



www.coloradoclimate.org

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY
AFW Policy Working Group
Call #4, April 2, 2007

Members Attending:

Michael Bowman
Tom Compton
John Covert
Tony Frank (Rocky Mountain Farmers Union)
Tom Fry
Susie Gordon
Eric Lombardi
Keith Paustian
Mike Ryan
Tim Sullivan

Governmental agency liaisons: John Ashworth (NREL)
Rocky Mountain Climate Organization: Tom Easley
Center for Climate Strategies: Katie Bickel, Steve Roe

Agenda Item#1: Review of Call #3 Summary. CCS reviewed the call summary and requested input from the PWG. No clarification or changes needed.

Agenda Item#2: Discussion of Balloting Results. CCS received votes from all but about 5 people. CCS tallied and synthesized results in table format and circulated last week. The list of ten priorities was prepared by tallying and sorting by raw votes, reviewing suggestions for consolidation, and combining catalog items (pulling in options that did not necessarily receive a high number of votes but that fit conceptually and were suggested for consolidation). The column "Priority for Analysis" contains the raw votes by original catalog option. CCS noted that you should ignore the yellow highlighting, it was embedded in the document and could not be removed. Red highlighting notes options that were consolidated into the top ten options.

CCS reviewed the initial results. The PWG asked clarifying questions and suggested modifications.

One PWG member suggested moving catalog item 10.2 into AFW-5. There were no objections and this change will be made. Another suggested combining AFW 5 and AFW 6 into a broader

category with a methane focus. There was some discussion to determine that AFW 5 should stand alone. AFW-5 focuses on unprocessed organic material that does not enter a landfill. But is instead composted, used for biogas energy, or used for other purposes (e.g. cellulosic ethanol feedstock). AFW-5 has two benefits of preventing landfilling and giving more flexibility for the use of materials for energy production. The relationship between AFW-5 to manure management was discussed. The handling of Municipal Solid Waste streams is done separately from ag waste streams, hence the separate options.

AFW-9 and its relationship to AFW-2 was discussed. AFW-2 looks at carbon benefits of forest management, which might include for example increased productivity. Increased productivity would lead to an increase in biomass available for biomass energy production, and that would link to AFW-9.

AFW-10. It was noted that to analyze this option, it is necessary to sort out the GHG benefits by raw materials, e.g., cellulosic production methods have higher GHG benefits.

The balance between combining several options together and keeping the options focused on a few key practices was discussed.

One PWG member noted that waste management received less attention in the final results and asked the group to look at option 9.1 (Advanced Recycling and Composting). In Fort Collins, they have demonstrated a 45% emission reduction in emissions from recycling through the Climate Wise program. At least two PWG members felt that we could add an option for increased recycling. Another suggested broadening AFW-5 to increase recycling in general. There were no objections and it was decided to include 9.1 in AFW-5. The question was asked if there are any GHG downsides to recycling. PWG members did not feel there were, but agreed that it needed to be addressed.

CCS noted that there is no coverage of the wastewater treatment sector in the priority options; however the PWG voting did result in balanced coverage of options across the three sectors.

Agenda Item#3: Assign Volunteers to Assist in Drafting Policy Options. CCS reviewed the process for developing policy proposals using the policy template provided by CCS. The process is driven by input from the PWG members with assistance from CCS. PWG volunteers draft mitigation text for several sections of the template and CCS takes the lead on quantification of costs and benefits.

One PWG member raised the issue of feasibility and it was discussed briefly, in terms of political, technical, and economic feasibility. These issues will be addressed in some way either through the process (political feasibility) or through the policy proposals themselves under the feasibility section and through quantification of costs and benefits. A PWG member commented that we should analyze the economics of a business as usual approach (i.e., future negative economics of no action, such as reported in the Stern Report).

CCS provided a sample policy template with the level of detail that will be needed for the first two sections of the template. CCS reviewed the template. PWG volunteer groups will first draft text on the mitigation option description and mitigation option design, which includes goal levels. CCS explained that goals should be stated numerically so that the actual costs and benefits can be directly estimated. CCS also encouraged the PWG to begin filling in Related Policies and Programs in Place. This will provide the Advisory Panel with additional information on baseline policy conditions to gauge the appropriateness of the PWG recommended policy design.

One PWG member asked where the actual policy design is elaborated (e.g., taxes, credits, grants, etc.). This is covered under the Implementation Mechanisms section, which the PWG drafts (but at the next phase of policy option development). The PWG asked for more information on what other states are doing. CCS recommends that the PWG review the policy designs in the following state processes: Arizona (www.azclimatechange.us); New Mexico (www.nmclimatechange.us); North Carolina (www.ncclimatechange.us); and MT (www.mtclimatechange.us). Contact CCS if you need more assistance locating specific documents. The AFW web pages on these websites will have text on policy design drafted by these other state processes.

CCS will fill in Estimated GHG Savings and Costs per MtCO₂e. Key Uncertainties, Costs and Benefits, and Feasibility Issues will be drafted by the PWG with input from CCS. The last three sections are reserved for the CAP.

A PWG member asked about the timeframe for completion. The Straw proposal (i.e., mitigation option description and mitigation option design) is the first step. Once approved by CAP (probably at the July CAP meeting, but possibly sooner, if this meeting is moved up), then the PWG and CCS will move forward with the other sections (and no longer call them straw proposals).

PWG members volunteered for working on specific options. Group assignments, lead volunteer designations, and contact information are provided at the end of the call notes. **PWG members that have not yet volunteered for one or more options or missed the call are asked to do so** (please consider volunteering for 2 or more options if possible and ask to lead a volunteer subgroup, if possible, so that work is distributed evenly throughout the PWG). Contact Steve Roe to sign up for a volunteer group. In a small number of cases, PWG members nominated another PWG member who was not on the call to be a volunteer on a policy subgroup (please contact Steve Roe if you are not willing to act as a volunteer).

It was clarified that you can look for input from outside the group, but the information must be provided by a PWG member. PWG members are responsible for drafting text for the policy options.

CCS will send the PWG a word version of the template.

Agenda Item#4: Next Steps for PWG. RMCO gave a quick update on changes in the process. Principals from the Ritter Administration would like to complete the process by Oct. 1 instead of Nov 1. One PWG member asked why the deadline was moved up. RMCO explained that the Ritter Administration would like to have a clear-cut plan before the next legislative session. CCS explained that this would mean a tighter process for preparing the policy options and encouraged PWG members to take early initiative and begin drafting text even though the CAP has not given final approval on the priority options.

The next CAP meeting is May 3, where the list of ten priority options will be reviewed for approval. In the meantime, PWG members can begin working on the straw proposals by drafting mitigation descriptions and mitigation option design (volunteer groups should self organize for this but contact CCS for assistance, as needed). CCS requested draft text on mitigation option descriptions and design by April 24th. CCS will consolidate and post in preparation for the next PWG meeting.

The next PWG meeting is tentatively set for May 4, in person at the NREL headquarters, from 1:00 – 4:30 PM. The PWG will discuss in detail the design of straw proposals with the aim of developing nearly final drafts. This will include identifying quantitative goals. CCS encouraged PWG volunteers to consider before the meeting their potential data needs for setting goal levels, and to come prepared with the necessary data (or ask CCS to help gather the information).

Agenda Item#5: Review and Discussion of the Colorado GHG Inventory and Forecast.
Not enough time, postponed until the next call.

Agenda Item#6: Agenda, Time and Date for Next Call.

Next CAP meeting: May 3

Next PWG meeting: May 4, 1:00 – 4:30 PM

Agenda: draft straw proposals; review Inventory & Forecast

Agenda Item#7: Public Input and Announcements. None.

Preliminary Number	Revised Number	Preliminary Title	PWG Volunteers (lead volunteer in bold)
AFW-1	AFW-1	Agricultural Crop Management	Tony Frank ¹ , Mike Bowman, Keith Paustian
AFW-2	AFW-8	Forestry Programs to Enhance GHG Benefits	Mike Ryan , Tom Fry, Tim Sullivan
AFW-3	AFW-2	Manure Management and Energy Utilization	Mike Bowman, Meg Collins , Susie Gordon
AFW-4	AFW-6	Preserve Lands with Carbon Storage Value	Tim Sullivan , Tom Compton, Will Shafroth, Tom Fry
AFW-5	AFW-9	Prevent Landfilling of Unprocessed Organic Material	Susie Gordon , Eric Lombardi
AFW-6	AFW-10	Landfill Methane Energy Programs	Eric Lombardi , Susie Gordon
AFW-7	AFW-4	Biodiesel Production	Tony Frank ¹ , Keith Paustian, John Ashworth
AFW-8	AFW-3	Reductions in On-Farm Energy Use	Tony Frank ¹ , Tom Compton
AFW-9	AFW-7	Biomass Feedstocks for Energy Production	Mike Bowman , Mike Ryan, Tom Fry, Lynda Joyce
AFW-10	AFW-5	Ethanol Production	Keith Paustian , Tom Compton, Mike Bowman, Tony Frank, ¹ John Ashworth
¹ With the Farmer's Union.			

PWG Contact List:

Matt Baker	Environment Colorado	(303) 573-3871	
Mike Bowman	25x'25 Univ. of Colorado Board of Regents	ext. 309	mbaker@environmentcolorado.org
Tilman Bishop		(303) 570-9277	mike@echogreen.org
Mel Jr.	Coleman Natural Foods Colorado Livestock Association	(970) 244-1885	tilmanmb@bresnan.net
Meg Collins	La Plata Electric Association	(303) 468-2530	mcoleman@colemannatural.com
Tom Compton	Colorado Working Landscapes	(303) 413-1802	megcollins2@aol.com
John Covert	Rocky Mountain Farmers Union	(303) 283-3524	compton@frontier.net
Tony Frank	Colorado State University	(303) 752-5800	covert@workinglandscapes.com
Tony Frank		(303) 650-5818	tony.frank@co-ops.org
Tom Fry	The Wilderness Society	x 110	tony.frank@colostate.edu
			tom_fry@tw.s.org

Susie	Gordon	City of Fort Collins	(970) 221-6265	sgordon@fcgov.com
Steve	Hill	Summit County USDA Rocky Mtn	(970) 668-4202	SteveH@co.summit.co.us
Linda	Joyce	Research Station	(970) 498-2560	ljoyce@fs.fed.us
Eric	Lombardi	Eco-Cycle Natural Resources	(303) 444-6634	eric@ecocycle.org
Keith	Paustian	Ecology Lab, CSU USDA Rocky Mtn.	(970) 491-1547	keithp@nrel.colostate.edu
Mike	Ryan	Research Station Valley Wide Health	(970) 498-1012	mgryan@fs.fed.us
Marguerite	Salazar	Services Colorado Conservation		ceo@vwhs.org
Will	Shafroth	Trust The Nature Conservancy,	(720) 565-8289	wshafroth@coct.org
Tim	Sullivan	Colorado	(970) 974-7040	tim_sullivan@tnc.org
Stan	Zemler	Town of Vail	(970) 479-2105	szemler@vailgov.com
John	Ashworth	NREL	(303) 384-6858	john_ashworth@nrel.gov