



www.arclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON GLOBAL WARMING
Agriculture, Forestry and Waste (AFW) Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #5, April 15, 2008

Attendees:

TWG Members: Bill Reed, Miles Goggans, Steve Cousins, Aubra Anthony

Advisory Body Members:

Governor's Office: Mark Harrison

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality:

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

Members of the Public:

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

1. Summary of Call #4
2. Announcement and Agenda for Call #5
3. PowerPoint for Call #5
4. Preliminary AFW Straw Proposal Document

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary
3. GCGW Process Progress
4. Review of Results of GCGW Meeting #5 (April 9, 2008)
5. Consider Goals for GCGW Meeting #6 (May 19, 2008)
6. Discuss Next Steps in Developing Straw Proposals
7. Review Example Policy Options
8. Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings
9. Public Comments and Announcements

Discussion and Conclusions:

Introductions

No Comments

Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary

The Previous Call Summary was approved.

GCGW Process Progress

No Comments

Review Results of GCGW Meeting #5 (April 9, 2008)

There was extensive discussion of recent articles published regarding the efficacy of biofuels. It was decided that while further study is needed on the GHG benefits of biofuels, the TWG should still examine options relating to biofuels.

Consider Goals for GCGW Meeting #6 (May 19, 2008)

The question was posed to the TWG of whether there were any studies going on in the state of Arkansas. The University of Arkansas-Monticello has some studies from their forestry department, which is active in biofuels. Mike Ross hosted a panel with industry experts at Arkansas-Monticello regarding biofuels.

Discuss Next Steps in Developing Straw Proposals

We are trying to investigate the potential costs and GHG reductions of our straw proposals. The first step is establishing the goals of the straw proposals in terms of reductions and timeframe. The options will be reorganized to more accurately reflect the various sectors.

Review Example Policy Options

1. The important point that we are trying to get across with these example policy options is the diverse methods of implementing various policy proposals. How aggressive and broad the policies will be is largely up to the TWG in how they design their goals.
2. These policy options will be just a guideline at first, which will be gradually expanded upon as more work is done for them.
3. Remember that in Arkansas, goals should go through 2025, not 2020 as is shown in some of the example policy options. 2015 is the intermediate timeframe for reductions to be done.
4. Determining a feasible and realistic startup schedule is going to be another issue for consideration by the TWG.
5. The goals for each of the policy options will be quantified by CCS, which will then be reviewed by the TWG. Input from the TWG comes in determining realistic assumptions, providing useable data sources and recommendations for the best methodology to implement or quantify the various policies.
6. The role of advisory body members in the TWG was discussed. The TWG agreed that it would be essential to consult with advisory body members to provide expertise in some areas. The TWG suggested that in addition to the advisory body members already designated to the AFW TWG, other departments such as DNR should be incorporated into the straw proposal development process. It was suggested that the TWG consider where their expertise lies, and where the TWG will require the assistance of advisory body members.
7. The TWG agreed to re-order the policy options to group options focusing on similar sectors (e.g. group waste options together).
 - a) AFW-1 – There is expertise available on the TWG for Energy Supply issues, which makes up part of AFW-1.

- b) AFW-2 –It was agreed to consult with the advisory body members on realistic recycling goals. This policy could have both a forestry and municipal solid waste element in it. Aubra has some limited experience with MSW, but additional expertise needs to be found for an advisory role.
- c) AFW-3 – This also seems to be Aubra’s area. No other TWG members were suggested. John Shannon will also be needed in an advisory capacity. There was a request to change the wording of the policy description to eliminate the phrase “in areas with little or no forest cover”, because that is rather more restrictive than initially thought.
- d) AFW-4 – Steve Cousins volunteered to work on this issue. AFW 4 will be changed to “Expanded Production and Use of In-State Biofuels”.
- e) AFW-5 – Randy Young or Jamey Johnson may be good advisory body members for the TWG to consult with on this issue.
- f) AFW-6 – None of the TWG members present had specific expertise on this issue, though other TWG members may be useful in expanding on this policy option.
- g) AFW-7 – Same as AFW-6
- h) AFW-8 – Jerry Farris and Bill Reed had expertise on this issue.
- i) AFW-9 – Same as AFW-6.

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

1. Call #6 is scheduled for April 29, 2008, 1:00 to 2:30, Central time.
2. There was discussion of having another meeting on Tuesday, May 6, 1:00 to 2:30, Central time. There will be further discussion of whether this meeting is necessary and if that time is practical for the TWG.
3. The next GCGW meeting is scheduled for May 19, 2008.

Public Comments and Announcements

None

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