



www.arclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON GLOBAL WARMING
Agriculture, Forestry and Waste (AFW) Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #10, June 10, 2008, 1:00 to 3:00pm CST

Attendees:

TWG Members: Bill Reed, Aubra Anthony, Pearlie Reed

Advisory Body Members: Bryan Leamons, Robert Hunter, Karen Bassett (for Teresa Marks, ADEQ), and Adrian Baber (for Randy Young, DNR)

Arkansas Governor's Office: Jillian Hicks

Center for Climate Strategies: Joe Pryor, Steve Roe, Jackson Schreiber, Jen Jenkins, Brad Strode, Rachel Anderson

Members of the Public: Mark Allison

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

- Summary of Call #9
- Meeting Notice and Agenda
- PowerPoint for Meeting
- AFW Straw Proposal Document
- Draft Inventory and Forecast for AFW Sectors
 - Agriculture
 - Waste
 - Forestry

Agenda:

Introductions
Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary
GCGW Process Progress
Review Inventory and Forecast
Finalize Policy Design
Review Quantification Methods
Review of Next Steps for TWG
Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings
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 Inventory and Forecast

Details on the Inventory and Forecast Appendices are located on the website at:

<http://www.arclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm>

1. There was a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of showing gross emissions versus net emissions. Gross emissions are shown because of the difficulties in making an accurate estimate of sinks as well as the complexities of showing both positive and negative emissions of greenhouse gases.
2. It seems a little strange to ignore the emissions offsets (i.e. carbon sequestration) that each sector provides, particularly in the case of agriculture and forestry, where offsets are likely to be the highest.
3. The Municipal Solid Waste category does not include hazardous waste. It might be useful to expand the emissions inventory to include the burning of hazardous waste in the state, because there is a commercial hazardous waste plant in Arkansas. However, given the uncertainties associated with the GHG emissions of burning hazardous waste, quantification may not be possible.
4. There is some industrially generated waste in the state, but this does not typically result in GHG emissions. It would probably not be worthwhile to include those in the inventory.
5. Arkansas submitted information on waste and recycling for use on the AFW policy options. It is possible this information should be considered to refine/update the waste Inventory and Forecast.
6. There is significant uncertainty in the forestry analysis, which is why there are no projected changes in forestry sinks between 2005 and 2025. There have been changes in survey methods, thus making all estimates before 2000 significantly different from estimates made after then. This makes the window for using historical projections much smaller (beginning only after 2000). As can be seen in Arkansas, the estimate of forestry sinks in 1990 is almost double that of sinks in 2000. This level of uncertainty simply does not exist in most other sectors.

Finalize Policy Design

AFW-8

1. The AR DEQ has provided some valuable information, though there are some remaining information gaps. For example, there is no tracking the total amount of each type of waste stream produced. Goals should instead be focused on increasing the total amount recycled, because that is monitored. Newspapers, paper, plastics from residential use is probably the area that could be expanded the most easily.
2. There was also a concern expressed that recycling may not be an effective method of controlling GHGs. However, since recycling will have an enhanced GHG benefit outside of the waste sector in Arkansas (because of the reduced life-cycle cost of producing new materials), further analysis will be necessary to determine the cost effectiveness of recycling to reduce GHGs.

3. There was some question as to whether the GHG impacts of recycling would also be considered, because there is energy going into that process and transportation related emission involved in expanded recycling.
4. The incentives for recycling need to overcome the economic fact that it is typically more cost effective to simply add most materials into the waste stream.
5. There might need to be specific goals for each individual waste stream. It might be easier for the TWG to phrase the goal as increasing total recycling by a certain percent, but it may need to be broken up by tonnage per waste stream. The DEQ will forward their recommendation for a reasonable goal by this method. The TWG was in agreement that this was acceptable for the purpose of establishing a preliminary goal for AFW-8.

AFW-9

1. The largest landfills are required by the government to control their landfill emissions. Size and age of landfill, as well as climate conditions are all key factors on the amount of methane that is created in each landfill.
2. There are 24 landfills in the state, and 6 are already controlling their methane emissions. Of those 6, only two have landfill gas-to-energy programs. The other four could be converted to create energy from methane combustion.
3. The goal should be based on the percentage of landfills, rather than percentage of landfill gas, which might be more difficult to measure.
4. Many landfills are in rural areas, and that has an impact on the cost-effectiveness of landfill gas to energy programs, because there is little demand for energy in the immediate area.
5. It was agreed to use the goal of 25% of all landfills as the starting point for this option, and it may be revisited later in the process after quantification has occurred.

Review Quantification Methods

AFW-6 – Expanded Use of Locally Produced Farm and Forest Products

1. Some of the goals for AFW-6 have been revised based on recent information provided by the state. The Local Produce goal now includes fish/meat/poultry, as recommended by the TWG.
2. Distribution issues are often the problem with expanded use of local agriculture. Local agriculture can have disadvantages because they are small scale and therefore cannot get the best rate for transporting their wares. The state should develop a distribution mechanism to help overcome this disadvantage.
3. The TWG had no objections to presenting these revised goals to the GCGW.

AFW-4

1. Pearlie Reed has provided a definition for marginal agricultural land for energy crops. This information comes from the State Soil Geographic Databases. The definition provided has some disadvantages, but it was agreed by the TWG to proceed with the energy crop analysis with 16.3 million acres of marginal agricultural land in the state.

Assumptions Memo

1. The purpose of this memo is to ensure that the assumptions made within and across the TWGs are consistent. These include estimates of the availability of biomass, fuel prices, biofuels availability, etc.

AFW-7

1. There is a goal of no net loss of forests in Arkansas as part of AFW-7. Given that forest cover has been increasing since 1988, it will be difficult to establish “business-as-usual” (BAU) projections that indicate that there will be forest loss over the policy period (2005-2025). Differences in reporting, methods and standards for measuring tree cover make projections based on historical FIA data very problematic. Without a reliable BAU projection, it will be difficult to demonstrate that there are emission savings resulting from the implementation of this option.
2. Historical data that is used as an input for these analyses indicates a net increase of a few thousand acres annually. There was discussion of whether quantifying a no net loss of forests option would be possible. It was noted that such a policy would be important for the state.
3. There was some discussion over the best method of quantifying this particular goal.
4. CCS will send around an email to the TWG about the quantification of this no net loss goal, to make clear how quantification will occur and to ensure that all TWG members understand the quantification approach.

Review of Next Steps for TWG

No Comments

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

Next TWG meeting is July 1st, 2008. All future meeting dates are available on the website. If TWG members cannot make the call, please contact CCS and we will try and accommodate your schedule.

Public Comments and Announcements

None