

From: [HERB Kim * PUC](#)
To: [PUC PUChearings * PUC](#)
Cc: [BATMALE JP * PUC](#)
Subject: FW: Docket UM 7128 - Comments on Gas Presentations
Date: Friday, September 24, 2021 1:36:48 PM
Attachments: [Methane-Gas -Health-Safety-and-Decarbonization.pdf](#)
[bbc on curbing methane 8.15.21.docx](#)
[NYT methane op ed Castor 8.9.21.docx](#)
[Sightline Gas, RNG, gaslighting edited.docx](#)

Hi,

Can you please have this posted to UM 2178 (note the docket listed in the subject line is incorrect.

Thanks

Kim

From: Wendy Woods <woodsw67@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2021 1:32 PM
To: HERB Kim * PUC <Kim.HERB@puc.oregon.gov>
Subject: Docket UM 7128 - Comments on Gas Presentations

To Ms. Herb,

To OPUC Staff

You recently held a day of disheartening presentations on 9.14.21 from “Natural Gas” companies purporting to reduce their carbon emissions in the future. It is a myth that natural gas is “a clean bridge fuel”. Far from it, the IPCC report implores us to focus first on decreasing methane leaks and methane use. Why? First, it is important to understand that **both** “natural gas” and RNG are primarily composed of Methane, a potent greenhouse gas. **Methane is a major problem for the climate.**

Methane molecules are composed of carbon and hydrogen. One cannot “decarbonize” the carbon in methane and still use methane as a fuel. Second, **Methane is a potent greenhouse gas**, with more than 80x the heat trapping ability of Carbon dioxide in the first 20 years after emission. Third, **Methane leaks** throughout the distribution system, warming the atmosphere significantly. Fourth, when Methane is burned, it releases Carbon dioxide into the atmosphere which lingers hundreds of years, trapping heat that warms our planet. **Natural gas warms the planet both before (as methane) and after (as carbon dioxide) it is burned for fuel.** Fifth, **when burned in our gas stoves or furnaces inside of buildings, toxins quickly accumulate in the air that cause known health issues.**

We humans do not need natural gas. There are electric alternatives for appliances that use gas: heat pumps to heat and cool buildings, heat pump water heaters, electric or induction stoves, electric fireplaces, to name a few. Electrification of buildings, transportation, and generation of electricity from wind and solar are the real paths to solving our climate issues. The only people who need natural gas are the companies who sell it. **Natural gas company profits are rapidly making our planet uninhabitable.**

Northwest Natural Gas and other fracked gas utilities are spending massive amounts of money on a campaign to promote so-called “natural gas” as a sustainable and carbon-free fuel for the future. But a recent report, **“Methane Gas: Health, Safety,**

and Decarbonization,” tells a different story of **just how dangerous and deadly methane gas really is.** Supported by 64 organizations from around the Pacific Northwest, the report is intended to curtail confusion created by Northwest Natural and other fossil fuel entities’ purposeful misinformation campaigns targeting elected officials and the public.

To serve the interests of the public and the whole planet, the OPUC should act to **reduce the use of all fossil fuels as fast as possible,** focusing on methane first as the IPCC report recommended stating that Methane is our most important lever to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Please remain focused on taking important steps to **“Electrify” our future and to phase out use of natural gas in any form (fracked, RNG, fossil, synthetic).** Please do not be coerced or fooled by profit driven companies. Oregonians need you to act in the interest of the people, NOW. **We cannot afford to have the planet become any warmer.** The timetable for eliminating natural gas is too slow. You can do much better!

Please see attached documents for more details.

Thank you for listening to Oregonians,

Wendy Woods PhD

METHANE GAS: HEALTH, SAFETY, & DECARBONIZATION

Setting the record straight



Eric Gay/AP



Perla Irish/Dreamland Design

August 2021



Contributors

Nick Caleb, J.D., LL.M., Breach Collective

Katherine Muller, Ph.D.

Dineen O'Rourke, 350PDX

Anne Pernick, Stand.earth

Melanie Plaut, M.D.

Dylan Plummer, Sierra Club

Daniel Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper

Brian Stewart, Electrify Now

Noelle Studer-Spevak, M.S., M.P.A., Families for Climate

Theodora Tsongas, Ph.D., M.S.

Ann Turner, M.D.



Supporting Organizations

Dineen O'Rourke, Campaign Manager,
350PDX

Sharon Abreu, Executive Director, **Irthlingz
Arts-Based Environmental Education**

Lisa Arkin, Executive Director, **Beyond Toxics**

Greg Bourget, Executive Director, **Portland
Clean Air**

Cheryl Braginsky, Advocacy Action
Committee, **St. Michael & All Angels
Episcopal Church**

Nick Caleb, J.D., LL.M., Climate and Energy
Attorney, **Breach Collective**

Cathryn Chudy, Board Director & Lloyd
Marbet, Executive Director, **Oregon
Conservancy Foundation**

Heidi Cody, Council Member, **Alliance for
Community Engagement SW WA**

Cassie Cohen, Executive Director, **Portland
Harbor Community Coalition**

Mark Darienzo, Co-Chair, **Climate Jobs PDX**

Nikita Daryanani, Climate and Energy Policy
Manager, **Coalition of Communities of
Color**

Lenny Dee, Co-Founder, **Onward Oregon**

Anna Doty, Fossil Fuel Campaign Manager,
Washington Environmental Council

Sara Driscoll, Volunteer, **Boston Climate
Action Network**

Keith Ervin, Chair, **Green Buildings Now**

Charity Fain, Executive Director, **Community
Energy Project**

Peter Glenn, Co-Founder, **EV Life**

Lisa M. Hatten, Community Center Director,
St Andrew Catholic Church

Lee Helfend, Organizing Director, **OPAL
Environmental Justice**

Michael Hall, Co-Founder and Steering
Committee Member, **Quiet Clean PDX**

Patricia Hine, Board President, **350 Eugene**

Samantha Hernandez, Climate Justice
Organizer, **Oregon Physicians for Social
Responsibility**

Michael Heumann, Chair of Climate Change
& Environmental Justice Team, **Metropolitan
Alliance for Common Good**

Debra Higbee-Sudyka, Conservation
Committee Chair, **Oregon Chapter of the
Sierra Club**

Diane Hodiak, Executive Director, **350
Deschutes**

Joel Iboa, Executive Director, **Oregon Just
Transition Alliance**

Alan Journet, Co-Facilitator, **Southern
Oregon Climate Action Now**

Priya Judge, Coalition Coordinator, **Power
Past Fracked Gas**

Sally Keely, Lead Team Member, **No
Methanol 360**; and Owner, **Cascadia
Climate Action Now**

Kelsey King, Chair, **Loo Wit Group, Sierra
Club**

Joana Kirchhoff, Environmental Team Leader,
Portland Raging Grannies

Jonny Kocher, Associate, **Rocky Mountain
Institute**

Matt Krough, US Oil & Gas Campaign
Director, **STAND.earth**

Oriana Magnera, Climate, Energy, and
Transportation Manager, **Verde**

Marianne Mauldin, **St. Charles Borromeo
Catholic Church**

Michael McCord, Chair, **Back Bay Green**

Mamelang Memela, Organizing Coordinator &
Sarah Taylor, Co-Founder, **Braided River
Campaign**

Diane Meisenhelter, Action Team, **Extinction
Rebellion PDX**

Doug Moore, Executive Director, **Oregon
League of Conservation Voters**

Arvia Morris, Chair, **43rd Democrats
Environmental Caucus**; and Western
Washington Vice Chair, **Environment and
Climate Caucus**

Amy Morrison, Deputy Director, **Backbone
Campaign**

Dylan Plummer, Senior Campaign
Representative, **Sierra Club**

Gary Munkhoff, Publisher, **Green Living Journal**

Stacy Oaks, Organizer, **350 Seattle**

Court Olson, Board Chair, **People for Climate Action**

Mary Peveto, Executive Director, **Neighbors for Clean Air**

Lisa Reynolds, **Oregon State Representative**, House District 36

Janet Roche, Producer and Host, **Inclusive Designers Podcast**

Allie Rosenbluth, Campaigns Director, **Rogue Climate**

Bob Sallinger, Conservation Director, **Audubon Society of Portland**

Peter Sallinger, Council Member, **Portland Youth Climate Council**

Amy Schlusser, Staff Attorney, **Green Energy Institute at Lewis & Clark Law School**

Peter A. Sergienko, Board Member, Creation Justice Committee, **Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon**

Dan Serres, Conservation Director, **Columbia Riverkeeper**

Akash Singh, Western States Policy Advocate, **Union of Concerned Scientists**

Zach Snyder, Program Manager, **Solar Oregon**

Brian Stewart, Founder, **Electrify Now**

Eric Strid, Co-Convenor, **Columbia Gorge Climate Action Network**

Noelle Studer-Spevak, Board Secretary, **Families for Climate**

Jacob J. Trewe, Treasurer, **Eugene Democratic Socialists of America**

Ann Turner, Core Team Member, **CedarAction**

Mark Vossler, Board President, **Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility**

Lael and Thomas White, Co-Founders, **Climate Rail Alliance**

Wendy Woods, Coordinator, **Electrify Corvallis**

Table of Contents

Introduction	8
Rapid Electrification of Residential & Commercial Buildings is the Clear Path Forward	10
Methane Gas – Trying to Stay Relevant in a Decarbonizing World	14
The Northwest’s Gas Supply Comes Primarily from Fracking	14
Gas System Leaks Make Fracked Gas Carbon Impacts Similar to Coal	15
“Renewable Natural Gas” and Green Hydrogen are Not Viable Replacements for Gas in Buildings	16
Background on “Renewable Natural Gas” and Green Hydrogen	16
Renewable Natural Gas Cannot Meet Energy Demand and is not Cost-effective	16
Green Hydrogen is Incompatible with Existing Gas Pipelines	17
Methane Significantly Impacts Health and Indoor Air Quality	18
Methane Appliances Cause Hazardous Indoor Air Quality, Impacting Public Health and Perpetuating Environmental Injustice	18
Numerous Scientific Studies Confirm the Negative Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health	19
NW Natural’s Claim that Gas Cooking is Safe Relies on Outdated and Irrelevant Reports	21
Exposure to Indoor Air Pollution from Burning Methane is an Issue of Health and Environmental Justice	23
Methane Gas is a Threat to Public Safety	24
Transporting Gas in Any Form is Dangerous	24
Methane Gas and Extreme Weather and Fire Events	25
Continuing to Build Gas Infrastructure is Inconsistent with Oregon’s Climate Goals	25
The Gas Industry is Misleading the Public with False Promises of Decarbonization while Opposing Climate Policy at All Levels of Government	26
Conclusion	27
Endnotes	25

Introduction

On May 6, 2021, the United Nations released its Global Methane Assessment and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) director, Inger Anderson stated “Cutting methane is the strongest lever we have to slow climate change over the next 25 years...We need international cooperation to urgently reduce methane emissions as much as possible this decade.”¹

A few weeks later, the historically fossil fuel-friendly International Energy Agency issued a roadmap to net zero emissions by 2050 that recommends a rapid decline in the use of coal, oil, and gas, notably including banning the sale of new oil and gas furnaces by 2025.²

In truth, the only way to reach carbon emissions reduction targets at the global, national, and state level, and to improve indoor and ambient air quality for vulnerable communities, is to switch to renewable electricity wherever practically feasible (i.e. residential customers) and reserve limited biomethane and green hydrogen resources for hard-to-electrify mobile combustion uses, heavy industry, and energy storage.

In Oregon and Washington, we have seen a surge in the use of methane in direct conflict with our states’ climate goals. Even as the gas industry actively undermines climate goals, expands fossil fuel infrastructure, and lobbies against climate policy, it is claiming to be working towards carbon neutrality and sustainability. While misleading green branding can have an effect on public opinion, it is of utmost importance that policy makers are able to 1) identify false expressions of environmental care as a cover for climate-damaging activities; 2) know where to find accurate data about the many impacts of the gas industry; 3) avoid undue influence by fossil fuel interests; and 4) make sound policy decisions for the health and safety of our communities in the just transition to a decarbonized economy.

For years, NW Natural and the gas industry at large have promoted methane gas as a clean, safe energy alternative. From images of happy people at home, nestled by their gas fireplaces to using the name “natural,” NW Natural wants everyone to believe it is an environmentally conscious corporation you can trust. Recently, in an attempt to grow its customer base and stave off regulation of its dangerous product, NW Natural and the gas industry have ramped up their greenwashing efforts, promoting gas as a fuel that is helping Oregon and SW Washington reach their carbon emissions reduction targets.

But the science on health, safety, feasibility, economics, and climate is not on the side of NW Natural, nor any other gas corporation using similar marketing tactics. The many dangers and limitations of gas are clear. Fracked gas has become the largest contributor to global fossil fuels emissions increases. We no longer have time to entertain fossil fuel corporations’ deceitful public relations campaigns or delay necessary action to benefit their shareholders.

This report is intended to counter the confusion created by NW Natural and other fossil fuel entities’ purposeful misinformation campaigns targeted at elected officials and the public. Contrary to

assurances made by NW Natural in the public record and in their advertising materials, this report demonstrates the following indisputable facts:

- Electrification is the lowest-cost method to decarbonize buildings, increase efficiency, and protect families and communities from the hazards presented by gas.^{3,4}
- The Northwest’s gas supply comes primarily from hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” a dangerous extraction method that poses immense health and safety risks to communities living near fracking wells, harming both the climate and drinking water for millions of people.^{5,6}
- Methane is a potent greenhouse gas, with up to 86 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide.⁷
- Biomethane, commonly referred to as “renewable natural gas” (RNG), is still methane and is not a solution to the climate crisis, nor the health impacts associated with burning gas.
- Burning methane indoors generates byproducts known to be harmful to human health, including nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. These pollutants have been shown to cause or exacerbate respiratory conditions, including asthma, in children, the elderly, those with underlying health conditions, low-income, and Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) communities.⁸
- The dangerous health and safety impacts of gas—from extraction to compromised indoor air quality from gas stoves—fall disproportionately on low-income and BIPOC communities.^{6,8}
- Each year in the US there are massive and often fatal accidents involving gas explosions. An October 2016 gas explosion in Northwest Portland injured eight people and caused \$17.2 million in property damages.²

Given these facts, governments have a strong policy rationale for restricting new gas infrastructure and legislating a rapid and just transition toward electric and other non-greenhouse gas-emitting alternatives in new and existing buildings. Efforts must be taken to allocate resources for electrifying low-income households that cannot afford to replace gas appliances, as well as sharing information on how to mitigate the health impacts of gas stoves while the transition occurs. Renters and low-income homeowners must be protected from costs passed on to customers as NW Natural’s consumer base declines, and prevented from displacement as a result of energy efficient upgrades.^{10,11} Allowing disinformation to delay or prevent evidence-based decision-making will result in enormous costs to human health, higher utility bills, stranded assets, and further harm to our climate.

The undersigned 64 organizations contributed to and/or support the findings in this report to ensure that elected officials, community and business leaders, journalists, and the broader public are equipped with knowledge to safeguard our climate and the health and safety of our communities. Members of the undersigned organizations stand together to promote building electrification and counter recent misleading claims by NW Natural and others seeking to prolong and expand the use of methane gas.

This report was compiled during a time Washingtonians and Oregonians may never forget. Just days after Oregon legislators passed groundbreaking climate justice legislation, shaped and championed by grassroots environmental justice groups across the state, a heat dome settled over the Pacific Northwest claiming hundreds of lives, while desert-like winds dried out our forests. The record-setting Bootleg Fire and a dozen others followed. “Business as usual” has dire consequences and it’s time to make

important policy choices, including dramatically refocusing our infrastructure resources. Research supports rapid building electrification as an affordable way to help meet Oregon and Washington's carbon reduction goals and keep our communities healthy and safe.

Rapid Electrification of Residential & Commercial Buildings is the Clear Path Forward

Numerous major studies examining alternative methods for meeting our climate goals all reach the same conclusion: utilizing clean electricity rather than fossil gas for heating is the most effective and lowest-cost pathway to decarbonize our built environment. Many of these studies compare multiple scenarios for building decarbonization including scenarios that assumed high use of RNG within the gas distribution system. In every case, the high building electrification scenarios were found to be a lower cost and more effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Below is a list of recent studies with key findings describing the advantages of electrification over gas for heating in buildings.

UC Davis Western Cooling Efficiency Center (April 2021), Greenhouse Gas Emission Forecasts for Electrification of Space Heating in Residential Homes in the United States


This study modeled the 15-year greenhouse gas emissions and lifecycle impacts resulting from replacing a natural gas furnace with an electric heat pump in single-family homes in various climatic regions across the US. It utilized the most sophisticated projections available for long-run marginal emissions rates for electricity in each region and included emissions from methane leakage in gas distributions systems as well as methane combustion in the home and estimates for leakage of refrigerants. Over a 15-year period, heat pumps for residential space heating were found to reduce global warming emissions by 70% to 85% compared to high efficiency gas furnaces in the Pacific region.¹²

Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI) (October 2020), All-Electric New Homes: A Win for the Climate and the Economy

RMI compared construction costs for new all-electric versus mixed fuel (fossil gas plus electric) single-family homes in seven cities. It also modeled lifetime greenhouse gas emissions for each scenario.

“The new all-electric, single-family home has a lower net present cost than the new mixed-fuel home in every city we studied: Austin, TX; Boston, MA; Columbus, OH; Denver, CO; Minneapolis, MN; New York City, NY; and Seattle, WA.”

“The all-electric home results in substantial carbon emissions savings over the mixed-fuel home in all cities. The greatest



savings are found in Seattle (93%) and New York City (81%). Minneapolis, Columbus, Boston, and Austin all save more than 50% over the lifetime of the equipment compared with the mixed-fuel home.”³

Sierra Club (April 2020), New Analysis: Heat Pumps Slow Climate Change in Every Corner of the Country

In this study, the Sierra Club conducted a detailed analysis of the current and future electricity grid and assessed the impact of converting homes heated by gas to electricity in every state.

“Our analysis demonstrates that, while states with more ambitious clean energy deployment benefit the most, advanced electric appliances like heat pumps installed today will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in every state over the next 10 years of the appliance’s life.”

“In fact, for the average house, installing electric heat pumps in place of a gas furnace and gas water heater will reduce heating emissions more than 45 percent over the next 10 years.”¹³

Evolved Energy Research (December 2020), Washington State Energy Strategy Decarbonization Modeling Final Report

This research updated the Northwest Deep Decarbonization Pathways model with current cost and technology information. It examined multiple scenarios to achieve Washington State’s 100% clean electricity grid target as well as its 2030, 2040, and 2050 greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets including both electrification of buildings and continued use of methane gas and decarbonized gas for heating.

“Electrification of buildings lowers costs over retaining gas use – long-term benefits of avoiding the need for clean gas: 0.2% of GDP savings annually in Electrification case vs. Gas in Buildings case by 2050.”¹⁴

American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE) (October 2020), Electrifying Space Heating in Existing Commercial Buildings: Opportunities and Challenges

ACEEE explored the greenhouse gas emission reduction opportunities and the expected payback periods for converting space heating and central boiler/chiller systems from fossil gas to electric heat pumps in commercial buildings across the United States.

“The electrification opportunities we examined could reduce total commercial-sector site energy use in the portion of the commercial building stock we analyzed by about 37% and greenhouse gas emissions by about 44%.”

“Buildings with the best paybacks are more likely to be located in the southern United States and the Pacific region...”¹⁵

California Energy Commission, Energy Research and Development Division (April 2020), Final Project Report: The Challenge of Retail Gas in California’s Low-Carbon Future

This study evaluated scenarios that achieved an 80% reduction in California’s greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 from 1990 levels, focusing on the implications of achieving these climate goals for gas customers and the gas system.

“In all the long-term GHG reduction scenarios evaluated here, electrification of buildings, and particularly the use of electric heat pumps for space and water heating, leads to lower energy bills for customers over the long term than the use of renewable natural gas. Likewise, building electrification lowers the total societal cost of meeting California’s long-term climate goals.”

“Building electrification is found to improve outdoor air quality and public health outcomes...”⁴

Energy and Environmental Economics (E3) (April 2019), Residential Building Electrification in California

This study evaluated the consumer economics, greenhouse gas savings, and grid-impacts of electrification in residential low-rise buildings across six representative home types in six climate zones in California. Consumer economics were evaluated in three ways, by comparing: 1) upfront installed capital costs, 2) energy bills, and 3) lifecycle savings between gas-fired and electric technologies.

“Electrification is found to reduce total greenhouse gas emissions in single family homes by ~30% - 60% in 2020, relative to a natural gas-fueled home. As the carbon intensity of the grid decreases over time, these savings are estimated to increase to ~80% - 90% by 2050, including the impacts of upstream methane leakage and refrigerant gas leakage from air conditioners and heat pumps.”

“All-electric new construction is expected to be lower cost than gas-fueled new construction homes in homes that have air conditioning, resulting in lifecycle savings of \$130 - \$540/year. These findings are based on commonly available technology, without incentives or intervening policies.”

“87% of the simulated single family retrofit homes (all of which are assumed to have air conditioning) see lifecycle savings from switching from a gas furnace and air conditioner to an electric heat pump HVAC system”.¹⁶

Synapse Energy Economics Inc. (October 2018), Decarbonization of Heating Energy Use in California Buildings

This report focused on electrification as one of the major pathways for building decarbonization in California.

“Renewable gas produced from decay of wastes in sources like landfills or digesters, and other bio-energy and synthetic options for zero- or low-emission combustible fuels, are important parts of a cost-effective solution to California’s climate challenges. Their contribution comes in part through the need to capture methane from biogenic sources such as dairies and landfills.


However, their limited availability and high cost limit them to be a piece of the solution, not a wholesale alternative to large-scale electrification of the building sector.”

“Residents that choose electric space heating, water heating, or all-electric homes will substantially reduce the GHG emissions from their energy use, and that reduction will increase over time as California’s electric grid decarbonizes”.¹⁷

UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation (November 2019), California Building Decarbonization Workforce Needs and Recommendations

This study estimated the potential employment impacts of electrifying buildings to achieve California’s climate goals.

“In total, building electrification in California could support an average of 64,200 - 104,100 [additional] jobs annually, after accounting for losses in the gas industry”.¹⁸



Cumulatively, these reports leave no doubt that electrification is a superior and more cost-effective solution for building decarbonization across the US and specifically in the Pacific Northwest. Further expansion of methane gas infrastructure is inconsistent with these findings and, in fact, it is essential for our region to consider strategies for scaling back existing gas infrastructure, in a way that supports our most vulnerable neighbors.

It is critical that this transition is just and equitable, leaving no one behind. As the use of gas declines and NW Natural’s customer base shrinks, without a well-planned transition, costs may shift to remaining customers.¹⁰ Low-income households—who are least able to afford increased rates—must

not be left to shoulder these higher costs. Cities such as Portland and Seattle have implemented green building and sustainability projects that have not only failed to benefit all residents but have resulted in gentrification and displacement, undermining the success of these efforts.^{19, 20} To ensure that the wide array of benefits of electrification extend to all residents, a just transition must encompass housing stability and anti-displacement, and center the leadership of people with low incomes, BIPOC, and renters.^{21, 22}

Methane Gas – Trying to Stay Relevant in a Decarbonizing World

The Northwest's Gas Supply Comes Primarily from Fracking



The majority of the Northwest's methane gas supply comes from the extraction process of hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," explaining why many people in the region use the term "fracked gas" as a more accurate name than "natural gas." Fracked gas is a fossil fuel with tremendous health, safety, climate, and economic impacts. The process of fracking has led to earthquakes and puts drinking water at risk. Fracking causes economic losses and human suffering through toxic contamination of air, land, and water; human-caused and natural disasters; displacement of economic activities such as fishing, recreation, and tourism; desecration of culturally and historically significant sites; loss of habitat and despoliation of the environment; and

dramatic increases to greenhouse gas emissions in our energy supply. All of these deleterious effects are associated directly or indirectly with increased sickness and death in affected communities.⁶ These impacts disproportionately affect Black, Indigenous, People of Color, rural, and low-income communities, as documented by the Concerned Health Professionals of New York and Physicians for Social Responsibility:

"Studies consistently show that Black, Indigenous, Hispanic, rural, and impoverished white communities bear the brunt of exposures to toxic waste and fossil fuel-derived air pollution. These patterns extend to fracking and its infrastructure. In multiple regions where fracking is practiced, well pads and associated infrastructure are disproportionately sited in non-white, indigenous, or low-income communities. A 2019 analysis of socio-demographic characteristics of people living close to drilling and fracking operations in the states of Colorado, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Texas found strong evidence that minorities, especially African Americans, disproportionately live near fracking wells."⁶

“Renewable Natural Gas,” or RNG, usually refers to methane captured in landfills, large animal farms, and other methane-generating facilities. Hydrogen is sometimes produced using fracked gas, and it can be produced using other sources as well. As we describe in detail below, according to reports from Oregon, Washington, and industry observers, fracked gas will remain the dominant source of methane gas in our system for the foreseeable future. RNG will likely comprise only a small portion of our region’s overall gas supply, possibly one-fifth in a best-case scenario.²³ Recent Energy Information Administration data indicate that roughly two-thirds of the Northwest region’s gas comes from fracking, and the proportion is likely to increase over time as fracking wells replace conventionally produced gas in the market.²⁴ Accordingly, most of the gas we use in Oregon and Southwest Washington will continue to be sourced from fracking until we transition away from the use of gas entirely.

When state and local governing bodies incentivize gas infrastructure expansion or offer special treatment to this form of polluting fossil energy, they are investing in or “locking in” a carbon-based energy system that delays inevitable and essential renewable energy upgrades.²⁴ Projects that lock in gas infrastructure are also locking in all the water and air pollution created by the fracked gas production and transmission process. Research from the Green Energy Institute and other experts shows that locking in fracked gas poses a tremendous risk to decarbonization efforts. Ultimately, quitting fracked gas and methane will be essential to a clean energy transition.²⁵

Gas System Leaks Make Fracked Gas Carbon Impacts Similar to Coal

Until recently, the carbon emissions from producing and burning methane gas have been considered to be lower than emissions from burning coal. More and more research into the true extent of methane leaks from production, transmission, distribution, gas meters, and even the final stage of use in homes and buildings, has shown that leakage is much higher than previously thought and higher than the US EPA has reported.

Since unburned methane has a dramatically higher impact on global warming than burned methane, even a small increase in unburned methane due to distribution leakage significantly increases the carbon intensity of fossil gas. A recent report called *The Gas Index*²⁶ compiled data from multiple studies measuring gas system leakage in 71 cities across the US and leakage data from major production sites within the US. While the EPA estimates system leakage to be less than 2%, the study concludes that leakage rates for commercial and residential applications are more than twice that estimate. Leakage from the residential and commercial gas system in Portland, Oregon, was found to be nearly 3 times higher than the EPA estimates, and far higher than the national average despite the claim by NW Natural to have “one of the tightest, lowest emitting systems in the nation.”²⁷

Scientists estimate that a gas system that leaks unburned methane at rates higher than 2.7% will have the same global warming impact as burning coal.²⁸ The Gas Index reports that national leakage rates for residential and commercial gas systems average over 4%. In Portland, Oregon, the leakage rate is

reported at over 5.5%. These leakage rates mean that burning fossil gas to heat homes and buildings in Oregon is as bad as or potentially worse than burning coal.²⁶

“Renewable Natural Gas” and Green Hydrogen are Not Viable Replacements for Gas in Buildings


Background on “Renewable Natural Gas” and Green Hydrogen

Renewable natural gas (RNG) and green hydrogen are often held up by the fossil gas industry as green fuels that will one day replace the gas used in homes, buildings, and transportation across the US. While most experts agree that green hydrogen and RNG have a role in achieving full decarbonization — particularly in hard-to-decarbonize sectors — the use of gas in homes and buildings is not one of those applications. Exaggerating the potential of these fuels is a political strategy employed by the gas industry to allow for the continued expansion of gas infrastructure, muddying the water on electrification and greenwashing the industry’s anti-environmental lobbying efforts.

Renewable Natural Gas Cannot Meet Energy Demand and is not Cost-effective

The gas industry is actively developing RNG projects using agricultural and other forms of waste, but the potential of this technology is extremely limited. A 2018 Oregon Department of Energy Renewable Natural Gas Inventory report to the Oregon legislature found that in the best-case scenario, RNG could only replace about one fifth of the state’s current gas demand and even that amount is largely dependent on technology that is not currently operational in the US. Studies conducted in Washington²² and California³⁰ have come to similar conclusions. Limited availability alone makes RNG infeasible as a replacement for current fracked gas consumption.

Despite the Oregon Department of Energy’s conclusion that RNG is not a viable replacement for methane gas, the 2018 report²³ is often cited by NW Natural. This study found that, *theoretically*, RNG has the potential to generate 22.1% of Oregon’s 2018 natural gas use via anaerobic digestion (4.6%) and thermal gasification (17.5%).



However, to achieve this output, significant logistical, economic, and technological barriers would need to be overcome. Barriers for generating methane through anaerobic digestion at manure lagoons, landfills, or sewage treatment plants, etc. include the distance of agricultural operations from pipe infrastructure, high costs, and a lack of guaranteed supply. In addition, incentives to utilize some of these sources could lead to perverse outcomes, such as favoring soil-depleting industrial agriculture or causing food waste to be sent to landfills instead of compost facilities. The process of “thermal gasification” entails using energy to turn agriculture and commercial forest harvest residues into methane but, currently, there are no commercial thermal gasification plants in the US. The report states, “Once technical obstacles are overcome, thermal gasification could produce about 17.5% of annual natural gas use.” In other words, the vast majority (nearly 80%) of the potential for RNG in Oregon relies on technology that, according to the Oregon Department of Energy, is not commercially available and would require significant research efforts to “bring down the cost of conversion.”²³

NW Natural has misrepresented the top-line findings of this report by asserting that RNG has the real potential to replace all current residential gas consumption (which makes up a little less than 20% of all methane used in Oregon). Even an industry-influenced study by the international management consultant firm ICF found that, nationally, RNG could meet at most 16% of current gas demand.³¹ Furthermore, most authorities agree that our limited RNG resources should not be wasted on residential use, which can be easily and cost-effectively electrified.³²

Instead, the limited quantities of RNG that can be produced must be saved for hard-to-electrify sectors, such as marine, aviation, and industry. A Rocky Mountain Institute report emphasized that allocating RNG to homes and buildings would be a grievous misuse of a resource that could be critical in decarbonizing heavy industry.³³ Wise allocation of RNG is essential if Oregon is to achieve economy-wide emissions reductions in line with a trajectory to limit warming to 1.5°C or even 2°C.

Even if the fundamental issue of RNG availability were solved, renewable natural gas is very expensive to produce. As the Sightline Institute reported in March 2021,

“Today, a million BTUs (MMBTU) of natural gas costs \$3.67. According to a 2019 study prepared for the American Gas Foundation, about 44 percent of prospective RNG projects can be developed at a cost of \$7 to \$20 per MMBTU, with a median cost among those of approximately \$18. The remaining 56 percent of potential projects exceed \$20 per MMBTU. Many of the lowest-cost RNG projects (those developed from waste streams that are large, centrally contained, and conveniently located near existing pipelines) have for the most part already been developed. What remains are the costlier projects: smaller facilities farther away from pipelines, and biomass that is dispersed and therefore costly to gather and process.”³⁴

Green Hydrogen is Incompatible with Existing Gas Pipelines

Contrary to what the gas industry states, green hydrogen is also not the answer. Producing hydrogen is expensive and energy intensive.³⁵ While green hydrogen does have potential applications as a means to store renewable energy, it cannot be transported through existing gas lines in meaningful quantities. According to a report from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, hydrogen can only be added

to natural gas at 5-15% before it becomes incompatible with existing gas infrastructure, weakening pipeline integrity.³⁶ According to the US Department of Energy's Hydrogen Program Plan, additional research and development is needed to address issues such as mixing requirements, materials issues, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions, and other combustion-related phenomena.³⁷

While burning hydrogen does not produce greenhouse gas emissions, the combustion of green hydrogen in buildings emits NO_x,³⁵ exacerbating many of the indoor air quality threats currently posed by gas use in buildings, as discussed in the following section. These emissions also pollute air and water, and negatively impact human health.^{38,39} Pollution concerns specifically connected to green hydrogen were reported by the Union of Concerned Scientists in December 2020,

“When hydrogen is combusted (as opposed to being used in a fuel cell), it can generate significant NO_x emissions, commensurate with that of natural gas combustion—or worse. While hydrogen can be carbon-free, an oft-overlooked fact is that unless dedicated NO_x-mitigation research is advanced and combustion improvements made, hydrogen combustion may not be pollution free, unacceptably risking a further perpetuation of pollution harms.”³⁵


For these reasons, mixing hydrogen into existing methane distribution lines is not a practical, cost-effective, or safe solution to building decarbonization.

Methane Significantly Impacts Health and Indoor Air Quality

Methane Appliances Cause Hazardous Indoor Air Quality, Impacting Public Health and Perpetuating Environmental Injustice

While NW Natural denies that natural gas appliances cause hazardous indoor air quality, it is an accepted fact that the combustion of fossil fuels, including gas, emits pollutants including nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter into both indoor and outdoor air. Two comprehensive reviews, one conducted jointly by Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Rocky Mountain Institute, Mothers Out Front, and the Sierra Club and the other by researchers at the UCLA Fielding School of Public Health analyzed peer reviewed studies concluding that the pollutants emitted by gas burning stoves and ovens in residential homes are, in fact, harmful to health, especially the health of children, the elderly, those with underlying health conditions, and vulnerable minority and low income communities.^{8, 40}

Both the World Health Organization and the Canadian government have established indoor air pollution standards. Despite the fact that most Americans spend at least 90% of their time indoors, the US has not set similar standards.⁸ Research on indoor air pollution shows that concentrations of many pollutants in homes and buildings are often higher than outdoor air pollutants.^{8, 41}



Cooking food itself produces certain air pollutants, especially particulate matter. Combustion of gas from stoves and ovens produces additional NO_x and carbon monoxide. Average nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels are approximately 50% to over 400% higher in homes with gas rather than electric cookstoves,⁴² especially where individuals live in smaller homes and cook for longer periods of time. In addition, poorly maintained gas stoves are more likely to emit elevated levels of carbon monoxide.⁸

In many instances, the short- and long-term NO₂ levels in homes with gas stoves exceed outdoor EPA air quality limits, which, in turn are higher and less stringent than the indoor air quality guidelines issued by the World Health Organization and Health Canada (as stated above, there are no

indoor guidelines issued by the US EPA).⁴¹ In other words – cooking with gas can lead to levels of indoor air pollution, which, if outdoors, would exceed legal limits.

Numerous Scientific Studies Confirm the Negative Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health

In its communications with policy makers, NW Natural dismisses the UCLA report entitled “The Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health”⁴⁰ because they said “it collected no new information.”⁴³ However, a literature review is not only a commonly-accepted scientific publication, it is recognized as an extremely valuable resource. This particular report reviewed data from more than 300 publications and government reports as well as conducting its own analyses to draw its conclusions.⁴⁰

NW Natural quoted a line from the UCLA study out of context, implying that the authors’ statement about “data paucity” somehow made their conclusions invalid. However, with regard to data limitations, the authors stated, “particularly for conducting future quantitative analyses with regard to equity, the development of additional, publicly available databases to include more detailed and higher spatial resolution data would be a significant asset.”⁴⁰ In other words, the authors were challenging entities to collect higher quality data to enable further analyses of equity factors related to gas appliances and air quality.


NW Natural also stated that the UCLA study “focused primarily on misuse of equipment or improper

ventilation, issues not generally relevant in today's homes. Current Oregon mechanical code requires vent hoods that exhaust to the outdoors for all cooktops, ranges and stoves – electric or gas.”⁴³ In truth, misuse of equipment and improper ventilation is a minor part of the UCLA report; it provides data from California confirming the health impacts of elevated pollutants from gas appliances (CO, NO₂ and NO_x), and the disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations. It also uses an equity lens to qualitatively assess the vulnerability of specific populations' exposure to indoor air pollution from gas appliance usage.⁴⁰

Furthermore, while it is true that Oregon's current mechanical code requires vent hoods for all cooktops, ranges, and stoves, this doesn't mean that homes in Oregon are properly ventilated. 54% of homes in Oregon were built before 1978 and may or may not comply with code.⁴⁴ A study of 1,000 California homes describes real-world hood configurations that impact efficacy. Only 17% of homes cooking with natural gas had hoods that covered all burners.⁴⁵ Not all range hoods are equally effective, as performance varies with installation location and duct route, and many are not as effective as advertised.⁴⁶ In addition, the UCLA study notes that fewer than 35-54% of households actually use their range hoods while cooking.⁴⁰

NW Natural's statements imply that the combustion of gas indoors is not harmful as long as it is properly ventilated. Even if buildings are vented and functioning exactly as designed, pollutants are still being emitted indoors and out. In fact, a recent Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health study estimates that 3,000-4,200 people died as a result of health impacts from residential gas use in 2017 alone.⁴⁷ Based on this study, in Oregon burning fossil fuels in buildings was responsible for 20 premature deaths and over \$2 billion in health costs in 2017, of which 89% were from the combustion of gas. This is a conservative estimate because it only includes the health impacts from outdoor PM 2.5 pollution.

NW Natural bases its claim that “gas does not cause hazardous indoor air quality” on a single 2013 study by Wong et al. which found no association between gas cook stoves and asthma in children.⁴⁸ However, this study is not a good model to examine the safety of cooking with methane. The study was actually designed to investigate whether cooking with open fires, burning wood, and other biomass products was associated with asthma in children. In addition, the study had methodological issues in that participants may have inadvertently misclassified their cooking fuel (i.e. liquefied petroleum gas vs. methane), which reduces the power of this study to find any ill effects.



In contrast to this single study, a 2013 meta-analysis by Lin et al., published in the *International Journal of Epidemiology*, analyzed data from 41 studies.⁴⁹ The goal of this meta-analysis was to update a

1992, 11-study meta-analysis by Hasselblad et al. which concluded that children exposed to a long-term increase of 15 ppb NO₂ indoors suffer a 20% increase in respiratory illness risk.⁵⁰ This early quantitative analysis became a benchmark study for the relationship between indoor NO₂ and respiratory illness in children, and an important reference for the outdoor NO₂ Air Quality Guideline value established by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1997 and confirmed in 2005. Lin et al.'s findings supported those of the earlier study:

“Our meta-analyses suggest that children living in a home with gas cooking have a 42% increased risk of having current asthma, a 24% increased risk of lifetime asthma and an overall 32% increased risk of having current and lifetime asthma; per 15 ppb increase in indoor NO₂ level, children have a 15% increased risk of having current wheeze. In summary, this meta-analysis provides quantitative evidence that gas cooking increases the risk of asthma in children, and indoor NO₂ increases the risk of current wheeze in children.”⁴²

In a 2013 study in *Epidemiology* entitled, “Household Levels of Nitrogen Dioxide and Pediatric Asthma Severity,” Belanger et al. concluded that “Asthmatic children exposed to NO₂ indoors, at levels well below the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency outdoor standard (53 ppb), are at risk for increased asthma morbidity.”⁵¹ Risks are not confined to children in the inner city, but also occur at NO₂ concentrations common in urban and suburban homes. The study, involving more than 1,342 patients, found that:

“Every 5-fold increase in NO₂ exposure above a threshold of 6 ppb was associated with a dose-dependent increase in risk of higher asthma severity score (odds ratio = 1.37 [95% confidence interval = 1.01–1.89]), wheeze (1.49 [1.09–2.03]), night symptoms (1.52 [1.16–2.00]), and rescue medication use (1.78 [1.33–2.38]).”⁵¹

These studies clearly link the ordinary use of gas stoves with harm to human health, especially children. NW Natural’s casual dismissal of scientific research shows a callous indifference to the well-being of its customers.

NW Natural’s Claim that Gas Cooking is Safe Relies on Outdated and Irrelevant Reports

NW Natural has stated that: “Neither the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) nor the Federal Interagency Committee on Indoor [Air] Quality identify gas-fired cooking appliances as having a significant negative effect on indoor air quality.”⁴³ In support of this statement, they reference an undated EPA publication with latest reference from 1993 entitled “Indoor Air Pollution: An Introduction for Health Professionals.”⁵² In contrast to NW Natural’s claims, this EPA publication actually identifies significant impacts of common gas stove pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) on respiratory health. For instance, the section on NO₂ states the following:

“Recent studies indicate that low-level NO₂ exposure may cause increased bronchial reactivity in some asthmatics, decreased lung function in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and an increased risk of respiratory infections, especially in young children.”⁵²

While indoor air pollution research has come a long way in the nearly 30 years since that EPA report was published, the American Lung Association still lists the following range of harmful pulmonary effects caused by NO₂ emissions from indoor combustion:⁵³

- Increased inflammation of the airways;
- Worsened cough and wheezing;
- Reduced lung function;
- Increased asthma attacks; and
- Greater likelihood of emergency department and hospital admissions.

The EPA publication also discussed the role of carbon monoxide as an asphyxiant (i.e. can cause death due to lack of oxygen):

“The elderly, the fetus, and persons with cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases are particularly sensitive to elevated CO levels. Tissues with the highest oxygen needs -- myocardium, brain, and exercising muscle -- are the first affected. Studies involving controlled exposure have also shown that CO exposure shortens time to the onset of angina in exercising individuals with ischemic heart disease and decreases exercise tolerance in those with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).”⁵²

In a section entitled “Health problems caused by other combustion products (stoves, space heaters, furnaces, fireplaces),” the EPA report lists the following signs and symptoms:

- Dizziness or headache;
- Confusion;
- Nausea/emesis;
- Fatigue;
- Tachycardia;
- Eye and upper respiratory tract irritation;
- Wheezing/bronchial constriction;
- Persistent cough;
- Elevated blood carboxyhemoglobin levels; and
- Increased frequency of angina in persons with coronary heart disease.⁵²

NW Natural’s statement that gas-fired cooking appliances “do not have a significant negative effect on indoor air quality”⁴³ is not supported by the publication they cite. As explained above, the EPA publication⁵² actually *confirms* the harmful health effects of gas appliances.

Exposure to Indoor Air Pollution from Burning Methane is an Issue of Health and Environmental Justice

In their 2018 Climate Change and Health Report, the Oregon Health Authority concluded that the “communities more affected by air pollution are communities of color and low-income households, who already bear a disproportionate burden of disease in Oregon.”⁵⁴ These communities include people with existing illnesses, people with disabilities, older adults, mothers, infants and children, indigenous peoples, immigrants, refugees, linguistically isolated, and communities of color. The connection between exposure to air pollution and the increased risk of heart disease, stroke, respiratory disease, and cancer – four of the top five leading causes of death in Oregon – is well established, as is air pollution’s disproportionate effect on communities of color and low-income communities.

According to a 2017 report jointly published by the NAACP and Clean Air Task Force:

“More than 1 million African Americans live within a half mile of existing natural gas facilities and the number is growing every year. As a result, many African American communities face an elevated risk of cancer due to air toxics emissions from natural gas development: over 1 million African Americans live in counties that face a cancer risk above EPA’s level of concern from toxics emitted by natural gas facilities.”⁵⁵

COVID-19 death rates have also been associated with fossil-fuel air pollutants, including PM 2.5, NO₂, ozone, and formaldehyde.^{56,57,58} These rates are 49% higher in places with a high Black population.⁵⁵

Low-income and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities are at much greater risk of harm from indoor pollution caused by gas stoves and ovens. Members of these communities are disproportionately renters and have no control over the quality of, or fuel used in their appliances, which are often older, poorly maintained, and not adequately ventilated. Frequently, people in these communities occupy smaller living spaces and experience overcrowding, resulting in increased use of appliances and the potential for increased concentrations of indoor pollutants. Finally, individuals have greater exposure to the products of gas combustion when they use gas ovens for home heating.⁸ In Multnomah County, there is a strong correlation between air pollution and asthma, with the highest rates in low-income and BIPOC communities.^{59,60} The average rate of asthma is 11% in Oregon and 10% in Multnomah County but is much higher (>14%) among those who earn less than \$20,000 per year or who are on the Oregon Health Plan.⁶¹

The impacts of our methane use are not just experienced locally. Frontline communities (those living adjacent to any part of the fracked gas extraction cycle) experience increased exposure to contaminated air, water, and soils. The process of methane extraction itself causes increased illnesses in nearby communities and contaminates surface and groundwater. Transportation of methane gas through pipelines, and burning it as fuel increases emissions of methane, and exacerbates climate disruption, with the worst health and economic impacts borne by frontline communities.⁶² Our use of gas in

Oregon puts all communities that are located adjacent to extraction, processing, and transportation sites at greater risk.

Creating an equitable energy future depends on much more than switching fuels. The Emerald Cities Collaborative⁶³ and The Greenlining Institute⁶⁴ offer valuable resources that lay out key questions and steps to use when planning and implementing electrification. These tools help to grow energy democracy, center human rights, and ensure that low income and BIPOC people, neighborhoods, and communities are not further disenfranchised in terms of health, jobs, housing, energy costs, and political power.

Methane Gas is a Threat to Public Safety

Transporting Gas in Any Form is Dangerous

NW Natural states that, according to the US Department of Transportation, pipelines are the safest form of methane gas transportation.⁴³ NW Natural argues that methane gas is safe by attempting to redefine safety. Transporting gas via pipelines may be safer than transporting gas via vessel, rail, or truck, but pipelines still pose major risks to our communities. For example, in the last three years, the US has averaged 76 “significant incidents” per year in gas distribution lines, which are defined to “include a fatality, or an injury requiring overnight, in-patient hospitalization, or \$50,000 or more in total costs.”⁶⁵

Portland residents experienced one such incident in 2016, when an explosion in northwest Portland caused multiple injuries and approximately \$17 million in damages.² This tally of “significant incidents” does not include leaks, leading to evacuations like the one experienced by northwest Portland business owners and residents in early 2021, when NW Natural discontinued service and cleared a multiple block area to manage a major natural gas leak.⁶⁶ NW Natural’s own safety report identifies the following safety concerns and “highest ranking threats” to its distribution system: excavation damage; material, weld, or joint failure; and equipment failure.⁶⁷ Should NW Natural introduce hydrogen into pipelines as planned, it would further exacerbate existing safety concerns, due to the highly corrosive and flammable nature of this fuel.⁶⁸

In addition, drawing attention away from real safety concerns related to transportation, NW Natural attempts similar misdirection when offering another example of safety — namely, that natural gas ranges cause fewer kitchen fires than electric ranges. Again, this narrow focus disregards not only the other types of fires associated with gas,⁶⁹ but also the myriad risks that methane presents during its lifecycle.

Other methane-related risks surround fracking⁶, storage,⁷⁰ leaking/poisoning,⁷¹ and combustion. In addition to the everyday impacts to indoor air quality, and the routine leakages and explosions discussed above, NW Natural stores and transports methane gas through areas where pipelines are at high risk of rupturing during the impending Cascadia subduction zone earthquake.⁷² (See the 2021 joint study by the City of Portland’s Bureau of Development Services and Multnomah County to

quantify these risks in detail.)⁷³

Finally, continued reliance on methane gas exacerbates the many safety concerns attending a planet destabilized by climate change, including safety issues related to increased fires, smoke, drought, heat waves, flooding, food insecurity, and more.⁷⁴ To summarize, NW Natural's narrow focus on the potential dangers of other means of transporting gas misleadingly side-steps pipeline safety issues and ignores the sweeping consequences of continued methane gas use and development.

Methane Gas and Extreme Weather and Fire Events

NW Natural has run advertisements implying that if customers have natural gas in their homes, they will be less affected by extreme weather.^{75,76} In truth, most home heating systems and other gas appliances require electricity to ignite pilot lights and, as such, may not function in the event of power outages. Outages also impact the function of essential ventilation systems, which, as discussed, are critical to mitigating the worst impacts of gas combustion on indoor air quality. Insufficient ventilation concentrates pollutants from gas appliances, exposing families to noxious fumes and associated health impacts.

Oregon's 2020 wildfire season increased awareness about gas stoves and indoor air quality. As the climate crisis progresses and our region experiences hazardous air quality from more frequent summer wildfires, gas stoves are a significant liability. On hazardous air quality days, the EPA guidance includes the following: "Avoid activities that create more fine particles indoors, including smoking cigarettes or using gas, propane or wood-burning stoves and furnaces."⁷⁷ On these hazardous air-quality days it is dangerous to open windows or run fans as recommended while cooking with gas. This means that the primary way to decrease the indoor air pollution of gas stoves is no longer available during periods of hazardous air quality.

The devastating Texas storms of 2021 led to massive grid failures, and despite what the fossil fuel industry would have us believe, renewable energy infrastructure did not lead to the outages. According to the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT), which operates the state's power grid, "while some wind turbines did freeze, failures in natural gas, coal and nuclear energy systems were responsible for nearly twice as many outages as renewables."⁷⁸ Experts agree, the solution for extreme weather events (climate-driven or otherwise) is a more resilient grid and greater investments into emergency energy storage, decentralized renewable energy generation (i.e. rooftop solar), and housing retrofits to increase energy efficiency, insulation, and climate resilience, *not* more explosive gas infrastructure.

Continuing to Build Gas Infrastructure is Inconsistent with Oregon's Climate Goals

Gas in buildings is one of the fastest growing sources of emissions in Oregon⁷⁹ and is directly at odds with Governor Brown's 2020 Executive Order,⁸⁰ the 100% Clean Energy for All standard passed in the

Oregon State Legislature in June 2021,⁸¹ and the best available science on mitigating the climate crisis. Decarbonizing the electricity grid, combined with aggressive building electrification and energy storage, is the primary path toward reducing emissions in Oregon’s built environment.⁸²

Oregon has the fastest timeline to eliminate greenhouse gas emissions from the electric sector in the US, with the goal of reducing emissions 80% below baseline emission levels by 2030, 90% by 2035, and 100% by 2040.⁸¹ As of 2015, Oregon’s overall emissions were 42% above 1990 levels.⁸³ As described in Oregon Senate Bill 98’s RNG plan,⁸⁴ continued pipeline expansion would not decarbonize Oregon’s built environment. The bill set a goal of reaching 30% RNG in Oregon’s methane gas pipelines by 2050. This implies that 70% would still be methane — the greenhouse gas that is up to 86 times more potent than CO₂.⁸⁵

The Gas Industry is Misleading the Public with False Promises of Decarbonization while Opposing Climate Policy at All Levels of Government

NW Natural is currently conducting an advertising campaign, which can be viewed on television and on its “Less We Can” website.⁸⁵ It features images of people riding bikes, planting home gardens, and recycling. It implies that customers can continue to use gas ranges and other gas appliances if they “join [NW Natural] to find more ways to do less;” together, we will achieve “a Low Carbon Pathway for energy.” The “Less We Can” campaign is an example of a gas industry greenwashing strategy claiming to be “saving” carbon emissions and minimizing the harmful effects of its product while NW Natural actually increases its annual carbon emissions as it adds more customers, incentivizes home builders to install gas appliances, and lobbies elected officials at the local, state, and federal level to prevent laws and efficiency standards that reduce emissions.⁸⁶

At the center of the “Less We Can” campaign is NW Natural’s “voluntary carbon savings goal of 30% by 2035.” NW Natural first made this pledge in 2016. A footnote in the NW Natural 2019 Environmental, Social and Governance Report clarifies that “this is an emissions savings goal equivalent to 30% of the carbon emissions from our sales customers’ gas use and company operations from 2015.”²²

A 30% “savings goal” may sound impressive, but to achieve that goal by 2035, NW Natural will only need to “save” approximately 1% of its emissions every year for the next 20 years. As their emissions grow each year due to increased sales of fossil gas, as they have for the past four years, these small annual “savings” add up to an amount equivalent to 30% of the emissions they created in 2015.

In its 2019 Environmental, Social and Governance Report, NW Natural claims that it is “on track to meet or exceed [its] voluntary carbon savings goal of 30% by 2035.”²² The report includes a chart showing annual “savings” achieved for the last 4 years. Roughly half of these “savings” are achieved through energy efficiency measures funded through Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO). The other half are

achieved through biogas “Smart Energy” offsets funded by NW Natural customers who sign up for additional voluntary charges of 10.5 cents per therm. “More than 8% of our customers—about 58,000—are enrolled in the Smart Energy program. In 2019, they funded approximately 160,000 metric tons in emission reductions.”

In effect, these relatively insignificant savings (1% per year) come from NW Natural’s compliance with the state-mandated ETO program and offsets that their customers pay for as an additional charge on their gas usage. Meanwhile NW Natural’s annual gas sales and associated emissions have increased by 18% since making this pledge.²⁷

As more attention is paid to the massive emissions associated with the gas industry, and public desire for regulation grows, the industry is working to ensure not only its survival, but its growth. Recently, NW Natural CEO David Anderson was promoted to Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Gas Association (AGA), the industry group that supports the methane gas industry.⁸⁷ In late 2020, the AGA successfully pressured the US Department of Energy to abandon a proposed efficiency standard for gas furnaces, which would have raised performance from 80% to 92% Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE).⁸⁸ The DOE estimated that this measure would have avoided 143 million metric tons of CO₂ emissions, thousands of tons of other air pollutants, and saved ratepayers \$5.6 to \$21.7 billion in gas utility bills.⁸⁹ The AGA and the gas industry shut down this proposal, which would have made the readily-available condensing gas furnace the new standard and eliminated inefficient older, non-condensing furnaces.²⁰

It is clear that NW Natural and the wider gas industry are making highly misleading statements that make it appear they have “an important role to play in helping our region move toward a low-carbon, renewable energy future.”⁸⁵ Not only are they failing to do something substantive to achieve that future, they are actively and systematically fighting government efforts to reduce carbon emissions.

Conclusion

Gas is now the leading contributor to global fossil fuel carbon emissions increases.²¹ Despite what the fossil fuel industry would have us believe, methane gas has no role in decarbonizing Oregon and Washington’s built environment. Ongoing and expanding gas use is, instead, putting Oregon and Washington’s communities’ health and safety at risk, especially low-income and BIPOC communities. Both public health concerns and climate research support rapid electrification of buildings. Numerous safety concerns, coupled with the recent International Energy Agency report on necessary reductions in methane to address the climate crisis, and the multiple studies comparing methane gas, RNG and building electrification, build a strong case for prohibiting expansion of methane gas infrastructure and beginning to prioritize ways to equitably scale back existing gas infrastructure. It is imperative that all levels of government take decisive action to adopt policies to ensure a just transition to a more healthy, equitable, and electric future.

Endnotes

1. Chung, T., UNEP press release, (May 6, 2021) available at: <https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/press-release/global-assessment-urgent-steps-must-be-taken-reduce-methane>
 2. Bouckaert, S., et al. “Net Zero by 2050: A Roadmap for the Global Energy Sector”, *International Energy Agency* (May 18, 2021), available at: <https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/ad0d4830-bd7e-47b6-838c-40d115733c13/NetZero-by2050-ARoadmapfortheGlobalEnergySector.pdf>
 3. McKenna, C., et al., “All-Electric New Homes: A Win for the Climate and the Economy,” Rocky Mountain Institute, (October 2020) available at <https://rmi.org/all-electric-new-homes-a-win-for-the-climate-and-the-economy/>
 4. Aas, D., et al., “The Challenge of Retail Gas in California’s Low-Carbon Future,” Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. and University of California, Irvine, Advanced Power and Energy Program Engineering Laboratory Facility, Final Project Report to California Energy Commission, (April 2020) available at <https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2019publications/CEC-500-2019-055/CEC-500-2019-055-F.pdf>
 5. US Energy Information Administration, “Hydraulically fractured wells provide two-thirds of U.S. natural gas production.” (May 5, 2016), available at <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=26112>
 6. Concerned Health Professionals of New York, & Physicians for Social Responsibility, (June 2019), “Compendium of scientific, medical, and media findings demonstrating risks and harms of fracking (unconventional gas and oil extraction) (6th ed.),” available at https://concernedhealthny.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Fracking-Science-Compendium_6.pdf
 7. IPCC, Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.) “Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.” (2014), available at <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>
 8. Seals, B. and Krasner, A., “Health Effects from Gas Stove Pollution,” Rocky Mountain Institute, Mothers Out Front, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Sierra Club, (2020) available at <https://rmi.org/insight/gas-stoves-pollution-health>
 9. Oregon Public Utility Commission, (October 19, 2016), “Incident Investigation Report,” available at <https://digsafelyoregon.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/2016-10-19-NWN-Incident-Report-NW-23rd-and-Glisan-RPT.pdf>
- _____ for reference, where the citation editing began is below here _____
10. Davis, L. and Hausman, C., “Who Will Pay for Legacy Utility Costs?” (July 2021). Energy Institute at Haas, available at <https://haas.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/WP317.pdf>
 11. Samarripas, S., and A. Jarrah. “A New Lease on Energy: Guidance for Improving Rental

-
- Housing Efficiency at the Local Level.” Washington, DC: American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. (August 2021), available at <https://www.aceee.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/u2102.pdf>
12. Pistochini, T. (UC Davis Western Cooling Efficiency Center), “Greenhouse Gas Emissions Forecasts for Electrification of Space Heating in Residential Homes in the United States,” NRDC, (April 2021) available at <https://ucdavis.app.box.com/s/dqja4itdlh1wwicyjh6wag5yswwf97tc>
 13. Golden, R. and Bottorff, C., “New Analysis: Heat Pumps Slow Climate Change in Every Corner of the Country,” Sierra Club, (April 2020) available at <https://www.sierraclub.org/articles/2020/04/new-analysis-heat-pumps-slow-climate-change-every-corner-country>
 14. Evolved Energy Research, “Washington State Energy Strategy Decarbonization Modeling Final Report,” (December 2020) available at https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5d8aa5c4ff0274bdbe0c14b9/5febb8918f76059200377570_WA%20SES%20EER%20DDP%20Modeling%20Final%20Report%202012-11-2020.pdf
 15. Nadel, S. and Perry, C., “Electrifying Space Heating in Existing Commercial Buildings: Opportunities and Challenges,” ACEEE, (October 2020) available at <https://www.aceee.org/research-report/b2004>
 16. Mahone, A., et al., “Residential Building Electrification in California,” Energy and Environmental Economics, (April 2019) available at https://www.ethree.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/E3_Residential_Building_Electrification_in_California_April_2019.pdf
 17. Hopkins, A., et al., “Decarbonization of Heating Energy Use in California Buildings,” Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., (October 2018) available at <https://www.synapse-energy.com/sites/default/files/Decarbonization-Heating-CA-Buildings-17-092-1.pdf>
 18. Jones, B., et al., “California Building Decarbonization: Workforce Needs and Recommendations,” UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation, (November, 2019) available at <https://innovation.luskin.ucla.edu/california-building-decarbonization/>
 19. Got Green and Puget Sound Sage. “Our people, our planet, our power.” (2016) available at http://gotgreenseattle.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/OurPeopleOurPlanetOurPower_GotGreen_Sage_Final1.pdf
 20. Rice, J. et al., “Contradictions of the Climate-friendly City: New Perspectives on Eco-Gentrification and Housing Justice.” (2019) International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1468-2427.12740>
 21. Portland Zero Cities Project Report. (2021), available at <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57bf2cf2beba6b692dd3505c/t/5ff258410493bd282756a674/1609717835001/Zero+Cities+Report.pdf>
 22. Gridworks. “California’s Gas System in Transition: Equitable, Affordable, Decarbonized and Smaller.” (September 2019), available at https://gridworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/CA_Gas_System_in_Transition.pdf
-

-
23. Oregon Department of Energy, “Biogas and Renewable Gas Inventory SB334 (2017): 2018 Report to the Oregon Legislature,” (September 2018), available at <https://www.oregon.gov/energy/Data-and-Reports/Documents/2018-RNG-Inventory-Report.pdf>
 24. Sato, I., Elliot, B., Schumer, C., “What is carbon lock-in and how can we avoid it?” World Resources Institute (2021), available at <https://www.wri.org/insights/carbon-lock-in-definition>
 25. Powers, M., Steele, A., Powell, T., Bhargava, A., “Clean Energy Transition: Quitting Fossil Gas.” Lewis & Clark Law School, Green Energy Institute, (April 27, 2021), available at <https://law.lclark.edu/live/news/45927-watch-clean-energy-transition-quitting-fossil-gas>
 26. Inman, M., Grubert, E., Weller, Z., “The Gas Index,” (December 15, 2020) available at <https://thegasindex.org>
 27. NW Natural Holdings, 2019 NW Natural Environmental, Social and Governance Report, (October 6, 2020), available at: http://s3.amazonaws.com/nwnatural/uploads/2019-ESG-Report_FINAL.pdf
 28. Storrow, B., “Methane Leaks Erase Some of the Climate Benefits of Natural Gas,” Scientific American, (May 5, 2020) available at <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/methane-leaks-erase-some-of-the-climate-benefits-of-natural-gas/>
 29. Washington State University Energy Program, “Promoting Renewable Natural Gas in Washington State,” (2018), available at <https://www.commerce.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Energy-Promoting-RNG-in-Washington-State.pdf>
 30. California Energy Commission, “The Challenge of Retail Gas in California’s Low-Carbon Future—Technology Options, Customer Costs and Public Health Benefits of Reducing Natural Gas Use,” (2019) available at <https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2019publications/CEC-500-2019-055/CEC-500-2019-055-F.pdf>
 31. Sheehy, P., et al, “Exploring renewable natural gas as a decarbonization strategy,” (2021) ICF International Inc., available at <https://www.icf.com/insights/energy/renewable-natural-gas-decarbonization-strategy>
 32. Borgeson, M, “A Pipe Dream or Climate Solution? The Opportunities and Limits of Biogas and Synthetic Gas to Replace Fossil Gas,” Issue brief NRDC, (June 15, 2020) available at <https://www.nrdc.org/resources/pipe-dream-or-climate-solution>
 33. Billimoria, S. and Henchman, A., “Regulatory Solutions for Building Decarbonization,” Rocky Mountain Institute, (2020). available at <https://rmi.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Regulatory-Solutions-Framework-Report-070820.pdf>
 34. Feinstein, L. and de Place, E., “The Four Fatal Flaws of Renewable Natural Gas.” The Sightline Institute. (March 9, 2021) available at <https://www.sightline.org/2021/03/09/the-four-fatal-flaws-of-renewable-natural-gas/>
-

-
35. McNamara, J. “What’s the Role of Hydrogen in the Clean Energy Transition?” Union of Concerned Scientists, (December 9, 2020) available at <https://blog.ucsusa.org/julie-mcnamara/whats-the-role-of-hydrogen-in-the-clean-energy-transition/>
 36. Melaina, M. et al. “Blending Hydrogen into Natural Gas Pipelines: A Review of the Issues” *National Renewable Energy Laboratory*. (March 2013) available at <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy13osti/51995.pdf>
 37. US Department of Energy, (November 2020), “DOE Hydrogen Program Plan,” available at <https://www.hydrogen.energy.gov/pdfs/hydrogen-program-plan-2020.pdf#page=28>
 38. Specht, M., “No, Natural Gas Power Plants are not Clean,” Union of Concerned Scientists (2018) available at <https://blog.ucsusa.org/mark-specht/natural-gas-power-plants-are-not-clean>
 39. US Environmental Protection Agency, (2019), “Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) pollution,” available at <https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/basic-information-about-no2#Effects>
 40. Zhu, Y., et al., “Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health in California,” UCLA Fielding School of Public Health Department of Environmental Health Sciences, (2020) available at <https://coeh.ph.ucla.edu/effects-of-residential-gas-appliances-on-indoor-and-outdoor-air-quality-and-public-health-in-california/>
 41. US Environmental Protection Agency, (2020), “The Inside Story: A Guide to Indoor Air Quality,” available at <https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/inside-story-guide-indoor-air-quality>
 42. US Environmental Protection Agency, (2008), “Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) For Oxides Of Nitrogen – Health Criteria (Final Report, July 2008),” available at <https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/isa/recordisplay.cfm?deid=194645>.
 43. Northwest Natural to “Interested Parties.” (May 3, 2021) “Re: Rectification of incorrect claims, information on NW Natural’s decarbonization work, other energy system information.” available at https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EprrhQr7f7nnrNX9Wn_gg0LbwOQZi6LO/view
 44. National Center for Healthy Housing, (2020), “Oregon: State Healthy Housing Fact Sheet.” available at https://nchh.org/resource-library/fact-sheet_state-healthy-housing_or.pdf
 45. Klug, V. and Singer, B., “Characteristics of range hoods in California homes—data collected from a real estate website,” Lawrence Berkley National Lab (2011) available at <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/87b4z3fx>
 46. Singer, B., et al. “Pollutant Removal Efficiency of Residential Cooking Exhaust Hoods,” Department of Energy, Lawrence Berkley National Lab., (2011) available at <https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/1048291>
 47. Buonocore, J.J., et al., “A decade of the U. S. energy mix transitioning away from coal: historical reconstruction of the reductions in the public health burdens of energy,” (2021) *Environmental Research Letters* (2021) available at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/abc74c>
-

-
48. Wong, G., et al. "Cooking fuels and prevalence of asthma: a global analysis of phase three of the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC)." *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, (2013) available at [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanres/article/PIIS2213-2600\(13\)70073-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanres/article/PIIS2213-2600(13)70073-0/fulltext)
 49. Lin, W., et al., "Meta-analysis of the effects of indoor nitrogen dioxide and gas cooking on asthma and wheeze in children," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, (2013), available at <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyt150>
 50. Hasselblad, V., et al., "Synthesis of environmental evidence: nitrogen dioxide epidemiology studies," *J Air Waste Manage Assoc.* (1992) available at <https://doi.org/10.1080/10473289.1992.10467018>
 51. Belanger, K., et al. "Household levels of nitrogen dioxide and pediatric asthma severity," *Epidemiology* (2013) available at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1097%2F00006500-201305000-00002>
 52. American Lung Association, Environmental Protection Agency, Consumer Products Safety Commission, American Medical Association (not dated; website last updated 9/2015; latest reference 1993) "Indoor Air Pollution: An Introduction to Health Professionals," available at <https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/indoor-air-pollution-introduction-health-professionals-printable-version>
 53. American Lung Association, (February 2020), "Nitrogen Dioxide," available at <https://www.lung.org/clean-air/outdoors/what-makes-air-unhealthy/nitrogen-dioxide>
 54. Oregon Health Authority, (November 2018), "Climate Change and Public Health in Oregon," available at <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/HEALTHYENVIRONMENTS/CLIMATECHANGE/Documents/2018/2018-OHA-Climate-and-Health-Policy-Paper.pdf>
 55. Fleischman, L. and Franklin, M., "Fumes across the Fence-Line: The Health Impacts of Air Pollution from Oil & Gas Facilities on African American Communities," NAACP, Clean Air Task Force, (November 2017) available at <http://catf.us/resources/publications/files/FumesAcrossTheFenceLine.pdf>
 56. Petroni, M., et al., "Hazardous air pollutant exposure as a contributing factor to COVID-19 mortality in the United States," *Environmental Research Letters* (2020), available at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/abaf86>
 57. Pozzer, A., et al., "Regional and global contributions of air pollution to risk of death from COVID-19," *Cardiovascular Research*, (1 December 2020) available at <https://doi.org/10.1093/cvr/cvaa288>
 58. Wu, X., et al. "Air pollution and COVID-19 mortality in the United States: Strengths and limitations of an ecological regression analysis." *Science Advances*, (04 Nov 2020) available at <https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/covid-pm/home>
 59. Multnomah County 2014 Report Card on Racial and Ethnic Disparities, (December 2014) available at <https://www.multco.us/file/2014-report-card-racial-and-ethnic-disparities-full-report-v121214pdf-0>
-

-
60. Regional Equity Atlas (date not stated; data from 2010-2012) available at <http://www.equityatlas.org/atlas-maps/asthma-rates>
 61. Oregon Health Authority, (2015-2017), "Tracking Chronic Disease in Oregon," available at <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/DiseasesConditions/ChronicDisease/DataReports/Pages/index.aspx>
 62. Oregon & Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility, "Fracked Gas Infrastructure: A Threat to Healthy Communities," (2019) available at https://www.oregonpsr.org/fracked_gas_a_threat_to_healthy_communities
 63. Emerald Cities Collaborative Report, (2020), "The Building Electrification Equity Project," available at https://nmcdn.io/e186d21f8c7946a19faed23c3da2f0da/9bb11a106d6f43d5ae8118a05a071e96/files/BEE_Report_Final.pdf
 64. The Greenlining Institute, (2019), "Equitable Building Electrification: A Framework for Powering Resilient Communities," available at https://greenlining.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Greenlining_EquitableElectrification_Report_2019_WEB.pdf
 65. US Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), (data as of July 12, 2021), "Gas Distribution Significant Incidents 20 Year Trend," available at https://portal.phmsa.dot.gov/analytics/saw.dll?Portalpages&PortalPath=%2Fshared%2FPDM%20Public%20Website%2F_portal%2FSC%20Incident%20Trend&Page=Significant
 66. OPB Staff, "Portland crews respond to major natural gas leak" (February 16, 2021), OPB, available at <https://www.opb.org/article/2021/02/16/portland-natural-gas-leak/>
 67. Northwest Natural, (September 30, 2020), "2021 Safety Project Plan, Oregon," available at <https://edocs.puc.state.or.us/efdocs/HAQ/um1900haq16950.pdf>
 68. St. John, J., "Green Hydrogen in Natural Gas Pipelines: Decarbonization Solution or Pipe Dream?," Green Tech Media now Wood Mackenzie, (November 30, 2020), available at <https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/green-hydrogen-in-natural-gas-pipelines-decarbonization-solution-or-pipe-dream>
 69. Ahrens, M. and Evarts, Ben, "Natural Gas and Propane Fires, Explosions and Leaks Estimates and Incident Description," National Fire Protection Association Research (NFPA), (October 2018), available at <https://www.nfpa.org/-/media/Files/News-and-Research/Fire-statistics-and-reports/Hazardous-materials/osNaturalGasPropaneFires.ashx>
 70. Michanowicz, D., et al., "A national assessment of underground natural gas storage: identifying wells with designs likely vulnerable to a single-point-of-failure," *Environ. Res. Lett.* (May 24, 2017), available at <https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/underground-gas-leak-risk/>
 71. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, "Non-Fire Carbon Monoxide Deaths Associated with the Use of Consumer Products 2017 Annual Estimates," (Tables 1 & 2) (November 2020), available at
-

-
- https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/Non-Fire-Carbon-Monoxide-Deaths-Associated-with-the-Use-of-Consumer-Products-2017-Annual-Estimates.pdf?sHaPhWib_IJzkCJMfCDLJMZnqD.vvuKY
72. Wang, Y. et al, “Earthquake Risk Study for Oregon’s Critical Energy Infrastructure Hub,” State of Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries,” (2013), available at <https://www.oregon.gov/energy/safety-resiliency/Documents/2013%20Earthquake%20Risk%20Study%20in%20Oregon%E2%80%99s%20Critical%20Energy%20Infrastructure%20Hub.pdf>
 73. City of Portland and Multnomah County, “Impacts of a Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake on CEI Hub,” (2021), available at <https://www.multco.us/sustainability/cei-hub-draft-seismic-risk-analysis-public-comment>
 74. Salas, R.N., et al., “2018 Lancet Countdown on Health and Climate Change Brief for the United States of America,” (November 2018), Lancet Countdown, 2018, available at https://www.apha.org/-/media/files/pdf/topics/climate/2018_us_lancet_countdown_brief.aspx
 75. Northwest Natural, “How to Operate Your Natural Gas Cooktop During a Power Outage,” (May 8, 2021) available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N1Fs7Se1hWU>
 76. Northwest Natural, “Earthquake Shut-Off Valves,” (October 4, 2017) available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rJn_A_jsKNA&t=27s
 77. US Environmental Protection Agency, (website last updated 6/21/2021), “Wildfires and indoor air quality,” <https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/wildfires-and-indoor-air-quality-iaq>
 78. Farrer, Martin and agencies, “US conservatives falsely blame renewables for Texas storm outages,” The Guardian Environment section, (February 17, 2021), available at <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/feb/17/conservatives-falsely-blame-renewables-for-texas-storm-outages>
 79. Oregon DEQ, (2018), “Oregon Greenhouse Gas Sector-Based Inventory Data,” available at <https://www.oregon.gov/deq/aq/programs/Pages/GHG-Inventory.aspx>
 80. Brown, K., “Executive Order 20-04. Directing State Agencies to Take Actions to Reduce and Regulate Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” (2020) available at https://www.oregon.gov/gov/Documents/executive_orders/eo_20-04.pdf
 81. Oregon State Legislature, “HB 2021C,” (June 2021) available at <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2021R1/Measures/Overview/HB2021>
 82. Clean Energy Transition Institute (2019), “Meeting the Challenge of Our Time: Pathways to a Clean Energy Future for the Northwest,” available at <https://www.cleanenergytransition.org/meeting-the-challenge>
 83. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, (2018) “Oregon’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions through 2015,” available at <https://www.oregon.gov/deq/aq/programs/Pages/GHG-Oregon-Emissions.aspx>
 84. Oregon Senate Bill 98 (2019 Legislative Session) <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2019R1/Measures/Overview/SB98>
-

-
85. Less We Can website, Our Low Carbon Pathway, NW Natural, available at <http://lesswecan.com/>
 86. Cunningham, N. "Oregon Utility Using Greenwashing and 'Renewable Natural Gas' To Push Back on Potential Gas Bans," *Desmog* (May 6, 2021) available at <https://www.desmog.com/2021/05/06/oregon-utility-greenwashing-renewable-natural-gas-climate/>
 87. American Gas Association News Release, (October 14, 2020), available at <https://www.aga.org/news/news-releases/david-anderson-nw-natural-to-lead-as-aga-chair/#:~:text=Washington%20D.C.%20%E2%80%93%20David%20H.,a%20virtual%20meeting%20earlier%20today>
 88. Siccione, T., "DOE withdraws gas furnace efficiency rule proposal after years of debate," *S&P Global Market Intelligence*, (Jan 14, 2021), available at <https://www.spglobal.com/marketintelligence/en/news-insights/latest-news-headlines/doe-withdraws-gas-furnace-efficiency-rule-proposal-after-years-of-debate-62125213>
 89. US Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Office, (September 2016), "2016-09-23 Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnaces; Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNOPR) and announcement of public meeting," Document ID: EERE-2014-BT-STD-0031-0230, available at <https://www.regulations.gov/document/EERE-2014-BT-STD-0031-0230>
 90. Urbanek, L., "DOE Issues Hot Mess of a Rule on Furnaces and Water Heaters," *NRDC*, (January 2021) available at <https://www.nrdc.org/experts/lauren-urbanek/doe-issues-hot-mess-rule-furnaces-and-water-heaters>
 91. Erzini, I., Malik, Z., Fischer, L., "Gas, Climate, and Development: Exploring the Case for Ending Public Finance for Fossil Gas," *E3G*, (November 6, 2020) available at <https://www.e3g.org/publications/gas-climate-and-development/>

Climate change: Curbing methane emissions will 'buy us time'

By Matt McGrath

Environment correspondent

8.15.21

An aggressive campaign to cut methane emissions can buy the world extra time to tackle climate change, experts say.

One of the key findings in the newly released IPCC report is that emissions of methane have made a huge contribution to current warming.

The [study](#) suggested that 30-50% of the current rise in temperatures is down to this powerful, but short-lived gas.

Major sources of methane include agriculture, and leaks from oil and gas production and landfills.

For decades, the main focus of efforts to curb global warming has been the ever-rising emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) from human activities, such as generating power and clearing forests.

There's been good scientific reasons for this, as CO₂ is the biggest driver of temperatures responsible for around 70% of the warming that's taken place since the industrial revolution.

Methane (CH₄), though, hasn't had the same focus.

That may be changing, as earlier this year, [a major UN study highlighted its environmental impact](#).

Now, as this week's [IPCC report](#) points out graphically, methane's influence has been calculated as adding about 0.5C to the warming the world is experiencing right now.

So where is all this methane coming from?

Around 40% of the gas comes from natural sources such as wetlands - but the bigger share now comes from a range of human activities.

"It's a combination of sources, from agriculture, including cattle and rice production, another large source of methane is rubbish dumps," said Prof Peter Thorne, an IPCC author from Maynooth University in Ireland.

"One of the biggest is from the production, transport and use of natural gas - which is really misnamed and should be called fossil gas."

Since 2008, there's been a big spike in methane emissions, which researchers believe is linked to the boom in fracking for gas in parts of the US.

In 2019, methane in the atmosphere reached record levels, around two-and-a-half times above what they were in the pre-industrial era.

What worries scientists is that methane has real muscle when it comes to heating the planet. Over a 100-year period it is 28-34 times as warming as CO₂.

Over a 20-year period it is around 84 times as powerful per unit of mass as carbon dioxide.

However, one key positive about CH₄ is that it doesn't last as long in the air as CO₂.

"If you emit a ton of methane today, in a decade's time, I would expect half that ton to remain in the atmosphere," said Prof Thorne.

"In two decades, time, there would be a quarter of a ton, so basically, if we managed to stop emitting methane today by the end of this century, emissions would be down to natural levels, that they were in about 1750."

In the short term, experts believe that if methane emissions were cut by 40-45% over the next decade, you'd shave 0.3C off the increase in global temperature by 2040.

In a world where every fraction of a degree counts, that's a potentially huge difference to hopes of keeping the 1.5C threshold alive.

What excites many researchers is the belief that are a range of relatively simple actions that can quickly curb the production of methane.

"It's relatively cheap to bring down some of the sources," said Prof Euan Nisbet from Royal Holloway University of London.

"In particular, I'm talking about leaks from the gas industry, which now are so much easier to find, than they were 10-20 years ago, because the instruments are so much better."

"Some things we can do quite quickly - in the tropics, you can put soil on top of these huge urban landfills and you can do a lot about stopping crop waste fires."

Quick fixes really do work. In the US, efforts to collect gas from landfill sites saw methane emissions cut by 40% between 1990 and 2016.

In agriculture there are also many technical changes related to manure and animal feed that can make a difference in lowering emissions.

But getting the really big cuts will require political action.

In countries like Ireland and New Zealand, where farming plays a huge role in the economy, these changes are contentious.

To succeed, they will have to be fair and equitable.

"You can't just say that people can no longer keep cattle or sheep," said Prof Thorne.

"It needs policies to aid a transition to other means of managing the land, but it is not going to happen by people pronouncing you can't keep livestock any longer, it needs to be a much more nuanced approach."

Consumer choice when it comes to dairy and meat will certainly impact this sector.

The oil and gas industry also faces a massive challenge in curbing methane.

Regulations to date have failed to stop leaks, but there's a growing interest among fossil fuel companies in using technology that can rapidly identify and stem the emissions.

"If you look at it from an objective standpoint, the industry is improving, they are improving the leaks, they are improving the number of incidents, but it's not quick enough," said Arnel Santos, a 25-year oil industry veteran with Shell and now chief operating officer of energy technology company mCloud Technologies.

"We need to go faster with respect to this challenge, to really show we can quickly deploy technology to augment what they're doing, because the improvements to date will not be quick enough with what we're seeing."

Perhaps the biggest change that's required is to separate out methane from other warming gases on the international stage.

There are worries that because UN climate negotiators deal with all greenhouse gases in the same process, there are concerns they may make trade-offs, comparisons and compromises on methane that muddy efforts to reduce these emissions.

Many are now calling for a separate process for methane, along the lines of the Montreal Protocol, that [successfully brought countries together to regulate ozone-depleting gases](#).

"To halt long-term warming, we need to halt carbon dioxide emissions," said Prof Thorne.

"But to aid us on that path, we could treat these gases differently. And if we were to treat methane differently, it might buy us time to adapt to the changes that are occurring."

"It's carbon dioxide that absolutely needs to get to net zero. But if we are to halt long term warming, methane can absolutely help us on the way."

<https://www.nytimes.com/section/opinion>

Guest Essay --by Rep. Kathy Castor (D- Fla.)

To Address the Climate Crisis, Focus on More Than Carbon Dioxide

Aug. 9, 2021

In conversations around the climate crisis, there's often a focus on carbon dioxide. It is [trapping heat and warming our atmosphere](#), fueling [deadlier climate disasters](#) than normal and [costing billions](#) year after year. We are right to focus on carbon dioxide. In 2019, it made up about [80 percent of human-caused, heat-trapping pollution](#) in the United States. Reducing it remains the key to achieving as soon as possible a net-zero economy.

But an alarming [new report, released today](#), by the United Nations-backed (IPCC) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, sheds light on the [urgent need to cut down on another harmful pollutant: methane](#). Over 20 years, methane has more than 80 times the heat-trapping power of carbon dioxide, making it a major contributor to the climate crisis.

The new report makes it clear: If we are to keep global temperatures in check, [we urgently need to focus on cutting methane pollution](#). When every fraction of a degree counts, [moving quickly to reduce this super pollutant is one of the most immediate and powerful ways to start solving the climate crisis](#). And because of methane's relatively short life span — it lingers in the atmosphere for [around 12 years](#), while carbon dioxide hangs around for [hundreds of years](#) — bringing down our methane emissions will [help clear the atmosphere](#), helping to moderate temperatures and making a real impact on our near-term climate goals.

The panel's findings have important implications for our clean energy future. When it comes to generating electricity in the United States, increased use of so-called clean natural gas has [often made up for decreased](#) use of carbon-intensive coal. This has led some of my Republican colleagues [to call for expanded natural gas production](#) and the [easing of restrictions](#) on exporting the resource abroad.

But the [natural gas we use is made up of 85 to 90 percent methane](#). Yes, natural gas [often emits somewhat less carbon dioxide than does coal](#) when burned at power plants. [Methane, however, escapes at every point of its production and distribution](#), from when it's extracted from drilling or fracking sites to when it's transported through gas pipelines to when it's purified at refineries.

The science is clear on [the need to keep greenhouse gases like methane out of our atmosphere](#). A global methane assessment released in May [showed](#) how reducing its emissions by 45 percent this decade could help us avoid nearly 0.3°C of warming globally as early as the 2040s. That doesn't sound like a lot, but it would make a world of difference for vulnerable communities in America and [across the globe](#). Each fraction of a degree of warming we avoid can help protect families from climate-fueled devastation, including more intense hurricanes, more severe flooding, more frequent droughts and more extreme heat and wildfires.

We're already living with the devastating consequences of having warmed the planet more than 1°C. From the [deadly heat domes](#) in the Northwest to the [harmful algal blooms](#) killing the fish that we see washed up on the shores of Florida, humans have caused this problem. But we have the tools to fix it.

We can expand climate solutions and clean energy, which have the incredible potential to create millions of good-paying jobs, lower energy bills, strengthen our national security, and provide clean air and water for communities hurt by environmental injustice.

To solve this crisis, Congress must act. Last year, the Democrats on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis released a [road map](#) to help America reach net zero emissions. In our Climate Crisis Action Plan, we recommended reducing methane pollution from oil and gas extraction by 90 percent by the end of the decade, as well as phasing out the routine flaring of methane.

Last month, I was disappointed to see [only 12 House Republicans join our Democratic majority](#) when we voted in favor of stronger safeguards against methane pollution. This was truly [low-hanging fruit](#): a measure to require oil and gas companies to regularly find and repair methane leaks. The resolution even had support from some of the [world's largest oil companies](#). And yet most of our colleagues across the aisle refused to put the health of American families above the profits of polluters.

This is a huge issue. While some Republicans have softened their rhetoric when it comes to climate, many of them continue to stand in the way of clean energy and climate solutions. This needs to change quickly, and they must get serious about tackling this crisis with urgency.

Whether through a bipartisan infrastructure bill, a reconciliation package or some combination of the two, [Congress has a moral obligation to advance policies that push the United States toward clean electricity and a net-zero emission economy](#). We have an urgent need to build out renewable energy, to fund job-creating programs like the Civilian Climate Corps and to help employ former fossil fuel workers to clean up orphaned oil and gas wells and abandoned mines.

We've known for years that we are in a race against time. [We've run out of time](#). Now, every bit of pollution — and every fraction of a degree — counts.

Kathy Castor is the chair of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. She represents Florida's 14th Congressional District.

SIGHTLINE ON FRACKED GAS AND RNG

Author: Laura Feinstein and Eric de Place

April 19, 2021 at 5:11 pm

Gas utilities are facing an existential crisis: fossil fuels have no future in a decarbonized economy. Yet that bit of reality hasn't shocked utilities into changing course, not even in the Northwest, where state climate targets are flatly incompatible with continued gas usage.

Rather than adapt, these utilities are doubling down on gas with a deceptive campaign centered on "renewable natural gas" (RNG). The problem, as we detailed in our first exploration of RNG, is that it has four fatal flaws: cost, availability, carbon footprint, and industry obfuscation. In this installment, we will dive into industry obfuscation, which we think is the most toxic. The gas industry uses RNG as a smokescreen to mask its real intention of maintaining its climate-unfriendly status quo.

Before we go any further, we want to acknowledge right up front that RNG does have a few worthwhile applications. For example, some waste facilities and farms capture their otherwise-wasted methane gas and use it to generate heat or electricity on-site. And, in the future, it may make sense to substitute RNG for fossil fuel gas where a truly net-zero carbon solution doesn't exist, as is the case for some industrial processes. But these are niche applications. In no way should we pin our energy hopes on RNG.

The industry's playbook

After decades of touting natural gas as a "bridge fuel" for climate progress, a tactic that is alarmingly deceptive, the industry started losing its public relations fight. The localized impacts of fracking along with the global imperatives of carbon reduction were finally taking a toll on its reputation. By 2017, the anti-fossil fuel "keep it in the ground" movement was catching the attention of business leaders in the natural gas sector.

Meanwhile, Northwest cities and states were starting to zero in on gas in their climate action plans, establishing new policies intent on curbing its use. Gas utility leaders needed to recast their product as green. So they turned to their friends in Northwest legislatures. In 2017, new legislation in Oregon and Washington instructed the states to inventory all potential sources for RNG to "stimulate the state's clean energy economy." These laws were extensively informed by the industry, including NW Natural and the Northwest Gas Association. Two years later, both Oregon and Washington passed laws instructing gas utilities to offer RNG to their customers.

These bills were among the first steps taken by the gas industry to establish a new narrative around gas—one that could obscure the dirtier aspect of the industry under a budding "renewable" solution.

Gas Industry Greenwash

Almost immediately after these bills passed, the public relations campaign got serious. A consortium of all four of Cascadia's privately-owned gas utilities—Avista, Cascade Natural Gas, NW Natural and Puget Sound Energy—along with affiliated industries stood up an astroturf lobbying group, Partnership for Energy Progress (PEPNW). The group aims to promote natural gas and “prevent or defeat” initiatives that would reduce or prohibit its use. “Our goal is for consumers to feel confident that natural gas is part of a clean energy future,” says PEPNW on its Facebook page.

To do this, the industry conflates the attributes of RNG and fossil natural gas, trying to transfer some of the goodwill for “renewable” energy onto fossil gas. According PEPNW, “Our goal is to communicate the work we do to provide reliable, affordable energy to homes and businesses, and highlight the progress we’re making to address climate change.”

The point seems to be to position gas—bolstered by the over-hyped environmental benefits of RNG—as a major part of the path to decarbonization. But it's a ruse. If gas utilities get their way, they will invest millions of ratepayer dollars into new gas pipeline infrastructure designed to bring the meager amounts of RNG to their customers. Then, when the supply of RNG can't meet the demand, as it assuredly cannot, utilities might quietly meet that demand with fossil gas, thereby reversing any benefits RNG might provide.

At most, the US might be able to produce enough RNG to offset 15 percent of gas usage today, but only at a five-fold cost increase and with a carbon footprint that is still 55 to 60 percent that of conventional natural gas. According to a report by the Energy Transitions Commission that explores decarbonization pathways for challenging sectors like the plastics industry and aviation, there is nowhere near enough RNG (or other forms of energy derived from biomass) to supply the full range of possible uses in industry and transportation. It must therefore be deployed in a highly targeted way on activities where there are no good alternatives for full decarbonization. If not, RNG may wind up being used for home heating and cooking where a zero-carbon alternative exists in the form of electricity.

Obfuscation a la NW Natural

Perhaps no gas utility has been as aggressive in using RNG to greenwash its image as NW Natural, which serves Portland and much of western Oregon. The utility downplays the greenhouse gas footprint of gas, arguing that “gas is the cleanest energy option” for Oregon. Simultaneously, the company responds to customer sentiment about climate change by creating a marketing campaign to showcase its carbon reduction goals and highlight RNG as a key strategy to achieve them.

The point seems to be to position gas—bolstered by the over-hyped environmental benefits of RNG—as a major part of the path to decarbonization. But it's a ruse.



Frustratingly, NW Natural pitches RNG as a fuel for residential use, perhaps the most wasteful and costly way to use it. It seeks to cultivate goodwill for RNG in forums around the region, including the Northwest Power and Conservation Council and the Oregon Global Warming Commission. In the October 2020 meeting of the Global Warming Commission, NW Natural officials monopolized nearly half the agenda trying to argue that natural gas is a minor component of the state's emissions profile, that electrification is unsuitable, and that RNG is clean and widely-available. These are cherry-picked facts used to cast RNG in a more favorable light than it deserves.

The truth is NW Natural's climate plans are dubious at best. The utility claims to be decarbonizing its entire system by 2050, but the goal is non-binding and appears mostly an exercise in the creative use of smoke and mirrors. Consider just a few examples of misdirection:

- **Availability:** When NW Natural says there is potential RNG in Oregon to offset nearly all residential use today, it is omitting that residential use is less than 17 percent of all natural gas use in the state. Residential uses, like heating and cooking, are easily electrified and thus a poor candidate for RNG. The other 83 percent of gas used in the state—for industrial, commercial, electric power and transportation purposes—goes to more than just a few hard-to-decarbonize users. It would make far more sense to reserve this scarce commodity for industries that really have no other options.
- **Climate impact:** “RNG has similar climate benefits to wind and solar energy,” NW Natural claims in the presentation to Oregon Global Warming Commission. But this is false. In fact, today's RNG is largely sourced from landfills and has 55 to 60 percent the carbon footprint of conventional natural gas. Conversely, wind and solar emit no carbon or methane gases and have extremely low lifecycle emissions.
- **Affordability:** NW Natural is careful not to compare the price of RNG with the price of gas today, which is about \$3.31/MMBTU. The utility acknowledges that RNG will cost \$5 to \$30/MMBTU, but omits that a majority of the RNG available will actually come at a cost greater than \$20/MMBTU. That's because the most abundant sources of RNG come from the costly endeavors of sweeping forest and farmland floors for timber and agricultural residuals.

If it continues along its current path, NW Natural will never get to carbon neutral. It will not even achieve its interim goal of reducing emissions by 30 percent from 2015 levels by 2035. That's because it completely ignores gas sales growth in its reporting. In the end, NW Natural's current trajectory would actually increase carbon emissions—a bit like setting a goal of losing a little weight, but only after gaining a lot more first.

Reorienting RNG

Allowing utilities to call the shots about RNG would be a big mistake. If Northwest states are serious about decarbonizing, they will need to constrain RNG to very specific activities while also driving wide-spread adoption of zero-carbon alternatives like electrification. And, it would behoove everyone to acknowledge that the vision of widespread RNG use is not a reality that gas

utilities can deliver. There simply isn't enough of it, it doesn't reduce enough carbon, and it's too expensive.

Lawmakers in Oregon and Washington set the frenzy in motion with the 2019 laws requiring utilities to offer RNG service to all consumers. We need a course correction in order to bring utilities in line with recommendations from serious decarbonization plans, such as the 2021 Washington State Energy Strategy. That plan correctly recommends using RNG only where it is most needed and not in places where zero-carbon alternatives exist, like buildings. One such opportunity might be mandating that the controversial Tacoma LNG project use only RNG from the Roosevelt Landfill, a recently acquired RNG source for the project backer, PSE. (Indeed, the supply of RNG from the landfill and the facility's demand are nearly perfectly matched.) Lawmakers might also play matchmaker between other sources of RNG and hard-to-decarbonize industrial operations like steel and cement plants.

Left to their own devices, Cascadia's gas utilities would use RNG as a delay tactic, prolonging business as usual and locking in decades more climate pollution. And while it is true that the roadmap for Northwest decarbonization probably includes some RNG, it should be only a niche fuel for a few specialized applications. If they are serious about climate progress, the region's leaders should move ahead quickly with strategies for full electrification, replacing gas in nearly every use—particularly as a fuel in buildings. And then they should begin the hard work of decommissioning and dismantling gas infrastructure to make way for a cleaner future.