



www.akclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ALASKA CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION ADVISORY GROUP
Forestry, Agriculture, and Waste Management Technical Work Group
(FAW TWG)

Call #1, May 27, 2008, 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members:
Doug Buteyn, Donna Mears, Jeff Riley, Rick Harris, Charles Knight
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Steve Roe (steve.roe@pechan.com), Brad Strobe (brad.strobe@pechan.com)
3. Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation Observers: None.
4. Public Attendees: None.

Background documents:

(all posted at [http://www.akclimatechange.us/Agriculture Forestry Waste.cfm](http://www.akclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry_Waste.cfm))

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference.
3. AFW Draft Catalog of State Actions.
4. AFW State Actions Descriptions.

Discussion items and key issues:

This was the first conference call of the FAW TWG.

1. Steve Roe called the meeting to order, completed the roll call and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.
2. CCS gave an overview of the purpose and key outcomes of the process. The final report of the Mitigation Advisory Group (CCMAG) will be delivered to the Climate Change Sub-Cabinet (CCSC), which has been convened by the Governor.
3. CCS provided an overview of the CCMAG process convened by Governor Palin. Roles of the different process participants were covered. The TWG's role to support the actions of the CCMAG was described (primarily in technical analysis and providing recommendations to the CCMAG).

4. CCS discussed the roles of the TWG. Specifically, the TWG is responsible for identifying and prioritizing potential state actions, suggesting straw policy designs, assisting with analysis and review of policy options, assisting with development of policy alternatives, assisting with CCMAG reports, and reviewing and assisting with revisions to the state greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and forecast (I&F).
5. CCS gave an overview of the other TWGs; Energy Supply (ES), Oil & Gas, Transportation and Land Use (TLU), and Cross-Cutting Issues (CCI).
6. The TWG process ground rules were explained, followed by the timing of the CCMAG and TWG meetings. The CCMAG and TWG processes are stepwise. Therefore, it is important that members attend all meetings, share equal footing, stay current with information, do not backslide, and make objective contributions. Additionally, TWG members are expected not to represent the CCMAG or TWGs in the media or other public venues.
7. The 10-Step CCS Work Plan for the process was also covered. The TWG is currently working on the first 2 steps:
 - a. Develop an inventory and forecast of GHG emissions.
 - b. Identify a full range of possible actions.
8. The CCMAG process is open, inclusive, and comprehensive. The CCMAG will be voting on policy options. Recommendations to the CCSC are based on the results of these votes. All GHGs, sectors, potential implementation mechanisms, state and multi-state actions, and short and long-term actions are considered.
9. CCS explained the decision criteria used throughout the process. Specifically, the TWG will consider the GHG reduction potential, cost effectiveness (cost/savings per ton GHG avoided), non-quantified co-benefits or dis-benefits, and feasibility issues.
10. CCS introduced the catalog of state actions and accompanying state action descriptions. CCS requested that TWG members review the FAW catalog in advance of the next TWG meeting and be ready to discuss policy actions that might be missing from the catalog, as well as recent state actions that need to be added (e.g. recent legislation that relates to one or more of the options in the catalog). CCS requests that TWG members assist CCS in developing a list of recent and current actions relevant to policy options listed in the Catalog.
11. Each TWG follows a similar policy design template. For each policy option, the TWG is responsible for determining the timing, goals, and coverage of the option. CCS quantifies these options and presents these estimates for review by the TWG. The analysis conducted by CCS takes into account related programs and policies already in place in AK [noted as the “Business as Usual” (BAU) scenario]. Once each option has been completed by the TWG, they are reviewed and approved by the CCMAG.
12. CCS reviewed the structure and content of the final report. Each TWG will use the final report to submit its recommendations to the CCMAG. A section on the final AK I&F is also included in the CCMAG’s final report (the inventory & forecast is also a stand-alone report completed in this process).

13. CCS briefly covered the Catalog of State GHG Actions. The attention of TWG members is also called to the Descriptions of Catalog Items. When complete, the Catalog will display the GHG reduction policy option, nominal ratings for the potential GHG emissions reduction and potential cost savings, ancillary impacts and feasibility considerations, and notes and related actions in AK. Responding to a question from a TWG member, CCS clarified the process, as it relates to the current Catalog of actions. First, the TWG will prioritize the catalog actions to identify the most important FAW actions going forward. Upon concurrence from the CCMAG, the TWG will develop a straw proposal for each of the priority options selected. Then, the CCMAG will approve the straw proposals, whereby CCS and the TWG will complete a quantitative analysis of each high-priority option.
14. CCS suggested that suggestions for revisions to the Catalog and Descriptions documents be made by e-mail to CCS (email to Brad @ brad.strode@pechan.com). Key CCS e-mails are listed above. Please include necessary attachments, references, and links. If the information could be useful to the whole group, CCS will forward the information to the entire TWG. The goal of CCS is to facilitate a common understanding amongst TWG members.
15. CCS reviewed the AK GHG inventory approach and initial results; more specifically, emissions from the agriculture, forestry, and waste management sectors. When preparing the I&F, CCS placed an emphasis on transparency, consistency, and significance. The I&F used AK or regional data, where available. Also, CCS used electricity consumption-based emissions within the summary tables and graphs for the I&F rather than production-based emissions, to account for emissions associated with imports and exports of electricity from and to other states to inform the development of electricity supply-side and demand-side policy options (Note that this is common practice by CCS, although import/export of electricity in AK does not occur; hence AK is a unique case where consumption-based and production-based electricity emissions are equal). In situations where significant importing or exporting of emissions producing activity occurs, such as States that export a lot of solid waste for disposal, an accounting of emissions from the exported waste is probably useful. However, an accounting of emissions that have occurred to produce all of the materials consumed in the state (e.g. food, products, packaging) is not possible due to data limitations and the time and resource constraints of a pure consumption-based approach to GHG inventory development.
16. The I&F covers the six GHGs considered by the US EPA and UNFCCC: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. This is a policy-level I&F, built to diagnose GHG emissions and trends at a state-level, but not to develop a baseline or model for compliance or analysis of individual options at specific facilities. In summary tables and charts, gross GHG emissions are typically reported, which do not include sinks from forestry or agricultural soils (emissions/sequestration in these sectors are reported separately).
17. Estimated GHG emissions from the each of the sectors in AK were compared to US emissions from the same sectors. Emissions are reported by source category within each sector. A quick review of data sources, methods, assumptions, and uncertainties were provided for each sector.

18. CCS discussed the agenda and time for the next meeting. The TWG will work to add new options to and revise each existing policy in the catalog. The next TWG call is scheduled for June 24, 2008 at 9:00 AM Alaska time. CCS will propose a set of tentative dates and times for discussion during the next call.
19. The TWG members are asked to work on adding missing actions to the catalog, prepare revisions for the Catalog and Descriptions documents, and review the Draft AK GHG I&F.
20. Input from the public was solicited by CCS. No members of the public were present on the call.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on June 24, from 9:00 - 10:30 am.
2. TWG members should review the Catalog of State Actions before the next call and be prepared to discuss additions and revisions to the catalog on the next call. TWG members should send in comments/questions to Steve Roe (steve.roe@pechan.com) and Brad Strode (brad.strode@pechan.com)
3. When posted, TWG members should review at least the FAW appendices of the GHG Inventory & Forecast Report, so that issues can be discussed on the next call. CCS will notify the TWG members when these materials are available for review as well as the full I&F report.