



www.scclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
SOUTH CAROLINA CLIMATE, ENERGY AND COMMERCE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

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

Call #3, July 17, 2007, 2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Attendance:

1. Technical Work Group Members:

- John Bonitz – Agriculture Energy Coordinator, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
- Art Braswell – Division Director, Mining and Solid Waste Management, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
- Cary Chamblee – Legislative and Government Consultant for South Carolina Wildlife Federation and Sierra Club
- Bob Giangorgi – Vice President, Priority Metrics Group
- Gene Hogan (for Danny Verdin) – SC Senate
- Joe James – CEO, Corporation for Economic Opportunity
- Bob King – Deputy Commissioner, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
- Carlton Owen – President/CEO, US Endowment for Forestry and Communities
- Russell Ott – South Carolina Farm Bureau
- Bob Perry (for John Frampton) – Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Programs Section, DNR
- Mark L. Robertson – Executive Director, The Nature Conservancy of South Carolina
- Guy Sabin – Environmental Management Section Chief, South Carolina Forestry Commission

2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) Staff:

- Steve Roe – Lead facilitator
- Brad Strobe

3. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC):

- Michael Juras – SCDHEC; Agency Liaison

4. South Carolina Agency Observers

- Leslie Coolidge

5. Public Attendees:

- Heather Spires - Coastal Conservation League
6. Technical Work Group Members not attending:
- Larry Boyleston – Director, Business and Government Relations, South Carolina Dept. of Agriculture
 - Scott Fennell – Carolina Waste
 - Chris Fisher – Fisher Recycling
 - Richard Horton – Sustainable Energy Manager, South Carolina Energy Office
 - Edwin Lesley – President, Business Development Corporation of South Carolina
 - Bob Scott – President, South Carolina Forestry Association
 - Daniel Tufford – University of South Carolina, Dept. of Biological Sciences
 - Johnny Williamson – CEO, South Carolina Soya, LLC.

Background documents:

(all posted at 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.
5. Agriculture, Forestry & Waste Management Appendices for the SC GHG Inventory & Forecast (I&F).

Discussion items and key issues:

This was the third meeting/conference call of the AFW TWG.

1. CCS called the meeting to order, completed the roll call and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call. CCS noted that the next TWG meeting will be an in-person meeting. Time was allowed at the end of the call to determine a date and time for this meeting. Members not in attendance are encouraged to contact Steve Roe to provide input regarding the scheduling of this meeting.
2. CCS reviewed the draft summary of Call #2 and provided an opportunity for TWG members to provide feedback on the summary. No revisions or comments were offered by the TWG.
3. The stepwise planning process was reviewed. The TWG's objectives for this call were to continue its discussion of the draft GHG emissions I&F and begin to identify initial priorities for analysis. On June 27, the CECAC approved the AFW Options Catalog. Therefore the second step – Identify a full range of possible actions – is complete.
4. CCS asked the TWG to bring up the catalog that was posted online at http://www.scclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry.cfm prior to this call. CCS explained that nominal ratings for potential GHG emissions reduction and cost per ton have been added to the catalog. These ratings are up for discussion and input from the TWG is encouraged. The ratings for emission reduction are; L – less than 0.1 million metric tons CO₂ equivalent (MmtCO₂e), M – between 0.1 and 1 MmtCO₂e, H – greater than 1 MmtCO₂e. Cost ratings are defined as; L – less than \$5 per metric ton CO₂ equivalent (MtCO₂e), M – between \$5 and \$50 per MtCO₂e, H – greater than \$50 per MtCO₂e. CCS' initial assignment of ratings is based on the GHG inventory & forecast,

assessments of similar actions conducted in other states, source activity or resources within the state (e.g. ag and forestry resources for biofuels production), and professional judgment.

5. CCS began the discussion of the catalog. Due to time constraints, CCS noted that a full discussion on each option was not possible. However, time was allowed for brief comment or discussion in order to help adjust the nominal ratings, as necessary.
 - a. AFW-1: A TWG member raised a question as to how CCS arrived at the cost rating for AFW-1.1. CCS responded that the focus of most of the options in the AFW TWG is feedstocks, and that the RCI and ES TWGs focus on the technologies necessary to drive demand for those feedstocks. The cost rating is based on cost estimates seen in states that have addressed similar options that have similar forestry and agricultural resources.
 - b. AFW-2: No feedback from the TWG was offered for this set of options.
 - c. AFW-3: CCS asked for feedback from a TWG member regarding the nominal ratings for AFW-3.3. No specific information was available at the time of this call, but the TWG member indicated that information would be provided off-line at a future time. A TWG member suggested that strip tillage be added to soil carbon management programs already proposed under AFW-3.1. CCS noted that the term “conservation tillage” in the title of the option was meant to be broad and cover any cultivation practice that achieved GHG benefits (e.g. no till, strip till, mulch till, etc.).
 - d. AFW-4: CCS requested TWG input for the nominal ratings for options 4.1 and 4.3. A TWG member commented that the costs of 4.2 might be lower than expected, given that most of the costs are borne by private landowners. However, as CCS stated, the quantification of the cost effectiveness of these options are based on societal costs (meaning total costs borne by both public and private parties). A brief discussion ensued in which the TWG felt that the actual carbon benefits are higher than the current nominal rating might indicate. CCS agreed to change the potential GHG reduction nominal rating for 4.2 from L to M. A TWG member proposed another option (4.4) that would provide for the utilization of impaired cropland. This option was added to the catalog.
 - e. AFW-5: A TWG member made CCS aware of current research done on “food miles” in Iowa that might aid the quantification of AFW-5.3. Beyond this comment, there were no suggested revisions to the nominal ratings for the AFW-5 group of options.
 - f. AFW-6: Questions were raised and discussed regarding AFW 6.4, although no changes to the ratings resulted from this discussion. There were no revisions proposed in this set of options. CCS said that they will follow up on other states’ work with “6.3 Improved Energy Capture from Wood Waste Combustion.”
 - g. AFW-7: The ancillary benefits to easements created as a result of options such as 7.1 and 4.2 are said to be high by a TWG member. However, CCS stated that the costs, however, are only calculated over the policy period (about 2020). It was noted that this short time frame may underestimate the benefits of options that

may be accrued in perpetuity. A note will be added to 7.1 and 4.2 to address this issue.

- h. AFW-8 through AFW-11: As time was running short, CCS asked that the TWG contact Steve Roe and/or Brad Strode to make any comments or revisions to these options. TWG members should also contact Steve, if they are unclear what is meant by any of the options in these groups. Questions and revisions should be provided by 7/23/07, so that changes to the catalog can be made before the ballots are distributed.
6. After updates to the catalog are completed, TWG members will be provided with a ballot via email. Each member can choose ten options with one choice per option. The results of the balloting will be tabulated by CCS and distributed to the TWG prior to the next TWG meeting. TWG members will also have the ability to provide additional input in a text box next to each option. For example, if a TWG member feels that the option they are selecting should be combined with another option, this input can be provided to CCS and will be taken into consideration when CCS consolidates the balloting results. TWG members will be given about one week to return their ballots to Brad Strode.
7. CCS brought up a discussion of the next meeting, which will be a face-to-face meeting. This meeting will be on August 8 in Columbia (meeting location details to be provided by email). Proposed times were discussed. An 11 AM start time was proposed and accepted by the TWG. The meeting is expected to last until 3:30 with a brief break for lunch.
8. Although there were members of the public in attendance, there were no public comments provided.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The date for the next TWG meeting is August 8 at a location TBD from 11:00AM to 3:30PM. Depending on the availability of TWG members, this meeting will be a face-to-face meeting to allow more time for discussion of the inventory and forecast and to consolidate the priority options for analysis.
2. Members are asked to submit any further comments or revisions regarding the catalog to Steve Roe or Brad Strode via email as soon as possible, so that they may be included in the AFW Actions Catalog that will be distributed along with the ballot.
3. An email ballot will be distributed to TWG members in about one week. Directions on filling out the ballot will be provided in the email. Members will be given one week to return the ballots to Brad Strode. CCS will compile the results and provide these during the next meeting on August 8. The goal for the next meeting will be to provide a list of 8-12 priority policies for analysis to the CECAC during their August 22 meeting.