

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Washington Climate Advisory Team (CAT)**  
**Agriculture Technical Work Group (AW TWG)**  
Call #8, November 5, 2007, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members: Sejo Jackson (for Aaron Reardon), Cathy Baker, Tim Crosby, Jim Davis, John Ewald, Chad Kruger, Sally Sharrard (for Steve Wamback)
2. Facilitation team (Center for Climate Strategies): Katie Bickel, Steve Roe, Brad Strode
3. Washington State Agency (ECY/CTED) liaison and attendees:  
Chery Sullivan

**Background documents:**

(all posted at [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat\\_twg\\_agr.htm](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat_twg_agr.htm) )

1. Agenda
2. PowerPoint presentation (including agenda) for meeting
3. Draft Priority Options Description
4. Summary of AW Call #7

**Discussion items and key issues:**

1. The meeting started with a roll call of participants and a presentation of the agenda for the meeting.
2. The TWG had no comments on the Call #7 Meeting Summary, and the Summary was accepted.
3. CCS reviewed the schedule
4. CCS reviewed changes/updates to the policy options documents:
5. AW-1: Annual cost estimate has been revised. Capital costs were increased to take into account local trends (fewer covered lagoons than in national data set used to derive original costs). Cost of MSW estimate may be high. Electrical production lowers costs, but there are problems associated with linking to the transmission system. The barrier to electricity transmission may be addressed under ES-2 (decentralized transmission systems) and ES-7 (combined heat and power) to some degree. It was noted that 22% of the estimated GHG reductions are from biogas electricity and the analysis assumes no transmission system barriers. Co-location of digesters with energy users could help with transmission barriers and could be addressed as an implementation issue, as well as a key uncertainty. Include a footnote on page 10, re: cost assumption \$234/ton for OFMSW anaerobic digestion is high.

6. AW-2: CCS reviewed the quantification, noting that benefits are incremental GHG impact of using cellulosic ethanol over corn-derived feedstocks using lifecycle emission factors. The TWG asked several clarifying questions. Revisions include: The goals statement will be clarified with a note that 1.5 million of the total goal of 3 million is derived from ag sources and 1.5 from forestry sources. It will be noted that the 80,000 acres of perennial bioenergy feedstocks are the same as AW-4, with different GHG benefits estimated under each option. Assumptions regarding when the technology will be feasible will be discussed with the forestry TWG for consistency with F-7. It will be clarified where the market share assumptions for E10 and E85 come from. Text making the link to the TLU low carbon fuels option will be added; analysis will be reviewed for overlaps with TLU and revised as needed.
7. AW-3: A TWG member reviewed additional text added to address CAT questions coming out of the Oct 4 CAT meeting. It was also noted that Feasibility Issues are covered under Key Uncertainties, and a reference will be added to the text.
8. AW-4: CCS reviewed quantification and noted that cost assumptions for green manure have been refined. In response to a TWG member's concern, it was clarified that technology implementation is non-specific, i.e., any given implement can be used; this is important from a farmer's perspective, as flexibility and cost are an important concern. Need to take into account the lifetime carbon storage and potential future decay of carbon in bioproducts (will refine methodology if additional data can be located). The TWG decided to report findings by sub-options in the summary table to highlight the relative contribution of sub-goals to the overall GHG reductions and costs.
9. AW-5: CCS reviewed quantification and noted gaps that need to be filled in the text.
10. AW-6: CCS reviewed quantification and noted gaps that need to be filled in the text. Potential overlaps with ES TWG and AW-2 were noted. A TWG member noted that no-till may lead to increased demand for pesticides and fertilizer. This will be noted in the document; however the degree to which this would happen varies by site and research on the extent to which this would impact GHG emissions is ongoing.
11. AW-7: CCS reviewed quantification briefly and asked for input by email
12. AW-8: TWG member reviewed refinements made to the text since the last call.

**Next steps and agreements:**

1. CCS will revise the AW policy options document reflecting discussions during the TWG meeting and refined/additional quantification estimates for remaining AW policy options. The revised document will be posted for CAT consideration at the November meeting.
2. TWG members are encouraged to review the CAT version and submit comments to CCS.

**Next meeting:**

The next CAT meeting is set for Thursday-Friday, November 15-16 in Olympia.

The next AW TWG teleconference is for Monday, November 19, from 11:30 AM –1:30 PM.