

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

MEETING SUMMARY
MICHIGAN CLIMATE ACTION COUNCIL

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

Call #4, March 27, 2008, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM EDT

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members:
Jeff Andresen, Jim Byrum, Ken Dahlberg, Jordan Devries, Dana Kirk, Phil Korson, Doug Parks, Lisa Scramlin, Carrie Vollmer-Sanders, Brian Warner, Anne Woiwode
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Steve Roe, Rachel Anderson
3. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality:
Terri Novak, Jim Ostrowski, Steve Kulesia, Duane Roskoskey
4. State Agency Participants: Steve Shine, Shauna Tonsor, Tom Stanton, Larry Pedersen (for Donna LaCourt)
5. Public Attendees: none

Background documents:

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

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. Catalog Balloting Results
4. Draft Michigan AFW Options Description
5. Draft Michigan AFW Catalog
6. Summary of Call #3

Discussion items and key issues:

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 reviewed Call #3 minutes and provided an opportunity for TWG members to provide feedback. No revisions or comments were offered by TWG so the summary was accepted without change.
3. CCS reviewed the next steps for the MCAC meeting on April 25th where they will be going over balloting results.
4. CCS reviewed the ballot results that contain raw voting data and consolidation of options into a final recommendation for analysis. Low priority options received 2 votes or less. Medium priority options were those that received 3 to 4 votes. Above 4 votes were considered high priority.
5. CCS reviewed the ballot results:
 - a. AFW-1: “Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production” bundles 1.1 which received 11 votes and 6.1 which received 7 votes. Question: Do we know if the same people voted for both options? Answer: Most people who voted for one didn’t vote for the other if they recommended it for bundling. Some members requested to know who voted for what. Others commented that anonymity was better to protect member’s ability to feel free to choose what they want. Apparently other TWGs shared who voted for what. CCS will check in with Tom Looby but if that is what other groups did then that is probably what we will do too. (NOTE: No ballot attribution will be shared with the public but it is up to the TWG if they would like to see ballot attribution internally). The preliminary title is “Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production” but TWG members are welcome to provide input on what the title should be. A member noted that if there were increased efficiency in other sectors such as energy supply then there wouldn’t be the need for energy from ag sources and suggested that maybe we should wait until other groups work on their efficiency issues so that we can see how much energy from ag resources would be needed. CCS responded that we can put language in the recommendation that encourages efficiency to be pursued before increasing energy supply from the AFW sector. Question: When we talk about encouraging biomass do we mean infinite encouragement? Or do we want to limit the encouragement. How do we incorporate that into the option? Answer: As we build the straw proposals and policy option proposals we will have the opportunity to include refinements that are specific to each policy.
 - b. AFW-2: “In-State Liquid Biofuels Production” bundles 1.2 and 6.2. The option description is very high level at this point as it does not include specific language about feedstocks or energy crops. The TWG will have opportunity later to refine the description. Comment: Algae and Bio-oils could be included in this as well. *CCS will include a note that algae sources should not be neglected when working on this policy option.*
 - c. AFW-3: “Methane Capture and Utilization from Manure and other Biological Waste” bundled 1.3 and 2.1.2. 1.3 focused on digesters

whereas 2.1.2 could be methane capture such as covers and from lagoons. Question: Why was 2.1.1 not included as well? Answer: Only 1 member suggested combining 2.1.1 with the others. A TWG member suggested bundling 11.3 Methane and Bio-gas as well since it could refer to capturing methane from food and other organic waste and received two votes. . Suggestion: Perhaps once we identify the top ten options then the volunteer for each option can ensure that it includes all the policy ingredients that would be helpful in developing that policy. There was consensus that 11.3 be added.

- d. AFW-4: “Expanded Use of Bio-based Materials” bundled 1.5 and 6.5. It may be difficult to quantify emissions reductions with this option. A member suggested that some good research on bio-based plastics is being done in MI. Question: Not sure where the greenhouse gas benefits come in on this option. Answer: Conceptually could be replacing fossil-based plastics with bio-based plastics that would reduce lifecycle emissions. A member suggested that it would also result in less trash going to landfills and that bio-based plastics could be composted.
- e. AFW-5: “Land Use Management that Promotes Permanent Cover” 4.1. This option potentially can be used as a preventive measure to prevent plow-up of land and can also be used to help farmers maintain protected lands. The ecosystem services and carbon sequestration associated with this provide benefits which hopefully can be quantified, but it is challenging to deal with preventive actions in terms of mechanisms and quantification. A member noted that this option can be used to both prevent loss of preserved lands and also identify acres of marginal lands that could be protected.
- f. AFW-6: “Forestry and Agricultural Land Protection” is 4.2 and 7.1 combined. Comment: TLU could address sprawl and development issues while AFW could focus on the use of agricultural and forestry lands. Should include note that focuses on “smart growth” and likely linkage to this type of policy being developed by the TLU group.
- g. AFW-7: “Promotion of Farming Practices that Achieve GHG Benefits” bundles 5.2, 3.1, and 5.4. Some members suggested including 3.2 nutrient management noting that this was an important one in MN and could be bundled together into this option. There was much discussion about whether to include 5.3 Buy Local Food Programs or not with comments about it not being a farming practice countered with comments that a policy developed on building demand for local food supply would have additional GHG savings. There was also discussion on if 5.4 Organic Farming should be included in this option. CCS noted that we will have to explain to the MCAC why some things were included in this bundle but others not and that the question might come back from the council – what are you including under 5.2? We should list the various catalog options here that could be used to meet this goal. There was consensus that 3.2 Nutrient Management will be added.

- h. AFW-8: “Forest Management for Carbon Sequestration and Biodiversity”, 7.4. There was a discussion on the inclusion of the word “biodiversity” in the title. It was added in by workgroup members to make sure that biodiversity was not lost within the design of this policy – that it isn’t the driver but an important factor. Could be changed to “Sustainable Forest Management.” Response: except some might not be ‘managed’ but left intact on its own. It’s not a goal but a side factor. Another member recommended that “sustainable” be added instead of the biodiversity. Adds a long-term emphasis and broadens protection emphasis. If we do that we need to provide an appropriate definition for ‘sustainable’. For some it means a sustainable harvest year after year. If we include “sustainable” it could be included in the title of every option as sustainable liquid biofuels, etc. If we leave biodiversity then we need to make it very clear in the policy option what we mean by biodiversity. The final conclusion of the discussion was that we won’t change the title just yet but it can be changed later in the process. CCS will put in a note for the MCAC that there is some disagreement about the inclusion of the word biodiversity.
 - i. AFW-9: “Advanced Recycling, Source Reduction, and Composting” is 9.1 alone. The order of the title could be changed to “Source Reduction, Advanced Recycling, and Composting,” since that is the logical order of waste management. Comment: 9.4 Organic Waste Management could be added to this. Comment: Toronto’s green bin program separates out organic waste streams and sends those for digestion – a TWG member will provide more information on this. Suggestion: Change Composting to Organics Management to leave it open to other options that are being developed. Agree to change title to “Source Reduction, Advanced Recycling, and Organics Management.” Comment: Could also include 6.4 Biomass gasification since that is one way to handle organics management. Organics management could cover composting, digesting, and gasification.
- 6. There was a discussion of Implementation mechanisms with members noting that some are voluntary and some are mandatory.
- 7. A member brought up the local food option again and wanted to know if it was going to be included in the process. A member nominated bundling 5.3 and 5.4 and making it the tenth policy option. Another member noted that we already had a voting process. A question: Is there another group that could cover this one? We will let the council know that there is interest in the workgroup for covering local food but that it did not receive enough votes or bundling nominations to be included in the high priority tier. CCS noted that the current nine priority options are highly consolidated (over 15 catalog items) and that the TWG’s plate for policy development and analysis is quite full.
- 8. CCS briefly reviewed the policy option template and asked members to start thinking about which of the policy options they are most interested in working on.

Members can work on as many options as they want but it is recommended that they only be the lead volunteer for one option.

9. CCS will be presenting these priorities to the council for their approval. We will continue to cover the Inventory & Forecast. Rachel has made some updates to the waste sector to include landfills divided up by emissions controls. We will post that to the website and let you know when it is ready for review. If members have any I&F contributions please send them to Rachel at: rachel.anderson@pechan.com.
10. A member suggested changing the May 29th date since it is the week of Memorial Day. We will look at either moving it up a week or back a week.
11. The next AFW TWG call is scheduled for Thursday, May 1st from 1-3 PM.
12. Public input: none.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, May 1st, from 1:00 - 3:00 pm. Please RSVP to Terri Novak novaktl@michigan.gov 517.930.3170, if you will be attending in person at DEQ Constitution Hall conference room.
2. Dates for upcoming TWG conference calls:
 - a. May 1st, 1-3 PM
 - b. May 29th, 1-3 PM – tentative.
 - c. June 26th, 1-3 PM
 - d. August 7th, 1-3 PM
 - e. September 25th, 1-3 PM
 - f. October 30th, 1-3 PM.