



www.scclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
SOUTH CAROLINA CLIMATE, ENERGY AND COMMERCE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management Technical Work Group
(AFW TWG)

Call #8, December 13, 2007, 2:00–4:00 PM

Attendance:

1. Technical Work Group Members:
 - John Bonitz – Agriculture Energy Coordinator, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
 - Larry Boyleston – Director, Business and Government Relations, South Carolina Dept. of Agriculture
 - Stephen Henry – Natural Resource Conservation Center
 - Bob Perry – Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Programs Section, DNR
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) Staff:
 - Steve Roe – Lead facilitator
 - Brad Strode – Co-Facilitator
3. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC):
 - Michael Juras – SCDHEC; Agency Liaison
4. Public Attendees:
5. Technical Work Group Members not attending:
 - 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
 - Scott Fennell – Carolina Waste
 - Chris Fisher – Fisher Recycling
 - Erika Hartwig – South Carolina Energy Office
 - Joe James – CEO, Corporation for Economic Opportunity
 - Bob King – Deputy Commissioner, South Carolina Environmental Council
 - Edwin Lesley – President, Business Development Corporation of South Carolina
 - Russell Ott – South Carolina Farm Bureau
 - Carlton Owen – President/CEO, US Endowment for Forestry and Communities
 - Mark L. Robertson – Executive Director, The Nature Conservancy of South Carolina
 - Guy Sabin – Environmental Management Section Chief, South Carolina Forestry Commission
 - Bob Scott – President, South Carolina Forestry Association

- Daniel Tufford – University of South Carolina, Dept. of Biological Sciences
- Danny Verdin – SC Senate
- 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. Summary of Call #7
3. PowerPoint for Teleconference.
4. AFW Draft Priority Policy Options for Analysis

Discussion items and key issues:

Introductions and Review

1. CCS called the teleconference meeting to order, completed the roll call and outlined the agenda.
2. CCS reviewed the draft summary of Call #7. No revisions or comments were offered by the TWG .
3. CCS announced that the TWG has reached Step 5 of the Stepwise Planning Process: Quantify GHG Reductions and costs/savings. This call will detail the work needed from the TWG to complete this step.
4. CCS identified the next steps in development of the priority policy options (Slide 7 of the PowerPoint). CCS asked that all volunteers go back to the policy options to add as much detail as possible to the “Implementation Mechanisms” and “Related Policies/Programs in Place” sections.

Discussion of CECAC Input and Policy Options Document

1. AFW-1: General comment from AFW-1 (that applies to many options) is that the Committee would like to see information that allows them to determine what sort of reductions and costs would be associated with different goals. CCS communicated to the Committee that for some options this will be fairly easy to accomplish, while in other cases, such a task is beyond the scale of time and resources available under this process.
 - a. No changes to this proposal were requested by the Committee
 - b. TWG members should submit text for the Implementation Mechanisms to CCS as soon as possible in order for CCS to design the quantification of costs and benefits. TWG members are encouraged to take a look at policy options developed in other states as a starting point for the development of the Implementation Mechanisms (this note applies to all options discussed below).
 - c. CCS also reviewed the sections of the Policy Options Document (POD), emphasizing the importance of the sections described above in (b). Also, the TWG subgroups should submit text for “Key Uncertainties,” “Additional Benefits and Costs,” and “Feasibility Issues.”
 - d. DHEC asked CCS what process the development of Implementation Mechanism text would follow. CCS requested that a single set of text be submitted for each option following discussions between the individual groups.
2. A TWG member raised a general question (although applied to AFW-1 and 2) regarding the methods used by CCS to develop quantitative goals and results in this process. This member asked CCS whether there is a standardized process/model that has been

developed for the quantification of options. CCS noted the starting point for the quantification of options is the Draft Inventory and Forecast (I&F). The I&F will be a key data source for baseline data and emission factors. This TWG member was uncomfortable with the lack of transparency regarding the development of the I&F. CCS noted that the model used is publicly available and all data and methods are documented in the I&F appendices. CCS offered to spend as much time as necessary off-line with TWG members to help them feel comfortable with methods, data, and models used thus far.

3. AFW-2: A TWG member asked whether energy recovery and production or GHG reduction is the most important criteria of AFW-2. This member suggested that methane recovery might not be as effective as a GHG mitigation tool as methane avoidance. The TWG suggested that some changes to the design might be necessary to address best available technologies that have come to light since the original development of the straw proposal. CCS noted that additional refinement of the goals is allowable under the process, while drastic changes to the option design might be considered “backsliding” and thus not allowed under the CCS process. CCS asked TWG members to submit all additional text to Brad Strobe (brad.strobe@pechan.com).
4. AFW-3: The CECAC was not clear as to whether a baseline assessment of the consumption of in-state agriculture exists. A TWG member familiar with the industry of local foods stated that it has been difficult to accurately state the deliveries of SC agricultural products to grocers (especially large chains). CCS noted that it has been difficult to complete quantification in many states, as it has been difficult to collect sufficient data to provide comprehensive analysis. This policy option is an example of one that can go forward as a non-quantified option should the TWG not feel comfortable with the analysis that can be completed within the scope of this process.

There are currently significant efforts to determine under what circumstances local marketing works. Clemson University is conducting a study to measure effectiveness of branding to encourage purchase of local products.

It was noted that the current system of a sort of debit card for food stamp use only allows for purchasing foods where a credit card processor is used. Many local food providers do not have credit card processors. This may exclude food stamp users from purchasing local foods.

5. AFW-4: The CECAC requested that the TWG consider not only the current goal, but also the upper-bound of potential feedstock availability. A TWG member suggested that CCS reach out to AFW TWG and CECAC member Joe James on this issue and review the work of the SC Biomass Council.
 - a. This option will have an overlap with the Transportation/Land Use (TLU TWG) low-carbon fuel standard. The TLU standard is focused on the demand-side of biofuels, while the AFW standard is a supply-side proposal. CCS noted that after each TWG has completed quantification, the overlap between these two options will be considered when the cumulative benefits are presented to the CECAC.
6. AFW-5: CCS requested that the TWG members send a copy of the “La Capra” report that provides the current availability of biomass feedstocks. The CECAC asked the AFW TWG to consider woody energy crops, as well as biomass residues. CCS said that it would be necessary to know what the available acreage for such crops would be.

- a. CCS pointed out that there is an overlap between this option and options proposed by the Energy Supply TWG and that this overlap will be considered once the individual options are quantified.
 - b. CCS also noted that some of the Implementation Mechanisms are more directed towards the end-user, rather than the producer. Keeping in mind the supply-side intention of this option, the TWG should take another look at the Implementation Mechanisms, with a focus on the biomass resource itself.
7. AFW-6a: A TWG member noted that a paper had been sent by him to CCS that conveys the soil carbon impact of several different cropping systems. The CECAC had indicated that they would like to see the TWG develop as much baseline data as possible, as well as an assessment of the potential of manure management as a GHG mitigation tool. CCS requested that if any TWG member has any information regarding baseline carbon management practices.
 8. AFW-6b: The TWG still needs to identify some numerical targets for this option, as a default number was originally included. CCS urged forestry members to work quickly towards a goal, in order for quantification to begin. Also needed are goals for reforestation and urban forestry.
 9. AFW-7: While there was no input from the Committee, it is noted by CCS that there is work to be done to the Implementation Mechanisms section, as a broader range of strategies is needed to accomplish the goals of this option. The TWG has supplied CCS with additional edits to this option and will continue to work to refine this option.

Inventory and Forecast

1. CCS stated that while the AFW TWG has had an ample opportunity to request/suggest changes to the Draft Inventory and Forecast, the I&F is still up for discussion and review. However, CCS will not go through a thorough review of the I&F at this time

Next Steps

1. Input from the public was solicited. There were no members of the public in attendance.
2. TWG members should work quickly to supply additional text in the Implementation Mechanisms and Related Policies/Programs in Place sections to CCS by December 28, in order to give CCS time to complete the quantification process.

Agreements

1. The next meeting of the AFW TWG will be held via teleconference on **January 22, 2008 (2:00 to 4:00 p.m.)**
2. The Call Summary for this meeting will include a current list of priorities and volunteer work group members to date. (See table below.)

Revised Option #	Draft Policy Option Name	Straw Proposal Volunteers
AFW-1	On-Farm Energy Efficiency	<i>Stephen Henry, John Bonitz, Russel Ott</i>
AFW-2	On-Farm Waste Energy Recovery	Stephen Henry, John Bonitz, Russel

Revised Option #	Draft Policy Option Name	Straw Proposal Volunteers
		Ott
AFW-3	Expanded Use of Local Agricultural Products	Dan Tufford, Russel Ott
AFW-4	In-State Liquid Biofuels Production	<i>Erika Hartwig, John Bonitz, Johnny Williamson</i>
AFW-5	Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production	Erika Hartwig, Bob Giangiorgi, John Bonitz, Carlton Owen
AFW-6	Terrestrial Carbon Sequestration	Bob Perry (f), Guy Sabin (f), John Bonitz (a), Erica Westbrook (a)
AFW-7	Conservation and Restoration of Forest and Agriculture Lands for Enhanced Carbon Sequestration	Guy Sabin, Bob Perry , Dan Tufford, Bob Scott
AFW-8	Advanced Recycling and Composting	Bob Giangiorgi , Scott Fennell
AFW-9	Waste-to-Energy Reclamation	Edwin Lesley, Scott Fennell
AFW-10	Water and Wastewater Energy Efficiency Improvements	Venkat Lakshmi , Dan Tufford