



www.mnclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
MINNESOTA CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY GROUP
Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management Technical Work Group
(AFW TWG)

Call #2, June 7, 2007, 3:00pm – 4:30pm

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members: David Tilman, Julie Ketchum, Don Hejna (for Peter Aube), Will Anthony, Ted Troolin (for Steve Raukar), Bill Hunt, Bill Lee, Carrie Mellesmoen, Mitch Davis, Jim Klienschmidt, Mike Harley, Tom Gieseke, Cheryl Miller, Dave Zumeta, Shalini Gupta, Staci Bohlen.

2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Stephen Roe, Brad Strode

3. Minnesota Department of Commerce (DOC) and Pollution Control Agency (PCA)
Liaisons and Attendees:
Liaison - David Richfield, MPCA
State staff attendees - MPCA: David Thornton, Jim Chiles, Wayne Anderson, Allen Dotson, Peter Ciborowski, Lisa Herschberger, Anne Clafin, Brian Timerson
DNR: Keith Wendt, Clarence Turner
Agriculture: Paul Burns, Michael Yost
Met Council: Rebecca Flood
Commerce: Linda Limback

4. Public Attendees: None

5. Observers:
Ginny Black; Audubon Society
Doug Carnival; National Solid Wastes Management Association

Background documents:

(all posted at http://www.mnclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry.cfm)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference.

3. AFW Draft Catalog of State Actions.
4. AFW State Actions Descriptions.

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS conducted the roll call and reviewed the Agenda for the call.
2. CCS reminded the TWG members to review the call summary, especially if they are not able to attend a meeting. The first call summary was reviewed and the TWG was invited to provide feedback on the call summary. The summary of call 1 was approved by the TWG.
3. CCS reminded TWG members that there is a MCCAG meeting on June 14, 2007. TWG members who are not MCCAG members are invited to attend and are asked to contact PCA (e-mail Steve Roe or Brad Strode with CCS for contact information) if they wish to attend and receive a continental breakfast, lunch, and other conference materials.
4. The focus of the call moved on to the catalog of state actions. TWG members who have provided CCS with feedback were asked to share their comments with the TWG.
5. A question from TWG member raised a process question pertaining to the necessity of experts from all three sectors to participate on each call, rather than going into more depth within each individual sector. CCS explained that it is important for the entire TWG to be up-to-date on each option for the purpose of prioritizing the options for future analysis.
6. TWG comments and conversation specific to the AFW Actions Catalog:
 - a. A TWG member commented that the life-cycle net benefits should be considered when developing the liquid fuel-related options on AFW-1.
 - b. CCS explained that the next step of the process is to insert nominal ratings (low-medium-high) for potential GHG emissions reductions and cost-per-ton.
 - c. A TWG member suggested that another sub-action be implemented under AFW-2: using biofilters to increase biomass production. Additionally, implementation mechanisms for manure and nutrient management are discussed. Another potential action that was proposed is to capture methane from confined livestock facilities for energy production. Within the “manure management” sub-action, it was suggested manure management be broken into manure utilization and manure capture.
 - d. Another sub-action within AFW-3 was proposed that would implement auto-steer mechanisms to reduce energy and improve farm efficiency. This measure might also be captured by AFW-5.
 - e. A question regarding the coverage of AFW-4.1 regarding the definition of “grassland cover.” Herbaceous cover was proposed as an alternative from grassland cover. Another land use conservation measure that had been suggested was the conversion to – or preservation of – peat bogs. A TWG member stated that MN has more peat-land than any other state in the contiguous 48 states. CCS

asked for clarification as to whether the conservation of peat-lands should be its own category or a sub-category within the AFW-4 Land-use change options. CCS will create a separate category called AFW-12, a combined Ag-Forestry category that covers the preservation of peatlands and wetlands.

- f. CCS reviewed the sub-options within AFW-5. A question was raised regarding the commodities or goods covered by AFW-5.3. CCS responded that it is the intention of later analysis to be as comprehensive as possible and would invite the TWG to provide as much Minnesota-specific data regarding local agriculture product marketing and consumption as possible.
- g. Upon transitioning to the forestry options (AFW 6-8), CCS emphasized that policy options can be developed across sectors.
- h. Concern regarding energy production from marketable timber (roundwood) was raised by the TWG. It was brought to the attention of CCS and the TWG that a current action exists that prohibits the production of energy from roundwood that could be used for long-lived forestry products.
- i. CCS reviewed the options under AFW-7 and solicited comments. A TWG member raised a point regarding the reclamation of mining lands in NW Minnesota. This reclamation is captured under AFW-7.3. Another TWG member suggested including additional options regarding wildfires and insect blight is warranted, given recent concerns surrounding these issues.
- j. A TWG member suggested that the wording of AFW-8.1 be changed to read “Utilization of Sawmill Residues.” After a concern was raised regarding the applicability of AFW-8.2 to Minnesota, CCS reminded the TWG that the Catalog is developed from actions developed by other states, with the task of the TWG being to revise the catalog to apply more specifically to MN.
- k. The action “Promotion of new technologies for waste energy conversion” was proposed and implemented by CCS as 9.7 under AFW-9. This option would promote not only new technologies for waste energy conversion, but also existing best-available technologies. A question was raised regarding AFW-9.1 and the type of composting that is included. CCS responded that the overall goal of the option was to increase the diversion from the waste stream.
- l. A TWG member commented that AFW-9.4; Resource Management Contracts. This member questioned the relevance and potential for this option, citing that nearly 75% of total recycling was from the Commercial/Industrial/Institutional sector (the sector to which AFW-9.4 most likely applies). Additionally, a TWG member addressed concern with this option, due to the nature of contracts between two parties, and the feasibility of this contract process being influenced by State policy. It was noted by CCS that options are generally not deleted in this stage of the process and that the TWG members will have the opportunity to prioritize the options during future TWG conference call meetings.
- m. It was noted that options 9.1 and 9.6, pertaining to single-stream organic composting, may actually increase GHG emissions as a result of the long distances that such waste must travel to reach existing composted facilities.

- n. No comments for the TWG were entered for AFW-10.
 - o. Additional options that pertain to AFW-11 were distributed prior to the call. CCS solicited additional comments from the TWG.
7. After completion of the discussion regarding the catalog, a lack of time prevented in-depth discussion of the inventory and forecast (I&F). It was noted that the I&F is going to be updated to include match up to the time horizons of the Next Generation Minnesota Energy Act. The methods of the extension of the I&F to 2025 are points of discussion for future calls and offline input from TWG members.
 8. The schedule of future TWG calls was briefly reviewed by CCS.
 9. Public comments are solicited. All public comments had already been addressed in the call.
 10. A brief discussion regarding the inventory and forecast took place at the end of the call with issues regarding carbon sequestration in forest products and anaerobic waste processing raised by the TWG.
 - a. A TWG member suggested that the LAND GEM model used to estimate emissions for the Waste sector generally overestimates emissions. This TWG member suggested using instead the 75% default emissions that EPA uses and would like to have input regarding I&F protocols in future meetings. CCS noted that the I&F is currently in DRAFT form and will be addressed in future calls.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on June, from 3:00 - 4:30 pm.
2. When posted, TWG members should review the AFW appendices of the Draft GHG Inventory & Forecast Report distributed by e-mail and posted on the AFW website, so that issues can be discussed on the next call.
3. Any additions or revisions to the Catalog that were not discussed during the call should be directed by TWG members to Steve Roe or Brad Strode.