



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
NORTH CAROLINA CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TECHNICAL WORK GROUP**

Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management TWG Call #12, April 12, 2007

Attendance:

1. TWG Members: Jim Durham, Bob Hazel, Dennis Hazel, Jim Hickman, Chris Hopkins, Amy McDonald, Paul Sherman
2. Public: none
3. CCS: Stephen Roe, Katie Bickel
4. DAQ/DENR: Heather Hawkins, Jim Southerland, Brock Nicholson, Charles Davis, Gary Saunders

Background documents:

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

1. Agenda
2. AFW TWG Call #11 Summary
3. AFW Policy Options Document
4. Power Point Presentation to the AFW TWG

Discussion and conclusions:

1. CCS requested comments or suggested revisions on the last call summary. None were provided.
2. CCS reviewed the latest draft policy document. Changes since the last call are noted with highlighting. CCS reviewed the numbers on the summary table, noting that there was one area of overlap in the waste sector that needed to be adjusted for in the overall total.
3. The TWG reviewed the individual options with the purpose of providing a sense of the remaining issues and level of support for the options, in preparation for presenting the options to the CAPAG.
4. AFW-1. Includes a revised cost estimate using a weighted average, which makes the cost close to the cost for swine operations. There was a suggestion to add a sentence to the option description or design to clarify that the options will probably impact swine operations almost exclusively. Additional clarification is also needed for the weighted

- cost effectiveness estimate (the weighted cost effectiveness value is nearly identical to that estimated for swine operations, since nearly all of the emission reductions come from the swine sector). No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.
5. AFW-2. No major changes. CCS noted remaining gaps, i.e., Parties Involved is still marked as TBD. It was agreed to use the AFW-6 list and remove the forestry parties. No objections were raised with presenting this option to the CAPAG following revision.
 6. AFW-3. CCS reiterated that on the last call there was considerable discussion about the GHG impacts of organic farming and how best to incorporate organic practices into the option. CCS felt that quantifying the GHG impacts of organics would be somewhat misleading given the state of the science. CCS has included the organic farming element within the goals and implementation as well as a strong role for research in NC to determine the GHG impacts of organic production methods, but has not tried to quantify the specific GHG benefits of organic practices. One TWG member noted that language in the option description was somewhat misleading (see highlighted text on high levels of soil organic carbon). A correction was made to language under “Other”, clarifying that the PA and CA studies were comparing organic to conventional till practices (as opposed to no till). The TWG also discussed removing the specific goal for organic or incorporating into the overall option. A TWG member noted that a key TWG member involved in developing this option was not present. It was agreed that CCS would strike the organic goal, and seek input from the key member off line before finalizing. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.
 7. AFW 4A. One TWG member requested more specificity in how the numbers were derived and will provide comments off line. Concern was expressed about the relationship between this option and preserving capacity to produce food, fuel, and resources for society; this value is not captured in the analysis. CCS suggested adding language to additional costs and benefits sections. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.
 8. AFW 4B. TWG members expressed a need to refine the language and clarify the land conversion process in resulting land use, removing the concept that forests are “lost” and clarifying what is meant by poor management. The TWG also wants to add the concepts of parcelization and fragmentation and their impacts on forest land and carbon stocks. Suggested language will be circulated to the whole group. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.
 9. AFW 5. No comments. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option.
 10. AFW 6. CCS noted that a considerable amount of biomass will be needed to fulfill the goals. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option.
 11. AFW 8. CCS noted a few changes that were made for internal consistency and to add a missing detail on the cost estimate. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.

12. AFW 9&10. CCS noted that one TWG member had concerns about the feasibility of increasing funding for the target program to the levels indicated in the option. The TWG agreed to provide some language to address the feasibility issues. In addition, one TWG member noted that the carbon sequestration values for high productivity forests looked low (Table 2). The TWG member will review the sources and let CCS know if adjustments are necessary. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.
13. AFW 11. No comments. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option.
14. AFW 12. No comments. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option.
15. AFW 13. Need to complete Parties Involved. TWG will provide to CCS. No objections were raised with presenting to the CAPAG this option following revision.

Next steps

16. Next CAPAG is May 8, 2007 (9:30 am at Wake Commons). CAPAG will vote on approving AFW options. CCS will communicate issues that need clarification back to the TWG and CCS will work with the TWG to address the issues.
17. Next TWG call is May 18, 1-3pm. TWG will discuss CAPAG concerns and next steps with preparing the final report.

TWG Volunteers for Policy Option Development

Option No.	GHG Reduction Policy Option	TWG Volunteers
AFW-1	Manure Digesters/Other Waste Energy Utilization	Mitch Peele, Marion Deerhake, Kraig Westerbeek
AFW-2	Biodiesel Production (incentives for feedstocks and production plants)	John Bonitz, Mitch Peele, [Alex Hobbs, Solar Center, who is not a TWG member was mentioned as a technical resource]
AFW-3	Conservation Tillage/No-Till (carbon sequestration and reduced energy use)	Mitch Peele, Chris Hopkins, David Smith
AFW-4	Preserve Open Space/Agricultural Land	David Smith, Mitch Peele, Max Merrill, (Bill Holman)
AFW-5	Agricultural Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity or Steam Production	Mitch Peele, (Dennis Hazel).
AFW-6	Policies to Promote Ethanol Production	John Bonitz, Mitch Peele, Chris Hopkins, Bob Slocum
AFW-7	Forest Protection – Reduced Clearing and Conversion to Nonforest Cover	Chris Hopkins, Bob Hazel, Stephen Whitfield, Max Merrill
AFW-8	Afforestation and/or Restoration of Nonforested Lands	Bob Slocum, Chris Hopkins, Bob Hazel, Stephen Whitfield, (Dennis Hazel)
AFW-9	Expanded Use of Forest Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity (fuel switching)	Chris Hopkins, Bob Slocum, Stephen Whitfield, (Dennis Hazel)
AFW-10	Expanded Use of Forest Biomass Feedstocks for Residential, Commercial/Institutional, or Industrial Heating	Chris Hopkins, Bob Slocum, Stephen Whitfield, (Dennis Hazel)
AFW-11	Landfill Methane and Biogas Energy Programs	Jim Hickman, (David Mickey, not a member of the TWG offered himself as a technical resource)
AFW-12	Increased Recycling Infrastructure and Collection	Jim Hickman, Chris Hopkins, (David Mickey, not a member of the TWG offered himself as a technical resource)