



[www.arclimatechange.us](http://www.arclimatechange.us)

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**ARKANSAS GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON GLOBAL WARMING**  
**Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management (AFW) Technical Work Group (TWG)**  
Call #3, March 18, 2008

**Attendees:**

**TWG Members:** Steve Cousins, Bill Reed, Pearlie Reed, Aubra Anthony

**Advisory Body Members:** John Shannon and Jamal Solaimanian and Robert Hunter for  
Teresa Marks (Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality)

**Governor's Office:** Mark Harrison.

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

**Members of the Public:** Paula Randle-Smith, Jim Sherrill.

**Background Documents:** (all posted at [www.arclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm](http://www.arclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm))

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

**Agenda:**

1. Introductions/Roll Call
2. Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary
3. GCGW Process Progress
4. Review Goals for GCGW Meeting #5 (April 9, 2008)
5. Development of Catalog of State Actions with Notional Ratings
6. Introduction to Balloting Process
7. Review of Next Steps
8. Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings
9. Public Comments and Announcements

**Discussion and Conclusions:**

**Introductions/Roll Call**

No Comments

## Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary

Brief review of the previous call summary. Summary was approved.

## GCGW Process Progress

CCS is working on getting the Inventory and Forecast out to the TWGs.

## Review Goals for GCGW Meeting #5 (April 9, 2008)

No Comments

## Development of Catalog of State Actions with Notional Ratings

This is the final meeting in which additions can easily be made to the catalog. More possibilities can be considered after balloting, but it is best if all additions to the catalog are made by the end of this meeting.

There were no comments on the notional ratings made at the previous meeting.

There was discussion on whether CCS should provide insights from previous states where the TWG is uncertain about the notional rating. The group was mostly inclined to have CCS provide information in areas where there was no strong impression on costs/benefits.

### 1. AFW 1 – Agriculture – Production of Fuels and Electricity

- a. *Expanded use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity or Steam Production* (1.1) likely is High Benefit, High Cost/ton. *In-State Liquid Biofuels Production* (1.2) could be M-H, while *Encourage Cogeneration at Ag-Biomass Energy Sites* (1.4) has medium GHG reduction potential. *Manure Digesters/Other Waste Energy Utilization* (1.3) should be rated as medium reduction potential.

### 2. AFW 2 – Agriculture – Livestock

- a. *Manure Management* (2.1), *Changes in Animal Feed* (2.2) are high GHG reduction potential. In terms of costs/ton it seems that *Manure Management* (2.1) and *Changes in Animal Feed* (2.2) would vary dramatically depending on the implementation mechanism. *Rotational Grazing/Improve Grazing Crops and/or Management*(2.3), *Utilize Biofilters to Control CAFO Emissions*(2.4), *Increase Pasturing and Lower Densities*(2.5) should be low GHG reduction potential.

### 3. AFW 3 – Agriculture – Crop Production

- a. No-till cultivation (considered in *Soil Carbon Management* (3.1)) is something that is already being considered in many areas of Arkansas, regardless of the GHG benefits.
- b. *Water Management*(3.4), *Drainage Management*(3.5), *Promote Use of Surface Water Over Ground Water* (3.6) seem particularly politically charged. Some of these, such as *Water Management*(3.4), *Drainage Management* (3.5) may have low potential GHG reductions, whereas *Promote Use of Surface Water Over Ground Water* 3.6) may best be considered a M for GHG reductions.

- c. For *Soil Carbon Management (3.1)*, *Nutrient Management (3.2)*, *Technology Improvements To Increase Efficiency (3.3)*, were considered to have medium emission reduction potentials.
- d. *Soil Carbon Management (3.1)*, *Nutrient Management (3.2)*, can have negative costs associated with them (reduced fuel/fertilizer costs, for example). Thus, these two are considered to be low cost by CCS, whereas the other four had uncertain costs.

**4. AFW 4 – Agriculture – Land Use Change**

- a. The consensus of the TWG was that the options in AFW 4 have a low emissions reduction potential. Other states have found these to have relatively high costs compared some other options.

**5. AFW 5 - Agriculture – Farming Practices**

- a. *Reductions in On-Farm Energy Use(5.1)* should have low GHG benefits for the state of Arkansas. This would likely have high initial costs at the very least. This could have some cost savings as well, giving it medium costs/ton overall.
- b. *Promotion of Farming Practices That Achieve GHG Benefits (5.2)* may be better implemented by means outside of state policy. This one could be considered to have low GHG benefits. The cost/ton will be considered uncertain for this policy.
- c. *Leave Programs To Support Local Farming/Buy Local(5.3)*, *Technical Assistance and Education (5.4)* as also having low GHG benefits. The cost/ton was considered to be uncertain.

**6. AFW 6 - Forestry – Production of Fuels and Electricity through Forestry**

- a. *Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, and Steam Production (6.1)* has M-H GHG reduction potential and a High cost/ton.
- b. *In-State Liquid Biofuels Production (6.2)* has M-H GHG reduction potential and M-H costs/ton.
- c. *Improved Energy Capture within the Forestry Products Industry (6.3)* has L-M GHG reduction benefits and Medium costs/ton.
- d. *Improved Commercialization of Biomass Gasification and Combined Cycle (6.4)* has a High reduction potential and medium to high cost/ton.
- e. *Encourage the Use of Energy Crops as a Feedstock for Energy Production(6.5)* has M-H GHG reductions and M costs.

**7. AFW 7 – Forestry – Biomass Protection and Management**

- a. Regarding *Forest Protection—Reduced Clearing and Conversion to Nonforest Cover(7.1)*, conversion to non-forest cover is not the problem in AR as it is in other states. This should be rated as a medium GHG benefit. This should have a high cost/ton because it would get in the way of land development, which is a lucrative business.
- b. *Urban Forestry(7.2)* has low GHG benefits and costs/ton would be high.

- c. *Afforestation/Reforestation* (7.3) should have a high GHG benefit. This should be considered to have Medium costs/ton.
- d. *Forest Management for Carbon Sequestration* (7.4) has a low GHG benefit and a high cost/ton.
- e. *Mitigation of Forest Carbon Sequestration Loss and Emissions Due to Forest Fire* (7.5) also has a low GHG benefit. Fire is natural in Arkansas, and it is unlikely we could reduce it much more than we're already doing. This would also have high costs/ton.
- f. *Mitigation of Forest Loss Due to Insects/Disease* (7.6) would have low GHG benefits and high costs/ton.

## **8. AFW 8 – Forestry - Wood Products and Waste**

- a. There aren't a lot of policies available to make wood cutting more efficient, because plenty is already being done. This could apply to *Improved Mill Waste Recovery—Utilization of Sawmill Residues and Emissions* (8.1), to a lesser extent *Improved Logging Residue Recovery* (8.2).
- b. *Improved Mill Waste Recovery—Utilization of Sawmill Residues and Emissions* (8.1) would have low GHG benefit. This would have high costs/ton.
- c. *Improved Logging Residue Recovery* (8.2) should have low-medium GHG benefit. This would have high cost/ton.
- d. *Expanded Use of Wood Products for Building Products* (8.3) has significant GHG benefits possible. There is increasing evidence of this being a low cost option. This should be rated as a High GHG benefit. On cost/ton this option should be low.

### **Introduction to Balloting Process**

1. Ballots will be sent to Joe Pryor ([joseph.pryor@pechan.com](mailto:joseph.pryor@pechan.com)). Initial bundling and compilation will be done by CCS in this process based on recommendations from the TWG.
2. Ballots will go out Tuesday afternoon (directly after the TWG meeting), and are due on Friday 21 March. This is so that we can review the balloting results at the meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup>.
3. There was a question regarding if technical advisors are allowed to submit ballots of their own. The CCS process states that only TWG members may participate in the balloting process.

### **Review of Next Steps**

No comments

### **Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings**

Our next meeting is **Tuesday, March 25, from 1 to 2:30 pm**, Central time. There we will go over the balloting results and prepare for the upcoming GCGW meeting.

### **Public Comments or Announcements**

Jim Sherrill – Environmental Consulting Firm – Encouraged TWG to support utilization of methane over flaring of methane, because this can have significant environmental and economic benefits.

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