



www.mnclimatechange.us

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

Call #5, August 16, 2007, 1:00PM – 3:00PM

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members: Ted Troolin (for Steve Raukar), Joe Maher, Andy Hart, Greg Miller, Shalini Gupta, Jim Kleinschmit, Stacey Bohlen, Julie Ketchum, Mike Harley, Tim Gieseke, Dave Tilman, Cheryl Miller, Stan Ellison
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Stephen Roe, Brad Strode, Gloria Flora
3. Minnesota Department of Commerce (DOC) and Pollution Control Agency (PCA)
Liaisons and Attendees:
Liaison - David Richfield, MPCA
Other MPCA: Jim Chiles, Bill Sierks, David Thornton, Myrna Halbach, Anne Claffin
DNR: Keith Wendt
Agriculture:
Met Council: Rebecca Flood
Commerce:
4. Public Attendees: Doug Carnival, NSWMA
5. Observers: Tim Brownell, Eureka Recycling; Dan Donkers, Ramsey County; Darwin Schultz, Hennepin County

Background documents:

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

1. Summary of Call #4
2. Meeting Notice and Agenda
3. PowerPoint for Teleconference.
4. AFW Draft Priority Policy Options for Analysis

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS conducted the roll call and reviewed the Agenda for the call.
2. CCS discussed proposed changes in dates for the next two conference calls. The new proposed dates are October 2 and 23. These dates were not acceptable for the TWG. Alternative dates that were proposed were October 11 and November 1.
3. CCS reviewed the draft summary of Call #4. No changes to the summary were proposed by the TWG.
4. The steps in the stepwise planning process that have been addressed (or are being addressed) were reviewed. Currently, the AFW TWG has completed the second and third steps. The first and fourth steps - “Develop inventory and forecast of emissions” and “Develop Straw Proposals” - are steps that were addressed during this call.
5. CCS reviewed the comments made by the MCCAG on the Initial Priorities for Analysis. Concerns were raised by the TWG regarding whether the priorities approved by the MCCAG accurately reflect what the intention of the TWG was during balloting. CCS replied that there will be time during the development of straw proposals to work through questions and problems with the options.
6. Turning to the Priority Policy Options Template - posted on the website - CCS began the process of soliciting volunteers for the development of straw proposals. CCS stressed the importance that the language of the Straw Proposals reflects the knowledge and opinions of the TWG. Therefore, work group volunteers should use discretion when soliciting input from outside sources (i.e., trade associations). A TWG member inquired whether MPCA staff would be available for consultation regarding the development of Straw Proposals. CCS suggested that volunteers contact Dave Richfield to seek members within the MPCA or other state agencies that might have expertise in a certain field. The MPCA commented that the role of state staff is to provide technical information and expertise, not personal opinion.
7. Returning to the Template, CCS noted that this document is currently a list of straw proposals. After the MCCAG has approved the Policy Description and Design (the components of the straw proposal), the straw proposals become known as “Policy Options” and this document becomes the “Policy Options Document.” CCS recommended that the volunteers use the language CCS used for the Policy Description as a starting point, but should feel free to adjust the Policy Description to their discretion, remembering to keep the Policy Description succinct.
8. The discussion of the Policy Design component of the Straw Proposal was based upon the template found under AFW-3. CCS said that the numeric goals that are set should use relevant metrics (not emissions reductions) and are aimed towards 2025. The incremental goal should be consistent (2012). A TWG member questioned whether the volunteers should take into account the short-term viability of the technology mandated by a certain option when developing the incremental goal.
9. CCS reviewed each of the priority proposals for analysis, highlighting key points in the Policy Description Section drafted by CCS, as well as providing brief examples of what the Policy Design could look like. Please refer to the end of this summary for links to

documents from other states that might help in the development of the straw proposals. For the “Parties Involved” section, include any agencies, organizations, or other groups that may be stakeholders for that particular policy. For “Other,” it might be prudent to include any “business as usual” actions already taken that might influence the policy design. The straw proposals should be drafted by the volunteers in time for CCS to pull them together in advance of the September 6 meeting. Although this is short notice CCS would like the work group volunteers to work expeditiously to develop the straw proposals for this date. The full set of straw proposals must be complete by September 20.

10. CCS reviewed the results of the recent forest and waste management inventory and forecast conference calls. The waste management inventory and forecast will be revised this coming fall.
11. During the next meeting, the TWG will attempt to review and finalize straw proposals.
12. Members of the public were offered the chance to provide input. Doug Carnival questioned whether the process is similar across TWGs, as well as whether members of the public will have the chance to observe the work group volunteers’ development of the straw proposals.
13. Please click on the links below to view examples of Policy Options Documents from other States. Pay particular attention to the Policy Design sections:
 - a. <http://www.ncclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O120F11667.pdf>
 - b. <http://www.vtclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O123F12488.pdf>
 - c. <http://www.mtclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O127F12594.pdf>
 - d. <http://www.coloradoclimate.org/ewebeditpro/items/O14F12851.pdf>

*Note that these documents are in Draft form.

Next steps and agreements:

1. Remaining TWG meetings are September 6, October 11, November 1, November 29, and December 20. The time for the August 16 meeting is 1:00PM to 3:00 PM.
2. Please send all Straw Proposal language to Gloria Flora (gflora@s-o-solutions.org) so that she may incorporate the text into the Priority Options Template.
3. TWG members have been sent an e-mail with the contact information for all TWG members on the distribution list. This information is for the benefit of the members of this group and will not be made public.

Revised Number	Preliminary Number	Preliminary Title	TWG Volunteers (lead volunteer in bold)
AFW-1	AFW-1	Agricultural Crop Management	Andy Hart , Staci Bohlen, Jim Kleinschmit, Dave Tilman, Greg Miller, Tim Gieseke
AFW-2	AFW-5	Land Use Management Approaches for Protection and Enrichment of Soil Carbon	Staci Bohlen, Stan Ellison , Will Anthony, Jim Kleinschmit, Cheryl Miller, Dave Tilman, Tim Gieseke
AFW-3	AFW-7	In-State Liquid Biofuels Production	Andy Hart, Shalini Gupta , Dave Tilman
AFW-4	AFW-4	Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production	Stan Ellison, Will Anthony, Shalini Gupta, Greg Miller
AFW-5	AFW-2	Forestry Management Programs to Enhance GHG Benefits	Cheryl Miller, Dave Zumeta
AFW-6	AFW-6	Forest Protection – Reduced Clearing and Conversion to Nonforest Cover	Cheryl Miller, Dave Zumeta
AFW-7	AFW-3	Integrated Waste Management	Julie Ketchum , Ted Troolin, Jim Kleinschmit
AFW-8	AFW-8	End of Use Waste Management Practices	Julie Ketchum, Ted Troolin , Shalini Gupta