

The Kansas City Climate Protection Steering Committee voted to **not** endorse Ordinance 230891. Here are some of the concerns shared during our meeting last night:

### **Not What the Community Wants**

During the climate planning process, the community was opposed to having Spire invest ratepayer funds in renewable natural gas (RNG) because it is not a viable or affordable pathway to eliminating emissions from homes and buildings. RNG injected into the gas distribution system got the lowest score of the 24 climate solutions scored (with help from consultants) during the climate planning process, and the community spoke out loudly against it, so it was not included in the Climate Protection and Resiliency Plan.

### **Full Cost of Rate Increases Unknown**

Spire will raise rates on customers to cover the full costs of this project plus operations and maintenance. The City Council should not be approving projects that will be paid for by another rate base outside the City's control, especially when the full costs are not provided. We need a full picture of the calculated costs before we can proceed

### **Goes Against the Guidance of Office of Environmental Quality**

Injecting RNG into the gas distribution network goes against Office of Environmental Quality's 2022 recommendations to KC Water. It sounds as if better solutions were discarded solely because they were not as profitable for KC Water.

### **Emission Reductions are Questionable**

Methane leaks from the RNG facility are a big concern and could cancel out any emission reductions. A [2019 study of RNG facilities at wastewater treatment plants](#) found an average leak rate of 7.5%. Spire will control the RNG facility and there is nothing in the agreement requiring Spire to monitor and report on leaks. Coupled with the production of methane, the sustainable elements of this project appear dubious at best.

#### Abstract

Methane losses from biogas plants are problematic, since they contribute to global warming and thus reduce the environmental benefits of biogas production. Total losses of methane from 23 biogas plants were measured by applying a tracer gas dispersion method to assess the magnitude of these emissions. The investigated biogas plants varied in terms of size, substrates used and biogas utilisation. Methane emission rates varied between 2.3 and 33.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub> h<sup>-1</sup>, and losses expressed in percentages of production varied between 0.4 and 14.9%. The average emission rate was 10.4 kg CH<sub>4</sub> h<sup>-1</sup>, and the average loss was 4.6%. Methane losses from the larger biogas plants were generally lower compared to those from the smaller facilities. In general, methane losses were higher from wastewater treatment biogas plants (7.5% in average) in comparison to agricultural biogas plants (2.4% in average). In essence, methane loss may constitute the largest negative environmental impact on the carbon footprint of biogas production.