

**From:** Dominick DellaSala [<mailto:dominick@geosinstitute.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 05, 2018 2:36 PM  
**To:** Forest Carbonstudy \* ODF <[forest.carbonstudy@oregon.gov](mailto:forest.carbonstudy@oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** input on next meeting

Hi folks - I wanted to provide some input on the agenda for the Jan 3 meeting on forest carbon accounting.

I am currently acting as a technical reviewer for the next IPCC report. In my review of the chapters on land use emissions, IPCC is not only reporting on net flux from land use activities but has clearly stated the need to show the gross vs. net emissions especially in relation to other sectors (sources and sink relations). Additionally, the report includes the importance of carbon residence times - holding on to the carbon in ecosystems - carbon reservoirs. I cannot share the specifics of the report until it is published. However, I ask that our analysis include comparable measures of net and gross land use emissions (in this case from forestry activities) and not just the net plus the residence time of carbon stored in forests so that they can be compared to that in wood product pools. Previously, I sent carbon residence estimates for public vs. private lands provided by Dr. Mark Harmon. Please let me know if you would like me to resend those. In general, IPCC has noted the importance of carbon stores being retained along with reducing the flux of carbon from emissions.

I would also caution against any recommendations in our report as I think it will get bogged down in disagreement among group members. Can you focus the reporting on factual, contextual, and trend lines and keep it squeaky clean so we don't waste a great deal of time arguing over what should or should not be done by managers? It would be prudent in itself to just provide the data and summary stats to decision makers and let someone else do the translation.

Moreover, as mentioned in prior discussion, I would like to recommend the inclusion of the NECB and NEP datasets as published by Bev Law and her associates for the PNW. Those go back to a period before the FIA 2000 datasets (1985 forward) and need to have comparable standing as a potential baseline for comparison to the FIA datasets that are on a much shorter time line (baseline or reference). This could include explain the methodological differences.

Please consider these groupings of the FIA carbon datasets

- \* ecoregions (modified Omernick Level III/FS Ecomap as discussed with Chad)
- \* landowners - private industrial, non industrial, state, BLM, FS, NPS, other (see prior report by the commission that was adopted by the commission as a resolution to ODF for inclusion)
- \* carbon density by density intervals - see Krankina et al. 2014 (attached) for justification - 1-200 Mg/ha, 201-400, >400 Mg/ha - preferably spatially explicit mapping if doable
- \* carbon density values as a function of land designations (GAP 1-4 designations)
- \* carbon density values as a function of age class distribution (i.e., this comports with residence time as well)
- \* natural mortality emissions as a function of age class distribution and carbon density
- \* logging emissions as a function of age class distributions and carbon density

Any discussion of management (e.g., thinning etc), should reference or include the attached Krankina et al. 2012 but I suggest avoiding this all together.

I offer these as suggestions for inclusion in the report, to ensure there is a transfer of prior work done by the commission, and so that the ODF reporting comports with the IPCC carbon land use assessments.

Cheers

Dominick A. DellaSala, Ph.D | President, Chief Scientist  
Editor and Primary Author "Temperate and Boreal Rainforests of the World: Ecology & Conservation" <https://islandpress.org/author/dominick-a-dellasala>  
Co-editor and Author "The Ecological Importance of Mixed-Severity Fires:Nature's Phoenix" [www.scitechconnect.elsevier.com/author/dominick-dellasala/](http://www.scitechconnect.elsevier.com/author/dominick-dellasala/)  
Co-editor "Encyclopedia of the Anthropocene" <https://www.elsevier.com/books/encyclopedia-of-the-anthropocene/dellasala/978-0-12-809665-9>

Geos Institute | 84 Fourth Street | Ashland, Oregon 97520  
Phone: 541.482.4459 x302 | 541-621-7223 (cell) | Fax: 541.482.7282  
E-mail: [dominick@geosinstitute.org](mailto:dominick@geosinstitute.org) | Website: [www.geosinstitute.org](http://www.geosinstitute.org)

The Geos Institute is leading the way to climate change solutions that matter.