



www.arclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON GLOBAL WARMING
Agriculture, Forestry and Waste (AFW) Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #11, July 1, 2008, 1:00 to 2:30pm CST

Attendees:

TWG Members: Jerry Farris (PhD), Steve Cousins, Aubra Anthony, Miles Goggans, Kevin Smith, Bill Reed

Advisory Body Members: John Shannon (Forestry Commission), Richard Bell (Agriculture Department), Adrian Baber (for Randy Young, Arkansas Natural Resources Commission), Karen Bassett (for Teresa Marks, ADEQ).

Arkansas Governor's Office: Andrew Parker

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

Members of the Public: Jeffery Hall (Arkansas Farm Bureau)

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

- Summary of Call #10
- Meeting Notice and Agenda
- PowerPoint for Meeting
- AFW Straw Proposal Document

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary
- Review of Next Steps for TWG
- GCGW Meeting Results
- Discuss Development of Policy Options including quantification
- 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, with some modifications. On page 4, AFW-7, paragraphs 1 and 2, John Shannon requested clarification on the identification of a forest cover baseline in Arkansas. The historical data in Arkansas is used to project the estimates of future forest cover. However, the Forestry Service can create a report card of forest cover in the state for each year. Difficulties arise from the differences in reporting and standards, thus making a projection very uncertain.

- The meeting summary will be updated to indicate that the problem lies with the difficulties in making *projections* of forest cover not measuring the baseline.
- A recent paper by the Society of American Foresters about forest management for GHG benefits could be very valuable in this policy-making.
- Paragraph #2 states that “therefore quantifying a no-net loss option would not be possible”, which does not seem likely. The issue will be rephrased as “there was discussion regarding whether it would be possible to quantify the no-net loss option”. CCS will provide the TWG with further information regarding the difficulties in quantifying the forestry option.

Review of Next Steps for TWG

No Comments

GCGW Meeting Results

AFW-1

- CCS needs to work with the Arkansas NRC and DEQ to determine the best way to proceed with the manure management options.

AFW-2

- The TWG members should reach out to their colleagues to determine if there are any valuable sources for quantifying this item.

AFW-3

- There was discussion regarding whether the 10% reduction in groundwater should be specifically stated in the goal.
- Several TWG members objected to this change in the goal. This water is not necessarily interchangeable. Surfacewater is not generally used by municipalities.
- The goal will be left as is, with the intention that surfacewater use will be increased, but no specific provision on the reduction of groundwater use will be included in the goal, although it is noted that the quantification analysis makes assumptions about decrease groundwater use.
- There was a question regarding whether we could have some provision on storing surfacewater so that it would be useable. This possibility will be added to the implementation mechanisms.
- The Governor’s Office outlined that the last state water plan was done in 1991, another is planned to be completed soon.

AFW-5

- The term “advanced biofuels” will be used instead of biofuels. The term will be defined in the POD as per the U.S. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. While the option is non-technology specific If other feedstocks need to be considered, the TWG should outline them.

AFW-6

- There needs to be a clearer definition of the term “locally grown”. There is no universally accepted mileage that can be easily recommended. It is typically a range, as is practical for a certain area. The TWG suggested that at least initially within 100-150 miles could be used.
- Local forest products would be slightly different from produce and do not need to be from a certain county or an adjacent county, merely nearby. There will be further discussion on the appropriate definition of this topic.

- The TWG will have a local produce goal as a percentage of total food consumed in Arkansas, rather than having it quantified in terms of creating farmers markets, etc. The overarching goal of this item is increasing the use of local food/produce so as to reduce transportation costs/emissions.
- To help address some of the GCGW's concerns about the lack of clarity and to emphasize the purpose of this goal and to also simplify the quantification, CCS suggested simplifying the goals such that there was only one over-arching goal with the other "sub-goals" being discussed under the implementation mechanisms. It was suggested that they all have the main objective of facilitating the production and consumption of locally grown produce and hence achieving the goal of increased locally grown produce. The TWG were potentially comfortable with this revision. CCS will make this revision in the POD for the TWG's review at the next TWG call.

AFW-7

- The 500,000 acre goal for afforestation may not be achievable. Afforestation is going to be defined as an increase in total forested acres.
- If it is not economically beneficial to have certain areas be forested, then land-use change will occur. Policy alone is not likely to be adequate to ensure net afforestation.
- Forest management to ensure sequestration will likely be the best approach, or at least part of this option in order to ensure that forests are sequestering carbon.
- Where state policies are effective, there should be policies towards afforestation. The mechanisms required to make afforestation effective should be outlined in the implementation mechanisms.
- Some areas in AR will likely be more effective in terms of valuable afforestation.
- The last two goals for AFW-7 may need to be merged, so as to clarify the goals. No final decision was made on this item. Aubra Anthony agreed to come back to the group with goals that are clear, unambiguous and can be used for quantification.

AFW-8

- The solid waste management districts are the only group required to report their recycling rates in Arkansas.
- The recycling requirements in Arkansas are very generic. One example is that the state "must offer citizens the opportunity to recycle". There was a question regarding if this issue should be reopened to make legislation regarding recycling more aggressive.
- Bill Lord (Director of the Solid Waste District Operation), may present at the next commission meeting and will likely have better information on waste management than the Department of Environmental Quality.
- There was discussion of strengthening existing recycling legislation in the implementation mechanisms.
- Given the costs of recycling, it might be important to provide incentives to the municipalities to have more aggressive recycling efforts.
- Recycling paper in Arkansas has been a significant effort in the past; it is likely that a tie-in to this type of policy would be effective.
- Most of these issues will become part of the implementation mechanisms. CCS will include the above in implementation mechanisms, any further additions should be forwarded to CCS for inclusion in the POD.

AFW – 9

- The possible inclusion of wastewater treatment plants was considered under this option. AFW-9 may not be the most appropriate location for the inclusion of wastewater treatment plants but the TWG will consider if there is a need for their inclusion in the POD.
- CCS will provide details on the scale of methane capture at wastewater treatment plants in the state.

Discuss Development of Policy Options including quantification

In terms of the development of the policy options, review of the CCS quantification by the TWG is becoming more important.

AFW-5

- The goal is to generate 10% of the biomass for liquid biofuels production. We are making the assumption that these liquid biofuels are cellulosic ethanol, which may not be the case when the policy is implemented. If there are other scenarios that CCS needs to look at, the TWG should make that clear.
- An appropriate startup date for cellulosic ethanol was discussed. The first year of in-state ethanol production will be 2009.
- Cellulosic ethanol may not be practical for the very large scale production, as it is for corn ethanol. A larger number of smaller refineries may be necessary because many of the feedstocks have a lower heat content and thus it is more important that transportation energy expenditures be kept low.
- The option, as it stands now, does not include any biomass feedstocks from MSW fiber or from specifically grown biomass energy crops. CCS will work to include these.
- Issues of the uncertainty in the GHG benefits of biomass and possible adverse land-use change effects have been noted in the key uncertainties, but are not considered in the analysis directly.
- Table 5-1 has been updated since it was sent out to the group, and that will be made available before the next TWG meeting.
- When the updated POD goes out to the TWG, members should send any comments on the changes made to CCS so as to ensure the quantification is proceeding as planned.

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

There may be another meeting scheduled sometime between July 22-24 if possible for the TWG. CCS will check with the TWG members for their availability.

Public Comments and Announcements

It appears that there was a technical problem when attempting to provide opportunities for public comment. To address this problem we will invite public participants to speak at the beginning of our next call.

Thank you to everyone who participated on the call and contributed to the discussion of these issues.