



www.arclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON GLOBAL WARMING
Agriculture, Forestry and Waste (AFW) Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #2, March 11, 2008

Attendees:

TWG Members: Jerry Farris, PhD; Bill Reed; Miles Goggans.

Advisory Body Members: Marcus Tilley and Robert Hunter for Teresa Marks (Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality)

Governor's Office: Jillian Hicks

Center for Climate Strategies: Steve Roe, Joe Pryor, Jackson Schreiber.

Members of the Public: None

Background Documents: (all posted at www.arclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. Catalog of State Actions
4. Descriptions of State Actions
5. Summary of Meeting#1

Discussion and Conclusions:

Introductions and Review of Agenda

Roll call

CCS reviewed the Agenda

- a. Stepwise planning process: The TWG is on points 2 and 3, and should be moving forward with these by next meeting. We are beginning the process for step 4 as well.

Minutes of last call were reviewed and approved.

- b. Minutes approved but the TWG noted that there could be additions to the catalog in regards to projects which have received funding to utilize surface water of ground water.

Review of Governor's Commission on Global Warming

Summary of GCGW meeting #3

All of the comments and additions to the catalog that were recommended at the meeting have been taken into account, and are indicated in the catalog with blue text.

Goals for GCGW meeting #4

Before GCGW meeting#4, we will be focusing on improving the catalog and the carrying out the balloting process.

Catalog of State Actions

Discussion of AFW 3.1, 3.4 and 3.5

- a. At the GCGW's request, there was discussion on AFW 3.1, 3.4 and 3.5, and how these particular policy options could be clarified or expanded. It was agreed that for the moment these will remain as they are, and we will discuss different approaches to them if they are chosen after the balloting process.
- b. There are two distinct geographic areas in the state of Arkansas. The Northwest part is hilly, whereas the Southeast part is going to be very different. This means that we need to be careful to not get too specific, or different parts of the state might not be impacted at all. Particularly when we're talking about incentivizing, etc, it is important to make sure a policy will impact the state evenly across geographic differences.
- c. This can make balloting more difficult, because when things are kept so general, so as to avoid excluding any particular geographic region or policy approach, it is harder to make a decision regarding what our priorities should be.
- d. AFW 3.4. Water management could be approached in very different ways, such as different types of water delivery and working to achieve better drainage. At this point in the process the TWG agreed that it may be appropriate to keep the options general.
- e. Related to 3.4 and 3.6, the state has invested significant funding and technical support (in addition to local and federal funding) towards using surface water as opposed to ground water. Three projects currently under way are
 - i. Bayou Meto Water Management District
 - ii. Boeuff Tensas Water Management District
 - iii. White River Irrigation District
- f. Each of the above projects are in various stages of development in their goals to utilize surface water instead of groundwater for irrigation purposes. **Action Item:** the above projects will be added to existing actions under AFW 3.6.
- g. The TWG suggested that Advisory Body member Randy Young has expertise in this area and know a lot about these three projects. **Action Item:** Bill Reed will follow up with Randy Young (director, Arkansas Natural Resources Commission) for specific language referencing funding for the water management projects mentioned.
- h. Questions were raised about the inclusion of RCI water issues in the AFW group. The TWG recognized that water is probably more of a cost issue for the Agriculture sectors rather than the RCI sectors.
- i. It was recognized that the primary expertise and advisory capacity of the DEQ people is for expertise in waste, where the TWG was lacking some experience.
- j. Arkansas is so flat that it may have different water issues than many of the states that CCS has dealt with previously.

Notional Ratings

- a. Introduction to the Notional Ratings. Explanation of what they are measuring, how we are hoping the TWG members to make them. CCS noted that there are three main areas where the TWG can provide input: GHG emission reduction potential, potential costs, and other considerations (e.g. ancillary benefits or feasibility issues).
- b. CCS gave a brief breakdown of the state inventory for AR, regarding what agricultural, waste, forestry emissions are estimated to be for 2005. It is difficult to use these forecasts to determine how a particular policy is going to decrease the emissions in a given sector.
- c. CCS highlighted that the purpose of the notional ratings is to provide an additional information source to TWG members when making balloting decisions on which options to recommend to the GCGW. It is not used for quantification, as that process occurs later.
- d. Since we have two experts of waste from DEQ, we will start with the waste sections (AFW-9 through AFW-11). All suggested notional ratings have been indicated in the catalog.
- e. **AFW 9:**
 - 9.1 - *Advanced Recycling and Composting* – There are still lots of opportunities in AR. Recycling rate in AR is 43%. Could be increased dramatically, particularly for commercial use. Often recycling, particularly in smaller municipalities, is too expensive. About 3 million dollars a year go towards recycling, which is too low for Arkansas’s needs. Too many people see recycling as free, and this is a huge misconception.
 - CCS gave examples of notional ratings to begin discussion by TWG members – specifically if there were any comments on each rating or additional comments for consideration.
 - i. Green waste (yard trimmings, etc) has been banned from landfills, and this is either composted or reused. This means that *Enhanced Management of Organic Waste (9.6)* isn’t really an option in Arkansas.
 - ii. *Advanced Recycling and Composting (9.1)* medium, but the rest of the options in part 9 are probably low GHG reductions, because those are probably less likely to have significant benefits in AR.
 - iii. For *No Net Import of Waste (9.7)*, AR does not import waste, it exports a little bit of it.
 - iv. Cost/ton for *Advanced Recycling and Composting (9.1)* should be Low.
 - v. Source reduction was viewed to be low rather than negative.
- k. **AFW 10:**
 - i. There are significant numbers of landfills that are not capturing their methane emissions. *Flare Landfill Methane at Non-NSPS sites (10.1)* and *Landfill Methane Energy Programs (10.3)* should have M-H GHG reductions.
- l. **AFW 11:**
 - i. TWG members thought that most options in this section were in the low to medium range. ADEQ noted that land application of WWTP biosolids cost about 2 cents/gallon. The TWG noted that this was difficult to translate into cost per ton CO₂e.

- f. It was agreed to stop here having done all of the waste issues, and the rest of the notional ratings in the catalog will be finished in the next meeting. CCS will send out the preliminary notional ratings for TWG members to look over.

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

Next call is next Tuesday, March 18, 2008.

The next commission meeting is April 9, 2008. TWGs need to have completed the balloting by the next GCGW meeting.

Public Comments or Announcements

None.

CCS would like to thank all members for their meaningful contributions and excellent discussion.