

A summary of the second meeting of the ODF Western Climate Initiative Working Group - Monday January 28, 2008 in Portland, Oregon.

Present: Jay Morey – ODF, Jim Cathcart – ODF, Dave Van't Hof – Oregon Governor's Office, Cameron Smith – Oregon Governor's Office, Craig Partridge – WA DNR, Linc Cannon – OFIC, Adrian Miller – WFPA, Steve Brink – CFA, Chris West – American Forest Resource Council, Mike Gaudern – OSWA, Mark Copeland – OSWA Advisor, Tom Nygren – Small Woodland Owner, Mike Cloughesy – OFRI, Matt Donegan – Forest Capital Partners, Keith Balter – Forest Capital Partners, Brian Kernohan – Forest Capital Partners, Wade Mosby – The Collins Company, Eric Schooler – The Collins Company, Neil Sampson – The Sampson Group, John Audley – The Nature Conservancy, Bettina Von Hagen – Ecotrust, Brent Davies – Ecotrust, Matt Fehrenbacher – Pacific Forest Trust, Sara Vickerman – Defenders of Wildlife, Gina Larocco – Defenders of Wildlife, Evan Smith – The Conservation Fund, Bruce Lippke – University of Washington

Via Conference Call: W. Ray Jones – Roseburg Forest Products, and Greg Miller – Weyerhaeuser Company

Cameron from the Governor's Office provided a brief background of the WCI, how it is set up, and the timelines for the WCI:

- A draft of recommendations should be put together by approximately May 2008.
- Group desires to heighten focus on forestry and offset possibilities.
- The input generated in this group goes to the WCI Offsets sub-committee.
- Forestry is unlikely to be regulated, most likely voluntary.

General Discussion:

- Adrian Miller from WFPA felt the group should frame an opinion to keep forestry in voluntary non-regulated offsets, forest landowners would very strongly push for this approach.
- Matt Donegan recapped the three potential approaches discussed at the last meeting, land use, fire mitigation, and silviculture.

Protocols Discussion:

- Should the group put together our own set of protocols for the WCI input?
- Bettina Von Hagen brought up the Voluntary Carbon Standard (VCS) protocols. These protocols are a management tool rather than a certification, mainly an organizational framework, not feeding any individual standard or market.
- Mike Gaudern said we learned a lot from forest certification where the process quickly got to topics of disagreement, this problem should be avoided with the WCI input. Mike felt to build some momentum with the WCI, we should focus on local and global, putting together something that would work globally. Maybe in the future forestry will be better off in other ecosystems services? Variety and simplicity are the key, forest owners are going to say don't mess with our management.

- Linc Cannon brought up most protocols aren't international, we need to be innovative.
- Dave Van't Hof raised the question whether going global would benefit the west and Oregon? Where is the benefit going?
- Sara Vickerman mentioned long rotations as a key component to the carbon discussion.
- Bruce Lippke said wood substitutes for steel and concrete and short rotations are the avenues to success for reducing the carbon footprint. Any forestry, long rotation, short rotation, fire mitigation etc. are all benefits in reducing greenhouse emissions.
- Bettina Von Hagen said both long rotation and short rotations can be beneficial, depending on the project design. In terms of permanence, the reductions should last as long as the commitment you are making. Forests create problems with permanence.
- Chris West felt a variety in offset projects is important with rotations etc. Energy and co-gen opportunities are already here. The ultimate future is to reduce our carbon footprint.
- Mark Copeland said additionality is a huge assumption or FPA is not realistic. There is too much \$\$\$ out there to drive other options for forest use.

#### California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) Discussion:

- Evan Smith said the perpetual conservation easement approach of the CCAR in California doesn't enforce the buyer's contractual rights. There could be "double selling" taking place as this is a trust based operation. The marketplace is demanding permanence. Evan felt we would be better off not using CCAR as a template due to difficulty in getting many parties involved due to costs and protocol constraints.
- The CCAR is not necessarily in tune with the WCI.
- Steve Brink said the CCAR has been directed on 10-25-07 to look at other protocols since perpetual conservation easements and the up front costs of certification and the framework of the CCAR protocols is not generating much interest from forest landowners. The CCAR also doesn't account for public lands in California. There are currently 6-8 modules under examination by John Nickerson to look at other options including alternatives to conservation easements, involving public lands, protocols for carbon as a commodity, and market based determination of value in carbon credits. The CCAR looking at other protocols is not supported by everyone, many have different agendas. Steve said the other states and provinces (OR, WA, BC, etc.) would be better served looking at other options than CCAR.
- Steve Brink said it is going to take a year or more for California to get the situation sorted out on how or if they are going to implement other protocols. This WCI working group doesn't have time to wait around and see what California does.
- John Audley said it is a matter of opinion that the CCAR is not working. However, California has done their thing and we can't wait around with the

- timeline we have. This WCI working group has the opportunity to influence policy and community decisions beyond forests.
- Eric Schooler said the CCAR would not be the way to go for our WCI input as the CCAR only addresses about 1/10 of 1% of forest lands.
  - Chris West said it is important to recognize the differences between BC and OR, WA, and CA. British Columbia is driven provincially.
  - Our guest speaker Neil Sampson presented some key differences between the Chicago Climate Exchange and CCAR protocols. [The presentations and related papers from Neil are attached.](#)

#### Next Steps:

- There was a general feeling we need a common view amongst states and provinces to be the most successful in influence with the WCI. General principles should be agreed on before we can work any further on details. We want to be leaders, not followers throughout this WCI input process.
- A broad deliverable with small differences worked out would be most effective possibly recognizing numerous protocols and project types.
- Bettina Von Hagen suggested we focus on project types rather than protocols and get agreement on key principles.
- Bettina Von Hagen suggested we use papers and position statements to more efficiently communicate thoughts rather than trying to share in the context of a meeting with many people. The group agreed to submit position statements and papers to Jay Morey, who will then disseminate them to the entire group for comments. In order to be more efficient and timely, it was agreed a smaller sub-committee would be formed to break down the papers, finding key agreements and disagreements etc. This committee tentatively consists of Jay Morey, Linc Cannon, Adrian Miller, John Audley, and Bettina Von Hagen. The findings from analyzing these papers and position statements will be discussed at the next meeting.
- Sara Vickerman said the concept of loss of forest should be a minimum to get into the game and then details can be worked out from the top down.
- Brian Kernohan said it is important to distinguish the difference between principles and design elements. For example land use as a principle and permanence as a design element.
- Chris West said it would be helpful once the final product is put together to display the principles that can and cannot be agreed upon. This would help policy makers in terms of reasoning, importance, and decision making.
- Use science to help with the process. Bruce Lippke tentatively said he could do a presentation at the next meeting.
- Possibly have someone discuss the Voluntary Carbon Standard protocols at the next meeting or a future meeting.
- Craig Partridge from Washington DNR was in attendance. He said Washington is moving quickly to establish a working group once they can meet with the Governor. This will happen fairly quickly and we should have the opportunity to integrate either fully or at least partially with WA and possibly groups, states, or provinces in the near future. However, the formation of the WA group may not

be finalized prior to our next meeting. Craig said Washington intends to be leaders and not followers as well.

- Possibly integrate into a regional group with OR, WA, and BC, etc.

**Next Meeting:**

- Work through papers via the sub-committee and discuss with the larger group key similarities and differences in principles. Discuss and work to get agreement on what our core principles will be.
- Tentatively have Bruce Lippke present some scientific research to help guide our input process.
- Possibly have someone discuss the Voluntary Carbon Standard protocols.
- Have a plan or timeline laid out prior to the meeting to get us to May 2008 with a deliverable product.

**When: Monday February 11, 2008 from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

**Where: Portland - Board Room (Third Floor) at the old US Bank Building located at 625 SW Stark Street, Portland, OR 97205.**

Jay C. Morey  
Forester - Astoria District - Sunset Unit  
jmorey@odf.state.or.us