

<http://www.miclimatechange.us/>

MEETING SUMMARY
MICHIGAN CLIMATE ACTION COUNCIL

Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Technical Work Group (TWG)
(AFW TWG)

Call #1, January 10, 2008, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM EST

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members:
Jeff Andresen, Jim Byrum, Michelle Crook, Ken Dahlberg, Jordan Devries, Dana Kirk, Liesl Clark (in place of Don Koivisto), Andrew Kok, Donna LaCourt, Pete Madden, Doug Park, Jan Patrick, Lisa Scramlin, Tom Stanton, Michael Toth-Purcell, Brian Warner, Carrie Vollmer-Sanders (in place of Scott Piggott), Anne Woiwode, , Steve Shine (MDA)
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Steve Roe, Rachel Anderson
3. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality:
Terri Novak, Duane Roskoskey, Matthew Flechter
4. Michigan Agency Observers: None.
5. Public Attendees: Ken Evans (Consumer Energy), Dan Hager – MI potato growers (in place of Ben Kudwa), Ray VanDriessche – Michigan Sugar Co.

Background documents:

(all posted at <http://www.miclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm>)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. Michigan AFW Options Description
4. Michigan AFW Catalog

Discussion items and key issues:

This was the first conference call of the AFW TWG.

1. Steve Roe called the meeting to order, Rachel Anderson completed the roll call, and Steve reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.

2. CCS provided an overview of the overall Michigan Climate Action Council (MCAC) process, which was convened by Governor Granholm. The MCAC's interim report will be completed by April 30th with initial policy recommendations from the Technical Working Group's (TWGs). The final report is due at the end of calendar year 2008 with detailed policy recommendations and a complete inventory and forecast (I&F).
3. CCS reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the parties in the process. The TWG's role to support the actions of the MCAC was described, serving primarily with technical analysis and providing recommendations to the MCAC. The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) will ensure timely and full completion of MCAC duties.
4. In answer to a question, the DEQ facilitator said she would follow up with why recommendations are going to DEQ and not to the Governor. Another TWG member asked why we don't have a water resources work group. CCS indicated that our group is focused specifically on mitigation of GHG focused on climate change, not adaptation. It is unknown if MCAC is involved in any adaptation. DEQ said they would also look into that.
5. CCS reviewed the TWG's roles – review and assist with GHG I&F and prepare recommendations and strategies for GHG mitigation. The TWG will begin by identifying a full set of mitigation options – then prioritize options most likely to deliver best GHG mitigation potential and other ancillary benefits. It will develop straw proposals that indicate what a given policy option is designed using numerical recommendations for future implementation. In the end the TWG will have a set of potential GHG mitigation strategies and their costs. These will be communicated to the MCAC. Once approved the TWG will build out the details for each priority option that has been selected. All TWG's use a template so that all following same format. These will be subject to approval by the MCAC, which has the voting power to accept policy options as designed or return them to TWG for additional work, and then incorporate them into overall set of recommendations that goes to DEQ. The TWG also reviews and revises the I&F as necessary.
6. CCS gave an overview of the other TWGs and introduced the ground rules of the process – keep up with the information available so the group doesn't have to backtrack, don't represent MCAC or TWG to others. CCS indicated that the MCAC is a voting body that accepts straw proposals but that the TWG itself is less formal. There will be balloting to narrow the list of priorities. A TWG member asked a question about looking at the whole process since GHGs are cumulative, rather than looking at just individual pieces. The facilitator responded that the focus of the TWG tends to be on task we have been assigned with.
7. In response to questions on how to deal with cross-cutting issues and ancillary issues such as environmental quality and job creation, CCS responded that we try to incorporate them early into our recommendation process and weigh those factors in choosing priorities for the workgroup.

8. CCS explained that that outside of priority balloting, there won't be formal balloting but that at each phase of the process there is plenty of room for contribution and all are encouraged to add things to the catalog. Once we have selected priorities we will break up into subgroup to help develop materials for each option, bring that back to TWG for review on subsequent calls, and get input from rest of workgroup. There may be individuals who aren't fully on board with aspects of policy options – that should be included in the policy document to make sure MCAC is aware, and leave it up to them to revise or accept as see fit.
9. In response to a question about communicating with the MCAC, CCS encouraged TWG members to attend MCAC meetings to provide recommendations to MCAC.
10. MCAC is stepwise planning. The TWG is currently working on the first 2 steps:
 - a. Develop inventory and forecast of emissions.
 - b. Identify a full range of possible actions
11. The MCAC process is open, inclusive, and comprehensive. All GHGs, sectors, potential implementation mechanisms, state and multi-state actions, and short and long-term actions are considered.
12. The decision criteria for selecting policies are: GHG reduction potential (MMtCO_{2e}), cost (\$/MtCO_{2e} reduced), co-benefits & feasibility. The last two are not quantified but described qualitatively in the documentation.
13. CCS introduced the catalog of state actions. It is based on a list of actions taken or planned in other states, and includes notes where action has already been taken by the state. The catalog chart was described along with the key to ranking potential GHG emissions and potential cost.
14. CCS walked through the categories in the catalog and asked workgroup members to go through catalog and see if there are other policy options we should include. CCS responded to several questions about how to handle policy options that are interlinked or have downstream effects on other options. CCS explained how policies can take various things into account and be very flexible and encouraged the members to include those ancillary issues, even non-quantitative ones in their policy description. Members were encouraged to enhance policy options by explaining how they link to other options.
15. TWG members requested a compiled list of other states who have undergone similar climate change policy processes and their websites and reports to get a sense of where to start. Members were asked to direct revisions/additions to the catalog and options document to Rachel, who will update them and highlight changes for next meeting.
16. In response to questions about working offline with other TWG members, CCS indicated that the group normally breaks into subgroups at a later date but we can send out a list of contact information now if that would be helpful. There were no votes in opposition. The facilitator mentioned that in 2nd call TWG members can start to identify which area they are interested in.

17. In response to questions about bringing other more specialized people in to subgroups, CCS responded that the proposal probably needs to be taken to DEQ to see if they can approve additional TWG members. The facilitator also reminded the group that members of the public will always have opportunity to take part and weigh in on each call and that they won't be working in a vacuum. It is expected that they will be going out and working with other people and gathering information.
18. A TWG member asked how the people on the TWG were chosen and the DEQ representative responded that it started with Council members choosing their TWG and recommending others. A list was also passed around for those sitting in public to indicate their interest in TWGs. In response to an inquiry, the DEQ representative said members can contact Lyn Fiedler see if additional people can be added to the TWG. Or they could participate as general public.
19. CCS reviewed policy design proposals and the policy options template, which includes concept, goals, timing, and coverage. The final MCAC report will include an executive summary, I&F, chapter for each TWG, and detailed appendices based on the TWGs full policy options document with a full set of completed templates for each policy option.
20. CCS outlined the Michigan Inventory and Forecast, noting that inventory covers current and past while the forecast covers the future. Each sector includes individual assumptions about behavior out into the future creating a Business as Usual reference case. The facilitator indicated that growth can be negative and that gross emissions are just sources while net represents sources and sinks. Standard methods such as those used by EPA & UN were used for the I&F, which were documented so that a reader could essentially recalculate it. A preference was given to MI or regional data, though in some cases national data had to be relied upon. TWG members are asked to review and, if necessary, revise the overall I&F report as well as the specific AFW appendices that include procedures and sources.
21. The I&F covers the six GHGs considered by the US EPA and UNFCCC: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. This is a policy-level I&F, built to diagnose GHG emissions and trends at a state-level, but not to develop a baseline or model for compliance or analysis of individual options at specific facilities.
22. CCS discussed the agenda and time for the meeting. The next steps are to have TWG members formulate catalog options and review the I&F. It will be made available to TWG members. Steve from CCS will attend MCAC meeting Feb 14 where the AFW catalog will be presented.
23. There was a discussion on how TWG meetings should be announced and if posting in on the webpage is sufficient. TWG member expressed a desire for a listserv that people can join if they want to be informed of meetings.

24. A final comment from a member mentioned a WRI report, in particular supplementary page 55 showing a net change in MI from 1990 to 2003 from a net sink of carbon of ~60 MM tons to net source of 6-8 MM tons.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, January 24, from 1:00 - 3:00 pm.
2. TWG members should review the Catalog of State Actions before the next call and be prepared to discuss additions and revisions to the catalog on the next call. TWG members should send in comments/questions/additions to Rachel Anderson (rachel.anderson@pechan.com).
3. When posted, TWG members should review at least the AFW appendices of the GHG Inventory & Forecast Report, so that issues can be discussed on the next call. CCS will notify the TWG members when these materials are available for review as well as the full I&F report.