



WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US

Agriculture & Forestry TWG Call #3, 10/19/05 8:30 – 10:00

Attendance:

1. TWG members: Jason Allen, Tim Darden, Kim Kostelnik, Denise McWilliams (for Cecilia Abeyta), Louise Pape, and Amy Welch.
2. NMED staff: Brad Musick, Jim Norton
3. CCS staff: Steve Roe, Tom Peterson, Holly Lindquist
4. Other attendees: none.

Background documents:

1. Agenda: see presentation for Call #3 (Slide #2) below.
2. Presentation for Call #3:
<http://www.nmclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O117F7085.pdf>.
3. Draft Call#2 Summary:
<http://www.nmclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O117F7089.pdf>.
4. Updated policy matrix:
<http://www.nmclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O117F7087.pdf>.
5. Other documents as needed: none.

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS provided a review of the call summary for Call #2 (see link above), housekeeping issues, and TWG process overview.
 - a. TWG member (L. Pape) asked whether SGIT accounted for emissions that occurred during vegetable farming. CCS responded that SGIT was driven by crop acreages from the USDA, which should include vegetables (row crops). CCS will check into this issue. L. Pape also reiterated the importance of incorporating emission estimates for rangelands, soil carbon, and assessing full life cycle impacts of control options.
 - b. CCS mentioned that facilitator S. Roe will be on travel for 3 weeks beginning 10/22/05. Holly Lindquist will act as co-facilitator with T. Peterson during this

period. TWG members should direct all communications to Holly at holly.lindquist@pechan.com in addition to S. Roe and T. Peterson.

- c. CCS described the overall TWG process timeline and that this current ranking of policy options was only being done in order to rank options for analysis. No options were being taken off the list, and TWG members were still able to add options to the list. Moving forward, revisions to the emission inventory and forecasts will also be made, as new methods and data are analyzed.
2. TWG members asked if there should be one or more federal agency contacts added to the TWG (e.g. USFS, BLM, NRCS). K. Kostelnik agreed to provide a list of contacts.
3. CCS provided a description of how the initial ranking of options was performed based on feedback from five TWG members.
4. The review of options was initiated with the forestry measures. Option 6.1 was reviewed and ranked. The initial medium ranking was shifted to high following discussion based on the group's decision that forestland conversion to development should be ranked high, but forestland conversion to grassland should be incorporated into forest health and density management options (for later discussion).

Next steps and agreements:

1. During the next call, we will pick up on the review of forestry options at Option #6.2. After all of the forestry options have been covered, we will begin ranking the agricultural options.
2. Any new information on revisions to the draft inventory and forecasts will either be covered during the next call, or forwarded to the group via email or website postings.
3. The next set of calls will be scheduled after the CCAG meeting on 10/19/05. This schedule of proposed dates will be forwarded to the group for consideration.

List of Attachments: none needed.