

A summary of the sixth meeting of the ODF Forest Carbon Stakeholders Working Group - Monday March 24, 2008 in Portland, OR.

Present: Jay Morey – ODF, Jim Cathcart – ODF, Cameron Smith – Oregon Governor's Office, Mike Schnee – Michael Schnee Consulting (Facilitator / Mediator), Craig Partridge - WA DNR, Steve Bernath – WA Dept. of Ecology, Chris West – AFRC, Linc Cannon – OFIC, Steve Brink – CFA, Mike Gaudern – OSWA, Scott Zimmerman – Oregon Woodland Cooperative, Greg Miller – Weyerhaeuser, Ralph Saperstein – Conkling, Fiskum & McCormick, Matt Donegan – Forest Capital Partners, Keith Balter – Forest Capital Partners, W. Ray Jones – Roseburg Forest Products, Jake Gibbs – Lone Rock Timber Company, Eric Schooler – The Collins Company, Mike Powelson – The Nature Conservancy, George Schunk – Ecotrust, Brent Davies – Ecotrust, Sara Vickerman – Defenders of Wildlife, Gina Larocco – Defenders of Wildlife, Sara Obrien - Defenders of Wildlife, Rick Brown - Defenders of Wildlife, Evan Smith – The Conservation Fund, Hal Salwasser – OSU, Olga Krankina – OSU, Mark Harmon – OSU, Dave Powers – EPA, Bob Deal – USFS PNWRS, and Joyce Casey – USFS Region 6

Via Conference Call: Adrian Miller – WFPA and Kevin Raymond – Pacific Forest Trust

Educational Presentation by Mark Harmon and Olga Krankina from Oregon State University:

- Mark and Olga gave an informative presentation on the potential carbon storage of forests and forest products. They provided specific details related to rotation lengths and fire risk mitigation. See their attached PowerPoint presentation.

WCI Offsets Sub-committee Update:

- Cameron Smith provided an update on a newly formed WCI Sub-committee working group consisting of agency personnel and representatives from Governor's and Premier's Offices of WCI partners. The first conference call was held last week with representatives from Oregon, Washington, California, Arizona, Utah, British Columbia, and Manitoba. This working group within the WCI Sub-committee will be preparing a document of principles which will include discussion on avenues to incorporate forestry into the WCI.

Discussion of the group's letter sent to the WCI Offsets Sub-committee:

- Mike Schnee provided an explanation on how comments were sorted and incorporated into the letter. See attached PDF to view the letter.
- The letter was sent to the WCI Offsets Sub-committee Chair on Friday March 21, 2008 with signatures from all 18 organizations within the core group.

Discussion on the Work plan:

- Mike Schnee sent out a work plan he put together prior to the meeting. Group members should have received this plan as an attachment from Mike Schnee on Sunday 3-23-08.
- The general group feeling was the work plan should get us to a deliverable product in May.
- Several topics of necessary discussion were identified which were not included into the work plan. The work plan can and will be amended along the way to reflect newly identified or overlooked topics, however, it should be a valuable tool to keep the group working through the issues efficiently.
- The group was agreeable to extending meetings to longer hours and putting in the necessary drafting work to get through the complicated process we are engaged in. Several members suggested and concurred there may be a necessity to organize several drafting sub-committees in order to accomplish all the work still ahead, with each sub-committee or drafting group taking certain topics or pieces of the "Principles Document" to work on revisions etc.

Discussion on the "Principles Document":

- Several topics not addressed in the current draft were identified. These topics include having a synopsis and comments on a subset of major standards (protocols) already in place, strategic investment, some discussion about the specific carbon pools to account for in the offsets design, entity versus project reporting, and a discussion on the interaction of landscape goals and project – specific standards.
- Discussion on Section II, 3a. “Real”:
 - (1) The sentence containing *“there needs to be an established mechanism such that the market values of different offset types are commensurate with their capacity to store carbon”* could imply a very complex system. For the system to be effective, it must be credible and as simple as possible.
 - (2) It was brought up that “real” can mean whether or not an activity can be observed, quantified, monitored, or reversed. Consider these for our definition.
 - (3) The question was raised on how can “real” be identified or measured at the project scale and provide reasonable certainty that landscape scale goals will be achieved. The cumulative effect of the projects will not necessarily result in landscape goals being achieved. What advice can we provide? This also came up during the discussion on additional. The group appeared to be in agreement that we should consider adding a “landscape context” topic to the principles document. The topic likely is applicable to numerous design elements.
 - (4) The sentence containing *“to a given standard of precision and accuracy”* raised concerns about creating a measurement system that could demand levels of precision & accuracy that would be overly cumbersome to potential users. We should encourage simplicity and cost effectiveness in measuring and monitoring to encourage broad landowner participation. The system must balance precision and accuracy with practicality.
 - (5) The set of protocols should recognize the variability in certainty associated with different projects.

A straw poll was taken and the group agreed to ask the drafting subcommittee to incorporate these ideas into the language in this section of the Principles document. This will then be reviewed at a later date.

- Discussion on Section II, 3b. “Surplus/additional”:
 - (1) The discussion began with a discussion of the definition of additional as it is described in the first sentence of this section of the document. This is still something to work on.
 - (2) There was discussion that additionality can come in at least three forms: temporal, financial, or regulatory.
 - (3) The group agreed to a suggestion to discuss baseline prior to additional, since baseline is really where it all starts and you need to have that conversation first.
- Discussion on Baseline:
 - (1) Baselines might also be thought of in various ways e.g. financial, temporal, and regulatory.
 - (2) Another way of thinking about a baseline is to ask the question – What could someone do with the land?
 - (3) There should be incentives to keep forest land in forests.
 - (4) There should be incentives for “good carbon” forestry.
 - (5) Baseline should be defined in simple terms with minimal wording to be easily understood.
 - (6) The discussion of “good” and “bad” carbon forestry is not helpful, what matters in this discussion is more or less carbon footprint offsetting potential. Provide incentives for forestry that produces more carbon or avoids fossil fuel emissions.

- (7) Any discussion shouldn't just center around carbon storage and sequestration offsets, but should include the offsets that bio-fuels offer in overall reduction of the carbon footprint.
- (8) The question was raised on whether activity that increases carbon benefits without intention or has done so in the past be rewarded? The general feeling was yes, these types of activities should be rewarded. It seems inadvisable to not reward past behavior that has resulted in more carbon benefits but to then provide incentives to those who have historically been carbon neutral or have actually reduced carbon storage/sequestration.
However, this approach may pose a difficult challenge to the overall goal of the system - to promote increased carbon storage/sequestration in the future. If too many offsets are awarded based on "historical performance" then there may not be enough of a market to achieve the real goal of the system. This is a paradox that we must at least describe if not offer suggestions on how to address.
- (9) A baseline should encourage reforestation/afforestation only on those sites where forests are appropriate and with appropriate species.
- (10) Afforestation may be the type of project where the benefits are so far in the future that they will not serve the more immediate needs for increased carbon benefits.

The discussion on additional/baseline will continue at a future meeting.

Next Meeting:

- Continue working through the second draft of the "Principles Document".

When: Monday April 7, 2008 from **9:00 am to 4:00 pm** with a brown bag educational presentation (topic and speaker TBD) from 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm

Where: Portland - Board Room (Third Floor) at the US Bank Building located at 625 SW Stark Street, Portland, OR 97205. [See the Google link below for maps and directions.](#)

<http://maps.google.com/maps?f=q&hl=en&geocode=&time=&date=&ttype=&q=625+sw+stark+st,+portland&sll=37.0625,-95.677068&sspn=31.646818,59.238281&ie=UTF8&ll=45.522691,-122.677739&spn=0.006825,0.014462&z=16&om=0>

Future Meetings Scheduled:

When: Mondays April 21st, May 5th and 19th, 2008 from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm with a brown bag educational presentation (topics and speakers TBD) from 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm

Where: Portland – Location TBD

Jay C. Morey

Forester - Astoria District - Sunset Unit

Chair - Astoria District Safety and Wellness

Office - (503) 325-5451 ext. 306