

Colorado
Climate
Project



www.coloradoclimate.org

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY
AFW Policy Working Group
Call #7, June 19, 2007

Members Attending:

Eric Lombardi
Tim Sullivan
Meg Collins (briefly)

Governmental agency liaisons: none

Rocky Mountain Climate Organization: Stephen Saunders

Center for Climate Strategies: Steve Roe, Katie Bickel, Brad Strobe

Agenda Item#1: Review of Call #6 Summary. CCS reviewed the call summary. No changes were requested by the PWG.

Agenda Item#2: Review of Status of CAP Process: CCS provided a slide on the 10-Step CAP Process and the point at which the process is currently (Steps #4 and #5).

Agenda Item#3: Review of Policy Options Document. For AFW-2 (Manure Management and Energy Programs), the TWG requested another review by CCS of text submitted by one of the TWG volunteers and to incorporate additional material (e.g. implementation mechanisms). CCS agreed to do this.

CCS reviewed the updated version of the Policy Options Document. As there were no members of the PWG with agriculture expertise (after the first few minutes of the call), it was decided that the focus of the call would be to discuss AFW-6, AFW-9, and AFW-10 (based on the PWG members present). The purpose of this discussion was to evaluate quantification methods proposed by CCS. PWG members not present on this call should review the policy options document and submit comments to CCS as soon as possible.

AFW-6: The first issue that was addressed was the specificity of the policy goal: is it more important to change the pace of land development, or focus on the conservation of lands with high carbon value. The synergy of AFW-6 and options under consideration with the TLU PWG was mentioned (smart growth). It is thought that land conservation and smart growth policies work hand-in-hand. Data are available to project development trends and determine what types of lands are likely to be developed and will be provided to aid the quantitative analysis of AFW-6. The process of identifying high carbon value lands that maximize the carbon benefit relative to

the cost of implementation was proposed as a starting point for the quantification of this option. Data on projected development patterns under a policy scenario where high-carbon value lands are protected and lower carbon value lands left open to development will be provided for quantification of GHG benefits. The cost of this option will be based on the expected cost of conservation easements (CO-specific information also to be provided by the PWG).

AFW-9: No changes were proposed for AFW-9. Some additions to text have been communicated to CCS via e-mail. CCS will implement these additions into the Policy Options Document.

AFW-10: A change was proposed by a PWG member to change the title of AFW-10 from “Landfill Methane Energy Programs” to “Landfill Methane Reduction Programs.” The new wording would reflect a change in the implementation mechanisms, such as a reduction or elimination of unprocessed organic waste emplacement in landfills. CCS emphasized that part of the goal is to utilize or “flare” the methane produced from anaerobic digestion. CCS will implement the PWG member’s suggestions to the Policy Options Document.

CCS then discussed the methodology of landfill emission inventory development. The inventory method used by CCS based on the previous version of EPA’s State Guidance and Inventory Tool (SGIT). Within the past couple of months, a new version of SGIT model that is consistent with EPA’s AP-42 method was released. CCS agreed to re-run the landfill emission estimates using the new version of SGIT.

The main concern of the PWG was that landfills have “legacy” emissions, meaning that wastes deposited at present time have emissions far into the future. CCS explained that the emissions inventory and GHG reductions estimated for the CO State Plan are done within a specific “policy period” (i.e. through 2020); however, the understanding is that any policy option will achieve permanent reductions in GHG emissions after the policy period. If there are instances where the reductions are temporary, these need to be explicitly stated in the policy options document, so that an appropriate accounting of them can be made when all of the policy options from all TWGs are summed together.

Agenda Item#4: Next Steps for the PWG. CCS will send an e-mail out to the PWG to solicit input prior to the next call on July 13. The draft Policy Options Document needs to be completed for the August 1 CAP meeting, where CAP members will vote on approval of options. PWG volunteers on each option are asked to review their options and provide any missing text on the following sections: Implementation Mechanisms, Related Policies/Programs In Place, Additional Benefits & Costs, and Feasibility Issues. PWG volunteers (see Table at the end of this summary and contact information) should work off-line on these sections and provide them to CCS by July 6. CCS will be focused on the remaining sections.

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

Next CAP meeting: August 1, 2007

Tentative PWG meeting dates: July 13 (10:00 AM – 12:00 PM). At the next meeting, CCS will provide an updated options document with materials submitted by the PWG volunteers and initial quantification of benefits and costs for each option by CCS.

Agenda Item#7: Public Input and Announcements. No members of the public present.

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	Coleman, Jr.	(303) 570-9277	mike@echogreen.org
Mel Coleman	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	Association	(303) 413-1802	megcollins2@aol.com
John Covert	Colorado Working		compton@frontier.net
		(303) 283-3524	covert@workinglandscapes.com

		Landscapes		
Tony	Frank	Rocky Mountain Farmers Union	(303) 752-5800	tony.frank@co-ops.org
Tony	Frank	Colorado State University	(303) 650-5818	tony.frank@colostate.edu
Tom	Fry	The Wilderness Society	x 110	tom_fry@tw.soc
Susie	Gordon	City of Fort Collins	(970) 221-6265	sgordon@fcgov.com
Steve	Hill	Summit County USDA Rocky Mtn Research Station	(970) 668-4202	SteveH@co.summit.co.us
Linda	Joyce	Eco-Cycle	(970) 498-2560	ljoyce@fs.fed.us
Eric	Lombardi	Natural Resources Ecology Lab, CSU USDA Rocky Mtn. Research Station	(303) 444-6634	eric@ecocycle.org
Keith	Paustian	Valley Wide Health Services	(970) 491-1547	keithp@nrel.colostate.edu
Mike	Ryan	Colorado Conservation Trust	(970) 498-1012	mgryan@fs.fed.us
Marguerite	Salazar	The Nature Conservancy,		ceo@vwhs.org
Will	Shafroth	Colorado Town of Vail	(720) 565-8289	wshafroth@coct.org
Tim	Sullivan	NREL	(970) 974-7040	tim_sullivan@tnc.org
Stan	Zemler		(970) 479-2105	szemler@vailgov.com
John	Ashworth		(303) 384-6858	john_ashworth@nrel.gov