



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change
State of Florida

FLORIDA ENERGY and CLIMATE ACTION TEAM

Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Technical Work Group (TWG)
Notice of Teleconference Meeting, Call #6.1
June 19, 2008
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM EDT

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members:
Marc Bruner, Janet Bowman (for Doria Gordon), Eugene Jones, Ray Scott (for Jay Levenstein), R. David McConnell, Gary Peter, Andrew Walmsley, Celeste White, Chris Wynn (for Nick Wiley)
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Steve Roe, Rachel Anderson
3. Florida Department of Environmental Protection: James McNeil,
4. Florida Agency Observers: none
5. Public Attendees: Bob Krasowski with the Florida Alliance for a Clean Environment

Background documents:

(all posted at <http://www.flclimatechange.us/AFW.cfm>)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. Summary of Call #6
3. Power Point Presentations for Teleconference
4. Straw Proposal Template
5. Draft Straw Proposals

Discussion items and key issues:

1. Steve Roe called the meeting to order, Rachel Anderson completed the roll call, and Steve reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.
2. Steve reviewed the Call 6 summary. The Call summary was accepted without change.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

3. CCS mentioned that some updates have been made to the Forestry Inventory & Forecast. If time allows those will be reviewed later in the call.
4. We are currently on the Straw Proposal design step in the process. This includes the Policy Description and Policy Design, which should include a quantifiable goal with an associated timeline.
5. The Straw Proposal document includes a table with estimated biomass supply and a placeholder table where the TWG will detail biomass demand of each policy option (and options from other working groups as well) to ensure that FL has the appropriate amount of biomass supply to meet the goals set by the TWGs.
6. The draft Straw Proposal document was reviewed as follows:
 - a. AFW-1: Forest Retention. A Member asked how much detail we want in each description and do we want the level of detail to be the same for all the options? CCS noted that we don't want to overload the Action Team with too many details but we do want the reader to have an understanding of where FL is now and where the goal will take the state. Question: How do we note the overlap between the various forestry options? CCS responded that we can add text to each option to note overlaps. We want to make sure that each policy correctly communicates the will of the group. CCS commented that AFW-1 focuses on no net loss and that AFW-2 could be considered incremental above AFW-1; or is AFW-2 meant as a policy that supports the goals in AFW-1? A member asked if AFW-1 is based on a carbon stock goal or land footprint goal? The carbon stock question overlaps with AFW-3 Forest Management, which is focused on how those acres are managed for improved carbon stock. We could also look at AFW-3 as an option that supports AFW-1's "no net loss" type of approach. Members noted that AFW-1 seems to lean towards an acreage goal. A member asked what other states have done and CCS commented that some states liked the "no net loss of carbon stocks" approach because it doesn't assume "no development." (e.g. development can be offset by improved forest management and increased carbon stock in other forests). A member noted that "no net loss" has room for more trade-offs. CCS gave a quick overview of the updates to the forestry I&F, noting that recent FIA data are showing lower levels of loss at ~7,400 acres per year between 1995-2005 (compared to an earlier estimate of around 80,000 acres/yr). CCS asked the TWG members what forestry data source they want to use as the basis for assessing future losses of forested land (for use in both the inventory and forecast, as well as policy design): the recent past (based on FIA data) or estimated future forests (based on the source used in the current AFW-1 policy description? Members were asked to be ready to discuss this issue during the next call. Members noted an interest in keeping the 3 forestry options separate in terms of design (i.e. making them incremental to one another, so that benefits could be more clearly assessed). A Member noted that AFW-4 and 7 mention short rotation



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

forests as biomass source – FL doesn't currently have short rotation forests. Should these be included in the forest counts under the forestry options? CCS noted that the TWG can make a decision about whether we want to include these in the forest cover options or not.

- b. AFW-2: Afforestation and /or Restoration of Non-forested Lands. It was suggested that we merge the two paragraphs of the urban forestry description. CCS will build language to note the linkage between AFW-2 and AFW-3 Forest Management. It was suggested that the second paragraph should be moved to AFW-3. A Member noted that ag lands are where the short rotation forests can be placed. This option can potentially look at bringing more acres into forest cover, or look at degraded forest lands that can be improved (that could fall under either AFW-2 or AFW-3). A Member asked if the 2.5% annual increase goal is reasonable and feasible? A quick calculation estimated that that would be about a 6 million acre increase by 2025. A Member noted that it is ambitious but there is a question about where the land is coming from – noting that it isn't going to be coming out of development. CCS can put in another table up front which provides current land use in the state so we can look at the "supply" and "demand" of land for the various options. A Member asked what afforestation means– i.e. what kind of land do we suggest being converted? CCS asked the TWG for additional input on this issue; also it was decided that the TWG would follow up with Dept. of Forestry and find more information about where the 2.5% number came from and where those acres are going to come from. CCS noted that the option can include tree planting or a tree retention component for development. A member asked if there are any baseline data on urban canopy cover? It was decided that the TWG should follow up with Dept of Forestry on this as well to get a better understanding of where we are currently. Dr. Michael Andrews at the University of Florida has modeling software that is being used to model urban carbon storage and energy savings. In regards to offsetting "metropolitan carbon emissions", it was decided that the TWG should ask Dr. Andrews what metropolitan carbon emissions includes – indirect electricity, residential/commercial fuel, transportation, all of these, etc.? CCS asked which urban forest goal the TWG wants to go with – emissions offset or canopy cover? A Member noted that emissions offset is more strategic in terms of where the trees are planted and that canopy cover is easier to quantify. CCS suggested that we will try to merge the urban forestry goals into a single goal such as: Plant and maintain enough trees to establish a canopy cover that will offset the 2008 metropolitan emissions 10% by 2025. In the process of quantification, we can see what that really means in terms of metric tons of carbon. Then, we can determine the number of trees that would be required and how achievable that goal is. CCS also mentioned to the TWG that we will need to build some additional specificity into the goal regarding the



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

placement of new trees (e.g. fraction of these strategically placed to achieve energy benefits).

- c. AFW-3: Forest Management umbrella option. The TWG volunteer for this option indicated he would be sending text for this proposal on Friday. The challenge will be to define how the goals will be different from business of usual. A Member noted we also need to keep in mind how to keep forests profitable, so that the land stays as forest and doesn't move to development.
- d. AFW-4: Expanded Use of Forestry, Agriculture, and Waste Management Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, and Steam Production. A Member noted the need to make sure biomass can be provided in a sustainable manner. Another noted that we need to provide incentives for waste-to-energy because it very expensive. The goal of 500% was used for the first design element, because the baseline wasn't known (this can be updated later, based on new information). There are several new plants being constructed that will be using biomass resources. A Member asked: does this option just cover selling electricity for power? Or does it cover pulp and paper mills and all other sources that consume biomass as well? Members suggested we should look at all biomass being used for energy. When asked about current energy crop biomass supply, a Member noted that FL currently has about 150,000 acres of sugarcane, sweet sorghum, and corn. A member noted that producers are ready to grow more energy crops if there were a demand for them. CCS asked if the TWG wants a large, general goal for energy crop production with smaller specific sub-goals (e.g. by crop type)? Or do we want to just have one large goal (in which case, we would need to apply assumptions about the types of crops involved during the quantification of benefits and costs)? Members noted that we could generalize the crop goal so that particular crops aren't excluded that could meet the goal in an environmentally sustainable way. It was also noted that we could write the goal in terms of amount of dry biomass desired.
- e. AFW-5: Promotion of Farming Practices that Achieve GHG Benefits. A Member noted that incentives tend to work better than "command and control" and that options need to be economically viable for producers. A Member noted that under this option biotechnology/technology research can be a benefit both in terms of reducing emissions and improving yields. CCS noted that these are important issues to include under "Implementation Mechanisms" during the next phase of the process. A member noted that the Agricultural Land Conversion sub-goal might fit better under one of the Land Use options. A Member noted that marginal ag lands can also include low-lying areas, intermittent wetlands, and pastures. It was suggested that we should check and see if there are available estimates for amount of marginal ag land in FL. Some species of



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change *State of Florida*

energy crops appear to be able to grow well on marginal ag lands or even former mining lands. At this juncture, there is not a specified goal for marginal ag lands, so TWG members are asked to try to come up with a goal for the next call (e.g. potentially as a percentage of available marginal agricultural land).

- f. AFW-8: A Member noted that collection of solid waste is a major GHG emitter from the solid waste sector and recommended including it with this option. It appears that TLU has not included collection or fleet efficiency in their options, so this AFW option might be a good place to include waste collection efficiency. TWG members agreed.
7. On the next call we will pick at AFW-6 and move through the rest of the options and then circle back and pick up any remaining issues from the first five options. There was a motion to extend our next meeting on June 24th from 10 am to 1 pm, so that we have sufficient time to cover all the options, and the motion was accepted.
8. Public comments:
 - a. Bob Krasowski with the FL Alliance for a Clean Environment brought up incineration of waste streams, noting that it releases more CO₂ than many types of power plants. He noted that he would like to see efficiency of collection covered as well. He also noted that it would have been helpful to have the Straw Proposal document available to the public as well before the call. (CCS note: the document was sent to the webmaster for posting and should be posted shortly. CCS will make every effort to get the documents posted in advance and will continue to do so to allow the public access to the documents.)
9. Please send any data sources that would be helpful to:
Rachel.anderson@pechan.com.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 24th, from 10:00 am- 1:00 pm.
2. Next FL Action Team meeting is Wed-Thu, July 9th-10th. The AFW TWG straw proposals will be presented on the 9th.
3. Dates for upcoming TWG conference calls:
 - a. June 23rd, 10 am – 12 pm - **CANCELLED**
 - b. June 24th, 10 am – 1 pm
 - c. July 1st, 10 am – 12 pm - **CANCELLED**
 - d. July 15th, 10 am – 12 pm
 - e. July 29th, 10 am – 12 pm



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

- f. August 12th, 10 am – 12 pm
- g. August 26th, 10 am – 12 pm