



**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**IOWA CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Subcommittee**  
Call #10, July 2, 2008

**Attendance:**

*Subcommittee members:* Tom Hadden, Dave Miller, Duane Sand, Dean Lemke, Peter Thorne, Rick Cruse

*Center for Climate Strategies:* Joe Pryor, Jackson Schreiber, Brad Strode, Steve Roe

*Iowa Department of Natural Resources:* Marnie Stein

*Public Attendees:* Eric Fultouse (Iowa Air Quality Management District)

**Background Documents:** ([http://www.iaclimatechange.us/Agriculture\\_Forestry.cfm](http://www.iaclimatechange.us/Agriculture_Forestry.cfm))

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. Summary of Call #9
4. Policy Options Document

**Discussion and Key Items:**

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Review and approve prior call summary
3. Inventory and Forecast discussion
4. Review Results from ICCAC Meeting
5. Review Policy Options Document
6. Next Steps for AFW subcommittee
7. Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meetings
8. Public Input and Announcements

*Call to order and roll call – CCS Introductions*  
No Comments.

*Review and approve prior call summary*  
No Comments or Revisions. Prior call summary approved.

*Inventory and Forecast Discussion*

The Inventory and Forecast shows both dairy and beef cattle populations decreasing between 2005-2025. The subcommittee felt that the decrease in dairy cattle populations is reasonable to expect to continue. Beef cattle trends have been less clear, but there have been declining populations over the last thirty years. The current population projections for dairy and beef cattle are reasonable will remain as it is currently written.

*Review Results from ICCAC Meeting*

AFW-3

- There was a question regarding whether it is sustainable/realistic to have 75% removal of forest products/wood products in this goal. Sustainable can be difficult to pin down, but in this case it is viewed as maintaining ecosystem health.
- It might be important to talk with the state forestry service to know this for sure. In general, the wood products in a forest do not have significant nutrients, and if these are removed and not decomposing, it is very possible there would be minimal impact. CCS will contact Paul Tauke after the meeting to determine if he is indeed comfortable with the goal as it stands.

AFW-5

- The phrasing of the goal has been changed to focus on unmanaged grazed forested land.

AFW-8 and 9

- The goals outlined by the subcommittee were approved by the ICCAC.

*Review Policy Options Document*

We are hoping to get input on the implementation mechanisms and feasibility issues that may come with each policy option. Any assistance in expanding the POD will be helpful in moving the process forward.

AFW-8

- There were no questions or comments on the quantification of AFW-8 as it is currently presented in the POD.

AFW-9

- There was a discussion of the amount of electric generation that can be done. Some sites should have flaring, but be too small to effectively generating electricity.
- Landfills in Iowa with more than 1,000,000 tons of waste were assumed to have economically viable electricity production.
- Controls on sites of more than 1,000,000 tons may not be adequate to achieve the goals as they are currently written. These sites make up 62.5% of the methane generated. Since capture is generally only 75% effective, it is possible that we have not yet reached the 50% goal.
- There was discussion of whether the goal is too aggressive as it is currently written. No changes were recommended, but CCS will investigate if the goal should be changed.
- The four largest landfills (in terms of waste in place) already have methane capture installed.
- Mid-American Energy has done an analysis to determine the best sites to generate electricity from methane. That information should be considered in this analysis.
- The flood in Iowa is likely to cause a large surge in waste in this year due to ruined houses and property. This may need to be accounted for in our analysis of the inventory and forecast. Tom Hadden will investigate if such information is available.

- There was a request for information from the subcommittee on the price that will be paid to landfills for electricity generated. This price will be lower than the retail rate for electricity. The current estimate is 4.5 cents per kWh.

#### AFW-7

- The subcommittee was comfortable with the current shares of renewable energy technologies as presented in table 7-2.
- For an estimate of the cost of an energy audit program in Iowa, check with Roger Wolfe at the Iowa Soybean Association.
- CCS noted that the technology types were chosen for quantification purposes only. However, CCS will present more information on the types of technologies considered for the energy efficiency improvements. This will allow the subcommittee to have a better idea of how the cost estimates for these technologies were carried out.
- The water-pump efficiency improvements are for diesel pumps, and the number of pumps of this type in Iowa is relatively small. *[Subsequent investigation by CCS indicated that both diesel and electrical pumps are considered in the analysis.]*

#### AFW-2

- Research is ongoing about a new approach coming out of Iowa State University that may allow for quantification of this item. The preliminary GHG benefits of this option should be complete by the next subcommittee meeting.
- The option that is being developed shows both GHG benefits and an economic gain.
- The goals currently in place for this option are pretty general, and the quantification being done at ISU uses those goals as much as possible. This option is pursuing a water quality improvement, and much of the GHG benefits come in the Gulf of Mexico or in downstream rivers. If denitrification occurs, there is a higher release of N<sub>2</sub>O, so avoiding this has real GHG benefits.
- These new goals are likely to have an impact on AFW-1 (seasonally flooded areas), because there is significant overlap.
- The next subcommittee meeting is on Wednesday, July 16. If any results for this could be sent to CCS before July 14<sup>th</sup>, that would allow the items to be incorporated into the POD.

#### *Next Steps for AFW Subcommittee*

There isn't a prioritization of the subcommittee options. The options are put forward for the council's approval. The subcommittee's task is to ensure that the policy options are presented in the best possible form, addressing the appropriate issues and any possible barriers.

If the subcommittee wishes to add in a new option due to changed circumstances, then the recommendation can be made to the council to add a new option or change one significantly. This recommendation to ICCAC can be made after consensus at the Subcommittee level. There was a question of whether cellulosic ethanol needs any state incentives at all, given the high price of oil and the (relatively) lower prices of cellulosic ethanol. Discussion of this item will continue at the next subcommittee meeting.

#### *Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meetings*

There may be another subcommittee meeting scheduled to allow for further discussion of these policy options. It is also possible that meetings will be 2 hours rather than the typical hour and a half.

*Public Input and Announcements*

None

Thank you to everyone who participated on the call and contributed to the discussion of these issues.