



www.mdclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
MARYLAND CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY GROUP
Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management Technical Work Group
(AFW TWG)
Call #12, March 11, 2008

Attendance:

Technical Working Group: Gary Allen (Center for Chesapeake Communities), Cindy Parker (Johns Hopkins School of Public Health), Laura Miller (Montgomery County DEP), Bob Ensor (Howard Soil Conservation District).

Maryland State Department Representatives: Liz Entwisle (MDE), Katy Perry (MDE).

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

Public Attendees: None

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

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. AFW Policy Options Document
3. AFW Review Guide

Discussion items and key issues:

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Review and approval of prior call summary
3. Where we are in the process
4. Goals for today's call
5. Review latest quantifications for policy options
6. Augment Policy Option Descriptions
7. Next Steps
8. Date, time, & agenda items for next meeting

Discussion:

1. Next MWG meeting – March 19, 2008

- a. Goals and quantification for each option need to be finalized and will be modified and/or approved at this meeting.

Dan Rider's Comments:

1. Search and replace phrases to clarify that the intent is to manage forested lands even in a protection scenario vs. preservation as is, Gloria to make sure this is included.
2. Include suggested implementation mechanisms under AFW-4

3. "...manage 100% of public land using sustainable mgt practices by 2020 for State-owned resource lands." Include all forested land on state land, i.e., land classified as forest under state ownership. Concept approved, acreage number needs clarification.
4. Sustainable Forestry Act of 2008 has not passed out of the legislature yet so will not be listed as an implementation mechanism. First year is just a policy declaration for greater sustainability. But there is no mandate. Gary to provide text on this Act for inclusion into the POD under AFW 1.
5. Mention existing incentive programs in place for encouraging forest management on private lands. Gary can identify and provide 3 or 4. Dan should be able to provide examples of existing policies.
6. This question of whether to use perpetual easements is unresolved. Potentially, perpetual easements restrict are off-putting to donors/sellers, but RGGI is leaning towards mandating perpetuity. Focus should be on conservation of forest rather than individual trees and doing what is right for MD, not necessarily conforming only to RGGI. Need flexibility on the application of easements to various land types. Use the terminology "perpetual or very long term".
7. Dan's suggestion is consistent to what is currently proposed. But 5,000 acres/yr only achieved in 2020. Add note as to what CRP (Conservation Reserve Program) riparian buffer goals are.
8. Other benefits are not included in quantification currently but should be captured in Additional Costs/Benefit section. For greater strength, include in both quantification and additional cost/benefits sections.
9. Other comments to be addressed under AFW-6

Specific Direction for Each AFW Policy Option from TWG Discussion:

AFW-1: Forest Management for Enhanced Carbon Sequestration.

1. No additional comments other than above.

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

1. Specific goal of 50% urban tree canopy goal. Implementation mechanisms are generic – possibility for additional that direct address planting.
2. Could be ambitious but need a tough goal to achieve.
3. Laura suggested some examples for the subgroup will review and approve. They are:
 - Encourage planting programs in all communities, including a replacement program for dead trees where a tree with equal potential is planted in as good or better site to maximize longevity and efficacy
 - Insert urban tree planting in all comprehensive plans
 - Encourage local counties to identify, maintain and augment street tree populations
4. Mortality is currently included in the sequestration rate (i.e. total carbon stored divided by number of urban trees = annual increment). There may be an issue over how many trees to plant, e.g. after 12 years trees may not still be alive yet is counted. Need to identify this in the POD. Could add replacement program as an implementation mechanism.
5. Negative cost is actually a net benefit in accounting vernacular, Gloria to highlight this issue with MWG.

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

1. Wetland goal is currently generic. We should include a specific goal or reference Chesapeake Bay goals, although not for quantification.
2. Adopt goals from “Chesapeake 2000” (Chesapeake Agreement). Noting that occasionally goals are updated (e.g. forestry goals updated in 2006). Target acreage of wetland restoration/enhancement as Chesapeake 2000 or updates to the specific goals set in that agreement.
3. Implementation mechanisms: Forest Conservation Act – tax law program is not an appropriate reference.
4. FCMA requires a new bullet – Laura suggests the following edits.
 - Forest Conservation Act – ~~tax law program~~
 - Forest Conservation Management Act (FCMA) – provides landowners a reduction in property taxes on lands actively managed for forest conservation including newly planted areas
 - Also other property and inheritance tax incentives

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

1. Indirect emissions and land use practices before and after conversion to other uses are too difficult to quantify but will be noted as an emission source.
2. We are awaiting further information on saltwater marshes from Dr. John Sherwell.

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

1. Transportation savings could be identified and may be significant in the importation and local value-add manufacturing of lumber but recognize that it may be difficult. Dan Rider may have comments. If not, leaving as non-quantified is OK. A description of what emission might be reduced could be included.
2. Farmer’s Market: Agree with using Farm-to-School program as an example but need to only reference rather than focus on this. Also need to note under the cost estimates the explicit exclusions from the cost analysis.

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

1. Co-firing is used as a basis for cost but noted that other technologies may present more opportunities. (D. Rider’s concern about seeming focus on co-firing.)
2. D. Rider suggests that implementation mechanisms expressly state that DGS (Department of General Services) be encouraged to treat wood-as-fuel equally favorably with other fuels ; tax credits for using renewable fuels for heat; and acknowledge that MD’s energy policy is devoid of any discussion regarding thermal loads which are 40% of MD’s total energy budget.
3. Poultry litter explicitly added as a potential fuel source.
4. Impacts of switchgrass on land conversion from food-based agricultural use and as a monoculture noted.

AFW-7: In-State Liquid Biofuels Production

1. No food for fuel – phase out soybean as a feedstock from biodiesel calculations.
2. Possibly include implementation mechanisms for establishing new technologies.
3. Remove CRP as a feedstock for cellulosic ethanol.
4. Note, the removal of the two items above will make the achievable goals quite low in terms of gallons.
5. Cellulosic ethanol conversion – 100% of all available feedstocks (after beneficial uses such as retaining soil productivity, wildlife needs, etc. are met) may be too much. Proceed with 100% at this stage but note that it may need to be revised.
6. Some of the above should be added to Key Assumptions or Key Uncertainties section.

AFW-8: Nutrient Trading with Carbon Benefits

1. George may be able to add a paragraph on additional benefits
2. Also Key Assumptions section is lacking information.

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

1. Ed Dexter has reviewed current POD and cannot confirm or deny some of the assumptions. Given the process, they appear credible.
2. Could also highlight MD-specific information gaps as an area for further research in Implementation Mechanisms.

Next steps and agreements:

1. CCS to revise POD as recommended and on behalf of the TWG, present the near-final Policy Option Descriptions (POD) to Mitigation Working Group.
2. MWG reviews POD's & provides feedback (March 19)
3. MCCC meets to approve PODs and quantifications in light of meeting GHG Reduction Goals. (March 20)
4. AFW TWG subgroups incorporate MWG's recommendations and finalize PODs – full template. See reminders on what needs to be done
5. Final inputs due (April 15 at the latest!)
6. MWG approves final PODs (April 22)
7. MCCC reviews and approves compilation of Science, Adaptation and Mitigation Working Groups recommendations (May)
8. CCS will send out information regarding the next TWG meeting (Call #13), possibly April 3. The purpose of the next call will be to review the MWG comments and to finalize policy options. Subgroups should have their input on final template sections to Gloria as soon as possible.
9. Next MWG meetings are March 19, 2008 and April 22.
10. TWG members are encouraged to forward germane data and reference material to the facilitator addressing the policy option that their comments pertain to.
11. **Milestones:** The Final Report is targeted for the mid June, 2008.

Materials for each call will be posted at the Maryland Climate Change website (see address above). Thanks again to the TWG members who attended. We recognize this is work above and beyond your already full schedules. Your meaningful contributions and excellent discussions are very encouraging.