

LETTER • **OPEN ACCESS**

Meeting GHG reduction targets requires accounting for all forest sector emissions

To cite this article: Tara W Hudiburg *et al* 2019 *Environ. Res. Lett.* **14** 095005

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Environmental Research Letters



LETTER

Meeting GHG reduction targets requires accounting for all forest sector emissions

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED

20 February 2019

REVISED

3 June 2019

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

11 June 2019

PUBLISHED

23 August 2019

Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence](#).

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

Tara W Hudiburg^{1,4} , Beverly E Law², William R Moomaw³ , Mark E Harmon²  and Jeffrey E Stenzel¹ 

¹ Department of Forest, Rangeland and Fire Sciences, 875 Perimeter Dr MS 1133, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844, United States of America

² Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society, 321 Richardson Hall, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97333, United States of America

³ Center for International Environment and Resource Policy, The Fletcher School, and Global Development and Environment Institute, Tufts University, Medford MA, United States of America

⁴ Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: thudiburg@uidaho

Keywords: carbon, forests, wood products, climate mitigation, GHG mandates

Supplementary material for this article is available [online](#)**Abstract**

Atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs) must be reduced to avoid an unsustainable climate. Because carbon dioxide is removed from the atmosphere and sequestered in forests and wood products, mitigation strategies to sustain and increase forest carbon sequestration are being developed. These strategies require full accounting of forest sector GHG budgets. Here, we describe a rigorous approach using over one million observations from forest inventory data and a regionally calibrated life-cycle assessment for calculating cradle-to-grave forest sector emissions and sequestration. We find that Western US forests are net sinks because there is a positive net balance of forest carbon uptake exceeding losses due to harvesting, wood product use, and combustion by wildfire. However, over 100 years of wood product usage is reducing the potential annual sink by an average of 21%, suggesting forest carbon storage can become more effective in climate mitigation through reduction in harvest, longer rotations, or more efficient wood product usage. Of the ~10 700 million metric tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents removed from west coast forests since 1900, 81% of it has been returned to the atmosphere or deposited in landfills. Moreover, state and federal reporting have erroneously excluded some product-related emissions, resulting in 25%–55% underestimation of state total CO₂ emissions. For states seeking to reach GHG reduction mandates by 2030, it is important that state CO₂ budgets are effectively determined or claimed reductions will be insufficient to mitigate climate change.

Introduction

Heat trapping greenhouse gases (GHGs) are being added to the atmosphere at an accelerating rate by fossil fuel combustion and land use change. Climate change consequences were recently described by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the United States National Climate Assessment (USGCRP 2018). The IPCC Special Report (IPCC 2018), Global Warming of 1.5 °C, concludes that to keep global average temperature below 1.5 °C by 2100, it is essential to reduce fossil fuel emissions by

45% by 2030, while substantially increasing the removal of atmospheric CO₂. Both reports emphasize the need to increase atmospheric CO₂ removal strategies by forests in addition to sustaining current forest carbon uptake (Houghton and Nassikas 2018). Some states in the US have set targets for reducing GHGs that include forest climate mitigation options (Anderson *et al* 2017, Law *et al* 2018), yet consistent, rigorous accounting methods are required for evaluating options. Challenges include determining the extent that forests, harvest operations, and wood products affect GHG budgets and emissions accountability.

The most recent global carbon budget estimate indicates that land-based sinks remove 29% of anthropogenic emissions (including land use change) with a significant contribution from forests (Le Quéré *et al* 2018). However, none of the agreements or policies (IPCC 2006, NRCS 2010, Brown *et al* 2014, Doe 2017, EPA 2017, Duncan 2017) provides clear and consistent procedures for quantitatively assessing the extent forests and forest products are increasing or reducing carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere. Assessments are challenging because they involve components that require multiple types of expertise and accounting methods (i.e. forest ecosystem processes, wood products, and inherently uncertain substitution credits). Methods are often in disagreement over the wood product Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) assumption of *a priori* carbon neutrality, where biogenic emissions from the combustion and decomposition of wood is ignored because the carbon released from wood is assumed to be replaced by subsequent tree growth in the following decades (EPA 2016). Despite a multitude of analyses that recognize that the assumption is fundamentally flawed (Harmon *et al* 1996, Gunn *et al* 2011, Haberl *et al* 2012, Schulze *et al* 2012, Buchholz *et al* 2016, Booth 2018), it continues to be used in mitigation analyses, particularly for wood bioenergy.

Forests are sustainable *net* sinks as long as forest carbon uptake from the atmosphere exceeds emissions from harvesting, wood product use and decomposition, and wildfire. Wood products ultimately release CO₂ to the atmosphere as they are manufactured, disposed of, and decompose or are burned. However, because of concerns about double-counting, significant emissions associated with harvest and wood product use have not been counted for any sector (EPA 2018). These emissions are often not included in state CO₂ budget estimates (Brown *et al* 2014, Oregon Global Warming Commission 2017), even when they are included in national budgets (EPA 2017) (table S1 is available online at stacks.iop.org/ERL/14/095005/mmedia). If US states intend to use forests for mitigation strategies, they must account for all contributing sources and sinks of forests and forest-derived products (Stockmann *et al* 2012, IPCC 2014).

By focusing on a region with sufficient information to conduct a meaningful LCA, we demonstrate how a quantitative assessment of forests, management practices and wood products can assess the actual role played by forests and forestry practices in managing atmospheric CO₂. We calculate the regional forest carbon balance (from 2001 to 2016) using observations from over 24 000 forest inventory plots in Washington, Oregon, and California (states with GHG reduction mandates). Net forest sector carbon balance is quantified using an improved LCA including harvest, transportation, manufacturing, wood product pool storage and decay, emissions associated with fire, and

substitution for both building construction and energy production. We specifically consider global warming potential associated with carbon dioxide and do not include additional GHGs such as nitrous oxide and methane. Our aim is to provide an accurate cradle-to-grave, transparent and transferable accounting method of all forest-derived carbon for other states and countries with GHG reduction mandates (figure 1; box 1; figure S1; tables S2–S6).

Results

Western US forest ecosystem CO₂ balance (2001–2016)

Forest carbon uptake and release (net ecosystem production (NEP); figure 1(a)) controlled by ecosystem biological processes is calculated as the balance between forest carbon uptake (net primary production (NPP)) and forest carbon release through the decomposition of dead organic matter (heterotrophic respiration; R_h). In this study, a negative number indicates a net carbon sink (removal from the atmosphere) and a positive number indicates a net carbon source (addition to the atmosphere). The coastal Western US states together are a strong forest carbon sink with NEP of -292 ± 36 million metric tonnes (MMT) CO₂e per year ($-857 \text{ g CO}_2\text{e m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) (table 1; table S1), and account for approximately 60% of total Western US forest NEP (coastal, southwestern, and intermountain regions).

In addition to NEP, disturbances from harvest and wildfire influence estimates of net ecosystem carbon balance (NECB = NEP minus losses Chapin *et al* 2006; figure 1(a)). In the Western US states, the significant carbon losses from the forest are primarily from removals of wood through harvest, decomposition or burning of aboveground and belowground harvest residues, and wildfire (Law and Waring 2015). Significant harvest has been occurring in the western US since the early 20th century (figure S2). Up to 40% of the harvested wood does not become a product and the products themselves decay over time, resulting in product accumulation much smaller than the total amount harvested (figure 2(a); solid line) (Harmon *et al* 1996, Dymond 2012, Williams *et al* 2016, EPA 2017). Emissions include combustion of wood that does not become a product, combustion for energy, decomposition and/or combustion at end-of-life (table 1; rows 5, 6, 9, and 10). When these carbon losses are accounted for, these forests remain significant carbon sinks at -187 ± 33 MMT CO₂e per year ($-551 \text{ g CO}_2\text{e m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), with the largest sink in California (40%) followed by Oregon (33%) and Washington (27%). Despite California having twice the fire emissions of the other states (~ 10 versus ~ 5 MMT CO₂e yr⁻¹ per state) the ranking is due to much lower harvest removals in California (~ 12 MMT CO₂e yr⁻¹) compared to almost double in




Figure 1. Conceptual diagram of Forest-GHG (a) describes the natural, land-based forest carbon sink where the net of growth and decomposition is net ecosystem production (NEP), and after accounting for removals from fire and harvest, the balance is net ecosystem carbon balance (NECB), (b) describes the cascade of wood products until eventual deposition in landfills or the atmosphere and shows the pathway of emissions.

Washington (~ 20 MMT $\text{CO}_2\text{e yr}^{-1}$) and triple in Oregon (~ 31 MMT $\text{CO}_2\text{e yr}^{-1}$). Fire emissions are a third of harvest removals region-wide.

Building on our earlier work (Harmon *et al* 1996, Hudiburg *et al* 2011, Law *et al* 2018), we developed a modified cradle-to-grave model (Forest-GHG) for combining the balance of carbon captured in forest ecosystems, wood product use, lifetime emissions, and eventual return to the atmosphere or long-term storage in landfills. Forest-GHG tracks emissions associated with harvest of wood and manufacturing, transport and use of wood products. Harvest removals result in immediate (combustion of residues on-site or

as mill residues with and without energy recapture), fast (short-lived products such as paper), decadal (long-lived products such as wood) and centuries-long (older buildings and land-filled) timeframes before emissions are released back to the atmosphere (figures 1(b) and S1). Our model includes seven product pools and temporally dynamic recycling and landfill rates. Most importantly, we now include a more mechanistic representation of longer-term structural wood in buildings, by moving beyond a simple half-life with exponential decay (figure 3 and SI methods and SI tables 2–6). Our new building cohort-component method tracks decay of short- and




Table 1. Average annual total fluxes by state and region from 2001 to 2016. All units are in million MT CO₂e. Negative numbers indicate a carbon sink (CO₂ is being removed from the atmosphere). The more negative the number, the stronger the sink. Grey shading is used to indicate net values that represent carbon sink strength both before and after removals are accounted for.


Ecosystem	Washington	Oregon	California	Total
1. Forested area (million hectares)	9.7	12.4	11.9	34.0
2. Net ecosystem production (NEP)	-89.9	-102.0	-99.8	-291.6
3. Fire emissions	5.1	5.3	10.3	20.7
4. Harvest removals	18.5	30.5	11.5	60.5
Net ecosystem carbon balance (NECB) (sum of rows 1 through 4)	-66.4	-66.2	-78.0	-210.5
Forest industry	Washington	Oregon	California	Total
5. Harvest residue combustion (onsite)	3.9	6.5	2.5	12.9
6. Harvest, transportation, manufacturing (FFE emissions)	2.8	4.6	1.6	9.0
7. Wood product pool annual inputs	-18.5	-30.5	-11.5	-60.5
8. Landfill annual inputs (from products)	-6.8	-11.9	-4.2	-22.9
9. Wood manufacturing losses	3.9	6.5	3.9	14.3
10. Wood product and landfill decomposition	21.4	36.2	13.3	71.0
Net forest sector carbon balance (NECB + sum of rows 5 through 10)	-59.5	-54.7	-72.4	-186.6
11. Wood product substitution (wood)	-3.0	-4.9	-1.6	-9.4
12. Wood product substitution (energy)	-1.8	-3.0	-1.8	-6.6
Net forest sector carbon balance (with credits; NECB + sum of rows 5 through 12)	-64.3	-62.6	-75.8	-202.7

long-lived building components annually, and the lag time associated with these losses (figure S3). Our wood bioenergy substitution credits (Sathre and O'Connor 2010) include wood waste from harvest, mill residues, and wood products displacement of more fossil fuel intensive materials.

Using our component tracking LCA, we found that of the ~10 700 MMT CO₂e of wood harvested in all three states since 1900 (figure 2), only 2028 MMT CO₂e are currently stored in wood products with half stored in Oregon (1043 MMT CO₂e). In just over 100 years, Oregon has removed the equivalent of all live trees in the state's Coast Range forests (Law *et al* 2018), and returned 65% to the atmosphere and transferred 16% to landfills. Even though these are some of the most productive and carbon dense forests in the world

(Hudiburg *et al* 2009), the carbon accumulated in much of the removed biomass took up to 800 years to accumulate—and cannot be recovered if current management practices continue.

Forest harvest-related emissions have averaged 107 MMT CO₂e annually from 2001 to 2016 (table 1; row 5, 6, 9, and 10). Emissions are highest from decay of the wood product pool that has been accumulating for over 100 years (table 1 row 10; figures 3 and S3). This is after accounting for recycling and semi-permanent storage in landfills. Structural wood product decay for long- and short-term components (wood in buildings; figure 3) account for about 30%–35% of wood product and landfill decomposition while paper and non-building wood products account for about 65%–70%. Under this complete accounting, the



lowest contribution to overall emissions is from fossil fuel usage during harvest, transportation, and manufacturing, i.e. less than 10% of total wood product-related emissions in the three states.

We found that wood-related substitution for construction materials (0.54 fossil fuel carbon emissions avoided per unit carbon of wood; table 1 row 11) and energy (0.68 fossil fuel carbon emissions avoided; table 1 row 12) may offset 18% of forest industry emissions. This assumes 50% of wood-derived construction products are substituted for a non-wood product and that 75% of mill residues are substituted for fossil fuel energy (Berg *et al* 2016).

We varied the maximum average life spans of the wood products used in construction (e.g. buildings) to examine its effect on emissions estimates. Emissions are minimally reduced by 2%–4% in each state when a longer average maximum lifespan is used (100 years) for the long-term building components and minimally increased by 2%–3% when a shorter average maximum lifespan is used (50 years, which is the mean lifetime of buildings in the US EPA 2013).

Combined, the US west coast state forest sector (cradle-to-grave) is a net carbon sink, removing ~187 MMT CO₂e annually from the atmosphere and

potentially reducing fossil fuel emissions by up to another 20 MMT CO₂e through product and energy substitution. Harvest-related emissions reduce the natural sink (NEP—Fire) by 34, 46, and 27% for Washington, Oregon, and California, respectively. When substitution credits are included, this changes to reductions of 27%, 37%, and 23%. Harvest rates have been highest in Oregon (table 1), contributing to increasing wood product emissions and the largest reductions to forest sink capacity.

Discussion

NECB is a good estimate of ecosystem carbon uptake, e.g. for carbon offsets programs (Anderson *et al* 2017), and can be compared spatially with changing environmental conditions or disturbances, but is an incomplete calculation of the entire forest sector emissions. It does not include emissions from wood products caused by machinery, transport, manufacturing and losses—emissions that can equal up to 85% of the total versus 15% from fire, insects, and land use change (Williams *et al* 2016). Nor does it account for the storage and subsequent release of carbon in varying

end uses with varied product lifetimes. Given that not all harvested wood is an immediate source to the atmosphere and very little harvested wood is stored in perpetuity, it is essential to track associated emissions over time. For state- or region-level carbon budgets, a cradle-to-grave carbon LCA should be combined with the ecosystem carbon balance (NEP and NECB) to account for how much the forestry sector is contributing to or offsetting total carbon emissions.

If wood buildings are replaced by wood buildings, substitution is not occurring, and because wood is preferred for construction of single-family housing in North America, some of our substitution values are overestimated (Sathre and O'Connor 2010). Wood products store carbon temporarily, and a larger wood product pool increases decomposition emissions over time (figure 3). This emphasizes that increasing the wood product carbon sink will require shifts in product allocation from short-term to long-term pools such as reclaimed (re-used) wood products from demolition of buildings, and reduction of product manufacturing losses (EPA 2016). Clearly, there is potential for climate mitigation by using forests to sequester carbon in biomass and reduce losses associated with the wood product chain (Law *et al* 2018).

It is argued that there may be reductions in fossil carbon emissions when wood is substituted for more fossil fuel intensive building materials (e.g. steel or concrete) or used as an alternative energy source (Butarbutar *et al* 2016). Substitution is a one-time credit in the year of the input. Studies have reported a range of substitution displacement factors (from negative to positive displacement; Sathre and O'Connor 2010, Smyth *et al* 2017), but we found no study that has tracked the actual amount of construction product substitution that is occurring or has occurred in the past in the United States. This makes substitution one of the most uncertain parts of this carbon budget. It may be more easily tracked in the fossil fuel sector through a decrease in emissions because of reduction in product supply, in which case it would be double counting to then include it as a credit for the forest sector. We show results with and without the substitution credit (a decrease in forest sector emissions) because it cannot be verified. We show the potential impact it has on the overall forest sector carbon sink, even though the displacement factor may be unrealistically high (Smyth *et al* 2017, Dugan *et al* 2018). For forest sector emissions assessments, the uncertainty suggests exclusion of the credit.

Currently, state's GHG accounting budgets are incorrect because they are not full cradle-to-grave estimates of all CO₂ emissions associated with forest natural processes and human influences. For accurate GHG accounting, these emissions should be included in the forestry sector as they are not accounted for by state's energy and transportation sectors (IPCC 2006) (table S1). The US EPA reported average fossil fuel CO₂ emissions of 491 MMT CO₂e yr⁻¹ for the three

states combined (2013–2016). Forest industry harvest, transportation, and manufacturing fossil fuel emissions are included in this total. However, it is unclear to what extent wood product decay and combustion emissions are also counted in state budgets. In Oregon, they are not included at all, resulting in state CO₂ emissions that have been underestimated by up to 55% (Oregon Global Warming Commission 2017, Law *et al* 2018). Washington includes combustion emissions from the current year's harvest (table 1; Manufacturing losses; row 9), but not from wood product decay, resulting in up to a 25% underestimation of state CO₂ emissions. Because California's emissions from other sectors are so high (76% of regional total), and harvest rates have been historically lower than in Oregon and Washington, the impact of not including these emissions is very small as a proportion of the total. Although fire in California has received much attention, it only accounts for 3% of the state's total fossil fuel CO₂ emissions.

These underestimates are especially alarming for Oregon where GHG reduction targets are to be 10% below 1990 levels by 2020 and at least 75% below 1990 levels by 2050 (Pietz and Gregor 2014). California and Washington emissions are to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (Nunez 2006), and 80% and 50% below 1990 levels by 2050 (Washington State 2008), respectively.

In contrast, the US EPA reports emissions from wood product decay and landfills (EPA 2017) per the IPCC guidelines (IPCC 2006) (table S1). However, combustion emissions from logging and mill residues are not reported (EPA 2017). Moreover, ecosystem carbon losses are indirectly estimated through changes in biomass pools with measurement uncertainty that can be greater than the change (Ferster *et al* 2015). So even at the national level, emissions (as a fraction of fossil fuel emissions) would be underestimated by 10% and 24% in Washington and Oregon, respectively. Undoubtedly, there are implications for reduction mandates when the magnitude of emissions themselves are incorrect.

Conclusions

The goal for all societies and governments as stated in Article 2 of the *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change* (Oppenheimer and Petsonk 2005) should be '...stabilization of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.' The Paris Climate Agreement (UNFCCC 2015) aims to keep global average temperature from rising by no more than 2 °C above preindustrial levels, and if possible no more than 1.5 °C. Forests are identified as part of the strategy (UNFCCC 2015).

Although some US states have attempted to quantify a portion of forest-related emissions, improved estimates are essential to track emissions to meet

reduction goals. We identified the main components that should be part of the forest sector state estimates. We found that emissions have been underestimated by up to 55% in Oregon and 25% in Washington, and that at present, these emissions are not reported in state GHG reporting guidelines. The accuracy of forest sector emissions estimates can be improved with sub-regional data on residential and commercial building lifespans, recycling, verifiable substitution benefits and accurate monitoring of growth rates of forests. However, verifiable substitution of one material for another may be more readily quantified in the fossil fuel sector.

The 2006 IPCC GHG guidelines provide three different approaches for calculating emissions from harvested wood products (IPCC 2006) (including reporting 'zero') and reporting of this component is not required by UNFCCC. To complicate accounting further, several studies have shown that using the different recommended approaches results in emissions that differ by over 100% (Green *et al* 2006, Dias *et al* 2007). Moreover, according to IPCC and UNFCCC, emissions of CO₂ from forest bioenergy are to be counted under land use change and not counted in the energy sector to avoid double counting. However, this provides a 'loophole' leading to their not being counted at all.

The United States government currently requires all federal agencies to count forest bioenergy as carbon neutral because the EPA assumes replacement by future regrowth of forests somewhere that may take several decades or longer (EPA 2018). While it is theoretically possible that a replacement forest will grow and absorb a like amount of CO₂ to that emitted decades or a century before, there is no guarantee that this will happen, and the enforcement is transferred to future generations. In any rational economic analysis, a benefit in the distant future must be discounted against the immediate damage associated with emissions during combustion. Furthermore, the goal for climate protection is not climate neutrality, but rather reduction of net GHGs emissions to the atmosphere to avoid dangerous interference with the climate system. Allowing forests to reach their biological potential for growth and sequestration, maintaining large trees (Lutz *et al* 2018), reforesting recently cut lands, and afforestation of suitable areas will remove additional CO₂ from the atmosphere. Global vegetation stores of carbon are 50% of their potential including western forests because of harvest activities (Erb *et al* 2017). Clearly, western forests could do more to address climate change through carbon sequestration if allowed to grow longer.

Since it is now clear that both CO₂ emissions and removal rates are essential to meet temperature limitation goals and prevent irreversible climate change, each should be counted and reported. We recommend that international agreements and states utilize a consistent and transparent carbon LCA that explicitly

accounts for all forest and wood product storage and emissions to determine compliance with goals to lower atmospheric GHGs. Only by using a full accounting of GHGs can the world manage its emissions of heat trapping gases to achieve concentrations in the atmosphere that will support a stable climate.

Materials and methods

We calculated the 2001 to 2016 average net forestry sector emissions from cradle-to-grave, accounting for all carbon captured in biomass and released through decomposition by forest ecosystems and wood products industry in Washington, Oregon, and California. Building on our previous work (Harmon *et al* 1996, Hudiburg *et al* 2011, Law *et al* 2013, Law *et al* 2018), we developed a modified and expanded LCA method to combine with our ecosystem carbon balance, now called Forest-GHG (version 1.0; figure 1 and box 1). We accounted for all carbon removed from forests through fire and harvest. All harvested carbon was tracked until it either was returned to the atmosphere through wood product decomposition/combustion or decomposition in landfills, minus the amount semi-permanently stored in landfills (buried). This required calculating the carbon removed by harvest operations starting in 1900 to present day because a portion of the wood removed in the past century is still in-use or decomposing. In addition to carbon in biomass, we also accounted for all carbon emissions associated with harvest (equipment fuel, transportation, manufacturing inputs). Moreover, our wood product life-cycle assessment includes pathways for recycling and deposition in landfills. Finally, we give substitution credits for not using more fossil fuel intensive materials than wood used in construction of buildings and energy production.

Observed carbon stocks and fluxes (ecosystem carbon balance)

Carbon stock and flux estimates were calculated from over 30 000 forest inventory plots (FIA) containing over 1 million tree records in the region following methods developed in previous studies (Law *et al* 2018) (SI Methods). Flux calculations include NPP (Clark *et al* 2001) NEP, and NECB. The NECB represents the net rate of carbon accumulation in or loss from ecosystems.

Off-site emissions associated with harvest (LCA)

Decomposition of wood through the product cycle was computed using a LCA (Harmon and Marks 2002, Law *et al* 2018). A 117 year wood products pool (1900–2016) was simulated using reported harvest rates from 1900 to 2016 for Oregon and Washington (Harmon *et al* 1996, DNR 2017, Oregon Department of Forestry 2017) and from the California State Board of Equalization (CA 2018). Harvest was converted to

Box 1. Terminology and Flux Definitions for table 1

1. Forest Area = sum of all forest area in each state derived from US Forest Service forest area map (30 m resolution). Includes all ownerships.
1. NEP = Net Primary Production—heterotrophic respiration; microbial respiration as they decompose dead organic matter in an ecosystem.
1. Fire emissions = the emissions associated with *combustion* of organic matter at the time of the fire. Most of what burns is fine surface fuels, averaging 5% of aboveground biomass in mixed severity fires of Oregon and Northern California.
1. Harvest removals = Wood actually removed from the forest (not the total aboveground biomass killed). Removals are not equal to emissions but are the removed carbon from the forests at the time of harvest. This is subtracted from NEP along with fire emissions to calculate the net forest carbon balance from the viewpoint of the forest ecosystem.

NECB = NEP + Fire Emissions + Harvest Removals. The term is the simplest expression of forest carbon balance without tracking wood through the product life cycle. Although not all of the harvest removals will result in instant or near-term emissions, NECB still captures the impact of the removed carbon on the forest ecosystem carbon balance, and is consistent with international agreements (REDD+, conservation).

1. Harvest Residue Combustion = the emissions associated with combustion of slash piles; the branches, foliage, and non-merchantable wood left after harvest operations (remains in the forest) and burned onsite (assumed to be 50% of slash).
1. Harvest, Transportation, Manufacturing (FFE emissions) = the fossil fuel emissions associated with harvest (skidding, sawing, etc), transportation of logs to mills, manufacturing of wood and paper products, and transportation of products to stores (see table S5 for coefficients).
1. Wood Product Pool Annual Inputs = Harvest removals
1. Landfill Annual Inputs (from products) = The amount of wood and paper that is sent to landfills at end of life. In Forest-GHG, this occurs incrementally from 1950 to 1960 and then in 1961 is assumed to be constant at the current rate.
1. Wood Manufacturing Losses = fraction of wood that is lost at the mill (sawdust, etc) and is assumed to be returned to the atmosphere within one year through combustion (with 75% energy recapture) or decomposition.
1. Wood Product and Landfill Decomposition = fraction of the total wood product and non-permanent landfill carbon pools that is returned to the atmosphere annually.

Net Forest Sector Carbon Balance = sum of NECB and rows 5 through 10. Emission sources are rows 5, 6, 9, and 10. Sinks are rows 7 and 8.

1. Wood product substitution (Wood) = carbon credits that account for the displaced fossil fuel emissions when wood is substituted for a fossil fuel derived product in buildings (e.g. concrete or steel). We assume 0.54 g C fossil fuel emissions avoided per g of C of wood biomass used.

Box 1. (Continued.)

1. Wood product substitution (Energy) = carbon credits that account for the displaced fossil fuel emissions when wood is substituted for energy. In the Oregon, Washington, and California this primarily a mix of natural gas and coal. We include the biogenic emissions from combustion of forest-derived woody biomass and include an energy substitution credit if it is combusted with energy recapture.

Net Forest Sector Carbon Balance (with substitution credit) = sum of NECB and rows 5 through 12.

total aboveground biomass using methods from (Law *et al* 2018). The carbon emissions to the atmosphere from harvest were calculated annually over the time-frame of the analysis (1900–2016).

The coefficients and sources for the Forest-GHG LCA (figures 1(b) and S1) are included in table S1 through S6 with all units expressed as a function of the wood biomass being cut, transported, manufactured, burned, etc. We accounted for the fossil fuel emissions that occur during harvest (fuel for equipment) and the fossil fuel emissions associated with transport of wood to mills. Then, we accounted for the fossil fuel emissions associated with manufacturing of products followed by a second transportation emission for delivery of products to stores and warehouses. Wood that is not made into a wood or paper product (e.g. waste) is assumed to be combusted onsite at the mill (with 50% energy recapture as combined heat and power) or used in a product that will return the carbon to the atmosphere within one year (table 1 and box 1; Wood Manufacturing Losses).

Wood products are divided into varying product pools and are then tracked through the wood product cascade until end of life (figure 1(b)). Wood products are split into seven product pools: single-family homes, multi-family homes, mobile homes, non-residential construction, furniture and manufacturing, shipping, and other wood. We simulated wood product storage and emissions to 2050 for display purposes in the figures assuming a constant harvest rate after 2016.

We estimate the carbon pools and fluxes associated with buildings by separating buildings into components with different life spans (figures 3 and S3). This allows components and buildings to have a lag time before significant losses occur, and recognizes the difference between building life span and the residence time of carbon in a building. This also allows capacity for Forest-GHG to have component and building life spans evolve over time as construction practices and the environment (including biophysical, economic, and social drivers) change.

In Forest-GHG, a fraction of each year's new harvest is allocated to residential (single-family, multi-family, and mobile homes) and non-residential construction (Smith *et al* 2006). This fraction is further divided into the short-term (23%) and long-term (77%) components. The

resulting pools are tracked independently, quantifying losses through decay and demolition from the year they start until then end of the simulation.

All the components created in a given year are considered a building cohort that is also tracked separately each year. All components are summed to give the total amount of building carbon remaining in a cohort at a given time (figure S3). For each year, the amount lost to the atmosphere or to the landfills through demolition, is simply the current year's total wood product carbon pool plus the current years inputs and minus last year's total wood product carbon pool.

Substitution

We calculated wood product substitution for fossil fuel derived products (concrete, steel and energy). The displacement value for product substitution was assumed to be 0.54 Mg fossil C/Mg C (Smyth *et al* 2017, Dugan *et al* 2018) wood use in long-term structures (Sathre and O'Connor 2010). Although the displacement value likely fluctuates over time, we assumed it was constant for the simulation period. We accounted for losses in product substitution associated with building replacement (Harmon *et al* 2009), but ignored the leakage effect related to fossil C use by other sectors. We assumed 75% of 'waste wood' was used for fuelwood in homes or at mills (wood manufacturing losses in table 1). We accounted for displacement of fossil fuel energy sources using a displacement factor of 0.68 assuming a mix of coal and natural gas replacement (Smyth *et al* 2017, Dugan *et al* 2018).

Uncertainty estimates and sensitivity analysis

We calculate a combined uncertainty estimate for NEP and NECB using the uncertainty in the observations and input datasets (climate, land cover, harvest amounts). For the biomass and NPP observations, we performed Monte Carlo simulations of the mean and standard deviations for NPP (Hudiburg *et al* 2011) derived for each plot using three alternative sets of allometric equations. Uncertainty in NECB was calculated as the combined uncertainty of NEP, fire emissions (10%), harvest removals (7%), and land cover estimates (10%) using the propagation of error approach. Sensitivity analysis was only used for the long-term wood product pool by varying the average life spans of buildings by ± 25 years in our new cohort component method. Our estimates varied by 7%. This was combined with the uncertainty in NECB to calculate total uncertainty on the net forest sector carbon balance.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative of the US National Institute of Food and Agriculture Grant 2013-67003-20652 and the National Science Foundation award number DEB-1553049.

ORCID iDs

Tara W Hudiburg  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4422-1510>

William R Moomaw  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2690-2339>

Mark E Harmon  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4195-8288>

Jeffrey E Stenzel  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8881-0566>

References

- Anderson C M, Field C B and Mach K J 2017 Forest offsets partner climate-change mitigation with conservation *Frontiers Ecol. Environ.* **15** 359–65
- Berg E, Morgan T and Simmons E 2016 *Timber Products Output (TPO): Forest Inventory, Timber Harvest, Mill and Logging Residue-Essential Feedstock Information Needed to Characterize the NAPA Supply Chain* (Missoula, MT: University of Montana)
- Booth M S 2018 Not carbon neutral: assessing the net emissions impact of residues burned for bioenergy *Environ. Res. Lett.* **13** 035001
- Brown E G, Rodriquez M, Nichols M D and Corey R W 2014 First Update to the California Climate Change Scoping Plan (Sacramento, CA: California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board)
- Buchholz T, Hurteau M D, Gunn J and Saah D 2016 A global meta-analysis of forest bioenergy greenhouse gas emission accounting studies *GCB Bioenergy* **8** 281–9
- Butarbutar T, Köhl M and Neupane P R 2016 Harvested wood products and REDD+: looking beyond the forest border *Carbon Balance Manage.* **11** 4
- CA 2018 *California Timber Harvest Statistics* ed Equalization C B O (Sacramento, CA: California Board of Equalization) (<https://www.boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/pdf/harvyr2.pdf>)
- Chapin F *et al* 2006 Reconciling carbon-cycle concepts, terminology, and methods *Ecosystems* **9** 1041–50
- Clark D A, Brown S, Kicklighter D W, Chambers J Q, Thomlinson J R and Ni J 2001 Measuring net primary production in forests: concepts and field methods *Ecol. Appl.* **11** 356–70
- Department of Ecology (Washington) 2017 Washington Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program—Reported Emissions for 2012–2015 *Report* (Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology) (<https://ecology.wa.gov/Air-Climate/Climate-change/Greenhouse-gas-reporting/Inventories>)
- Dias A C, Louro M, Arroja L and Capela I 2007 Carbon estimation in harvested wood products using a country-specific method: Portugal as a case study *Environ. Sci. Policy* **10** 250–9
- DNR 2017 Washington Timber Harvest Reports (<https://dnr.wa.gov/TimberHarvestReports>) (Accessed: July 2017)
- Dugan A J, Birdsey R, Mascorro V S, Magnan M, Smyth C E, Olguin M and Kurz W A 2018 A systems approach to assess climate change mitigation options in landscapes of the United States forest sector *Carbon Balance Manage.* **13** 13
- Duncan A 2017 *Biennial Report to the Legislature* (Salem, OR: Oregon Global Warming Commission)
- Dymond C C 2012 Forest carbon in North America: annual storage and emissions from British Columbia's harvest, 1965–2065 *Carbon Balance Manage.* **7** 8–8
- EPA 2013 *Analysis of the Life Cycle Impacts and Potential for Avoided Impacts Associated with Single-Family Homes* (Washington DC: Environmental Protection Agency) (<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-11/documents/sfhomes.pdf>)
- EPA 2016 *Documentation for Greenhouse Gas Emission and Energy Factors Used in the Waste Reduction Model (WARM)* (Washington DC: Environmental Protection Agency) (<https://www.epa.gov/warm/documentation-chapters-greenhouse-gas-emission-and-energy-factors-used-waste-reduction-model>)

- EPA 2017 *Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2016* (Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency)
- EPA 2018 *EPA's Treatment of Biogenic Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Emissions from Stationary Sources that Use Forest Biomass for Energy Production* (Washington DC: Environmental Protection Agency) (<https://www.epa.gov/air-and-radiation/epas-treatment-biogenic-carbon-dioxide-emissions-stationary-sources-use-forest>)
- Erb K-H *et al* 2017 Unexpectedly large impact of forest management and grazing on global vegetation biomass *Nature* **553** 73
- Ferster C J, Trofymow J T, Coops N C, Chen B and Black T A 2015 Comparison of carbon-stock changes, eddy-covariance carbon fluxes and model estimates in coastal Douglas-fir stands in British Columbia *Forest Ecosyst.* **2** 13
- Green C, Avitabile V, Farrell E P and Byrne K A 2006 Reporting harvested wood products in national greenhouse gas inventories: Implications for Ireland *Biomass Bioenergy* **30** 105–14
- Gunn J S, Ganz D J and Keeton W S 2011 Biogenic versus geologic carbon emissions and forest biomass energy production *GCB Bioenergy* **4** 239–42
- Haberl H, Sprinz D, Bonazountas M, Cocco P, Desaubies Y, Henze M, Hertel O, Johnson R K, Kastrup U and Lacont P 2012 Correcting a fundamental error in greenhouse gas accounting related to bioenergy *Energy Policy* **45** 18–23
- Harmon M E, Harmon J M, Ferrell W K and Brooks D 1996 Modeling carbon stores in Oregon and Washington forest products: 1900–1992 *Clim. Change* **33** 521–50
- Harmon M E and Marks B 2002 Effects of silvicultural practices on carbon stores in Douglas-fir western hemlock forests in the Pacific Northwest, USA: results from a simulation model *Can. J. For. Res.* **32** 863–77
- Harmon M E, Moreno A and Domingo J B 2009 Effects of partial harvest on the carbon stores in Douglas-fir/western hemlock forests: a simulation study *Ecosystems* **12** 777–91
- Houghton R A and Nassikas A A 2018 Negative emissions from stopping deforestation and forest degradation, globally *Glob. Change Biol.* **24** 350–9
- Hudiburg T, Law B, Turner D P, Campbell J, Donato D and Duane M 2009 Carbon dynamics of Oregon and Northern California forests and potential land-based carbon storage *Ecol. Appl.* **19** 163–80
- Hudiburg T W, Law B E, Wirth C and Luysaert S 2011 Regional carbon dioxide implications of forest bioenergy production *Nat. Clim. Change* **1** 419–23
- IPCC 2006 *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme* ed H S Eggleston (Japan: IGES, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)
- IPCC 2014 *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed C B Field (Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press)
- IPCC 2018 *Global warming of 1.5°C Summary for Policymakers* ed P Zhai (Geneva: World Meteorological Organization)
- Law B E, Hudiburg T W, Berner L T, Kent J J, Buotte P C and Harmon M E 2018 Land use strategies to mitigate climate change in carbon dense temperate forests *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **115** 3663–8
- Law B E, Hudiburg T W and Luysaert S 2013 Thinning effects on forest productivity: consequences of preserving old forests and mitigating impacts of fire and drought *Plant Ecol. Diversity* **6** 73–85
- Law B E and Waring R H 2015 Carbon implications of current and future effects of drought, fire and management on Pacific Northwest forests *Forest Ecol. Manage.* **355** 4–14
- Le Quéré *et al* 2018 Global carbon budget 2018 *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **10** 2141–94
- Lutz J A *et al* 2018 Global importance of large-diameter trees *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **27** 849–64
- NRCS 2010 Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture (<http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov>). Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Eastern US
- Nunez F and Paveley F 2006 Assembly Bill 32: the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Sacramento, CA: California State Assembly)
- Oppenheimer M and Petsonk A 2005 Article 2 of the UNFCCC: historical origins, recent interpretations *Clim. Change* **73** 195–226
- Oregon Department of Forestry 2017 Timber Harvest Data 1942–2016 (<https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/timber-harvest-data-1942-2016>)
- Pietz A and Gregor B 2014 Oregon statewide transportation strategy: 2050 vision for greenhouse gas emission reduction *Transp. Res. Rec.* **2454** 45–52
- Sathre R and O'Connor J 2010 Meta-analysis of greenhouse gas displacement factors of wood product substitution *Environ. Sci. Policy* **13** 104–14
- Schulze E D, Körner C, Law B E, Haberl H and Luysaert S 2012 Large-scale bioenergy from additional harvest of forest biomass is neither sustainable nor greenhouse gas neutral *GCB Bioenergy* **4** 611–6
- Smith J E, Heath L, Skog K E and Birdsey R 2006 Methods for calculating forest ecosystem and harvested carbon with standard estimates for forest types of the United States *Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-343* Newtown Square, PA: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station
- Smyth C, Rampley G, Lemprière T C, Schwab O and Kurz W A 2017 Estimating product and energy substitution benefits in national-scale mitigation analyses for Canada *GCB Bioenergy* **9** 1071–84
- Stockmann K D, Anderson N M, Skog K E, Healey S P, Loeffler D R, Jones G and Morrison J F 2012 Estimates of carbon stored in harvested wood products from the United States forest service northern region, 1906–2010 *Carbon Balance Manage.* **7** 1
- UNFCCC 2015 *Article 5. Paris Agreement* (Paris, France)
- USGCRP *Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States: Fourth National Climate Assessment* vol II ed D R Reidmiller *et al* 2018 (Washington DC: US Global Change Research Program)
- Washington State 2008 Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 2815, State of Washington, 60th Legislature 2008 Regular Session (<http://lawfilesexet.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2007-08/Pdf/Bills/House%20Bills/2815-S2.E.pdf>)
- Williams C A, Gu H, Maclean R, Masek J G and Collatz G J 2016 Disturbance and the carbon balance of US forests: a quantitative review of impacts from harvests, fires, insects, and droughts *Glob. Planet. Change* **143** 66–80