



[www.ksclimatechange.us](http://www.ksclimatechange.us)

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**KANSAS CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION ADVISORY GROUP**  
**Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management Technical Work Group**  
**(AFW TWG)**

Call #1, June 25, 2008, 1:00 PM – 2:30 PM

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members: Chuck Rice, Mark Knight, Brad Harrelson (substitute for Steve Baccus), Jessica Bauser (substitute for Adrian Polansky), Tracy Streeter, William Upman, Charlie Sedlock, Charles Ayers, Carolyn McGinn
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff: Steve Roe ([steve.roe@pechan.com](mailto:steve.roe@pechan.com)), Brad Strode ([brad.strode@pechan.com](mailto:brad.strode@pechan.com))
3. Kansas Department Health and Environment Observers: Miles Stotts
4. Governor's Office Observers: Evan Maher, Jennifer Knorr
5. Public Attendees: Curtis Leslie – Ash Grove Cement Company

**Background documents:**

(all posted at [http://www.ksclimatechange.us/Agriculture Forestry Waste.cfm](http://www.ksclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry_Waste.cfm))

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference.
3. AFW Draft Catalog of State Actions.
4. AFW State Actions Descriptions.

**Discussion items and key issues:**

This was the first conference call of the AFW TWG.

1. Steve Roe called the meeting to order, completed the roll call and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call. CCS staff, TWG members, and KDHE staff identified and introduced themselves.

2. CCS requested that the TWG use the call-in number sent by e-mail to TWG members. TWG members call in on a different code than the public. Also, all call participants are asked not to put the call on hold (as this often transmits the participant's voice mail music into the conference call).
3. CCS gave an overview of the purpose and key outcomes of the process. The final report of the Energy and Environment Policy Advisory Group (KEEP) will be delivered to the Governor in January of 2010. A preliminary status report will be delivered in January of 2009.
4. CCS provided an overview of the KEEP process convened by Governor Sebelius. Roles of the different process participants were covered. The TWG's role to support the actions of the KEEP was described (primarily in technical analysis and providing recommendations to the KEEP). This process is a transparent and comprehensive, consensus-building process.
5. Decisions made within this process will be made based on quantifiable estimations (GHG reduction potential and cost or cost savings per ton GHG removed), as well as unquantified co-benefits, other externalities (e.g. jobs, energy), and feasibility issues.
6. The TWG process ground rules were explained, followed by the timing of the KEEP and TWG meetings. The KEEP process is stepwise. Therefore, it is important that members attend all meetings, share equal footing, stay current with information, do not backslide, and make objective contributions. Additionally, TWG members are expected not to represent the KEEP or TWGs in the media or other public venues.
7. The 10-Step CCS Work Plan for the process was also covered. The TWG is currently working on Steps 2 and 3:
  - a. Develop an inventory and forecast of GHG emissions.
  - b. Identify a full range of possible actions.
8. CCS discussed the roles of the TWG. Specifically, the TWG is responsible for identifying and prioritizing potential state actions, suggesting straw policy designs, assisting with analysis and review of policy options, assisting with development of policy alternatives, assisting with KEEP reports, and reviewing and assisting with revisions to the state greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and forecast (I&F). It was noted earlier that the KEEP members vote on the options at KEEP meetings. The TWG is responsible for the provision of technical expertise and informed recommendations for the KEEP to consider.
9. A TWG member asked whether the KEEP members were afforded the opportunity to vote on the ground rules and process elements. CCS stated that the KEEP was given an opportunity at their first meeting in May to object to or question the process. Mr. Stotts of KDHE stated that the first KEEP meeting was well attended, although a few positions had not yet been appointed.

10. CCS reviewed the KS GHG inventory approach and initial results; more specifically, emissions from the agriculture, forestry, and waste management sectors. When preparing the I&F, CCS placed an emphasis on transparency, consistency, and significance. The I&F preferentially used KS or regional data, where available. Also, CCS used electricity consumption-based emissions within the summary tables and graphs for the I&F, rather than production-based emissions, to account for emissions associated with imports and exports of electricity from and to other states to inform the development of electricity supply-side and demand-side policy options (production-basis electricity sector emissions data is also presented in the appendix of the I&F). In situations where significant importing or exporting of emissions producing activity occurs, such as States that export a lot of solid waste for disposal, an accounting of emissions from the exported waste is probably useful. However, an accounting of emissions that have occurred to produce all of the materials consumed in the state (e.g. food, products, packaging) is not possible due to data limitations and the time and resource constraints of a pure consumption-based approach to GHG inventory development.
11. A TWG member raised the concern that the data used to develop the Inventory and Forecast could be unbalanced, leaving out other (and perhaps contrary) data which may come from a differing point of view. It was this member's concern that the limited data will generate a limited/distorted perspective. CCS encourages TWG members to provide alternative data sources for the Inventory and Forecast. These data will be discussed amongst the TWG, who will then decide whether or not to recommend the changes to the KEEP.
12. The I&F covers the six GHGs considered by the US EPA and UNFCCC: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. This is a policy-level I&F, built to diagnose GHG emissions and trends at a state-level, but not to develop a baseline or model for compliance or analysis of individual options at specific facilities. In summary tables and charts, gross GHG emissions are typically reported, which do not include sinks from forestry or agricultural soils (sequestration in these sectors are reported separately). CCS discussed projection methods, the selection of consumption versus production methods and gross versus net methods (net methods include consideration of carbon sinks).
13. Estimated GHG emissions from each of the sectors in KS were compared to US emissions from the same sectors. Emissions are reported by source category within each sector. A quick overview of data sources, methods, assumptions, and uncertainties were provided for each sector. CCS reviewed the sector inventories and forecasts for the AFW sectors (including a brief I&F of the ethanol production industry, which has been included within the industrial processes sector), although a more in-depth discussion will take place during the second meeting.
14. KDHE asked whether the rangeland and cropland burning are counted in the Ag sector. CCS stated that the rangeland burning is a part of the Forestry I&F, while the cropland burning is a part of the Ag I&F, although the TWG can guide the final sector within which these emissions will be counted. Another question was raised by the TWG

concerning the inclusion of wetlands in the I&F. CCS replied that wetlands are included in the forecast to the extent that they are reported by the USFS (i.e. those that have sufficient forest cover to be considered forests). Non-forest wetlands are not currently captured in the I&F. CCS notes sufficient scientific uncertainty around the issue of carbon dynamics for wetlands; but requests input from TWG members on any new and/or KS-specific information on wetland GHG emissions/carbon sequestration.

15. CCS introduced the catalog of state actions and accompanying state action descriptions. CCS requested that TWG members review the AFW catalog in advance of the next TWG meeting and be ready to discuss policy actions that might be missing from the catalog, as well as recent state actions that need to be added (e.g. recent legislation that relates to one or more of the options in the catalog). CCS requests that TWG members assist CCS in developing a list of recent and current actions relevant to policy options listed in the Catalog.
16. CCS briefly covered the Catalog of State GHG Actions. The attention of TWG members is also called to the Descriptions of Catalog Items. When complete, the Catalog will display the GHG reduction policy option, nominal ratings for the potential GHG emissions reduction and potential cost savings, ancillary impacts and feasibility considerations, and notes and related actions in KS. A TWG member suggested that the catalog does not sufficiently cover options related to rangelands and grasslands. CCS asked the TWG to consider options that they would like to add and bring these up for discussion during the next meeting. One suggestion from CCS is to re-label some of the sections devoted to “Forestry” options to “Rangeland & Forestry” options.
17. CCS suggested that revisions to the Catalog and Descriptions documents be made by e-mail to CCS (email to Brad @ [brad.strode@pechan.com](mailto:brad.strode@pechan.com)). Key CCS e-mails are listed above. Please include necessary attachments, references, and links. If the information could be useful to the whole group, CCS will forward the information to the entire TWG. One of the goals of CCS is to facilitate a common understanding amongst TWG members.
18. CCS discussed the agenda and time for the next meeting. The TWG will work to add new options to and revise each existing policy in the catalog. The next TWG call is scheduled for July 10, 2008 from 9:00 to 10:30 AM CT. CCS will propose a set of tentative dates and times for discussion during the next call.
19. The TWG members are asked to work on adding missing actions to the catalog, prepare revisions for the Catalog and Descriptions documents, and review the Draft KS GHG I&F, in particular the appendices on agriculture, forestry, and waste management.
20. Input from the public was solicited by CCS. Curtis Leslie of Ash Grove Cement Company, and a CC TWG member, asked whether there were any AFW options concerning the use of waste fuels in lieu of solid fuels. CCS stated that there were three options pertaining to his concern (related to municipal solid waste). However, Mr. Leslie was wondering whether the burning of hazardous waste would be considered. CCS

replied that while the burning of hazardous waste is not covered by a current catalog option, the process is open to adding any option that has net GHG benefits. He and TWG members are encouraged to think broadly about options that have GHG benefits that could be added to the catalog.

**Next steps and agreements:**

1. The next TWG meeting will be held on July 10, from 9:00 - 10:30 am.
2. TWG members should review the Catalog of State Actions before the next call and be prepared to discuss additions and revisions to the catalog on the next call. TWG members should send in comments/questions to Steve Roe ([steve.roe@pechan.com](mailto:steve.roe@pechan.com)) and Brad Strobe ([brad.strobe@pechan.com](mailto:brad.strobe@pechan.com))
3. TWG members should review at least the AFW appendices of the GHG Inventory & Forecast Report, so that issues can be discussed on the next call. The I&F report is available at: <http://www.ksclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O1F17410.pdf>.