



www.coloradoclimate.org

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY
AFW Policy Working Group
Meeting/Call #2, February 14, 2007

Members Attending:

Mike Bowman
Meg Collins
Tom Compton
John Covert
Tom Fry
Steve Hill
Linda Joyce
Eric Lombardi
Keith Paustian
Mike Ryan
Tim Sullivan
Stan Zemler
John Armstrong

Government Agency Liaisons: Jill Cooper, Patrick Hamel, Phyllis Woodford

Rocky Mountain Climate Organization: Tom Easley

Center for Climate Strategies: Kathryn Bickel, Steve Roe, Marianne Tyrrell, Chris Yates

Agenda Item#1: Introductions, Review of Agenda and Purpose, Review of Call #1

Summary. Tom Easley welcomed participants and called the meeting to order. CCS reviewed the agenda noting that the majority of the meeting will be spent reviewing the Catalog of State Actions. CCS also noted that during each call there would be an opportunity to comment on and suggest changes to the previous meeting notes. No comment or changes were noted for the call summary from the last meeting.

Agenda Item#2: Continued Review and Discussion of the Catalog of State Actions. CCS noted that the goal for the day was to assess the catalog to make sure it is comprehensive before it is presented to the CAP tomorrow. The PWG was asked specifically to note where additional options should be added to the catalog. CCS reviewed updates to the catalog since the last call, including notional rankings for GHG reductions and costs/cost savings for each options, as well as notations indicating which options were priorities for analysis in other states (e.g., NM, AZ, and MT).

The PWG proceeded through the catalog discussing each option. There was some opportunity to comment on the initial notional rankings and ask clarifying questions. CCS explained that the notional rankings are an initial guess for CO and should be updated with information from the state and that rankings are based on several factors such as current practice, technical potential for GHG reductions, and feasibility/opportunity in Colorado. One PWG member noted that there might be opportunities to cluster options because they have some common features (e.g., soil management practices for increasing carbon sequestration). CCS explained that there would be opportunities to cluster options both before and during balloting (process where PWG members vote for ten options as priorities for analysis based on their GHG reduction potential and cost/cost savings).

Four new options were added to the catalog as a result of the PWG discussion: Strategic Agricultural Land Uses Management (targeted decision making based on resources and biophysical factors to optimize crop growth); Prevent conversion of grassland to cropland (specifically with regard to maintaining the benefits of land under the CRP program that is scheduled to come out of enrollment); Reductions in on-farm energy use (to capture opportunities to implement solar and wind power on farm operations); and Prevent landfilling of unprocessed organic material.

In addition, the PWG discussed clarifications and rewording of the original set of options. Specifically, it was clarified that the ethanol option (1.4) includes agriculture, forestry, and waste feedstocks; the title to 2.1 was changed to “Crop Best Management Practices”; Manure management (option 2.2) includes handling and storage of livestock manure as well as improved application; option 2.3. was reworded to “Changes in Animal Feed”; and it was clarified that the potential use for beer waste would fall under the composting option and/or the anaerobic digestion options.

Agenda Item#3: Introduction of CO GHG Inventory & Forecast (I&F). CCS reviewed the draft GHG inventory and forecast (I&F) for CO. The I&F was drafted for CO in conjunction with the Western Regional Air Partnership. The I&F looks back to 1990 and projects GHG emissions across all major sectors out to 2020; includes gross and net emissions (where net emissions take account of carbon sequestration); and covers the six major greenhouse gases (GHGs) under the UNFCCC as well as black carbon. The PWG discussed the results and underlying methodologies. Specific recommendations were offered for the waste sector estimates, and CCS agreed to examine data that were the source of the recommendations.

Agenda Item#4: Next Steps for PWG. There was some confusion about the sequence of next steps with respect to balloting procedures and opportunity for further discussion. CCS indicated the PWG should assume there will be another call to discuss rankings, after which a ballot will be distributed by email for voting. All PWG members will vote for the ten options they feel should be priorities for analysis; in addition, PWG members can make recommendations for consolidating options as part of the balloting process. CCS will tally votes and prepare a preliminary list of priority options for analysis, which will be reviewed on the following PWG

call. There will be two more PWG calls before the next CAP meeting. The PWG's recommended priority options for analysis will be presented at the next CAP meeting.

Agenda Item#5: Agenda, Time and Date for Next Call. The next PWG meeting has not been scheduled yet. It will take place approximately 3 weeks from now.

Agenda Item#6: Public Input and Announcements. None.