



MEETING SUMMARY
MICHIGAN CLIMATE ACTION COUNCIL
Agriculture, Forestry and Waste (AFW TWG)
Call #11, October 30, 2008

Attendance:

TWG members: Ken Dahlberg, Charles Griffith (TLU Member), Dana Kirk, Donna LaCourt,
Center for Climate Strategies: Steve Roe, Jackson Schreiber, Jen Jenkins, Brad Strode, Joe Pryor, Jared Nunery

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality: Terri Novak, Steve Kulesia, Matt Flechter

Michigan Department of Agriculture: Michelle Crook

Michigan Department of Natural Resources: Cara Boucher

Michigan Public Service Commission: Tom Stanton

Members of the Public: none.

Background Documents: (<http://www.miclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm>)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. Summary of Call #10
4. Policy Options Document

Discussion and Key Items:

Review and approve prior call summary

The previous call summary was approved.

Review Policy Options Document

To avoid inconsistencies between the CCS quantifications in other sectors, options will be quantified both on a life cycle basis showing reductions occurring both within and outside of MI (as previously shown in the POD) and a separate break-out of GHG reductions likely to occur within state boundaries (these reductions will be shown in the summary table at the front of the POD).

AFW-9

- The reductions for this option will be reduced significantly, because so many of the reductions are coming from energy reductions associated with the production/distribution of products and packaging that are likely to occur outside of the state.
- There was concern expressed that other CCS states in the past are considering the emissions reductions on the life cycle basis, and this could lead to inconsistency when comparing Michigan AFW options to AFW options from other states.
- The TWG felt that, for waste in particular, these analyses must use a life-cycle approach. This opinion will be presented to the MCAC.

- There was a request to the TWG to provide more information on “Parties Involved” and “Feasibility Issues” for this option.

AFW-10

- There was a request to the TWG to provide more information on “Parties Involved” and “Feasibility Issues” for this option.

AFW-6b

- Because this option could not be discussed at the meeting, there was a request that the TWG members look over this item in the POD and provide comments. A revised version of the POD with updated text will be distributed to the TWG next week.

AFW-7

- Ken Dahlberg had some recommended additions to Implementation Mechanisms that he will send along to CCS.

AFW-6a

- There was a request to the TWG to provide more information on “Key Uncertainties” and “Additional Benefits and Costs” for this option.

AFW-5

- There was a request to the TWG to provide more information on “Key Uncertainties” for this option.

AFW-4

- There was a request to copy some of the implementation mechanisms for AFW-9 to AFW-4, because they apply in both places.

AFW-3

- The TWG confirmed not to change the overall analysis approach, and Dana Kirk will be in touch with CCS to improve the write-up of this option.

Biomass Supply

- Biomass supply estimates have been revised downward, and these new numbers are now reflected in the POD.
- Existing biomass demand will be removed from Table 2 – Overall Biomass Demands from Policies, to avoid double-counting.
- The Key Uncertainties of AFW-1 and AFW-2 will show that the biomass estimates are meant to remain conservative, and therefore it would be possible to expand these options beyond where they are currently planned to be used.

AFW-1

- There was a request that the goal be changed back to producing 10% of in-state electricity from biomass by 2025, rather than increased to 12.5% as it is currently shown (which was the original goal proposed by the TWG). The 10% goal has already been approved by the MCAC. CCS will revise the numbers and text accordingly.

- There was a request to the TWG to provide more information on “Additional Costs and Benefits” for this option.

AFW-2

- There was a request to ensure that the estimates for starch-based ethanol match up to the figures provided previously by Jim Byrum.

Public Input and Announcements

No comments

Thank you to all TWG members and state representatives for your valuable comments.