



www.mdclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
MARYLAND CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY GROUP
Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management Technical Work Group
(AFW TWG)
Call #9, January 03, 2008

Attendance:

Technical Working Group: Joel Dunn (The Conservation Fund), Gary Allen (Center for Chesapeake Communities), George Kelly (Environmental Banc & Exchange), James Remuzzi (Forestry for the Bay – CBPO), Laura Miller (Montgomery County), Eric Sprague (Pinchot Institute), Cindy Parker (Johns Hopkins)

Maryland State Department Representatives: Liz Entwisle (MDE), Jim Wilkinson (MDE), Chris Rice (MEA).

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS): Gloria Flora, Steve Roe, Joe Pryor, Brad Strode, Rachel Anderson, Jen Jenkins

Public Attendees: None

Background documents: (www.mdclimatechange.us/GHG_Agriculture_Forestry.cfm)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. Summary of Meeting #8
3. Power Point for Call #9
4. AFW Straw Proposal Document

Discussion items and key issues:

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Review updated goals and quantification process and results to date.
3. Identify areas needing attention and further work.
4. Outline what will be presented to the MWG on Jan. 15
5. Next Steps for AFW TWG
6. Public Input and Announcements
7. Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meeting & Subsequent TWG Meetings

Discussion:

1. **Next MWG meeting – January 15, 2008**
 - a. Goals for each option need to be finalized.
 - b. Initial quantification will be presented at this meeting.

General Direction for Straw Proposals:

1. Continue to build on goals within the next week.
2. See other notes in document in addition to the comments below.
3. CCS Leads for each option will contact the relevant sub-groups
 - a. AFW-1, 2, 3, 4 (Forestry) – Jen Jenkins (j.jenkins@carbodynamicsllc.com)
 - b. AFW-7 Rachel Anderson (rachel.anderson@pechan.com)
 - c. AFW – 4 (Ag), 5, 6, 8 – Joe Pryor (joseph.pryor@pechan.com)
 - d. AFW- 9 – Brad Strobe (brad.strobe@pechan.com)
4. Please send your updates to Gloria (at gflora@s-o-solutions.org).

Specific Direction for Each AFW Policy Option from TWG Discussion:

AFW-1: Forest Management for Enhanced Carbon Sequestration.

1. May need to alter the goal slightly to aid quantification.
2. A number of questions for TWG to aid quantification:
 - a. Potential overlap with AFW-3 and 4. e.g. restoration of forests
 - i. Increasing management to enhance sequestration on existing forests for AFW-1 whereas AFW-4 is reducing conversion of forests.
 - ii. Change language from restore to “improve sustainable forest management” on 25,000 acres on private lands.
 - b. Programs for no net loss relate to forest cover, which may relate more to AFW-4. Move no net loss to AFW-4
 - c. Last bullet point on durable wood products is more of a guidance point rather than a quantifiable goal.
 - i. AFW-1 may provide a more appropriate option to quantify the amount of biomass available.
 - ii. MD forest service has info on biomass removed. Dan Ryder may be the most appropriate contact point.
 - iii. Move quantification of durable wood products to AFW-5
 - d. Data specifically for MD is required and the potential for changed management to impact on the availability of wood.
 - i. Certification systems information may have more detail on the carbon benefits of enhanced management.
 - ii. MD strategic forest initiative criteria may be a good source.
 - e. Insects and diseases play a big role but also issue of mismanaged woodlands. Can we pursue a methodology for calculating the GHG benefits of pest management.
 - i. Forest conservation act quantifies forest losses.
 - ii. James Remuzzi to send through information.
 - iii. George Kelly to send through information on Voluntary Carbon Standards and how they relate to forest management and afforestation.
 - iv. California Climate Action Registry may also have some information.
 - f. Implementation Mechanisms are really useful for quantification.
 - i. MD forest stewardship planning to encourage good management of private forests.
 - ii. State provides technical assistance and maybe the potential for tax relief.

AFW-2: Managing Urban Trees and Forests for Greenhouse Gas Benefits.

1. Some baseline data in EPA SIT data tool.
2. Contact Mike Galvin for more information on work in Annapolis and other cities.
3. Quantifying 1st and 3rd bullet point and 2nd bullet point may not be included under this option.
 - a. Emphasize that extra wood would be first used as a durable wood product rather than waste.
4. Dan Rider (DNR) should be contacted for information.
5. Durable wood products need to have a place – possibly under AFW-5.
6. Enhance green infrastructure as an implementation mechanism.
 - a. Goal already exists under greenways program (DNR).
 - b. Focus is not only lot basis but also the broader landscape basis and special distribution.
 - c. Need to redefine green infrastructure goal. Sub group to work on this offline.
7. For quantification there is sequestration value along with offset (cooling value). Distribution and specific placement do affect degree positive impact.

AFW-3: Afforestation, Reforestation and Restoration of Forests and Wetlands.

1. MWG is looking for a definition of reforestation and how it is used in RGGL.
2. Could be overlap with AFW-4
 - a. This is relating to an area not currently under forest cover.
3. Afforestation or restoration of 25,000 acres of private land by 2020 to be included under AFW-3.
 - a. Need to make sure that this is achievable.
 - b. Maybe a consequence of not achieving this goal is required.
4. Chesapeake Bay Commission goals need to be represented here and in the implementation mechanisms.
 - a. See specific place in POD for existing policies in place.
5. Information source: BayStat. Where MD can track status of Chesapeake Bay Commission goals on MD.

AFW-4: Protection and Conservation of Agricultural Land, Coastal Wetlands and Forested Land.

1. Move no net loss of forest to here
2. Establish sufficient acreage in forests to offset loss of 900 acres each month to development
3. Agriculture goal change to no net loss.
4. Wildlife action plans are also an important tool
5. Maybe a consequence of not achieving this goal is required
6. Wetlands protection is very nascent and maybe some sequestration but emissions are uncertain (particularly methane). Move forward as un-quantified option. Research required in implementation mechanisms.
7. CCX is doing some analysis on wetlands.
8. Coastal lands includes estuaries.
9. Easement/conservation costs, Garry Alan may have information.
10. Easement is best option

11. Information on soil carbon stock and conservation costs could come from:
 - a. Pat MacMillan (Dept. of Ag)
 - b. MALFP
 - c. Rural Legacy
 - d. MDE
 - e. Note that easement costs will vary through the state and the counties.
 - f.

AFW-5: “Buy Local” Programs for Sustainable Agriculture, Wood and Wood Products.

1. Vermont site and Montana sites for examples.
2. Need to progress offline.
3. Durable wood products could be placed here for quantification. See Dan Ryder. Forest
4. Need an appropriate Contact. Garry Alan recommended Steve Marbitco (sp?) who provides loans to farmers to market their products.

AFW-6: Expanded Use of Forest and Farm Feedstocks and Bi-Products for Energy Production

1. Information on biomass availability and costs of supply specific to MD are required:
 - a. A potential source of information could be the centre for agro ecology (residual waste) and the Maryland energy administration
 - b. James Remuzzi and Chris Rice both have information to send through.

AFW-7: In-State Liquid Biofuels Production

1. May need to change goal to be more reflective of available feedstock.
2. Is algal feedstock feasible? Need specific types of algae. Maybe 5% possible by 2020.
3. Rachel has provided an analysis on potential which suggests less than goal is available. Need to revise goal based on off-line discussion.
 - a. Production goals rather than replacement goals may be more realistic.
 - b. Production goal as it relates to consumption gives a reader an idea of what that means and what it is offsetting.
4. Costs – Missouri incentive as an example – 30 cents per gallon.
5. Karen Bedore on taskforce on how biofuels consumption can be increased in MD.

AFW-8: Nutrient Trading with Carbon Benefits

1. Benefits other than nutrient reduction will not be quantified but will be noted in the document.
2. Two elements – costs and carbon benefits.
3. Joe and George to work offline on information sources and appropriate goal setting.

AFW-9: Waste Management through Source Reduction & Advanced Recycling

1. Incremental benefits beyond BAU projected rate.
2. MD specific data will be used as much as possible.
3. MD has large amount of exported waste that goes to VA and PA. Resulting benefits will be attributed to MD.
4. Construction and demolition debris to be included?
5. Source reduction costs are program costs less tip fees.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting (Call #10) will be held on **Thursday January 17, 2008 from 1:00 to 3:00 EST**. The purpose of the next call will be to further complete the policy options and to discuss the preliminary quantifications.
2. Call#11 is scheduled for Thursday January 31, 2008 10:00 – 12:00
3. Group members who cannot make the calls can request a personal update in addition to the meeting notes.
4. Next MWG meeting is on January 15, 2008.
5. Following MWG meeting February 19, 2008
6. Next MCCC is on January 17, 2008.
7. TWG members are encouraged to forward germane data and reference material to Gloria Flora gflora@s-o-solutions.org or Brian Hug bhug@mde.state.md.us
8. **Milestones:** The Final Report is targeted for April 20, 2008.

Materials for each call will be posted at the Maryland Climate Change website (see address above). CCS will notify the TWG members when the materials are available for review.

Thanks again to all members. We recognize this is work above and beyond your already full schedules. Your meaningful contributions and excellent discussions are very encouraging.