



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

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Vermont Governor's Commission on Climate Change – Plenary Group (GCCC-PG)**  
**Agriculture, Forestry & Waste Resource Management (AFW)**  
**Technical Work Group**  
**Call #7, April 10, 2007**

Attendance:

1. TWG Members: Elaine Wang (for Debra Sachs), William Sayre, Elizabeth Courtney, Phil Benedict
2. Public: Earhard Frost (invited expert forester), Jamie Fidel (invited forestry expert)
3. CCS: Steve Roe, Katie Bickel
4. VTDEC: Jeff Merrell

Background documents:

(all posted at [http://www.vtclimatechange.us/Agriculture\\_Forestry.cfm](http://www.vtclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry.cfm))

1. Agenda
2. Power Point Presentation to the AFW TWG
3. AFW Policy Options Document
4. Summary Notes from Call #6

Discussion and conclusions:

1. Due to low attendance and difficulty with web access, CCS decided to adjust the schedule and expedite the meeting to hit on main points and then follow-up with the whole group by email.
2. CCS gave a quick review of progress to date. CCS will ask for input on last call summary by email.
3. CCS reviewed the purpose of today's call, i.e., to discuss the outcomes of the Plenary Group meeting. PG input included the following:
4. AFW-4&7 (Reducing the amount of agriculture and forest land conversion to developed use): PG requested input on current levels of conversion. CCS will provide data on this, which will be included in the draft proposals.
5. AFW-6 (Increased forest biomass energy use): The PG felt that the initial goal is to increase biomass energy production by 30% by 2028. PG felt the goal was low and wanted the TWG to look at feasibility of increasing it and suggested that the TWG contact the Biomass Energy Resource Center for preliminary results.
6. AFW-9: PG suggested increasing the goal level of recycling options
7. AFW-11: PG requested the TWG investigate the potential of micro-hydro generation, which is a technology that uses water flow to generate electricity.



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

8. CCS discussed next steps on policy option development. TWG volunteers should begin working on other sections of the template: implementation mechanisms, related policies and programs in place, additional benefits, and feasibility issues. CCS will begin working on GHG quantification and cost/costs savings estimates, completing the sections on GHG Savings and Costs per MtCO<sub>2</sub>e and Key Uncertainties.
9. A TWG member invited forestry experts to provide input on the feasibility and implementation of the forestry policy options under discussion. The TWG reviewed the forestry options with the invited experts to get initial feedback. CCS explained that the volunteer groups will further develop the options and there will be additional opportunities to provide input. Some issues discussed were:
  - a. AFW-5 (Forestry Programs to Enhance GHG Benefits): need some terminology clarification, e.g., what is meant by productivity or production, is it based on forest growth, harvest, or both. The invited expert shared information from another forestry expert, who felt that increases in production of 10% are about the maximum you can expect. Bigger increases may be possible if you put unmanaged land into active management (e.g., 30cuft/ac/yr in unmanaged forests, can get up to 45cuft/ac/yr if you actively manage, which is closer to 50% increase).
  - b. TWG members further discussed the issue of increasing forest productivity, TWG members see a potential for higher percentage growth if you look at both growth on site and harvest. One TWG member noted that part of this process is to push the boundaries on what can be accomplished and to identify barriers to implementation, e.g., landowner attitude, which may be as big a factor as site conditions.
  - c. CCS further elaborated on the issue of pushing boundaries and reported that the PG emphasized that this process should set ambitious goals.
  - d. AFW-6. Invited forestry expert noted the balance between taking additional fiber out of the woods and maintaining ecological functions. There may be opportunities to use roundwood in ways that improve forest structure and quality (in contrast to increasing the volume of whole tree chipping increases). The TWG noted another assumption that paper demand is on decline and the potential to shift biomass into other markets.
10. CCS reminded the TWG of next steps, to develop policy template and collaborate with CCS on formulating language, and pointed the TWG to a number of other state processes where there are relevant materials: [www.nclimatechange.us](http://www.nclimatechange.us); [www.nmclimatechange.us](http://www.nmclimatechange.us); [www.mtclimatechange.us](http://www.mtclimatechange.us).
11. One TWG member noted that AFW-3 was intended to include a composting option, and some concern was expressed regarding how to quantify the GHG reductions. CCS noted that this will need to be addressed as we move forward.
12. TWG members asked questions about quantification methodology, e.g., how will forest carbon stocks be quantified, and how are opportunity costs accounted for in terms of the



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

goal of supplying 30% of our food locally (AFW-1), and should we frame AFW-1 in terms of a regional program, rather than in the state of VT. CCS directed the TWG to revised policy description and implementation text to address a regional approach, if this is the direction that the TWG volunteers would like to take. These issues and others were discussed.

13. CCS decided to skip the review of the I&F due to low participation.
14. The TWG requested assistance with facilitating/mentoring the smaller groups. CCS will send out an email to encourage volunteer groups to begin drafting text. CCS will assist with organizing a call for the forestry volunteers as well.
15. The TWG asked for clarification on how to involve external sources. CCS explained that expert input from people outside the process is welcome and invited. The best way to involve external experts it to engage them in the volunteer group process.

Next Steps:

16. The Next TWG call is April 26<sup>th</sup>, 1-3pm. The purpose is to review progress on policy option development.
17. Next PG meeting is on May 17, 2007, at which CCS will present for PG approval the draft policy proposals.