

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

MEETING SUMMARY
MICHIGAN CLIMATE ACTION COUNCIL

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

Call #6, May 29, 2008, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM EDT

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members:
Jeff Andresen, Cara Boucher, Ken Dahlberg, Dana Kirk, Jan Patrick, Duane Roskoskey, Lisa Scramlin, Tom Stanton, Gary Wyckoff,
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Steve Roe, Rachel Anderson, Jackson Schreiber, Jennifer Jenkins
3. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality:
Terri Novak, Steve Kulesia, Timothy Unseld
4. State Agency Participants:
Anthony Weatherspoon - DNR
5. Public Attendees: none.

Background documents:

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

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. Summary of Call #5
3. PowerPoint Presentation for Teleconference
4. Straw Proposals
5. Description of State Actions

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 today's agenda, which is to review the draft Straw Proposals, discuss quantification methods, and review the Inventory and Forecast (I&F).

3. CCS reviewed the Call #5 minutes and provided an opportunity for TWG members to provide feedback. The summary was accepted without additional changes.
4. The straw proposals were reviewed as follows:
5. *AFW-1 Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production*: Donna LaCourt and Tom Stanton (co-leads). The Goal of 12.5% of total in-state electric generation from sustainable biomass feedstock by 2025 was discussed. The goal is to increase total capacity to 12.5%, not to increase capacity by 12.5% from the BAU estimate. It is important that the goal remains possible based on the demand for electricity and the supply of biomass available. There are already plants seeking permits to burn 25% of their fuel from biomass energy, which would substantially reduce the supply of available biomass. One study was cited as saying that it would be possible (from a biomass supply perspective) to double the amount of biomass burned in the state. It is possible that the utilities will be purchasing biomass on a much larger scale than currently seen as a method of co-firing to reduce the carbon/mWh footprint of their coal plants. Some coordination is necessary between the energy supply and AFW TWGs to ensure that adequate biomass supply exists to meet the demands of both parties.
6. *AFW-2 In-State Liquid Biofuels Production*: Donna LaCourt and Tom Stanton (co-leads). The Michigan Renewable Fuels Commission Final Report is useful in determining the appropriate/attainable level of biofuels for the state. There were concerns raised about the recent Science article that biomass/renewable fuels can have the potential to be net sources of Greenhouse Gases, rather than reducing the carbon footprint of fuels. Under implementation mechanisms, there is mention of the goal to “Increase permanent forestland cover (including improved stocking of under-stocked stands) across the state by 1 million acres through afforestation and reforestation by 2025.” This is not directly related to the biofuels option, but is included here to preserve current CRP or forested lands so that land won’t be converted to energy crop production. It may not be possible to increase the forestland cover by 1 million acres. However, it may be possible to increase the volume of wood/biomass available on forested land through better management practices. Previous studies have shown that there remains significant disagreement on the benefits of various biomass fuels. However, cellulosic ethanol is widely agreed to have significantly greater benefits than corn-based ethanol. It is important that the focus of this issue be on decreasing the carbon content of fuel, rather than just increasing the amount of biofuel used.
7. *AFW-3 Methane Capture and Utilization from Manure and other Biological Waste*: Dana Kirk, lead volunteer. This option has been expanded to include gasification technologies. An audit is needed of the organic waste stream in the state, and what percentage of that might be usable for on-farm application. It would also be useful to get the fraction of manure that is in a liquid form vs a dry form, so that transportation issues can be addressed.
8. *AFW-4 Expanded Use of Bio-based Materials*: Lisa Scramlin – lead volunteer. The goal is to expand the use of bio-based materials when compared with

- petroleum based materials. There was some discussion of whether the goal of 100,000 tons of bio-based products is appropriate. Bio-based materials are different from recycled products, and those items are considered separately within this option. Clearer guidelines may be needed to ensure that this distinction is clear. A study on the use of bio-based materials in the state will be sent to CCS to help with understanding/quantification of this item. An example of a bio-based product is utilizing waste wood from emerald ash borer
9. *AFW-5 Land Use Management that Promotes Permanent Cover*: It can be difficult to determine the GHG benefits of some types of land cover compared to other types (wetlands for example). This could be an ongoing issue with quantifying this option. Not all types of permanent cover are equally beneficial from a GHG perspective, which could further compound the quantification of this item. The goal could be changed to “reduce the rates of soil carbon loss” when changing from farmland and grassland. This would help ensure the carbon benefits of this program. The definition of permanent cover can be broadened to include things beside agricultural lands such as medians, lands along highways, etc.
 10. *AFW-6 Forestry and Agricultural Land Protection*: Cara Boucher – lead volunteer. The goal is designed to reduce the conversions of farm and forestland in Michigan. Curtailing urban sprawl by maintaining urban and suburban centers in Michigan is essential to the success of this option. Some parts of this goal remain unquantified because it is difficult to determine an appropriate/quantifiable starting point. The conservation easements in part B of the option could be considered implementation mechanisms for part A. At the very least there is some overlap amongst these options. It is possible that item will be moved pending consultation with the MCAC. For the moment, this will be put under the Other bullet at the end of the Policy Design segment. It will be difficult to quantify the GHG benefits of “reducing the rate of conversion between agriculture and non-agriculture use”. It is possible this would even have a net cost in terms of GHGs, depending on the type of land conversion that takes place.
 11. *AFW-7 Promotion of Farming Practices that Achieve GHG Benefits*: There was discussion of whether the first part, increasing the amount of organic farms in the state, could be changed to organic farms with a GHG benefit. This would ensure that the practices within the organic farms considered would have a measurable GHG reduction. It is important to link organic farming with GHG benefits. There will be an addition to both the Policy Description and Policy Design to ensure that the organic practices encouraged in this option have a measureable GHG benefit. There are currently ~45,000 organic acres in MI. This TWG subgroup will try to send to CCS the changes and potential goals (the appropriate number of acres) for this option within a week. It was agreed to remove the stipulation that some parts of this option are exclusively concerned with “small-farms”, because all farms should be considered under this option.
 12. *AFW-8 Forest Management for Carbon Sequestration and Biodiversity*: This option is related to AFW-6 and there is some overlap between these options. There are several items that were discussed as being additional goals for this item,

but were eventually moved to be implementation mechanisms instead. Additional discussion of this option will continue offline.

13. *AFW-9 Source Reduction, Advanced Recycling, and Organics Management:* Some of the goals for this option were made more aggressive since the previous meeting based on input from the sub-group.
14. *AFW-10 Landfill Methane Energy Programs:* Some of the goals of this option have been changed based on the decisions of the sub-group. Some potential implementation problems include uncertainty regarding collection efficiencies and landfill emissions within the state.
15. *Discussion of MI GHG Inventory and Forecast:* Quantification of these policy options will be easier if TWG members look over the Inventory and Forecast. Some small changes have been made on the Inventory and Forecast files. Members are asked to review the quantification methods as outlined in the powerpoint file from today's call.
16. Please send any feedback or updates to Rachel.anderson@pechan.com.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, July 10th, 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 the DEQ Constitution Hall conference room.
2. Dates for upcoming TWG conference calls:
 - a. July 10th, 1-3 PM
 - b. August 7th, 1-3 PM
 - c. September 25th, 1-3 PM
 - d. October 30th, 1-3 PM.