Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians AirWorks, Inc. Alaska Housing Finance Corporation Alliance to Save Energy Allumia Alternative Energy Resources Organization American Rivers Backbone Campaign Beneficial State Bank BFA Energy BlueGreen Alliance Bonneville Environmental Foundation Byrd Barr Place City of Ashland City of Seattle Office of Sustainability & Environment CleanTech Alliance Climate Smart Missoula Climate Solutions Coffman Engineers Community Action Center of Whitman County Community Action Partnership Assoc. of Idaho Community Action Partnership of Oregon Community Energy Project Counterbalance Capital Earth Ministry Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon eFormative Options Elevate Energy Energy350 Energy Trust of Oregon Environment Oregon Environment Washington Forth Global Ocean Health Green Energy Institute at Lewis & Clark Law School Grid Forward Homes for Good Home Performance Guild of Oregon Human Resources Council, District XI Idaho Clean Energy Association Idaho Conservation League Idaho Rivers United League of Women Voters Idaho League of Women Voters Oregon League of Women Voters Washington Montana Audubon Montana Environmental Information Center Montana Renewable Energy Association Multnomah County Office of Sustainability National Center for Appropriate Technology National Grid Natural Resources Defense Council New Buildings Institute Northern Plains Resource Council Northwest EcoBuilding Guild Northwest Energy Efficiency Council NW Natural OneEnergy Renewables Opportunities Industrialization Center of WA **Opportunity Council** Oracle/Opower Oregon Citizens' Utility Board Oregon Energy Fund Oregon Environmental Council Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility Oregon Solar Energy Industries Association Pacific Energy Innovation Association Pacific NW Regional Council of Carpenters Portland Energy Conservation, Inc. Portland General Electric Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action Puget Sound Cooperative Credit Union Renewable Hydrogen Alliance Renewable Northwest Save Our wild Salmon Seattle City Light Sierra Club Sierra Club, Idaho Chapter Sierra Club, Montana Chapte Sierra Club, Washington Chapter Small Business Utility Advocates Snake River Alliance Snohomish County PUD Solar Installers of Washington Solar Oregon Solar Washington South Central Community Action Partnership Southeastern Idaho Community Action Agency Spark Northwest Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners Sustainable Connections The Climate Trust The Energy Project Transition Missoula UCONS, LLC Union of Concerned Scientists United Steelworkers of America, District 12 Washington Environmental Council Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility Washington State Community Action Partnership Washington State Department of Commerce Washington State University Energy Program YMCA Earth Service Corps Zero Waste Vashon



June 15, 2020

Richard Devlin, Chair Northwest Power and Conservation Council 851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100 Portland, OR 97204

Dear Chair Devlin and Council members:

The NW Energy Coalition (NWEC) is pleased to write in support of the staff recommendation – with one exception as described below – for the assessment of upstream methane emissions for the 2021 Northwest Power Plan. We appreciate the review of the Natural Gas Advisory Committee and the work by staff member Steve Simmons to prepare a thorough and well documented methodology.

NWEC is committed to achieving the vision of a reliable, clean and affordable Northwest power system, and considers the work of the Council to have even more importance from this point onward in providing clear guidance for the rapid transformation needed to achieve our region's climate, clean energy, reliability, economic and environmental protection goals.

Identifying and rapidly reducing greenhouse gas emissions attributable to the power sector is a crucial aspect of that effort. While the role of carbon dioxide (CO₂) as the "control knob for the climate" with atmospheric and climate system effects for thousands of years is relatively well understood, methane (CH₄) is another very important greenhouse gas with climate impact on relatively short time scales of up to 20 years. The primary locus of emissions for CO₂ is combustion – and indeed, natural gas, primarily composed of methane, creates substantial CO₂ on combustion, as already accounted for in the Council's assessment and methods.

The key concern for methane, however, is emissions in the supply chain prior to combustion in natural gas power plants and otherwise. As staff's report indicates, assessing upstream methane emissions is a complex undertaking, and considerable research is ongoing to acquire more observational data and develop more robust assessment methods. NW Energy Coalition June 15, 2020 – Page 2

Given the relevance and magnitude of methane emissions related to the Northwest electric power system, NWEC believes it is very important to take the initial steps outlined by staff to include upstream methane assessment in the 2021 Plan. We recommend that the Council:

- Take an evidence-based approach to upstream methane emissions, recognizing rapid advances being made in data acquisition, refinement and assessment, but also recognizing the remaining areas of uncertainty and data gaps.
- Focus on data and assessments most relevant for the primary supply basins for Northwest power system use, particularly northeast British Columbia, Alberta, and the Rockies.
- Also fully consider national assessments in providing guidance.
- Invite scientific experts in the field of methane emissions, atmospheric chemistry and climate science to provide views and advice to the Council on the complex data and assessment issues involved.
- Take a flexible and incremental approach to avoid significant under or overestimation of upstream methane emissions and to incorporate new relevant information on an ongoing basis.
- Include one or more elements in the Action Plan for the 2021 Plan to facilitate additional progress on this important topic.

NWEC also supports the efforts by environmental regulators and the natural gas industry to mitigate upstream methane emissions through improved monitoring, reporting, leak detection and response (LDAR) programs, regulatory compliance and other efforts. As verifiable evidence of those efforts develops, that should also be folded into the Council's analysis.

Turning to the specific approach recommended by staff for the 2021 Plan, the key metric is L_d , the aggregate upstream methane emissions rate. The staff methodology is appropriate overall, and we support the recommendation to adopt the EDF Low L_d value for upstream emissions for US sourced natural gas used by the Northwest power sector, primarily from the Rockies region.

The EDF managed research program, which has now been running for a decade, is supported across many relevant sectors, involves rigorous field research protocols and scientific review, assesses emissions from many US supply basins, especially the Rockies, and has resulted in numerous peer reviewed publications.

However, we do not support the staff's recommendation for Canadian natural gas sources based on provincially adopted L_d values. Because Canadian gas, primarily from northeast British Columbia but also various parts of Alberta, comprises about two-thirds of Northwest gas supply, this is an important issue to consider as the Council finalizes the 2021 Plan.

NWEC believes that while the provincial values for upstream emissions have been widely cited, they are based on earlier baseline assessments that have not been updated for many years.

NW Energy Coalition June 15, 2020 – Page 3

However, quite a lot of new research is now available, and below we provide a capsule summary of several relevant publications:

- Atherton et al. $(2017)^1$ conducted an extensive field survey of gas and oil production areas in northeastern British Columbia, covering more than 1,600 well pads and processing facilities. They conclude: "Our calculated emission frequency values, combined with estimated and pre-established emission factors for wells and facilities, provided a CH4 emission volume estimate of more than 111 800 ± 15 700 t per year for the BC portion of the Montney. This value exceeds the province-wide estimate provided by the government of BC even though the Montney only represents about 55 % of BC's total natural gas production."
- Wisen et al. (2020)² reviewed natural gas well leakage data from the British Columbia Oil and Gas Commission. They found that about 11% of over 21,000 wells reported leakage during their lifetime, twice the rate indicated from earlier research in Alberta, and highlighted that both BC and Alberta have almost no leakage reporting from abandoned or retired wells.
- Ravikumar et al. (2020)³, as part of a field study of leak detection and response (LDAR) efforts, reviewed emissions studies in both Alberta and British Columbia and likewise concluded: "Both ground-based and aerial-measurements in Alberta showed higher vented and total methane emissions compared to provincial regulatory estimates. Similarly, mobile measurements using truck-mounted sensor systems in British Columbia and Alberta have consistently shown that a majority of the emissions are dominated by a small number of high-emitting sites, often identified as 'super-emitters.'"
- O'Connell et al. (2019)⁴ surveyed 1,299 oil and gas well pads and 2,670 unique wells and facilities in Alberta, and found: "As a result of measured emissions being larger than those reported in government inventories, this study suggests government estimates of infrastructure affected by incoming regulations may be conservative. Comparing emission intensities with available Canadian-based research suggests good general agreement between studies, regardless of the measurement methodology used for detection and quantification."

¹ Atherton et al., 2017, "Mobile measurement of methane emissions from natural gas developments in northeastern British Columbia, Canada," *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17, 12405–12420, 2017, DOI: 10.5194/acp-17-12405-2017.

² Wisen et al., 2020, "A portrait of wellbore leakage in northeastern British Columbia, Canada," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117 (2) 913-922; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1817929116

³ Ravikumar et al., 2020, "Repeated leak detection and repair surveys reduce methane emissions over scale of years," *Environmental Research Letters* 15 (2020) 034029, DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab6ae1

⁴ O'Connell et al., 2019, "Methane emissions from contrasting production regions within Alberta, Canada: Implications under incoming federal methane regulations. *Elementa* 7: 3. DOI: 10.1525/elementa.341

NW Energy Coalition June 15, 2020 – Page 4

After our review of the literature, including the examples cited here, NWEC believes the Canadian L_d upstream emissions metric should be updated to a higher value reflecting the more recent research.

To summarize, the Canadian L_d value proposed by staff is a methane loss rate of 0.77%. In comparison, that is about two-fifths of the EPA rate of 1.82%, and less than one-third of the EDF Low rate of 2.47%. We conclude the Canadian value is out of date and implausibly low given the results of numerous peer-reviewed studies in British Columbia and Alberta.

We recommend that the Natural Gas Advisory Committee be reconvened later this year to review the upstream methane emissions rate for Canadian supply areas, including presentations from experts having direct experience with these issues. It may be appropriate as a starting point to consider the EDF Low rate and adjust from there.

NWEC again thanks Council staff and the NGAC for close attention to this important issue and urges the Council to move forward with the staff recommendation to include the assessment of upstream methane emissions for the 2021 Plan, with an upward adjustment for the Canadian emissions rate.

Sincerely,

Jud Sente

Fred Heutte Senior Policy Associate NW Energy Coalition fred@nwenergy.org