#12-01

Harbage, Rebecca

From: DEQ Communications Team
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 11:01 AM
To: Climate Council
Subject: FW: General Comment,

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 24, 2020 1:11 PM
To: DEQ Communications Team <DEQCommunicationsTeam@mt.gov>
Subject: General Comment,

I am impressed with your climate change plan and want to voice support for it. I believe it is imperative that our state invest in comprehensive ways to lessen our carbon impact and support continued growth in ways that do so. Climate change is real and it is necessary to adopt creative ways to deal with it. This plan is geared toward that goal. Jean W. Guy, resident of Billings, MT 59102

- Jean Guy

#12-02

Harbage, Rebecca

From: Harbage, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 4:02 PM
To: Climate Council
Subject: FW: Climate Solutions Council Plan

From: Kevin Owens [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Harbage, Rebecca [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Climate Solutions Council Plan

Rebecca,

I have been following the Council's activities for the past several months. I do not have the time to go through the plan in infinite detail and provide line by line comments. However, as a professional who has worked in the Northwest energy and utility sector for over 40+ years I can offer a few comments more long term and strategic in nature.

It is very concerning and troubling that Montana has a Renewable Portfolio Standard derived in 2015 with a 15% target for renewables. It is truly out of date with how our industry has changed in five plus years and how customer sentiment has grown to favor more renewables.

At this moment, NWE is proposing to buy a larger share of Colstrip 4 with retirement planned for the year 2040. At hat closure date, they will take credit for emission reductions and increasing renewables in their portfolio.

Let me try this analogy….. Stepping back and looking at all factors concerning power supply in Montana it would seem that NWE is writing the last chapter of a novel with no regard for the chapters that lie in between. Theoretically, they would need to go back to write chapters that lead to a cliff hanger ending that was defined decades earlier. Strategic Planning processes would indicate that you write a book chapter by chapter to get to the cliff hanger. Is Montana being boxed into a conclusion decided decades earlier.

The Council needs to lay out a road map of where they want Montana to be, relative to climate, by the year 2050. A key element of that is power supply within the state.

Montana can greatly benefit from a staged approach to get to 2050, not one big plant shutdown in 2040. This also greatly assists NWE in their planning processes knowing they have to hit certain targets along the way to 2050.

I would suggest the following strategy has far more value to the Climate Solutions Plan for the future of Montana

2015	15% Renewables
2025	25% Renewables
2030	30% Renewables
2035	35% Renewables
2040	40% Renewables
2045	45% Renewables
2050	50% Renewables

To achieve such a target, it requires the CSC, PSC and Legislature all be on the same page. You can't have the PSC decide to allow NWE to purchase more output from Colstrip when it might be out of sync with plans of the CSC or Legislature. Your efforts may be well intentioned, but will fail miserably without cooperation.

These comments are personal in nature and do not reflect any opinions of my employer.

Respectfully,

Kevin P. Owens

#12-03

Harbage, Rebecca

From: Harbage, Rebecca
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 9:10 AM
To: Climate Council
Subject: FW: Climate Change Plan

From: Johnson, Dusti
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 12:28 PM
To: Harbage, Rebecca [redacted]
Cc: Thamke, Ed [redacted] Thompson, Ricknold [redacted]
Subject: Climate Change Plan

Dear Rebecca Harbage,

I write as a recycling market specialist and member of Montana D.E.Q.'s materials management team regarding opportunities in the "Governors Climate Change Action Plan." Montana can reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the reduction of solid waste generation while increasing recycling and composting as part of our state's strategy to engage Montana communities in the fight against climate change. There direct and substantial links between greenhouse gas emissions and solid waste management, recycling, and composting.

Waste reduction, recycling, and composting is a critical part of reducing emission in several ways:

- Reduced emissions from energy consumption. Recycling saves energy. Producing goods from recycled materials typically require much less energy than making goods from virgin materials. Waste prevention is even more effective. Less energy is needed to extract, transport, and process raw materials and to manufacture products when a product's life is extended, people reuse things, or when less material is used to make and package the product. The payoff? When energy demand decreases, fewer fossil fuels are burned and less carbon dioxide is emitted to the atmosphere.

- Reduce emissions from incinerators. Diverting certain materials from incinerators through waste prevention and recycling reduces greenhouse gas emissions to the atmosphere in addition to other pollutants.

- Reduce methane emissions from landfills. Waste prevention and recycling, including composting to divert organic waste from landfills, reduces the methane released when these materials decompose.

- Increased storage of carbon in trees. Forests take large amounts of carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere and store it in wood, in a process called carbon sequestration. Waste prevention and recycling of paper products can leave more trees standing in the forest, continuing to absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.

The EPA estimates that increasing our national recycling rate from its current level of 27 percent to 35 percent would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 11.4 million metric tons of carbon equivalent (MTCE, the basic unit of measure for greenhouse gases) over landfilling the same material. Waste

prevention also makes an important difference: By cutting the amount of waste we generate by just 5 percent, we could reduce greenhouse gas emissions by another 10.2 million MTCE. Together, these levels of recycling and waste prevention slash emissions by more than 20 million MTCE-an amount equal to the average annual emissions from the electricity consumption of roughly 12 million households.

In addition, landfilling food waste rather than composting it results in the loss of nutrients; a critical aspect for Montana's agriculture. Burying food waste and other organics, such as word waste, contributes to the production of leachate that must be treated methane **- one of the most potent greenhouse gases.** Food waste is a significate portion of the waste stream nationally was shown to constitute 20% of our state's waste stream to Montana's 2017 Solid Waste Diversion Survey. Composting represents tangible, local action to reduce greenhouse gases. Substantial greenhouse gases can be further gained by diverting methane-emitting feedstocks from municipal treatment centers, lagoons, and agriculture from landfills to composting operations.

I stand ready to help incorporate these aspects into our states' vision for a more sustainable future and would welcome the opportunity to quickly assemble a working group of Montana's on the ground experts in these areas of solid waste, recycling, and compost. Please let me know if you have any questions and what additional information I might provide.

Thank you for your consideration and work on this timely issue for Montana.

Sincerely,

Dusti Johnson

p.s. Montana D.E.Q. has begun a Zero Waste Effort in-house and in currently. By composting used coffee grounds, and paper towels, we are reducing the energy needed to process nutrients out of the water from Helena's waste waste treatment plant, the most energy-intensive operation in the Helena Valley!