



[www.scclimatechange.us](http://www.scclimatechange.us)

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**SOUTH CAROLINA CLIMATE, ENERGY AND COMMERCE ADVISORY**  
**COMMITTEE**

**Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management Technical Work Group**  
**(AFW TWG)**

Call #1, May 29, 2007, 2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members:  
Joe James, John Bonitz, Guy Sabin, Cary Chamblee, Art Braswell, Bob Perry, Bob Giangiorgi, Edwin Lesley, Chris Fisher
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:  
Steve Roe, Brad Strode, Tom Peterson
3. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC)  
Michael Juras, Agency Liaison
4. South Carolina Agency Observers: None.
5. Public Attendees: None.

**Background documents:**

(all posted at [http://www.scclimatechange.us/Agriculture\\_Forestry.cfm](http://www.scclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry.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 AFW 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. Final report to the Governor to be completed in one year (June, 2008).
3. CCS provided an overview of the CECAC process convened by Governor Sanford. Roles of the different process participants were covered. The TWG's role to support the

actions of the CECAC was described (primarily in technical analysis and providing recommendations to the CECAC).

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 CECAC reports, and reviewing and assisting with revisions to the state greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and forecast (I&F).
5. A TWG member raised the question of linkages between TWGs. CCS explained that TWGs may work together to determine which group is most appropriate to assess a particular option [e.g. reductions in emissions from industrial waste treatment in the Residential, Commercial, Industrial (RCI) TWG or our AFW TWG]. Additionally, a TWG member brought up the issue of existing sustainability-related policy measures, and how they affect the CECAC process. CCS stated that they plan to incorporate recent related actions into the analysis and prioritization of policy options.
6. CCS gave an overview of the other TWGs; Energy Supply (ES), RCI, Transportation and Land Use (TLU), Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management (AFW), and Cross-Cutting Issues (CCI).
7. The TWG process ground rules were explained followed by the timing of the CECAC and TWG meetings. The CECAC 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 CECAC or TWGs in the media or other public venues.
8. The 10-Step CCS Work Plan for working through each step in the process was also covered. The TWG is currently working on the first 2 steps:
  - a. Develop inventory and forecast of emissions.
  - b. Identify a full range of possible actions
9. The CECAC process is open, inclusive, and comprehensive. The advisory committee (CECAC) will be voting on policy options. Recommendations to the Governor 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.
10. CCS introduced the catalog of state actions and accompanying state action descriptions. CCS requested that TWG members review the AFW 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).
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 SC [noted as the “Business as Usual” (BAU) scenario]. Once each option has been completed by the TWG, they are reviewed and approved by the CECAC.

12. A question was raised regarding a specific GHG reduction goal for the AFW sector. CCS explained that the AFW policies are reviewed collectively by the CECAC along with the results of the other TWGs to determine whether the options recommended by the TWGs are sufficient to meet reduction goals for the state (no specific reduction goals are set by sector, only for the State overall). It is conceivable that if GHG reduction goals are not met, the CECAC may ask the TWG to seek additional GHG reduction potential within proposed policy options or policy options further down the prioritized list.
13. CCS reviewed the structure and content of the final report. Each TWG will use the final report to submit its recommendations to the CECAC. A section on the final SC I&F is also included in this final report (the inventory & forecast is also a stand-alone report completed in this process).
14. 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, potential GHG emissions reduction, potential cost savings, ancillary impacts and feasibility considerations, priority for analysis (a nominal value), and notes and related actions in SC.
15. CCS reviewed the SC 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 SC 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. SC is a net exporter of electricity. A TWG member raised the possibility of using consumption data for the transportation sector. The existing emission estimates for transportation are based on fuel consumption CCS explained that information barriers may prevent such an analysis in transportation and other sectors. 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 in the waste stream is not possible due to data limitations and the time and resource constraints of this process.
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.
17. Estimated GHG emissions from the Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management sectors in SC are reported and 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 specifically requested information from the TWG regarding industrial wastewater treatment. Currently, this category only includes fruit & vegetable processing based on

data available from DHEC. Other industrial sectors that often use wastewater treatment processes include pulp & paper and meat & poultry processing.

19. The forestry emission inventory shows a significant net emission from soil carbon. The US Forest Service considers the soil carbon estimates to be the most uncertain of all carbon pools, and therefore, the final inventory totals are reported with and without soil carbon. A TWG member requests that the time period be explicitly stated on the Carbon Flux table; CCS agrees. Additionally, the issue of forest fires in the Southeast was raised. The inventory is intended to capture forest fires as emission sources. Although fire emissions are releases of naturally-stored carbon, the increasing prevalence and severity of fires may have a net effect on the forest carbon flux that impacts the forecast results (e.g. higher wildfire occurrence in the future leading to lower sequestration). CCS mentioned that this should be an area of future discussion in the TWG for possible revision of the forestry forecast.
20. CCS discussed the agenda and time for the next meeting. The TWG will work to add new options to and revise existing policy in the catalog.
21. Final questions and comments from the TWG included a suggestion to refine the agriculture inventory (additional detail on emissions by primary crop type, including energy feedstocks). Additionally, the Energy Freedom and Rural Development Act was brought to the attention of the TWG. This is a bill under consideration in SC that may have an impact on the TWG process. CCS will follow up with Erica Hartwig of the SC Energy Office to gather available background information.
22. 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 12, from 2:00 - 3:30 pm.
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](mailto:steve.roe@pechan.com)).
3. When posted, TWG members should review at least the AFW 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.