due to intense heat produced, will initially loft high into the air in a plume of black smoke, organic carbon (OC), and NO₂ and SO₂ oxides emitted directly into the air by the combustion of fossil fuels. The main sources of NO₂ are vehicles, heavy equipment, forest fires, some industrial processes, and burning waste.

Secondary pollutants are formed in the atmosphere from other components. One of them is ozone, which is the result of complex photochemical reactions of NO_x and volatile organic components (SO₂, NO₂, ammonia (NH₃), and organic carbon emissions) [22–24].

PM is subdivided by particle size as coarse (PM₁₀) with diameter less than 10 µm, fine (PM_{2.5}) with diameter less than 2.5 µm, and ultrafine (PM_{0.1}) with diameter less than 0.1 µm. PM₁₀ particles derive from numerous natural sources (soil erosion, sand, volcanic ash, and woodsmoke) and other industrial sources. PM₁₀ particulates in general do not penetrate beyond the upper bronchus. Fine and ultrafine particles are products of the combustion of carbon-based fuels and fossil fuels and are a major threat to human health than coarse particles because they are inhaled deep into the respiratory system. PM_{2.5} has been constantly correlated with negative cardiovascular consequences regardless of location, especially for people with susceptibility and vulnerable conditions like asthma, pneumonia, diabetes, and respiratory and cardiovascular diseases [22–27].

Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are specifically regulated as a class of ozone precursors for major source purposes under the 40 C.F.R. § 51.165, § 51.166, § 70.2. VOCs are released by vehicles, oil refineries, chemical plants, and other industrial facilities, and they are defined under 40 C.F.R. § 51.100(s), which defines them as “any compound of carbon, excluding carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, carbonic acid, metallic carbides or carbonates, and ammonium carbonate, which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions”. A number of compounds are deemed to have “negligible photochemical reactivity” and are therefore exempt from the definition of VOCs. The federal definition of VOCs does not specify how to measure the mass of the organic compound being emitted to the air [28].

Ozone is a secondary pollutant formed in the atmosphere from complex photochemical reactions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and VOCs [23,29]. Ozone at ground level is a primary component of smog. Ground-level ozone can cause human health problems and damage forests and agricultural crops. Several studies have shown that exposure to ozone increases the susceptibility and can aggravate respiratory diseases like asthma and increase respiratory infections and lung inflammation; it also has been associated with cardiovascular morbidity and mortality [23,24,30–33].

CO is produced by fossil fuels when combustion is incomplete [25]. CO pollution mostly comes from emissions produced by fossil fuel-powered engines, including motor vehicles and non-road engines and vehicles. CO affects human health, and the symptoms of poisoning due to inhaling it include headache, dizziness, weakness, nausea, vomiting, and finally, loss of consciousness. Poisoning may occur in people exposed to high levels of carbon monoxide for a long period of time and may cause the loss of oxygen as a result of the competitive binding of carbon monoxide causing hypoxia, ischemia, and cardiovascular disease. CO is unlikely to be at very high levels outdoors. However, when CO levels are elevated outdoors, people with some types of heart disease can be affected [34].

CO emissions influence global and regional air quality. These emissions contribute indirectly to global climate change through their influence on tropospheric O₃ and atmospheric oxidants. CO is also formed by photochemical reactions in the atmosphere from methane and non-methane hydrocarbons (NMHC) and other volatile organic hydrocarbons, and organic molecules in surface waters and soils. CO affects the greenhouse gases that are tightly connected to global warming and climate [19,35].

The CAA Section 7412 addresses emissions of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). The CAA Amendment of 1990 instructed exposure standards for 187 compounds grouped as HAPs or urban air toxics, and emissions control strategies of 30 or more compounds

that present the greatest risk to public health. The EPA defines toxic air pollutants or hazardous air pollutants as those substances that are harmful to humans and cause or may cause cancer or other serious health effects or adverse environmental and ecological effects. Nowadays, the list of HAPs covers 33 pollutants (Table 2) [36].

Table 2. List of EPA’s defined toxic air pollutants or hazardous air pollutants.

HAPs Posing the Greatest Potential Health Threat in Urban Areas		
Acetaldehyde	Dioxin	Mercury Compounds
Acrolein	Propylene dichloride	Methylene chloride (dichloromethane)
Acrylonitrile	1,3-dichloropropene	Nickel compounds
Arsenic compounds	Ethylene dichloride (1,2-dichloroethane)	Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
Benzene	Ethylene oxide	Polycyclic organic matter (POM)
Beryllium compounds	Formaldehyde	Quinoline
1,3-butadiene	Hexachlorobenzene	1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane
Cadmium compounds	Hydrazine	Tetrachloroethylene (perchloroethylene)
Chloroform	Lead compounds	Trichloroethylene
Chromium compounds	Manganese compounds	Vinyl chloride
Coke oven emissions *	1,2-dibromoethane *	Carbon tetrachloride *

* HAPs are not generally emitted by area sources (they are not included as greatest potential health threats) [36].

HAPs are released into the air by urban activities like vehicles, power generation, use of solvents, industrial manufacturing, and wood burning. In addition to release into the air and secondary formation, volatile HAPs enter the atmosphere through intermediate transport. Even if a chemical is released initially into water, soil, sediment, or biota, when it is volatile, it will enter the atmosphere at some point through evaporation from water or soil [37,38].

Section 7430 of the CAA directs the EPA’s Administrator to conduct a review, and when there is a need, to revise the methods used to estimate the quantity of emissions of carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, and oxides of nitrogen from sources of such air pollutants (including area sources and mobile sources). Additionally, the Administrator must establish emission factors for sources for which no such methods have previously been established [12].

2.3. CAA Title V Permitting

The CAA 1990 amendments direct the EPA to develop and enforce rules and regulations for industries and other entities that emit toxic substances into the air. It requires the EPA to establish the operating permits program to assure that source operators know what air pollution control requirements apply, improve compliance, and resolve applicability questions. Operating permits are required for major sources and other sources subject to acid rain control requirements, new source performance standards, hazardous air pollutant standards, and permitting requirements under Title I of the Act [39].

Operating permits contain information about the pollutants that are being released, the amount and limits of how many pollutants may be released, and what kinds of steps the source’s owner or operator is required to take to reduce the pollution. Permits also have to include plans to measure and report the air pollution emitted, and sources must provide a monitoring report every six months. States and tribes’ governments are in charge of issuing operating permits under EPA approved programs. States must submit permit applications, proposed permits, and final permits to EPA for review, and provide notification of each permit application or proposed permit to nearby states. EPA can object to the issuance of a state-proposed permit that is not consistent with the CAA; if EPA does not object, any person may petition the EPA Administrator to make such an objection. These programs

are required to charge permit fees sufficient to cover the costs of the permit program, and permits are issued by a fixed term of five years [39].

Under the CAA, the EPA has authority for ensuring compliance and for pursuing enforcement actions against those who are in violation of the CAA. States that have programs approved or delegated by EPA under various provisions also have the authority to implement and enforce those programs.

3. Emissions from Burning Woody Biomass

Open burning (e.g., wildfire, prescribed fire) is one of the largest sources of atmospheric trace gases and has a major impact on air quality [40]. Open burning is the main source of black carbon (59%) and primary organic aerosol emissions (89%) [18]. Open vegetation fires represent about one-third of global CO and 62% of OC emissions [17]. Vegetation fires are also a major source of GHG, CO₂, and CH₄ [20]. This has become a concern at the local, regional, national, and international scale because of the large wildfires in the United States of America and abroad that threaten community health.

Because of the wildfires, many human health recommendations have been issued to keep people safe, especially those susceptible to pollution and with medical respiratory diseases.

Open burning releases soot and PM that are visible as a smoke plume, CO, CH₄ and other light hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) such as benzene, and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) like polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) such as benzo[*a*]pyrene. According to the burned materials, varying amounts of metals, for example, Pb or Hg may be discharged. Polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDDs/Fs) or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) can be released as well. Biomass open-burning sources usually emit less VOCs, SVOCs, and PAHs than anthropogenic sources on a mass emitted per mass burned basis [41].

When VOCs are released during wildfires, there can also be secondary pollutants such as ozone and fine particles [42]. The main source of VOCs is from wood polymers such as cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin. Commonly during a wildfire, biomass is heated to temperatures ~1100 °C and a large fraction of the wood is often gasified at a high rate [43]. Burning at different temperatures will result in different VOCs. At high temperatures, VOCs consist of aliphatic unsaturated hydrocarbons, (polycyclic) aromatic hydrocarbons, terpenes (emitted from distillation), HCN, HNCO, and HONO and are often from coniferous trees. At lower temperatures, burning wood emits aromatic oxygenates, furans, and NH₃ (e.g., from chaparral vegetation). These results can explain an average of 85% of the VOC emissions across various fuels representative of the western USA. However, the results of studies can be variable depending on wood type and conditions of burning [16,42].

In uncontrolled burns, some of the emissions are captured by the standing vegetation, but smoke and particulates are still a major concern for inhabitants, because of their impacts on human health. In addition, open burning, which includes combustion of post-harvest of agricultural residues, wood burning for domestic heating and cooking, and wildfires causes other damages. The most important damages are caused by wildland fires not only because of the pollutant emissions and impacts to human and wildlife health, but also the damage to forest ecosystems and their impacts on biodiversity [16]. Only municipal solid waste open burning can cause toxic impacts on human health. According to Kodros et al. [44], the premature mortality per year of adults, because of chronic exposure to fine particles (PM_{2.5}) from open waste combustion, was estimated to be 270,000 worldwide.

When forest management and restoration activities are carried out in western USA, the removing of trees results in big amounts of forest residues also known as woody biomass, slash, and wood waste, which are piled for burning with the aim of decreasing the risk of wildland fires. When these slash piles are burned in addition to the air pollutants emitted, they can cause burn scars in the soil that could require soil rehabilitation, and cause soil changes which could have a lasting effect on understory plant composition [45].

Wildland fires, in addition to releasing air pollutants, release CO₂ into the atmosphere exacerbating global warming. They also impact vegetation dynamics, biodiversity, wildlife, and impact watersheds, adding contaminants, increasing soil erosion, changing soil composition, and affecting slope stability increasing the risks of flooding, all this without considering the air pollution and impacts on human health [46].

When the woody biomass is burned using incinerators to obtain biobased products (e.g., biochar, biofuel), it is generally considered safer to burn under regulated pollutant emissions standards, as those established under the CCA. This is confirmed by Garcia-Perez et al. [47], who found that emissions from burning wood can be controlled during continuous production of biochar because the composition and the emissions flow rate is more constant, burners and cyclones control emissions from continuous multiple hearth kilns, and burners can improve emissions recovery resulting in decreased PM, CO, and VOCs of up to 80%.

4. Using Pyrolysis to Create Biochar

Woody biomass is a renewable feedstock with a growing variety of applications for producing biobased products. Creating biochar under limited air conditions can release volatiles, biochar, and thermal energy. During this process, emissions of several pollutants occur such as CO, CO₂, aerosols (PM_{2.5} and/or PM₁₀), NO, NO₂, and a mix of both known as nitrogen oxides (NO_x), methane, NMHC, and total suspended particulates (TSP) [48]. However, agricultural residues [49] and waste timber [50] also produce these emissions.

Wood composition has little variation. It consists of 50% C, 44% O, and 6% H, and trace inorganic elements. Combinations of these elements form cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin [51]. Wood also contains extractives that are nonstructural components of lignocellulose, such as fats, phenolics, resin acids, waxes, and inorganics. The content and character of the extractives varies from biomass to biomass and even varies between different parts of each plant [52,53].

The amount and types of pollutant emissions during the biochar production process could be explained by the variability of the biomass used. This variability is between species (trees, shrubs, grasses, and crops), chemical composition, and the harvesting conditions. Biomass composition characteristics (cellulose, hemicellulose, lignin, extractives/volatiles, and ash) and other properties, such as moisture content and material size, have influence on the biomass conversion process affecting the characteristics of the final product, and the amount of emissions depending on the type of pyrolysis system used. The three key components affecting biomass pyrolysis are ash content, volatiles, and lignin. The high ash content usually has a negative effect on biomass conversion by reducing the effectiveness of dilute acid pretreatment for biological processes and increasing char yields and sediment. Volatiles such as light organic acids (acetic acid and furans), for example, furans, can lower energy content and stability in bio-oils, and lignin can increase oil yield [54].

In pyrolysis, thermal decomposition of organic matter occurs in the absence of oxygen. The temperature at which pyrolysis occurs can be modified together with the reaction time, and the oxygen content is eliminated from the reaction medium. Performing this process allows to achieve high yields of liquid and gaseous products with high added value. Yields can be as high as 75% by weight in the liquid products [51].

According to Pecha and Garcia-Perez [52], wood combustion involves five phases when different temperatures are achieved. The process starts with evaporation of water and other volatile small molecules when temperatures of 200 °C have been reached, followed by torrefaction occurring between 225 and 300 °C, then pyrolysis occurs between 300 and 650 °C, gasification with the addition of limited air occurs between 700 and 850 °C, and finally, combustion with additional air between 450 and 2000 °C. They also pointed out that these phases occur in that order when the heating rate is very slow and an oxidizing agent is present. During the gasification process, reactions convert the char remaining from the pyrolysis step and the pyrolysis vapors into CO, H₂O, CH₄, and H₂, a gas mixture called “syngas”, which is typically produced in oxygen-starved environments. Then, pyrolysis

can be summarized as the process that at moderate temperatures produces carbon, with byproducts of carbon dioxide, water, methane, and traces of carbon monoxide [55].

Regarding pollutant emissions, there are two types of pyrolysis: one of them is carbonization, where the vapors are vented to the atmosphere or fired to produce more char and ignore the vapor products, and conventional, which allows for the collection of char, oil, and non-condensable vapors (syngas) to be combusted to recover process heat and/or electricity. Usually, the yield of biochar decreases, as the syngas production increases when the temperature is increased during the pyrolysis process and when air is used to partially oxidize pyrolysis gases [52].

This characteristic of the pyrolysis process technique allows its classification as fast pyrolysis, which is a direct thermochemical process that can liquefy solid biomass into liquid bio-oil for energy production, and slow pyrolysis, where the rate of heating is less than in fast pyrolysis, with longer residence time, and the feedstock is held at constant temperature or slowly heated. The low heating rate promotes adequate heat conduction which produces higher carbon deposition and increased biochar production. In slow pyrolysis, a higher pyrolysis temperature could be used for removing volatile matter from biochar, increasing its fixed carbon [56–59]. In relationship with biomass characteristics for biochar production with less pollutants, biomass is a clean energy source appropriate for combustion because of its low nitrogen and sulfur content, which restricts the formation of SO_x and NO_x gases and lowers the residues and smells tendency [60,61]. According to Schwartz et al. [62], combusting using fast pyrolysis pine sawdust products met CO , NO_x , and SO_2 EPA's emissions standards at 10.6 ppm, 16.8 ppm, and 2.3 ppm respectively; although PM emissions exceeded the standards, they could be met using a baghouse filter on the char burner and by adjusting the bio-oil burner air–fuel ratio. They also indicated that Cd, Pb, Hg, HCl, and dioxins/furans were not observed during testing as they typically depend on feedstock or are mostly reduced by burning liquid rather than solid fuels like dioxins/furans.

4.1. Mobile Biochar Pyrolysis Systems

Biochar has been made for centuries and is one of the oldest and most established processes developed by mankind [63]. Some methods use 'slow pyrolysis' which maximizes the amount of solid material (biochar) that is produced [64]. This method is typically what is found in mobile production units, whereas 'fast pyrolysis' generates syngas and bio-oil. Mobile units can produce biochar that has a carbon content of 75%–92% carbon, but the results vary by moisture content, equipment used, and feedstock type. Using slow pyrolysis, approximately 15%–20% of the original feedstock is returned as biochar. The process of making charcoal from ancient history up to now has evolved from charcoal pits, mound kilns, and retort kilns to modern technologies involving conventional technologies together with more advanced technologies such as gasification, torrefaction, microwave-assisted pyrolysis, hydrothermal carbonization, and modified traditional methods such as flash pyrolysis, vacuum pyrolysis, and microwave pyrolysis varying from simple units, like heated steel drums to fully automated and controlled processes [63,65].

The first kilns were designed as oven, furnace, or heated enclosures for processing a substance by burning, firing, or drying [66] to maximize charcoal production and were extremely polluting [67,68]. The first portable metal kiln was designed by Whitehead, but the emissions were still high and without any control system [69]. According to Fuchs et al. [70], campfires were the first step in the evolution of slow pyrolysis reactors, where a mound kiln could be considered a slow pyrolysis reactor that is similar to a campfire but covered with soil. Another cleaner type of kiln that evolved from the campfire is the so-called open fire kiln or flame cap pyrolysis technologies, defined as low technology systems, designed to restrict oxygen access to the biochar that releases low emissions as the smoke is burned in the flame [70].

Emissions associated with traditional charcoal making and kilns are usually characterized as CO , CH_4 , NMHC, and TSP, although NMHC regularly includes methanol, acetic

acid, and other oxygenated organic compounds, which are part of the VOCs [67]. Similar to wood burning during a wildfire or prescribed fire, the emissions interact with atmospheric chemistry, producing ozone, other oxidants, and carbon monoxide. Chemistry has regional air quality implications but also could have global effects on the organic carbon budget and the global warming potential of the emitted VOCs [43]. Mobile units that use a retort design (an inner chamber filled with wood and an outer chamber to insulate) significantly decrease emissions because the pyrolysis gases are combusted internally; however, biochar yield is not great, and the cost of a retort kiln does not make them attractive for producers [71,72]. Schettini et al. [73] found that furnace kilns could reduce GHG emissions by 40.2% and increase biochar yield by 32.5% higher as compared to other kiln types used in Brazil that do not have the GHG burners.

Mobile biochar pyrolysis system could be defined as small-scale portable thermochemical conversion systems for processing forest biomass residues in situ, where the feedstock is carbonized in a controlled aerobic environment with limited oxygen at a temperature between 700 °C and 750 °C. These systems include kilns and trailer-mounted or hauled pyrolysis equipment that can be used on-site.

Kilns are still used today, and they can be of varying sizes, but the basic principles of how to burn the wood are similar. Kilns are lit at the top of the wood and there is air movement across the top to feed the flame that heats the woody biomass. Kilns lit this way develop a flame cap that helps reduce emissions and many of the emitted gases are burned while also helping to create biochar underneath the flame. The constant air flux keeps the flame going as new raw material is fed. The combustion process maintains low flame lengths and is one method to reduce embers, sparks, and gaseous emissions. In short, this type of pyrolysis takes advantage of burning pyrolysis gases to help create biochar [74–78].

Other kinds of more modern mobile biochar pyrolysis systems are those known commercially as air curtain burners, also known as air curtain incinerators (ACI), and carbonizers. They are based on the principle of the air curtain described above, but they have a source of air flowing continuously to create the air curtain, which works like a lid covering the opening in a firebox. Following the process described above results in a clean burn [79,80]. A grate in the firebox removes the char before it is consumed. Although an open burn pile could be used for the same purpose, the final product will not have the same characteristics because the combustion process is different. In an open burn, the char and the biomass carbon are not protected from oxidizing to CO₂ [77], and the amount of emissions is very high. Table 3 presents the mobile biochar pyrolysis systems.

Table 3. Mobile biochar pyrolysis systems.

Mobile Pyrolysis Technology	Cost	Biochar Yield
Slash piles ¹ 	Low cost—\$1000 to 2000 per acre [81].	Limited biochar (1% of the initial volume is converted to biochar [77])
Kilns ¹  Ring of fire  Firebox	Low cost from \$2000 to \$12,000 [81].	Low volume of biochar (it is estimated 25% to 50% of the initial volume is converted to char); larger kilns need a loader, water to quench the biochar [77]

Table 3. Cont.

Mobile Pyrolysis Technology	Cost	Biochar Yield
Mobile systems		350 lb/h (160 kg/h) [82]
	Medium from \$150,000 to \$700,000.	Carbonator 6050 converts woody biomass into biochar of the initial volume to, i.e., 71% recalcitrant carbon, 91% void space, 8% ash [83]. Both systems require water for quenching in a water bath and a mini-excavator to load the woody biomass.
CharBoss ¹		
		
Tigercat Carbonator ²		

¹ Pictures: Carlos Rodriguez Franco, USDA Forest Service; ² Picture: Tigercat (6050-Carbonator-4pg-1.4-0122-web.pdf ([tigercat.com](https://www.tigercat.com) (accessed on 29 December 2023))).

Life cycle analysis studies relate the emissions toward a global warming potential (GWP) of the production system because it reflects the amount of GHG emitted through the supply chain of the specific product being produced. GWP indicates the amount of energy the emissions of 1 t of a gas will absorb in a given period, in relationship to the emissions of 1 t of CO₂ [84,85]. Although it is important to limit and have standards related to them, the main objective of the NAAQS is to regulate and limit the amount of emissions of pollutants that could cause impacts on human health, the environment, and property. Both the GWP and the NAAQS have in common emission factors and quantification. An emission factor is the amount of a pollutant released to the atmosphere with an activity associated with the release of that pollutant, and it is measured as the weight of the pollutant divided by a unit weight, volume, distance, or duration of the activity emitting the pollutant [86,87] (e.g., grams of particulate emitted per kg of woody biomass processed).

Soares Neto et al. [88] in Brazil determined that one hectare of the burned forest had average emission factors for CO₂ with 1599, CO with 111.3, CH₄ 9.2, NMHC 5.6, and PM_{2.5} 4.8 g/kg of burned dry biomass. Assessment studies of GHG and other pollutants emitted during biochar production indicated that airborne emissions from charcoal-making kilns commonly used in Kenya and Brazil (mound kilns, and 3 Brazilian kilns) can produce rather large net GHG emissions, and have high GWPs for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O only, with an estimated value of 0.77–1.63 kg C-CO₂ (carbon as carbon dioxide equivalents) emitted per kilogram of charcoal produced [48]. Sparrevik et al. [49] assessed the use of mound kilns and retort kilns in Zambia and concluded that when considering CO₂ sequestration and climate change effects, the use of biochar with conservation farming is more beneficial than conservation farming alone. Since earth-mound kilns produce negative effects because of the GHG emissions, especially methane, they did not completely annul the positive effect of CO₂ sequestration. However, the effects caused by the PM formation and the impact of the use of biochar produced in earth-mound kilns are inferior to conservation farming without biochar use. A similar conclusion was achieved by Sparrevik et al. [71] who tested the introduction of improved retort kilns where the pyrolysis gases are combusted internally with a significant decrease in emissions of products of incomplete combustion when using similar feedstock; as a result, the yield was not significantly higher with retort kilns, and because of their cost, they concluded that this makes it difficult for their adoption for biochar production in rural areas. Miranda Santos et al. [89] concluded that when charcoal is produced in Brazil, including furnaces, the combustion of gases reduces potential environmental impacts by approximately 90% in both a circular masonry kiln and a rectangular masonry kiln with gas combustion. In terms of climate change, the rectangular masonry kiln with gas combustion was approximately 63% less impactful than the circular masonry kiln with gas combustion. Regarding results of the emissions from all these studies, it is clear that several authors have found, in general, that emissions are reduced in comparison with wildland fires, open burning, slash pile burning, using fixed kilns that could be built on site (mound kilns and low technology brick kilns); still, those emissions are considered high and they have high GWP.

Nowadays, biochar production systems are evolving, and the development of portable biochar technologies could be a solution for rural areas without easy access as this would avoid the transportation of raw material or slash piles that could enhance fire risk, and where biochar could be part of the solution to increase CO₂ sequestration and at the same time decrease the amount of emissions during the production of biochar. This could be a good solution for an improved environment instead of leaving forest residues on piles without any use and producing GHG emissions that could exacerbate climate change, both when they are left for decomposition in the long term or when they catch fire. Lee and Han [90] compared open burning vs. ACB for disposal of forest residues and agreed with the previous statement since they concluded that ACB burning is being adopted in many forests to control emissions, smoke, and embers to improve oxygen and heat supply by the high velocity of airflow during the burn, making this technology much more efficient in reducing the negative environmental and societal impact of disposing forest residues. Susott et al. [91] found that the ACI burning technology traps unburned fine particles under the curtain in the zone where temperatures can reach up to 1000 °C, and the increased combustion time and turbulence result in more complete combustion of the forest residues. When they compared the ACI technology with open burning and slash pile burning, the air curtain incinerator (ACI) tested resulted in close to a 23-fold reduction in PM_{2.5} emissions over pile burns and a 33-fold reduction over understory burns. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality [92] conducted a source test report for 2023 with an emission factor testing mobile air curtain incinerator in Hillsboro, Oregon, with similar findings in reduction of emission to open burning, wildland fires, slash pile burning, and earth-mound kilns. Table 4 presents a summary of several studies on air pollution emissions factors for different technologies and includes open burning and wildland fire emissions.

Life cycle analysis has indicated that portable biochar production systems are an efficient way to decrease the impacts of climate change and decrease air pollutant emissions. Ref. [2] found that, in general, the production of biochar from forest residues reduced GHG emissions 2–40 times lower net CO₂eq (−0.3 to −1.83 t of CO₂eq/dry ton of forest residues) compared to pile burn when using the ACI, the Oregon kiln (OK) and the Biochar Solutions, Inc. mobile downdraft gasifier (BSI). In addition, the OK had the lowest GWP, emitting 0.11 t CO₂eq/t of fixed carbon in biochar, followed by the ACI with 0.16 t CO₂eq/t, and the GWP of the BSI gasifier varied from 0.25–0.31 t CO₂eq/t of fixed carbon in biochar, which was in the function of depending on feedstock characteristics and the electrical power generator used at the remote site [77].

Table 4. Comparison of air pollutant emission factors by different sources including portable biochar kilns.

Source of Emission	Emission Factor										
	CO ₂	CO	CH ₄	PM ₁₀	NMVOC	NO _x	NMHC *	PM _{2.5}	PM	Dioxins/Furan	SO
5 earth-mound kilns, (units g/kg) ¹	543–3027	143–373	32–62	-	-	NO _x 0.0054–0.13	24–124	-	13–41	-	-
Forest fires, (units g/kg) ²	1690	63	3.4	-	-	-	2.6	7.5	-	-	-
Open burning, (units g/kg) ³	-	50.0	-	-	Aldehyde 3.0	NO ₂ 2.0	7.5	11	-	-	SO ₂ 1.5
Open pile burning (Kg/Ton) ⁴	10,618	362	17.37	-	28.96	17.37	-	-	37.65	-	-
Open burning, (units g/kg) ⁵	-	34.7	1.2	3.7	-	3.1	-	-	-	0.5	SO ₂ 2.0
Rice residue pile burning (g kg ⁻²) ⁶	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.9 (±6.9)	-	-	-
Slash pile burning (kg/kg) ⁷	1.69	0.0653	0.00454	0.0044	0.00555	0.0025	-	-	-	-	-
Air curtain burner (kg/kg) ⁷	0.78	0.0026	0.0026	0.00128	-	0.000144	-	-	-	-	-
Oregon kiln (kg/kg) ⁷	0.78	0.0026	0.0026	0.00128	-	0.000144	-	-	-	-	-
Biochar Solutions, Inc. (kg/kg) ⁷	2.19	0.000698	0.000152	0.00138	-	0.00196	-	-	-	-	-
All-steel kiln (g/kg) ⁸	5600	38	57	22	6	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
Steel sheet soil pit (g/kg) ⁸	2300	23	14	9	5	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
Soil pit (g/kg) ⁸	3800	36	32	20	8	0.8	-	-	-	-	-
Shallow steel pyramidal kiln (g/kg) ⁸	4700	73	26	5	5	0.32	-	-	-	-	-
Average pile (lbs/t) ⁹	3268	179	13.9	-	-	-	9.9	25.5	-	-	-
Average understory (lbs/t) ⁹	3286	180	6.6	-	-	-	5.4	36.0	-	-	-
Average ACB (lbs/t) ⁹	3616	2.6	1.4.	-	-	-	1.1	1.1	-	-	-
Incinerator (2010) (g/kg) ²	1280	0.18	-	-	-	1.01	-	-	0.21	6.89 × 10 ⁻⁸	SO _x 0.12
Japan carbonizer (g/kg) ²	43.89	0.033	-	-	-	0.43	-	-	0.015	0	SO _x 0.65
Char burner PM filter (ppm) ^{10 **}	10.6	-	-	-	-	16.8	-	-	32.6 Mg/m ³	-	2.3

Table 4. Cont.

Source of Emission	Emission Factor										
	CO ₂	CO	CH ₄	PM ₁₀	NMVOC	NO _x	NMHC *	PM _{2.5}	PM	Dioxins/Furan	SO
EPA—OSWI (ppm) ¹⁰ **	40	-	-	-	-	103	-	-	30	-	3.1
EPA large—MSWI (ppm) ¹⁰ **	50	-	-	-	-	180	-	-	20	-	30
EPA small—MSWI (ppm) ¹⁰ **	50	-	-	-	-	500	-	-	24	-	30
air curtain incinerator BurnBoss (lbs./t) ¹¹	1248.5	14.2	0.668	-	1.17	1.98	1.17	-	4.25	2.88 × 10 ⁻⁹	SO ₂ 0.24
EPA national standard, primary (p), secondary (S) ¹²	-	P 9 ppm; S 35 ppm	-	P and S 150 µg/m ³	-	-	-	P 1 year 12.0 µg/m ³ ; S = 15.0 µg/m ³	-	-	SO ₂ 0.14 ppm 24 h

* Non-methane hydrocarbons; ** Emissions calculated on a dry basis at 7% oxygen per EPA standards. Sources: ¹ [48], ² [16]; ³ [93], ⁴ [94], ⁵ [49] ⁶ [95], ⁷ [2], ⁸ [75], ⁹ [91], ¹⁰ [16], ¹¹ [62], ¹² [96].

4.2. Permitting for Mobile Biochar Pyrolysis Systems in the USA

The EPA defined incineration as the process of oxidizing combustible hazardous materials (solid waste) at high temperatures above their ignition point in the presence of oxygen to destroy contaminants and maintaining it at high temperature for sufficient time to complete combustion to carbon dioxide and water. It is conducted in a type of furnace designed for burning hazardous materials in a combustion chamber, known as an incinerator. EPA requires that an incinerator can destroy and remove at least 99.99 percent of each harmful chemical in the waste it processes [97,98].

The CAA Section 7429 under the category covered by solid waste incinerator units provides the regulation for air emission pollutants, and the CAA Section 7411(d) and Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 60, Subpart B point out the standards that must include emissions limitations and other requirements applicable to new units and other requirements applicable to existing units [12].

In 2005, the EPA put into effect the OSWI's new source performance standards and emissions guidelines. This rule includes two categories for very small municipal waste combustors (VSMWC) and institutional waste incinerators (IWI), and states that pyrolysis/combustion units are two chamber incinerators with a starved air primary chamber followed by an afterburner to complete combustion [99]. EPA regulations set NSPS limits on incinerators. The current EPA regulations include rules for small MSWIs: <250 t/day, and large MSWIs: >250 t/day, and OSWIs (Table 4). From these regulations, it is clear that using an incineration process for solid waste disposal is a better option than open burning to decrease air pollutant emissions; however, in OSWI groups' pyrolysis with industrial waste combustion for regulation purposes, although both processes are completely different from the technical point of view, the pyrolysis process is conducted without oxygen presence during the combustion phase, and without an additional fuel source [100].

In recent years, EPA received inquiries about OSWI units and its regulations for pyrolysis/combustion units for a variety of process and feedstock types because of the recent market trends for plastics recycling. EPA recognized that under the current OSWI regulations, the term pyrolysis/combustion in the institutional waste incineration unit is not defined. This is based on EPA's analysis that indicated pyrolysis itself is not combustion and pyrolysis gases are not a "solid waste", so then a pyrolysis/combustion unit should not be referenced in the definition of a municipal waste combustors (MWC) unit for the OSWI rule. The EPA consistent with that technical definition proposed the revision of the MWC unit definition in 40 CFR 60.2977 and 40 CFR 60.3078 and removed the reference to "pyrolysis/combustion units" from the definition showing that those units should not be regarded as MWC units under the OSWI rule as part of the Agency's periodic review under the CAA [101].

In this same review, EPA decided to address the regulatory requirements of the 2005 OSWI rule, regarding ACIs that burn only wood waste, clean lumber, and yard waste to respond to several state requests that considered the Title V requirements as unnecessary burdensome and expensive for them to maintain, and the results of the available data showed that ACIs that burn exclusively wood waste, clean lumber, and yard waste are commonly located at facilities that would not otherwise require a Title V operating permit. However, in this rule, EPA considered that a Title V permit was necessary to assure compliance with the opacity and other requirements established for such incinerators and also because such units are not considered solid waste incineration units under Section 129 [101]. The regulation provides special provisions for ACIs burning wood waste. Stationary pyrolysis systems may be permitted differently according to their configuration and the rules of the air quality district.

After this review proposal, the EPA issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking titled "Potential future regulation addressing pyrolysis and gasification units" soliciting information and requesting comments for the potential development of regulations for pyrolysis and gasification units that are used to convert solid or semi-solid feedstocks, including solid waste, biomass, plastics, tires, and organic contaminants in soils and oily

sludges to useful products such as energy, fuels and chemical commodities. However, the EPA received significant adverse comments on the proposed provision [102] and on May 2023 withdrew the proposed provision that would have removed pyrolysis/combustion units from the other solid waste incineration (OSWI) standards under the Clean Air Act, and the current OSWI definition of “municipal waste combustion unit” will continue to include pyrolysis/combustion units [103].

The previous considerations for OSWI and ACIs are applied to stationary incinerators with different amounts of waste processing capabilities. In the case of portable ACIs, the OSWI regulation is applied for some mobile biochar pyrolysis systems (air curtain burners), but not for the flame cap carbonizers for biochar production in the forest, because it is not defined, making the permit regulations to be considered different and varying according to the jurisdiction where operations are going to be conducted.

According to Springsteen et al. [104], there are some instances where temporary operations are allowed, but most of the time, the regulations in place require that portable biochar production systems have permits. However, the regulatory agencies at state or local levels have concerns regarding the time they will be in a temporary location, frequency of movements, and areas of operation because not having this information makes the monitoring and inspection regulators’ work difficult. Another barrier is the lack of land use approval for multiple locations. Mutziger and Orozco [105] also have pointed out that each air regulating district could have a different permit approach including issuing an ACI operation as open burning, engine permit, or process permit based on known criteria pollutants.

Currently, the CAA title 40, Chapter 1, Subchapter C, Part 60, and Subpart EEEE and Subpart FFFF indicate that an ACI that burns 100% wood waste, clean lumber, yard waste, and 100% percent of those three raw materials of this section are required to meet only the requirements in §§ 60.2970 through 60.2974 and are exempt from all other requirements of this subpart [4].

40 CFR 60.2971 indicates limits such as within 60 days after the ACI reaches the charge rate at which it will operate, but no later than 180 days after its initial startup, the operator must meet the two following limitations: (1) the opacity limitation is 10 percent (6 min average), except when (2) the opacity limitation is 35 percent (6 min average) during the startup period that is within the first 30 min of operation. The limitations 1 and 2 of this section apply at all times except during malfunctions. 40 CFR 60.2972 covers the periodicity of the monitoring for testing for opacity; 40 CFR 60.2973 covers the recordkeeping and reporting requirements; and 40 CFR 60.2974 indicates the specification for Title V permitting [4].

Because of all of these air pollution regulatory agencies at the state, district, and county levels plus tribal, authorities considered the permitting difficult to carry out for portable biochar systems. This situation creates a highly diverse set of permit options when some regulators do not require permits; others have the same approach as open burning (no permit required), permit as engine operation, or formal permit. For operators with high potential capacity to operate in several states, it is difficult to plan their investments and operations under these conditions. The fact that pyrolysis is not defined in the regulations also makes the permit operation process difficult, because the setup will change when this definition is included. In the case of woody biomass processing, this is important because biochar presents the opportunity to promote forest management in areas with high risk for wildland fire while using low-value biomass for biochar production.

It has been documented that biochar could improve water quality, bind or decrease concentrations of heavy metals and toxic chemicals, and improve soil health to establish sustainable plant cover, prevent soil erosion, leaching, or other unintended, negative environmental consequences. Additionally, the use of woody biomass residues to create biochar helps decreasing woody biomass to diminish the risk of wildland fires and contribute to improve forest health and forest ecosystem resilience [106]. It is also important to mention that biochar is not flammable, because of the pyrolysis process used, all the oils and other chemical substances have been consumed [107]. Biochar potential applications in waste

management, renewable energy, greenhouse gas emission reduction, mine site reclamation, soil, and water remediation, enhancing soil health and crop productivity, and sequestering C within the mineral soil can be C-negative and could have major implications for the mitigation of climate change.

Nowadays, to develop the full biochar industry, there are still some barriers that have to be overcome such as woody biomass transportation costs, and the need for updated regulations among other limiting factors to increase the use of woody biomass feedstock that is both high quality and low cost. Biochar has become increasingly important for the bioenergy and bioproducts industries, especially in an era of megafires, where the conservation of natural resources for a good quality environment, and the safety of rural communities against the impacts of drought, flooding, and wildland fires require an increase in forest management activities, which will produce woody biomass residues, that if not used become an increase in wildfire risk. Here is where biochar is a great way to dispose of those residues, providing jobs for rural communities and generating additional income for the states with all the benefits already indicated.

5. Conclusions and Perspectives

Portable biochar-producing technologies are a potential tool to decrease the risk of wildland fires in overstocked forest stands with forest management and restoration activities.

Pyrolysis life cycle analysis results have demonstrated that disposing of forest residues for biochar production on-site results in the decrease in pollutant emissions, and is much more efficient compared with forest biomass with open burning or slash pile burning.

Air pollution producing biochar decreases potential CO₂ emissions caused by wildland fires or slash pile burning and brings associated benefits. Biochar incorporation soil amendment increases CO₂ sequestered, water retention and decreases CH₄ emissions from open burning.

To achieve the benefits of biochar production on-site with portable technologies of consistent policies, regulations, and directives at all jurisdictional government levels promote innovation and decrease pollution.

When considering barriers, challenges, and research needs for portable systems, there is a need to conduct research on sustainable woody feedstocks for biochar production; biochar characterization, economic and life cycle analysis of different portable systems, and air emission pollution assessments.

Author Contributions: C.R.F.: Conceptualization, Methodology, and Writing Original draft. D.S.P.-D.: Validation, Writing, Reviewing, and Editing. D.P.: Validation, Writing, Reviewing, and Editing. M.M.: Validation, Writing, Reviewing, and Editing. T.M.: Validation, Reviewing and Editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: The USDA Forest Service supported this work.

Data Availability Statement: All data in the manuscript are previously published.

Acknowledgments: We are thankful to Sara Brown, Program Manager of the Fire, Fuels, and Smoke Science Program for the USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station, for reviewing the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

1. Langholtz, M.H.; Stokes, B.J.; Eaton, L.M. *Billion-Ton Report: Advancing Domestic Resources for a Thriving Bioeconomy*; EERE Publication and Product Library: Washington, DC, USA, 2016. Available online: https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/12/f34/2016_billion_ton_report_12.2.16_0.pdf (accessed on 18 October 2023).
2. Puettmann, M.; Sahoo, K.; Wilson, K.; Oneil, E. Life cycle assessment of biochar produced from forest residues using portable systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *250*, 119564. [CrossRef]
3. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Clean Air Act Requirements and History. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/clean-air-act-requirements-and-history> (accessed on 13 July 2023).

4. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 40 CFR Part 60 40 CFR Part 60. 2023. Available online: <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/part-60> (accessed on 17 July 2023).
5. Domike, J.R.; Zacaroli, A.C. (Eds.) *The Clean Air Act Handbook*, 4th ed.; American Bar Association, Section of Environment: Washington, DC, USA, 2016; 820p.
6. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Criteria Air Pollutants. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants> (accessed on 14 July 2023).
7. U.S. Environmental protection Agency. Process of Reviewing the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/process-reviewing-national-ambient-air-quality-standards> (accessed on 14 July 2023).
8. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. NAAQS Designations Process. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-designations-process> (accessed on 14 July 2023).
9. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Guidance on Development and Submission of Infrastructure State Implementation Plans for National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Fact Sheet. 2015. Available online: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-12/documents/fact_sheet_guidance_on_infrastructure_sip_elements_final_sept_2013.pdf (accessed on 17 July 2023).
10. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Guidance on Infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) Elements under Clean Air Act Sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2). 2013. Available online: https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/urbanair/sipstatus/docs/Guidance_on_Infrastructure_SIP_Elements_Multipollutant_FINAL_Sept_2013.pdf (accessed on 17 July 2023).
11. Louis, G.E. A Historical Context of Municipal Solid Waste Management in the United States. *Waste Manag. Res.* **2004**, *22*, 306–322. [CrossRef]
12. U.S. Code. Title 42—*The Public Health and Welfare—Chapter 85—Air Pollution Prevention and Control*; U.S. Government Publishing Office: Washington, DC, USA, 2010. Available online: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2010-title42/html/USCODE-2010-title42-chap85.htm> (accessed on 7 July 2023).
13. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units (CISWI): New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) and Emission Guidelines (EG) for Existing Sources. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/stationary-sources-air-pollution/commercial-and-industrial-solid-waste-incineration-units-ciswi-new> (accessed on 18 July 2023).
14. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Criteria Air Pollutants. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants> (accessed on 24 July 2023).
15. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. What Are Hazardous Air Pollutants?. 2023. Available online <https://www.epa.gov/haps/what-are-hazardous-air-pollutants> (accessed on 21 July 2023).
16. Estrellan, C.R.; Iino, F. Toxic emissions from open burning. *Chemosphere* **2010**, *80*, 193–207. [CrossRef]
17. Wiedinmyer, C.; Akagi, S.K.; Yokelson, R.J.; Emmons, L.K.; Al-Saadi, J.A.; Orlando, J.J.; Soja, A.J. The Fire INventory from NCAR (FINN): A high resolution global model to estimate the emissions from open burning. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **2011**, *4*, 625–641. [CrossRef]
18. Andreae, M.O. Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning—An updated assessment. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *19*, 8523–8546. [CrossRef]
19. California Air Resources Board. What Is Carbon Monoxide? 2023. Available online: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/carbon-monoxide-and-health#:~:text=CO%20contributes%20indirectly%20to%20climate,weak%20direct%20effect%20on%20climate> (accessed on 1 August 2023).
20. Friedlingstein, P.; O’Sullivan, M.; Jones, M.W.; Andrew, R.M.; Gregor, L.; Hauck, J.; Le Quéré, C.; Luijkx, I.T.; Olsen, A.; Peters, G.P.; et al. Global Carbon Budget 2022. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **2022**, *14*, 4811–4900. [CrossRef]
21. Middlebrook, A.M.; Murphy, D.M.; Ahmadov, R.; Atlas, E.L.; Bahreini, R.; Blake, D.R.; Brioude, J.; de Gouw, J.A.; Fehsenfeld, F.C.; Frost, G.J.; et al. Air quality implications of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2011**, *109*, 20280–20285. [CrossRef]
22. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter. EPA-452/R-12-005. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards Health and Environmental Impacts Division. 2012. Available online: <https://www3.epa.gov/ttnecas1/regdata/RIAs/finalria.pdf> (accessed on 13 July 2023).
23. Newby, D.E.; Mannucci, P.M.; Tell, G.S.; Baccarelli, A.; Brook, R.D.; Donaldson, K.; Forastiere, F.; Franchini, M.; Franco, O.; on behalf of ESC Working Group on Thrombosis, European Association for Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation and ESC Heart Failure Association; et al. Expert position paper on air pollution and cardiovascular disease. *Eur. Heart J.* **2014**, *36*, 83–93. [CrossRef]
24. Hamanaka, R.B.; Mutlu, G.M. Particulate Matter Air Pollution: Effects on the Cardiovascular System. *Front. Endocrinol.* **2018**, *9*, 680. [CrossRef]
25. Brook, R.D.; Rajagopalan, S.; Pope, C.A., 3rd; Brook, J.R.; Bhatnagar, A.; Diez-Roux, A.V.; Holguin, F.; Hong, Y.; Luepker, R.V.; Mittleman, M.A.; et al. Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease: An update to the scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* **2010**, *121*, 2331–2378. [CrossRef]
26. Miller, M.R.; A Shaw, C.; Langrish, J.P. From particles to patients: Oxidative stress and the cardiovascular effects of air pollution. *Futur. Cardiol.* **2012**, *8*, 577–602. [CrossRef]

27. Manisalidis, I.; Stavropoulou, E.; Stavropoulos, A.; Bezirtzoglou, E. Environmental and Health Impacts of Air Pollution: A Review. *Front. Public Health* **2020**, *8*, 505570. [CrossRef]
28. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Response to Questions Regarding Volatile Organic Compounds. EPA Region 10. OAQ-107. 2000. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-08/documents/20001221.pdf> (accessed on 27 July 2023).
29. Stanek, L.W.; Brown, J.S.; Stanek, J.; Gift, J.; Costa, D.L. Air Pollution Toxicology—A Brief Review of the Role of the Science in Shaping the Current Understanding of Air Pollution Health Risks. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2010**, *120*, S8–S27. [CrossRef]
30. Brook, R.D.; Brook, J.; Urch, B.; Vincent, R.; Rajagopalan, S.; Silverman, F. Inhalation of Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Ozone Causes Acute Arterial Vasoconstriction in Healthy Adults. *Circulation* **2002**, *105*, 1534–1536. [CrossRef]
31. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Plain English Guide to the Clean Air Act. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards Publication. No. EPA-456/K-07-001. 2007; 27p. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-08/documents/peg.pdf> (accessed on 27 July 2023).
32. Raza, A.; Bellander, T.; Bero-Bedada, G.; Dahlquist, M.; Hollenberg, J.; Jonsson, M.; Lind, T.; Rosenqvist, M.; Svensson, L.; Ljungman, P.L. Short-term effects of air pollution on out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in Stockholm. *Eur. Heart J.* **2013**, *35*, 861–868. [CrossRef]
33. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Wildfire Smoke: A Guide for Public Health Officials. EPA-452/R-21-901. Chapter 1. Health Effects of Wildfire Smoke. 2021. Available online: <https://www.airnow.gov/sites/default/files/2021-09/wildfire-smoke-guide-chapters-1-3.pdf> (accessed on 27 July 2023).
34. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. What Is CO? 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/co-pollution/basic-information-about-carbon-monoxide-co-outdoor-air-pollution#What%20is%20CO> (accessed on 1 August 2023).
35. Fry, M.M.; Schwarzkopf, M.D.; Adelman, Z.; Naik, V.; Collins, W.J.; West, J.J. Net radiative forcing and air quality responses to regional CO emission reductions. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *13*, 5381–5399. [CrossRef]
36. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. About Urban Air Toxics. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/urban-air-toxics/about-urban-air-toxics> (accessed on 24 July 2023).
37. Leikauf, D.G. Hazardous Air Pollutants and Asthma. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2002**, *110* (Suppl. S4), 505–526. [CrossRef]
38. Kim, M.-J.; Baek, K.-M.; Heo, J.-B.; Cheong, J.-P.; Baek, S.-O. Concentrations, health risks, and sources of hazardous air pollutants in Seoul-Incheon, a megacity area in Korea. *Air Qual. Atmos. Health* **2021**, *14*, 873–893. [CrossRef]
39. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Clean Air Act in a Nutshell: How It Works. 2013. Available online: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-05/documents/caa_nutshell.pdf (accessed on 8 August 2023).
40. Knorr, W.; Lehsten, V.; Arneth, A. Determinants and predictability of global wildfire emissions. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *12*, 6845–6861. [CrossRef]
41. Lemieux, P.M.; Lutes, C.C.; A Santoianni, D. Emissions of organic air toxics from open burning: A comprehensive review. *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* **2004**, *30*, 1–32. [CrossRef]
42. Sekimoto, K.; Koss, A.R.; Gilman, J.B.; Selimovic, V.; Coggon, M.M.; Zarzana, K.J.; Yuan, B.; Lerner, B.M.; Brown, S.S.; Warneke, C.; et al. High- and low-temperature pyrolysis profiles describe volatile organic compound emissions from western US wildfire fuels. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2018**, *18*, 9263–9281. [CrossRef]
43. Greenberg, J.P.; Friedli, H.; Guenther, A.B.; Hanson, D.; Harley, P.; Karl, T. Volatile organic emissions from the distillation and pyrolysis of vegetation. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *6*, 81–91. [CrossRef]
44. Kodros, J.K.; Wiedinmyer, C.; Ford, B.; Cucinotta, R.; Gan, R.; Magzamen, S.; Pierce, J.R. Global burden of mortalities due to chronic exposure to ambient PM_{2.5} from open combustion of domestic waste. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **2016**, *11*, 124022. [CrossRef]
45. Rhoades, C.C.; Fegle, T.S.; Zaman, T.; Fornwalt, P.J.; Miller, S.P. Are soil changes responsible for persistent slash pile burn scars in lodgepole pine forests? *For. Ecol. Manag.* **2021**, *490*, 119090. [CrossRef]
46. United Nations Environment Programme. Spreading like Wildfire—The Rising Threat of Extraordinary Landscape Fires. A UNEP Rapid Response Assessment. Nairobi. 2022. Available online: https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/38372/wildfire_RRA.pdf (accessed on 29 December 2023).
47. Garcia-Perez, M.; Lewis, T.; Kruger, C.E. *Methods for Producing Biochar and Advanced Biofuels in Washington State. Part 1: Literature Review of Pyrolysis Reactors. First Project Report*; Department of Biological Systems and the Center for Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resources, Washington State University: Pullman, WA, USA, 2010; 137p. Available online: <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/1107017.pdf> (accessed on 3 August 2023).
48. Pennise, D.M.; Smith, K.R.; Kithinji, J.P.; Rezende, M.E.; Raad, T.J.; Zhang, J.; Fan, C. Emissions of greenhouse gases and other airborne pollutants from charcoal making in Kenya and Brazil. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **2001**, *106*, 24143–24155. [CrossRef]
49. Sparrevik, M.; Field, J.L.; Martinsen, V.; Breedveld, G.D.; Cornelissen, G. Life Cycle Assessment to Evaluate the Environmental Impact of Biochar Implementation in Conservation Agriculture in Zambia. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2013**, *47*, 1206–1215. [CrossRef]
50. Sørmo, E.; Silvani, L.; Thune, G.; Gerber, H.; Schmidt, H.P.; Smebye, A.B.; Cornelissen, G. Waste timber pyrolysis in a medium-scale unit: Emission budgets and biochar quality. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *718*, 137335. [CrossRef]
51. Ribeiro, N.J.L.; De Oliveira, M.C.J.; Da Silva, C.J.P. Chapter 1—Introducción. In *Torrefaction of Biomass for Energy Applications*; Nunes, L.J.R., De Oliveira Matias, J.C., Da Silva Catalão, J.P., Eds.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2018; pp. 1–43. [CrossRef]
52. Pecha, B.M.; Garcia-Perez, M. Chapter 29-pyrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass: Oil, char, and gas. In *Bioenergy*, 2nd ed.; Dahiya, A., Ed.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2020; pp. 581–619. [CrossRef]

53. Yang, C.; Lü, X. Chapter-Composition of plant biomass and its impact on pretreatment. In *Woodhead Publishing Series in Energy, Advances in 2nd Generation of Bioethanol Production*; Woodhead Publishing: Sawston, UK, 2021; pp. 71–85. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Williams, C.L.; Emerson, R.M.; Tumuluru, J.S. Biomass Compositional Analysis for Conversion to Renewable Fuels and Chemicals. InTech. 2017. Available online: <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/52751> (accessed on 29 December 2023).
55. Antal, M.J.; Grønli, M. The Art, Science, and Technology of Charcoal Production. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2003**, *42*, 1619–1640. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
56. Mohan, D.; Pittman, C.U., Jr.; Steele, P.H. Pyrolysis of Wood/Biomass for Bio-oil: A Critical Review. *Energy Fuels* **2006**, *20*, 848–889. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Itoh, T.; Fujiwara, N.; Iwabuchi, K.; Narita, T.; Mendbayar, D.; Kamide, M.; Niwa, S.; Matsumi, Y. Effects of pyrolysis temperature and feedstock type on particulate matter emission characteristics during biochar combustion. *Fuel Process. Technol.* **2020**, *204*, 106408. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Yaashikaa, P.; Kumar, P.S.; Varjani, S.; Saravanan, A. A critical review on the biochar production techniques, characterization, stability and applications for circular bioeconomy. *Biotechnol. Rep.* **2020**, *28*, e00570. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Safarian, S. Performance analysis of sustainable technologies for biochar production: A comprehensive review. *Energy Rep.* **2023**, *9*, 4574–4593. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Anand, A.; Gautam, S.; Ram, L.C. Feedstock and pyrolysis conditions affect suitability of biochar for various sustainable energy and environmental applications. *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis* **2023**, *170*, 105881. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Mishra, R.K.; Kumar, D.J.P.; Narula, A.; Chistie, S.M.; Naik, S.U. Production and beneficial impact of biochar for environmental application: A review on types of feedstocks, chemical compositions, operating parameters, techno-economic study, and life cycle assessment. *Fuel* **2023**, *343*, 127968. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Schwartz, R.N.; Paulsen, D.A.; Blaise, J.M.; Wagner, L.A.; Yelvington, E.P. Analysis of emissions from combusting pyrolysis products. *Fuel* **2020**, *274*, 117863. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Hornung, A.; Stenzel, F.; Grunwald, J. Biochar—Just a black matter is not enough. *Biomass Conv. Bioref.* **2021**, 1–12. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
64. Sohi, S.P.; Krull, E.; Lopez-Capel, E.; Bol, R. A review of biochar and its use and function in soil. *Adv. Agron.* **2010**, *105*, 47–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Gabhane, J.W.; Bhange, V.P.; Patil, P.D.; Bankar, S.T.; Kumar, S. Recent trends in biochar production methods and its application as a soil health conditioner: A review. *SN Appl. Sci.* **2020**, *2*, 1307. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Merriam-Webster. Dictionary. 2023. Available online: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/kiln> (accessed on 9 August 2023).
67. Brown, R.; del Campo, B.; Boateng, A.A.; Garcia-Perez, M.; Mašek, O. Fundamentals of biochar production. In *Biochar for Environmental Management Science, Technology and Implementation*, 2nd ed.; Lehmann, J., Joseph, S., Eds.; Earthscan from Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2015; 976p. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. Plaza, D.; Artigas, J.; Ábrego, J.; Gonzalo, A.; Sánchez, J.L.; Dro, A.D.; Richardson, Y. Design and operation of a small-scale carbonization kiln for cashew nutshell valorization in Burkina Faso. *Energy Sustain. Dev.* **2019**, *53*, 71–80. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
69. Whitehead, W.D.J. Construction of a Transportable Charcoal Kiln, Tropical Products Institute, U.K. Rural Technology Guide 13. 1980. Available online: https://iffybooks.net/wpcontent/uploads/Appropriate_Technology_Library/MF20-468%20The%20Construction%20of%20a%20Transportable%20Charcoal%20Kiln.pdf (accessed on 8 August 2023).
70. Fuchs, M.; Garcia-Perez, M.; Small, P.; Flora, G. *Campfire Lessons-Breaking Down the Combustion Process to Understand Biochar Production*; The Biochar Journal: Arbaz, Switzerland, 2014; Available online: www.biochar-journal.org/en/ct/47 (accessed on 23 August 2023).
71. Sparrevik, M.; Adam, C.; Martinsen, V.; Jubaedah; Cornelissen, G. Emissions of gases and particles from charcoal/biochar production in rural areas using medium-sized traditional and improved “retort” kilns. *Biomass Bioenergy* **2015**, *72*, 65–73. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
72. Nsamba, H.K.; Hale, S.E.; Cornelissen, G.; Bachmann, R.T. Sustainable Technologies for Small-Scale Biochar Production—A Review. *J. Sustain. Bioenergy Syst.* **2015**, *5*, 10–31. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
73. Schettini, B.L.S.; Jacovine, L.A.G.; Torres, C.M.M.E.; Carneiro, A.d.C.O.; Villanova, P.H.; da Rocha, S.J.S.S.; Rufino, M.P.M.X.; Silva, L.B.; Castro, R.V.O. Furnace-kiln system: How does the use of new technologies in charcoal production affect the carbon balance? *Ind. Crop. Prod.* **2022**, *187*, 115330. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. Schmidt, H.P.; Taylor, P. *Kon-Tiki Flame Cap Pyrolysis for the Democratization of Biochar Production*; The Biochar-Journal: Arbaz, Switzerland, 2014; pp. 14–24. Available online: www.biochar-journal.org/en/ct/39 (accessed on 28 August 2023).
75. Cornelissen, G.; Pandit, N.R.; Taylor, P.; Pandit, B.H.; Sparrevik, M.; Schmidt, H.P. Emissions and Char Quality of Flame-Curtain “Kon Tiki” Kilns for Farmer-Scale Charcoal/Biochar Production. *PLoS ONE* **2016**, *11*, e0154617. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. McAvoy, D. Hazardous Fuels Reduction Using Flame Cap Biochar Kilns. Fact Sheet 037. 2019. Available online: <https://extension.usu.edu/forestry/publications/utah-forest-facts/037-hazardous-fuels-reduction-using-flame-cap-biochar-kiln> (accessed on 29 December 2023).
77. Wilson, K.J. A Carbon Conservation Corps to Restore Forests with Biochar Using Flame Cap Kilns. In Proceedings of the 2021 ASABE Annual International Virtual Meeting, Virtual, 12–16 July 2021; p. 2100361. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

78. Bindar, Y.; Budhi, W.Y.; Hernowo, P.; Wahyu, S.; Saquib, S.; Setiadi, T. 1—Sustainable technologies for biochar production. In *Current Developments in Biotechnology and Bioengineering*; Ngo, H.H., Guo, W., Pandey, A., Varjani, S., Tsang, D.C.W., Eds.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2023; pp. 1–40, ISBN 9780323918732. [CrossRef]
79. Air Burners Technology. The Principle of Air Curtain Burning. 2022. Available online: https://airburners.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/air_burners_principle_of_operation-1.pdf (accessed on 29 December 2023).
80. Tigercat. 6050 Carbonator. 2022. Available online: <https://www.tigercat.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/6050-Carbonator-4pg-1.4-0122-web.pdf> (accessed on 29 December 2023).
81. Franco, C.R.; Page-Dumroese, D.S. Decreasing the urban carbon footprint with woody biomass biochar in the united states of america. *Carbon Footpr.* **2023**, *2*, 18. [CrossRef]
82. Airburners, Inc. CharBoss. 2023. Available online: airburners.com (accessed on 29 December 2023).
83. Rockwood, D.L.; Ellis, M.F.; Liu, R.; Zhao, F.; Fabbro, K.W.; He, Z.; Derbowka, D.R. Forest trees for biochar and carbon sequestration: Production and benefits. In *Applications of Biochar for Environmental Safety*; Abdelhafez, A.A., Abbas, M.H.H., Eds.; IntechOpen: London, UK, 2020. Available online: <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/72115#:~:text=DOI:%2010.5772/intechopen.92377> (accessed on 29 December 2023).
84. Vallero, A.D. Chapter 8-Air pollution biogeochemistry. In *Air Pollution Calculations: Quantifying Pollutant Formation, Transport, Transformation, Fate and Risks*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2019; pp. 175–206. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780443139871000235> (accessed on 29 December 2023).
85. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Understanding Global Warming Potentials. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/understanding-global-warming-potentials#Learn%20why> (accessed on 30 August 2023).
86. Mareddy, R.A. 5-Impacts on air environment. In *Environmental Impact Assessment*; Mareddy, A.R., Ed.; Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford, UK, 2017; pp. 171–216, ISBN 9780128111390. [CrossRef]
87. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Basic Information of Air Emissions Factors and Quantification. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-factors-and-quantification/basic-information-air-emissions-factors-and-quantification#resources> (accessed on 30 August 2023).
88. Soares Neto, T.G.; Carvalho, J.A., Jr.; Veras, J.A.C.A.G.; Alvarado, E.C.; Gielow, R.; Lincoln, E.N.; Christian, T.J.; Yokelson, R.J.; Santos, J.C. Biomass consumption and CO₂, CO and main hydrocarbon gas emissions in an Amazonian forest clearing fire Atmos. *Environment* **2009**, *43*, 438–446. [CrossRef]
89. Miranda Santos, S.D.F.d.O.; Piekarski, C.M.; Ugaya, C.M.L.; Donato, D.B.; Braghini Júnior, A.; De Francisco, A.C.; Carvalho, A.M.M.L. Life Cycle Analysis of Charcoal Production in Masonry Kilns with and without Carbonization Process Generated Gas Combustion. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 1558. [CrossRef]
90. Lee, E.; Han, H.-S. Air Curtain Burners: A Tool for Disposal of Forest Residues. *Forests* **2017**, *8*, 296. [CrossRef]
91. Susott, A.R.; Babbitt, R.; Lincoln, E.; Hao, W.M. Reducing PM2.5 Emissions through Technology. 2002. Available online: https://airburners.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/emission_factors_usda-fs_missoula_rbabbit.pdf (accessed on 2 March 2023).
92. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Source Test Report for 2023 Emission Factor Testing Mobile Air Curtain Incinerator Valley Environmental Hillsboro, Oregon. 2023. Available online: <https://www.oregon.gov/deq/aq/cao/Documents/montroseFSTestReport.pdf> (accessed on 26 September 2023).
93. Vallero, A.D. 1-Sources of Air Pollution. In *Fundamentals of Air Pollution*, 4th ed.; Elsevier: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2008; pp. 313–355. [CrossRef]
94. Springsteen, B.; Christofk, T.; Eubanks, S.; Mason, T.; Clavin, C.; Storey, B. Emission Reductions from Woody Biomass Waste for Energy as an Alternative to Open Burning. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* **2011**, *61*, 63–68. [CrossRef]
95. Lasko, K.; Vadrevu, K. Improved rice residue burning emissions estimates: Accounting for practice-specific emission factors in air pollution assessments of Vietnam. *Environ. Pollut.* **2018**, *236*, 795–806. [CrossRef]
96. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. NAAQS Table. 2023. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table> (accessed on 30 August 2023).
97. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Air Pollution Control Technology Fact Sheet. EPA-452/F-03-022. 2009. Available online: <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P100RQ6F.PDF?Dockkey=P100RQ6F.PDF> (accessed on 1 February 2023).
98. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. A Citizen’s Guide to Incineration. Office of Solid Waste and Environmental Protection Emergency Response. EPA 542-F-12-010. 2012. Available online: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-04/documents/a_citizens_guide_to_incineration.pdf (accessed on 1 February 2023).
99. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Withdrawal of Proposed Provision Removing Pyrolysis/Combustion Units from the Other Solid Waste Incineration Standards—Notice. Fact Sheet. 2023. Available online: https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-05/Fact%20Sheet_Withdrawal%20Notice_%20May242023.pdf (accessed on 6 September 2023).
100. Vallero, A.D. Chapter 9-Thermal reactions. In *Air Pollution Calculations: Quantifying Pollutant Formation, Transport, Transformation, Fate and Risks*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2019; pp. 207–218. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780443139871000211> (accessed on 6 September 2023).
101. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Other Solid Waste Incineration Units Review. EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0156-0139. 2020. Available online: <https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0156-0139> (accessed on 6 September 2023).

102. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Potential Future Regulation Addressing Pyrolysis and Gasification Units. 2021. Available online: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/09/08/2021-19390/potential-future-regulation-addressing-pyrolysis-and-gasification-units> (accessed on 6 September 2023).
103. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Other Solid Waste Incineration Units Review; Withdrawal of Proposed Provision Removing Pyrolysis/Combustion Units. 2023. Available online: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/06/05/2023-11476/standards-of-performance-for-new-stationary-sources-and-emission-guidelines-for-existing-sources> (accessed on 6 September 2023).
104. Springsteen, B.; Yorgey, G.G.; Glass, G.; Christoforou, C. Chapter 12: Air Pollutant Emissions and Air Emissions Permitting for Biochar Production Systems. In *Biomass to Biochar: Maximizing the Carbon Value*; Washington State University, Center for Sustaining Agriculture and Natural Resources: Pullman, WA, USA, 2021; 166p. Available online: <https://csanr.wsu.edu/biomass2biochar/> (accessed on 31 August 2023).
105. Mutziger, A.; Orozco, E. Air Curtain Incinerators & Carbonizer Use, Benefits, and Permitting. San Luis Obispo County, Air Pollution Control District. Presentation 23 September 2021. Available online: <https://www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/2021-09bcc-4.pdf> (accessed on 2 March 2023).
106. Rodriguez-Franco, C.; Page-Dumroese, D.S. Woody biochar potential for abandoned mine land restoration in the U.S.: A review. *Biochar* **2021**, *3*, 7–22. [CrossRef]
107. Zhao, M.Y.; Enders, A.; Lehmann, J. Short- and long-term flammability of biochars. *Biomass Bioenergy* **2014**, *69*, 183–191. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.