



www.mtclimatechange.us

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
Montana Climate Change Advisory Committee
Agriculture, Forestry & Waste Management
Technical Work Group
Call #3, October 20, 2006

Attendance:

1. TWG Members: Trudi Peterson, Ted Dodge, Dave Kelsey, Richard Liebert, Robert Boettcher
2. Public: None
3. CCS: Steve Roe, Katie Bickel
4. DEQ: Lynda Saul, Lisa Peterson, Pat Crowley, Jeff Blend

Background documents:

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

1. Agenda
2. Draft Summary of AFW TWG Call#2
3. Power Point Presentation to the AFW TWG
4. AFW Policy Options Catalog
5. AFW Policy Template
6. MT Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Forecast, 1990-2020 (posted at: <http://www.mtclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O127F8927.pdf>)

Discussion and conclusions:

1. CCS provided a brief review of what was covered during MT CCAC Meeting #2. The bulk of the meeting was spent reviewing the catalog of state actions. The review covered agriculture and forestry options primarily.
2. CCS noted a need to reach out to TWG members who were not on the call to confirm interest in participation and ensure they were receiving enough information. Lisa Peterson agreed to make those contacts.
3. The Waste options in the AFW policy options catalog were reviewed. The objectives of this review were to identify options that still were missing from the catalog, identify additional clarifying material for each option, and offer TWG members an opportunity to share their knowledge of specific options and their potential applicability in MT. Below are some of the main points from the discussion:
 - The observation was made that the solid waste options may all be considered as having low ghg reduction potential because emissions from the waste sector in the Inventory and Forecast amount to 0.2 MMTCO_{2e}. It is important to note that current emissions are only one aspect that should be considered

www.mtclimatechange.us

- regarding GHG reduction potential. Below it is mentioned that some landfills flare methane instead of putting it to use as an alternative energy source (which could offset emissions in the energy supply or RCI sectors)
- Clarification was made regarding how the initial high, medium, and low classifications were made; information was taken from other state analyses and expert opinion of CCS staff; initial rating is meant as a starting point
 - There are seven large landfills in MT that take 78% of the state's waste. Three of these landfills currently use methane capture with flaring but do not produce sufficient methane for energy generation. There are twenty-five smaller landfills in MT that handle the remaining 25% of the state's waste. A potential strategy of offering incentives to increase the use and capture of methane gas from the three large landfills was raised.
 - The TWG believes there is only one very small waste coal plant in MT. The decision was made to delete option 9.6 Waste Coal Recapture from the catalogue
 - The possibility of striking all wastewater options was raised, full support of the TWG, including key experts who were not present at this meeting would be needed
 - CCS noted that options that are not at all applicable in the state are generally removed from the catalogue and options that are not feasible will generally remain on the list, but fall to the bottom due to prioritization.
4. The TWG reviewed the preliminary ratings of high/med/low to the agriculture options. Below are some of the main points from the discussion:
- CCS noted that coordination between the Ag and Transportation sectors on options related to biofuels may be important; this has been the case in working with other states;
 - In 2005, MT passed legislation containing several biodiesel and ethanol incentives; copies will be provided by Jeff Blend at DEQ and circulated for the TWG to review;
 - There may be some issue with producing biofuels in MT, e.g, MT grows more wheat and barley than corn. Ways to support in-state production of biofuels were discussed briefly (e.g., interest in backyard biodiesel production, opportunities to co-locate cattle feedlots and ethanol production, including incentives in state renewable portfolio standard, interest from farm co-ops, etc);
 - Options 1.2 and 1.4 were set to medium (from medium to high) to account for feasibility issues;
 - The TWG discussed combining options 3.1-3.3 into a single option for conservation till/no-till because of the overlap in management practices. The rating for this consolidated category was revised to medium to high, recognizing the potential may be related to the market value of carbon. CCS explained that this is just one example of how individual options can be

www.mtclimatechange.us

- combined into a single option and that the TWG would have the opportunity to do this when voting on prioritizing options for analysis;
- Option 3.8 Promote Weed Management Programs will need further discussion; the GHG benefits are not entirely clear; Joel Brown from New Mexico would be a good resource; MT DEQ will provide additional information on the extent of the Napweed problem;
 - Option 4.4 Promote Restoration of Wetlands also needs further consideration to identify GHG benefits; the TWG will consider adding an option that covers keeping organic soils from being cultivated; cultivation of organic soils (i.e., wetland soils) is known to result in high CO₂ emissions per unit area of disturbed soils;
 - Rating for Option 5.3 Programs to Support Local Farming/Buy Local were revised to Medium, taking into account the associated decrease in transportation emissions;
 - Option 5.4 Policies to Promote Non-Irrigated Cropland will need further review. Ag experts on the TWG believe that dryland farming can reduce soil organic carbon, which may offset reductions achieved through lower water use and associated pumping;
 - There was a discussion about how to provide incentives at the state level for actions under federal programs (e.g., USDA Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program and Wetland Reserve Enhancement Program); in some cases, states provide added incentives (e.g., cost-sharing) on top of federal funds.
5. There was not sufficient time to review the preliminary ratings of the forestry options. An additional call to discuss forestry options and review the forestry inventory and forecast analysis was scheduled for November 13 from 2-4 pm. CCS will circulate background methodology documents for the forestry I&F analysis.
 6. CCS explained the process of prioritizing options for analysis. Following the next TWG call, each TWG member will receive a ballot via email (probably on Nov. 14). Each member can vote for 10 options with only one vote per option. Each member will also be able to provide additional input regarding their votes (e.g. desire to package two or more options together). CCS will consolidate the voting and present the results to the group during the following call. During that call, CCS will solicit volunteers from the TWG to develop straw proposals for the design of each policy. A standard policy template will be used for this purpose (also to be reviewed during an upcoming call).

Next steps:

1. TWG members should continue review of the policy catalog and be ready to discuss any final issues on these options during the next TWG call (see below). The review on the next call will focus on the forestry options.

www.mtclimatechange.us

2. CCS will provide information on forest inventory/forecast methods as they are developed from contacts with the USFS.
3. CCS will provide background methodology documents for the forest inventory/forecast methods
4. CCS will revise and repost the catalog based on today's discussion before the next call.
5. The next call is scheduled for Monday, November 13, 2006, from 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM.