



www.mtclimatechange.us

Catalog of State-Level GHG Reduction Policy Options Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management

Prepared by The Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) for the Montana Climate Change Advisory Committee (CCAC) and its Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) and Technical Work Groups (TWGs) based on actions undertaken or considered by all US states.

Key to Future Rankings of Options in the Table that Follows:

Potential Emission Reductions <u>1/</u>	Potential Cost or Cost Savings <u>1/ 2/</u>
High (H): At least 1 Million Metric Tons (MMT) carbon dioxide equivalent (CO ₂ e) per year by 2020 (~1% of current MT emissions)	High (H): \$50 per Metric Ton CO ₂ e (MTCO ₂ e) or above
Medium (M): From 0.1 to 1 MMT CO ₂ e per year by 2020	Medium (M): \$5-50/MTCO ₂ e
Low (L): Less than 0.1 MMT CO ₂ e per year by 2020, or 1 MMT CO ₂ e by 2050	Low (L): Less than \$5/MTCO ₂ e
Uncertain (U): Not able to estimate at this time	Uncertain (U): Not able to estimate at this time
<p><small>1/ Several measures may overlap in terms of emissions reductions and/or cost impacts. Estimates assume measures would be implemented independently from other measures.</small></p> <p><small>2/ Costs are denoted by a positive number. Cost savings (i.e., “negative costs”) are denoted by a negative number.</small></p>	

Definition of “Priorities for Analysis”:

- **High:** High priority options will be analyzed first.
- **Medium:** Medium priority options will be analyzed next, time and resources permitting.
- **Low:** Low priority options will be analyzed last, time and resources permitting.

Notation of Options: Options will be marked with an asterisk (*) at a later date to indicate options that are at least partially “base case” policies, i.e., that have been considered or undertaken at some level in Montana.

Potential State Actions - Agriculture, Forestry, & Waste Management (AFW)

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
AFW-1	AGRICULTURE – PRODUCTION OF FUELS AND ELECTRICITY					
1.1	Manure Digesters/Other Waste Energy Utilization		low	Neg to Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked with Option AFW2.2 below 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low potential for reductions in MT due to low level of confined animal feeding operation activity Recent proposed projects to incorporate this option with ethanol production (e.g. beef feedlots) in other states. Includes manure combustion for energy recovery
1.2	Biodiesel Production (incentives for feedstocks and production plants)		Medium to High	TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production from both virgin and waste vegetable oils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs are dependent upon the design of incentives program
1.3	Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity or Steam/Heat Production		Medium	Neg to Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to identify viable feedstocks and volumes [e.g., crop residue (wheat straw, corn stover) or energy crops (switchgrass)] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkage to Energy Supply TWG to determine availability of biomass plants or co-firing opportunities Linkage to RCI TWG for offsets of fossil based steam or space heat

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
1.4	Ethanol Production		Medium to High	TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starch- (e.g. corn-) and cellulosic production processes Costs dependent on structure of incentives program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starch-based ethanol has small GHG benefits, while cellulosic ethanol has much higher benefits due to the energy required for ethanol production Additional benefits can be achieved through capture of CO₂ during fermentation
AFW-2	AGRICULTURE – FERTILIZER AND MANURE MANAGEMENT					
2.1	Nutrient Management (improve efficiency of fertilizer use)		Low to Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant opportunities beyond current practice? 	
2.2	Manure Management (improve application methods)		Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked with Option AFW1.1 above and 2.1, 2.3 below. Co-benefits include reduction of ammonia and VOC emissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application improvement includes incorporation into soil, instead of surface spray/spreading. Low reduction potential due to low estimated emissions from manure application.
2.3	Manure Composting		Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially most feasible in the beef cattle sectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for reduction in CH₄ emissions. Current science on levels of CH₄ reduction uncertain; potential for increase in N₂O.
2.4	Change Feedstocks (optimize nitrogen for N ₂ O reduction and enteric CH ₄ reduction)		Low	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-benefits include reduction in ammonia emissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option includes supplements to reduce CH₄ from enteric fermentation, as well as nitrogen efficiency to reduce downstream N₂O.

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
2.5	Reduce Non-Farm (Residential and Commercial) Fertilizer Use		Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emissions from non-farm application are not currently in the inventory; unclear what the costs would be. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional research needed on the levels of N2O emissions from lawns, golf courses, etc.
AFW-3	AGRICULTURE – SOIL CARBON MANAGEMENT					
3.1	Conservation Tillage/No-Till (carbon sequestration and reduced energy use)		Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant opportunities beyond current practice? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need estimates on current practices/potential for increased acreage.
3.2	Reduce Summer Fallow (increase soil C content, reduce N ₂ O emissions)		?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant opportunities beyond current practice? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need estimates of fallow summer acreage
3.3	Increase Winter Cover Crops (increase soil C and/or N content)		?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant opportunities beyond current practice? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need estimates of winter acreage available for cover crops
3.4	Improve Water and Nutrient Use (to minimize soil C loss)		Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant opportunities beyond current practice? 	
3.5	Rotational Grazing/Improve Grazing Crops and/or Management		Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is impaired rangeland an issue in MT? 	
3.6	Incentives for Maintenance of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) Acreage		Medium to High	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option protects carbon on existing CRP acres that are projected to enter back into active production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs are dependent on the design of the incentives program
3.7	Incentives for Establishing Windbreaks		Medium	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size of the benefit dependent on the amount of windbreak acreage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits are achieved via higher above and below ground carbon stocks

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
3.8	Promote Weed Management Programs		?	?	•	• Benefits are achieved through lower fuel consumption, higher soil carbon, and lower chemical inputs
AFW-4	AGRICULTURE – LAND USE CHANGE					
4.1	Convert Land to Grassland or Forest or Woody Shrubs		Medium	?	• Reductions dependent on available acreage and end use	• Need estimates of marginal agricultural land with the potential for conversion. • Policies should favor native species
4.2	Preserve Open Space/Agricultural Land		High	?	• Reductions occur both from higher retention of carbon in soil and lower transportation activity	
4.3	Promote “No Net Loss” of Agricultural Land		High	?	• Reductions occur both from higher retention of carbon in soil and lower transportation activity	
4.4	Promote Re-Introduction of Wetlands		?	?	• Benefits are dependent on both changes in above- and below-ground carbon stocks and potential changes in GHG emissions (e.g., CH4)	
AFW-5	AGRICULTURE – FARMING PRACTICES					

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
5.1	Convert Diesel Farm Equipment to LNG/CNG, Hybrid Technology, or Biodiesel		Low	Medium to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LNG/CNG engines or engine conversions reduce BC emissions Availability of diesel hybrid equipment for farm applications? 	•
5.2	Organic Farming		Low to Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions occur via lower intensity agricultural practices (nutrient/pesticide application, reduced tillage) 	•
5.3	Programs to Support Local Farming/Buy Local		Low to Medium	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions occur through lower transport related emissions. 	•
5.4	Policies to Promote Non-Irrigated Cropland		?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions occur through lower water use and associated pumping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes in cultivation practices occur as a result of change over to non-irrigated cropland?
AFW-6	FORESTRY – BIOMASS PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT					
6.1	Forest Protection – Reduced Clearing And Conversion to Nonforest Cover		High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on business as usual rates of land clearing and viable alternatives 	•
6.2	Increase Maintenance of Urban and Residential Trees		Low	Low to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	•
6.3	Afforestation and/or Restoration of Nonforested Lands		Low to High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and risk 	•

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
6.4	Reforestation/Restoration of Managed Stands		Low to High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6.5	Increased Stocking of Poorly Stocked Lands		Low to High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6.6	Age Extension of Managed Stands		Low	Low to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> involves significant tradeoffs with carbon savings from harvested wood products, as well as ecological risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6.7	Thinning and Density Management of Managed Stands		High	Low to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cost and technology barriers to market use of harvested biomass may be high; supply potential is high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there opportunities to use grazing animals (e.g., goats) instead of mechanized equipment?
6.8	Fertilization and Waste Recycling		Low	Low to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> site and situation specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6.9	Expand Short Rotation Woody Crops (for fiber and energy)		Low to Medium	Low to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and market demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6.10	Expanded Use of Genetically Preferred Species		Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6.11	Modified Biomass Removal Practices (reduced decay and energy use)		Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be opportunities to use biofuels for equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
6.12	Fire Management and Risk Reduction Programs		High	Low to High	• implementation and market barriers may be significant, potential is high if biomass is directed to constructive reuse	•
6.13	Ecosystem Health Risk Reduction Programs (pest/disease, invasive species)		High	Low to High	• implementation and market barriers may be significant, potential is high if biomass is directed to constructive reuse	•
6.14	Drought Management Programs (tree selection, placement, protection)		High	Low to High	• implementation and market barriers may be significant, potential is high if biomass is directed to constructive reuse	•
6.15	Flood and Riparian Management Programs (tree selection, placement, protection)		Low	Low to High	• depends on available acreage	•
6.16	Watershed Management Programs (stand retention, enhancement and management)		Low to High	Low to High	• depends on available acreage and forest health issues	•
6.17	Habitat Management Programs (stand retention, enhancement and management)		Low to High	Low to High	• depends on available acreage and forest health issues	•

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
6.18	Promote Use of Fuel-Efficient Equipment or Alternative Fuels		Low to Medium	Low to Medium	• Level of benefit dependent on program design (level of penetration)	• Alternative fuels include biodiesel
AFW-7	FORESTRY - WOOD PRODUCTS AND WASTE					
7.1	Improved Mill Waste Recovery and Use		Low to High	Low to High	• technology and market dependent	•
7.2	Improved Logging Residue Recovery		High	Low to High	• technology and market dependent	•
7.3	Expanded Use of Wood Products for Building Materials		Med to High	Low to High	• technology and market dependent	• Supplant use of non-wood products (e.g. steel, cement) with wood products, where possible.
7.4	Expanded Use of State and Locally-Grown Wood Products		Low to High	Low to High	• technology and market dependent	• Reduces transportation-related emissions and embedded energy.
7.5	Residential Slash/Open Burning Alternatives		?	?	• Benefit and cost effectiveness dependent on whether beneficial reuse is possible (e.g. as energy source)	•
AFW-8	FORESTRY – ENERGY PRODUCTION					
8.1	Expanded Use of Forest Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity (fuel switching)		High	Low	• technology and market dependent	•

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
8.2	Expanded Use of Forest Biomass Feedstocks for Residential, Commercial/Institutional, or Industrial Heating		High	Low	•	•
8.3	Improved Efficiency of Wood Burning Stoves and Direct Heat		Low to Medium	?	•	•
8.4	Improved Energy Capture from Wood Waste Combustion		Low to High	?	• technology and market dependent	•
8.5	Expanded Landfill Methane Recapture (wood products waste)		?	?	•	• also included under AFW-10.3
8.6	Improved Commercialization of Biomass Gasification and Combined Cycle		Low to High	Med to High	• requires improved technology and market incentives	•
8.7	Biofuels Production from Forest Residue				• Benefit dependent on the amount of residue diverted to fuel production • Also included under AFW-1.6	• New portable technology shows potential for ethanol production in the field.
AFW-9	WASTE MANAGEMENT – WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES					

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
9.1	Advanced/Expanded Recycling and Composting		Low	Low to Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important element is the amount of additional energy required by the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could include expansion of recycling programs to rural areas.
9.2	Advanced Municipal Solid Waste Management Practices (e.g., bioreactors)		Low to Med	Neg to Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
9.3	Source Reduction Strategies		Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could include life-cycle requirements for manufacturers requiring them to take back the product after its useful life
9.4	Resource Management Contracting		?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires waste haulers to recycle portions of the waste collected.
9.5	Manure Digesters		Med	Neg to Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also under Agriculture (Option AFW1.1)
9.6	Waste Coal Recapture		?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste coal availability in MT? 	
9.7	Pricing Programs to Reduce Waste Generation		Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pricing programs for waste paper cups, plastic bags, etc. to reduce generation and promote alternatives.
AFW-10	WASTE MANAGEMENT – LANDFILL GAS STRATEGIES					
10.1	Flare Landfill Methane at non-NSPS (smaller) sites		Low	Med to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal New Source Performance Standards and Emissions Guidelines require methane capture at larger landfills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be limited to consideration at sites where energy can not be recovered feasibly; Need to consider energy required to collect CH₄.

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	Priority for Analysis	Potential GHG Emissions Reduction	Potential Cost or Cost Savings	Additional Impacts, Feasibility Considerations	Notes
10.2	Convert Landfill Methane to Electric Power, Space Heat, or LNG		Low	Neg to Med	• Methane conversion to motor fuels, electricity, steam, or space heat are examples	•
AFW-11	WASTE MANAGEMENT – WASTEWATER ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Energy Efficiency Improvements		Low	Neg to Low	•	•
11.2	Lower Waste Processing Needs (lower water consumption, waste production)		Low	?	•	•
11.3	Install Digesters and Turbines		Low	?	• Can be used where sludge is anaerobically digested	•
11.4	Install Fuel Cells		Low	?	• Can be used where sludge is anaerobically digested	•