

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
Montana Climate Change Advisory Committee
Agriculture, Forestry & Waste Management
Technical Work Group
Call #9, April 4, 2007

Attendance:

1. TWG Members: Ted Dodge, Dave Kelsey, Neil Sampson, Julie Anderson (for Lowell Whitney), Richard Leibert, Robert Boettcher, Collin Waters
2. Public: None
3. CCS: Steve Roe, Katie Bickel
4. DEQ: Bob Habeck, Pat Crowley, Jeff Blend, Lou Moore

Background documents:

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

1. Agenda
2. Draft Summary of AFW TWG Call#8
3. Power Point Presentation to the AFW TWG
4. MT AFW Policy Options
5. Revised Forestry Appendix to the MT GHG Inventory & Forecast Report
6. Revised Inventory & Forecast Text

Discussion and conclusions:

1. CCS reviewed the summary from call #8. No revisions were requested. Clarification was made that highlighting in the policy options document is meant to show where changes have been made since the last TWG call.
2. Agenda for today is to review CCAC input and discuss next steps on drafting policy options. In addition, review update on forestry inventory and forecast.
3. CCAC requested further TWG consideration on two options in particular: For AFW-3 Ethanol Production, the CCAC would like to see a higher cellulosic ethanol goal and asked the TWG to revisit the ratio of starch-based to cellulosic ethanol production. For AFW-12 Enhanced Solid Waste Recovery and Recycling, the CCAC would like the TWG to look at raising the rates of recycling by 2020. There was some discussion about how to set goals. CCS encouraged TWG members to consider it as a balance between setting ambitious targets within reasonable levels.
4. Discussion of AFW-12: In at least one half of the State, recycling activities are limited by transportation distance due to fuel expenses. Recycling opportunities are lower in those areas. Western third of the state there may be opportunities if you target the population centers (where 2/3rds of the population lives) and where

www.mtclimatechange.us

- forestry biomass is more abundant. CCS suggested considering directed opportunities at the organic portion of the waste stream, e.g., divert to biomass energy, composting, cellulosic feedstock, etc, instead of landfilling. TWG volunteer explained that the 25% goal was a straight-line approximation according to the state waste management plan and that the TWG could base goals on an upward curve to achieve greater benefits. CCS expressed that a purpose of this process is to push things further beyond business as usual. TWG volunteers agreed to make higher goals with inclusion of text on feasibility concerns. Volunteers will revisit goal levels.
5. Discussion of AFW-3: TWG volunteers consulted an expert group in establishing the goal levels. Volunteers were hesitant to overestimate as they felt the goals are fairly aggressive and realistically optimistic. CCS inquired about the limiting factors. Transporting feedstocks to production plants is seen as a big hurdle. Goal levels are based on current planned/permitted ethanol plants. CCS also noted that the CCAC was interested in seeing additional policies to promote cellulosic ethanol production in MT. CCS raised the possibility of incentivizing starch-based production driven by renewable fuels (e.g., in conjunction with beef feedlots where methane gas is captured and used for energy). TWG volunteers indicated there is a good synergy but the scale is typically small. Feedstock cost is also another issue; corn is the cheapest feedstock currently. Volunteers felt comfortable with increasing the amount of cellulosic production, with the assumption that a diversity of feedstocks will be available. The issue of the trade-offs, in terms of nutrients and erosion, of removing agricultural residues was raised. CCS asked the volunteers to regroup and reconsider the cellulosic goals as well as the ratio between starch and cellulosic production methods.
 6. CCS asked if others had comments on the CCAC meeting, in terms of issues to revisit in the straw proposals. No comments.
 7. CCS reviewed next steps in drafting policy options. CCS will begin quantifying costs and benefits of the options, working in close collaboration with the TWG volunteers and input from DEQ. TWG volunteers should develop additional details on Implementation Mechanisms, Related Policies/programs, and begin developing sections on Additional Benefits and Costs and Feasibility Issues. CCS will work on sections 5-7 (Reductions, Quantification of Benefits and Costs, Key Uncertainties).
 8. The TWG asked when would the cost effectiveness numbers be available. CCS indicated that draft numbers could be available by the next call.
 9. CCS reviewed current straw proposals and asked for input/edits from the TWG. AFW-1 language regarding tillage intensities was discussed. CCS proposed text changes, which were accepted by TWG members. One TWG volunteer suggested pulling in experts from the University or elsewhere to help quantify GHG benefits of organic farming methods. TWG volunteers will provide CCS with contact information and CCS will follow-up.
 10. Comment on AFW-3. Transportation distance is a key issue. CCS encouraged looking at a diversity of feedstock streams for cellulosic ethanol. Timing is another issue (crop residues come all at once and then need to be stored, if using

www.mtclimatechange.us

- for base load delivery). A diversity of sources helps provide a year-round feedstocks. Citing of facilities will be important. Community-based, small sized plants may be appropriate for MT. Additional information has been provided to CCS on related policies/programs (not shown in version posted on web, but has been included in most recent version).
11. AFW-4. Should be aware of new Farm Bill authorizations pending. Will need to see how that plays out.
 12. AFW-5 under Coverage of Parties, add “and Conservation” to Montana Department of Natural Resources.
 13. AFW-6. CCAC agreed with TWG proposal to incorporate into other options and discard this one (CCS will renumber options).
 14. AFW-7. Add to coverage of parties: University of MT College of Forestry and Conservation, US Forest Service, US Bureau of Land Management, private landowners, and industrial/commercial energy providers/consumers.
 15. AFW-8. Add Conservation Districts and Watershed Management Groups to Coverage of Parties. It was noted that riparian planting, windbreaks and shelter belts are not included in the reforestation goals. Given the potential opportunities (see text in “other” for discussion of opportunities) volunteers were asked to consider adding goals that would cover these areas. Under Coverage of Parties add “and Conservation” to MT Dept. of Natural Resources.
 16. AFW-9. Still need to provide a value for increased productivity levels under the goal.
 17. AFW-10. CSS would like to fill in data on current levels of wood in MT housing stock (in terms of board feet) and requested the data (which has been previously shared verbally on the phone).
 18. AFW-11. It was noted that the Proceedings of the Food and Ag Summit in MT might have some useful information. DEQ will try and locate the proceedings.
 19. AFW-12. No comments
 20. GHG Inventory and Forecast revisions. CCS reported on adjustments to the estimates and changes in the appendix and report text. DEQ requested review by Steve Running of the text changes, particularly in the report text.
 21. TWG requested someone coordinate updates from the legislature. Lisa Peterson and Lou Moore will provide a summary of the new legislation after this session (likely to be ready in early May).
 22. CCS encouraged the forestry group to consider having a subcommittee phone call the week of April 23rd to discuss the analysis framework for forestry options. CCS will follow-up to set a date/time.

Next steps:

1. Next TWG call May 9, 2007, 2:00-4:00 p.m.
2. Provide CCS with updated text and other information for each policy option by April 25.
3. CCS forestry subgroup will meet (date and time TBD).

**MT AFW Volunteers for Policy Option Development
(Additional volunteers are requested)**

Option #	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Volunteers
AFW-1	Agricultural Soil Carbon Management Programs	T. Peterson; D. Kelsey; R. Bricklemyer; C. Watters, R. Boettcher
AFW-2	Biodiesel Production (incentives for feedstocks and production plants)	C. Watters, D. Kelsey, B. Bahr
AFW-3	Ethanol Production	R. Liebert, C. Watters, J. Blend
AFW-4	Incentives for Maintenance of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) Acreage	T. Dodge, R. Bricklemyer, L. Saul
AFW-5	Preserve Open Space & Working Lands	L. Whitney, R. Liebert, L. Saul, J. Blend
AFW-6	Forest Health Programs for Carbon Management	B. Habeck, N. Sampson; S. Miller
AFW-7	Expanded Use of Forest Biomass Feedstocks for Energy Use	P. Crowley, N. Sampson, S. Miller
AFW-8	Afforestation and Reforestation Programs	N. Sampson, L. Whitney, B. Habeck
AFW-9	Improved Management and Restoration of Existing Stands	L. Whitney, B. Habeck
AFW-10	Expanded Use of Wood Products for Building Materials	B. Bahr, L. Whitney
AFW-11	Programs to Promote Local Food & Fiber	L. Saul, R. Liebert, C. Watters, R. Boettcher
AFW-12	Enhanced Solid Waste Recovery & Recycling	P. Crowley, B. Bahr
Contact Information		
Gary Perry	Perrysd35@aol.com	406-282-7477
Ted Dodge	ted.dodge@ncoc.us	406-723-6262
Trudi Peterson	elpranch@hotmail.com	406-374-2244
Dave Kelsey	dave_kelsey2@hotmail.com	406-669-3115
Neil Sampson	RNeilSampson@cs.com	703-924-0773
Ross Bricklemyer	rsb@montana.edu	406-994-5119
Lowell Whitney	lwhitney@mt.gov	406-542-4256
Collin Watters	cwatters@mt.gov	406-444-2402
Sterling Miller	millers@nwf.org	406-721-6705
Jim Evanoff	Jim_Evanoff@nps.gov	406-581-5470
Richard Liebert	wwranch@3rivers.net	406-736-5791
Robert Boettcher	boettrae@ttc-cmc.net	406-378-3243
Lynda Saul	lsaul@mt.gov	406-444-6652
Bill Bahr	bbahr@mt.gov	406-444-7305
Bob Habeck	bhabeck@mt.gov	406-444-5337
Jeff Blend	jblend@mt.gov	406-444-6762
Steve Roe	sroe@pechan.com	916-708-1893
Katie Bickel	kbickel@gmail.com	818-779-7861