DATE

EPA-SAB-16-xxx

The Honorable Scott Pruitt
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460

Subject: SAB review of *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources* (2014)

Dear Administrator Pruitt:

The EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) was asked by the EPA Office of Air and Radiation to review and comment on its *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources* (2014) ("2014 Framework"). The 2014 Framework considers the scientific and technical issues associated with accounting for emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2) from biogenic feedstocks used at stationary sources.

The purpose of the 2014 Framework is to develop a method for calculating the adjustment, or Biogenic Assessment Factor (BAF), for carbon emissions associated with the combustion of biogenic feedstocks taking into account the biological carbon cycle effects associated with their growth, harvest, and processing. This mathematical adjustment to stack emissions is needed because of the unique ability of biogenic material to sequester CO_2 from the atmosphere, in biomass and soil, over time frames of years or decades through the process of photosynthesis. The BAF is an accounting term developed in the Framework to denote the offset to total emissions (mathematical adjustment) that reflects a biogenic feedstock's net carbon emissions after taking into account its sequestration of carbon, in biomass or soil, or emissions that might have occurred with an alternate fate had it not been used for fuel.

The 2014 Framework is a revision of the 2011 Framework which the SAB previously reviewed. We are pleased that the 2014 Framework incorporated some of the SAB's prior advice and advanced the analytical foundation for making determinations about the net contribution of biogenic feedstocks to the CO_2 in the atmosphere. Specifically, the 2014 Framework has incorporated the SAB's prior advice as follows:

- It has adopted an alternate fate approach (i.e., a counterfactual evaluation of what the net biogenic atmospheric contribution might have been if the feedstocks were not used for energy) to the collection and use of waste-derived feedstocks, including avoided methane (CH_4) emissions.
- It includes a discussion of the trade-offs inherent in the selection of a temporal scale for considering net emissions.
- It has developed representative BAFs by feedstock and region in view of the data demands of a facility-specific BAF calculation.

- It includes a review of existing approaches to addressing leakage, the phenomenon by which efforts to reduce emissions in one place affect market prices that shift emissions to another location.
- It offers an approach to construct an anticipated baseline that allows assessment of the additional CO_2 emissions to or uptake from the atmosphere that can be attributed to biogenic feedstocks as a result of changes in biomass feedstock demand.

The 2014 Framework does not, however, provide the policy context, specific BAF calculations for that context or the implementation details the SAB previously requested. In fact, the lack of information in both Frameworks on how the EPA may use potential BAFs made it difficult to fully evaluate these frameworks. A policy context would have provided information relevant to the assessment of BAFs, such as the scale of demand for biogenic feedstocks and the anticipated time frame for that demand and eligible feedstocks to meet it. As we stated in our 2012 report and we reiterate here: this SAB review would have been enhanced if the Agency offered a specific regulatory application that, among other things, provided explicit proposed BAF calculations and defined its legal boundaries regarding upstream and downstream emissions in the feedstock life cycles. The 2014 Framework lacks concreteness and is written in a way that is too flexible, with too many possibilities. Rather than offering a lengthy menu of calculation options, the EPA needs to make some decisions and offer justification for those choices. For proper scientific evaluation, the Framework needs to be applied in a specific policy context with specific BAF calculations and clearly defined boundaries for EPA's regulatory authority.

That said, we have overarching suggestions for moving forward with a framework for assessing the BAFs of biogenic feedstocks. In addition to our specific responses to EPA's charge questions, we have general guidance regarding the calculation of BAFs. EPA's equations were based on emissions (fluxes) with some adjustment terms to account for carbon mass escaping the system between the point of assessment and the point of emissions. In the enclosed report, we offer an alternative formulation based on changes in terrestrial (non-atmospheric) carbon stocks (or pools) such as the live stocks in biomass, dead stocks, soil stocks, etc. that explicitly incorporates the principle of conservation of mass. While the carbon stock based accounting system results in a similar formula for BAF as the EPA's emissions based approach, it offers multiple advantages: it is typically inventoried and modeled in the scientific community; it can be aggregated and rearranged as needed or further subdivided; and it will follow conservation of mass and is subject to mass balance. Although this alternative formulation provides benefits, there still remain the issues of selecting appropriate temporal or spatial boundaries, considering variability between classes of feedstocks, accounting for non-CO_2 greenhouse gases such as nitrous oxide and methane, and quantifying stocks and fluxes that are difficult to measure or estimate. Nonetheless, we conclude a BAF formulation based on carbon stocks is preferred over an emissions-based approach, because a BAF formulation based on carbon stocks comports with conventional carbon accounting, has well-defined boundaries and follows conservation of mass as well as mass balance.

As mentioned above, the 2014 Framework provides an approach to estimate representative BAFs by feedstock and region. A facility-specific BAF was deemed impractical due to the conceptual and practical challenges of identifying spatial boundaries for feedstock supply to a facility and the potential for market-induced spillover (indirect) effects on land use, biomass production and diversion from non-energy uses and carbon stocks across space. We have also concluded since the increased demand for biomass feedstocks can affect terrestrial carbon stocks into the future (positively or negatively), a BAF

metric based on cumulative changes in carbon stocks over time is scientifically appropriate for representing these long-term effects.

Using a carbon stock formulation in the attached report, we show how the estimate of cumulative BAF of a feedstock can be obtained from the estimate of net biogenic emissions (NBE), defined as the difference in stocks of carbon between the reference (baseline) scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario in which multiple types of feedstocks are produced and demanded by stationary facilities. We show how the NBE varies over time and can be positive or negative at a point in time. As a result, the BAF of a feedstock can be increasing or decreasing at a point in time.

To fully account for dynamics of the changes in NBE, we have concluded that the scientifically appropriate time horizon for calculating a BAF is one over which the carbon stock changes due to increased demand for all biogenic feedstocks by stationary facilities stabilizes. This is the time horizon that is long enough to account for nearly all (e.g., >95%) of the positive and negative changes in terrestrial carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario (with increased demand for all types of bioenergy) and a reference scenario (without increased demand for bioenergy_. The use of a shorter time horizon than this would truncate effects on carbon stocks and could lead to feedstock-specific BAFs that either under- or over-estimate net carbon stock effects. Factors that could influence the length of this time horizon include the mix of feedstocks demanded, the scale of demand for feedstocks, the biophysical response of carbon stocks in the ecosystem to the additional harvests of biogenic feedstocks and the management practices implemented for feedstock production.

It is important to clearly differentiate policy from scientific considerations in selecting the time horizon for calculating BAFs. BAF calculations are fundamentally a carbon accounting activity of expected future changes in carbon stocks due to increases in demand for bioenergy. BAFs and their evaluation should therefore be carbon science-based and derived to assess the implications of policy decisions on carbon stocks. Policy concerns about climate change should be addressed through the selection of appropriate policies and policy targets for greenhouse gas reduction. The stringency of greenhouse gas reduction policy targets should not affect the methods and time-scale used to calculate BAFs.

As an additional caveat, the SAB is aware that this report is focused on greenhouse gases only. In considering the use of biomass for electricity generation, we only considered the risks of adding carbon to the atmosphere in accordance with our charge from the EPA. We did not evaluate other concerns like forest conservation, biodiversity and ecosystem services. If, for example, biomass pellets were ever sourced from old growth forests, that would pose unique risks that would not be reflected in a BAF calculated for greenhouse gases. We offer this caution about the boundaries of our review along with a recognition that biodiversity and ecosystem health are valid concerns worthy of a whole different analysis and policy response.

We recommend consideration of two alternative approaches for calculating a cumulative BAF, both based on carbon stock changes under an increased biomass feedstock demand scenario (with increased demand for bioenergy) relative to a reference scenario (without increased demand for bioenergy). The first approach is EPA's cumulative BAF metric from the 2014 Framework, which computes the difference in carbon stocks at the end of the time horizon. The second approach was developed by members of the Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel, which accounts for the time path and residence time of the additional emissions in the atmosphere. This second BAF approach accumulates the annual

differences in carbon stocks on the land over time as a proxy for the presence of carbon in the atmosphere each year. Both cumulative BAFs are biophysical estimates that attempt to adjust biogenic emissions for sequestration and alternate fates. The choice of appropriate cumulative BAF metric should be informed by a scientific assessment of the dynamics of additions to atmospheric carbon stocks and mechanisms by which changes in atmospheric carbon stocks affect the climate and other ecosystem functions, such as ocean acidification. For one of these effects, namely global temperature, we cite studies showing that it is likely to be affected by cumulative emissions over a long time period and that it is not likely to differ much across different scenarios of emissions pathways over the next several decades as long as there are equivalent cumulative emissions in the long run. The climate effect of cumulative changes in carbon stocks in the long run is therefore likely to be captured by EPA's cumulative BAF while the effect of transitional changes in carbon stock in the near term on the climate is more likely to be captured by the second cumulative BAF alternative. Although we recommend that the BAF be calculated for a time horizon long enough to account for the large majority of changes in terrestrial carbon stocks, we note that both BAF measures (BAF_T and $BAF_{\sum T}$) should be calculated for varying levels of T to examine their time paths. If the time path of carbon stock changes between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is of particular interest, then the second alternative cumulative BAF will provide this information for any time horizon of interest.

Finally, EPA did not ask us for feedback on its modeling approach but given that different approaches can yield different results, we think this was an oversight. An integrated modeling approach that captures economic and biophysical dynamics and interactions is appropriate to implement the anticipated future baseline approach and estimate the additional effect of increased bioenergy demand on CO_2 emissions. While the 2014 Framework certainly employed such an integrated model for some of its alternative BAF calculations, EPA did not offer explicit justification for its modeling choices derived from articulated criteria. In addition, sensitivity of BAF responses to some underlying features of the model was not examined. Thus, we conclude EPA should identify and evaluate its criteria for choosing a model and examine the sensitivity of BAF estimates to key modeling features.

The SAB appreciates the opportunity to provide advice on the 2014 Framework and looks forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Dr. Peter S. Thorne, Chair
Science Advisory Board

Dr. Madhu Khanna, Chair
SAB Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel

Enclosure

NOTICE

This report has been written as part of the activities of the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB), a public advisory group providing extramural scientific information and advice to the Administrator and other officials of the Environmental Protection Agency. The SAB is structured to provide balanced, expert assessment of scientific matters related to problems facing the Agency. This report has not been reviewed for approval by the Agency and, hence, the contents of this report do not represent the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor of other agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal government, nor does mention of trade names of commercial products constitute a recommendation for use. Reports of the SAB are posted on the EPA Web site at http://www.epa.gov/sab.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Science Advisory Board
Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel

CHAIR

Dr. Madhu Khanna, ACES Distinguished Professor in Environmental Economics, Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL

PANEL MEMBERS

Dr. Robert Abt, Professor of Forestry, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, College of Natural Resources, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Dr. Morton Barlaz, Professor, Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering, Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Dr. Marilyn Buford, National Program Leader, Silviculture Research, Research & Development, USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC

Dr. Mark Harmon, Professor and Richardson Chair, College of Forestry, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR

Dr. Jason Hill, Associate Professor, Bioproducts and Biosystems Engineering, College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN

Dr. John Reilly, Senior Lecturer and Co-Director, Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, Center for Environmental Policy Research, E19-439L, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

Dr. Charles Rice, Distinguished Professor, Department of Agronomy, Soil Microbiology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS

Dr. Steven Rose, Senior Research Economist, Energy and Environmental Analysis Research Group, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA

Dr. Daniel Schrag, Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Dr. Roger Sedjo, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Forest Economics and Policy Program, Resources for the Future, Washington, DC

Dr. Ken Skog, Supervisory Research Forester (retired), Economics and Statistics Research, Forest Products Laboratory, USDA Forest Service, Madison, WI

Dr. Tristram West, Ecosystem Scientist, Joint Global Change Research Institute, University of Maryland, College Park, MD

Dr. Peter Woodbury, Senior Research Associate, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, U.S.A.

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF

Dr. Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Science Advisory Board

CHAIR

Dr. Peter S. Thorne, Professor and Head, Department of Occupational & Environmental Health, College of Public Health, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA

MEMBERS

Dr. Joseph Arvai, Max McGraw Professor of Sustainable Enterprise and Director, Erb Institute, School of Natural Resources & Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Dr. Kiros T. Berhane, Professor, Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

Dr. Sylvie M. Brouder, Professor and Wickersham Chair of Excellence in Agricultural Research, Department of Agronomy, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

Dr. Ingrid Burke, Director and Wyoming Excellence Chair, Haub School and Ruckelshaus Institute of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY

Dr. Ana V. Diez Roux, Dean, School of Public Health, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA

Dr. Michael Dourson, President, Toxicology Excellence for Risk Assessment, Cincinnati, OH

Dr. Joel J. Ducoste, Professor, Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Dr. David A. Dzombak, Hamerschlag University Professor and Department Head, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

Dr. Elaine M. Faustman, Professor and Director, Institute for Risk Analysis and Risk Communication, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, School of Public Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Dr. Susan P. Felter, Research Fellow, Global Product Stewardship, Procter & Gamble, Mason, OH

Dr. R. William Field, Professor, Department of Occupational and Environmental Health, and Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA

Dr. H. Christopher Frey, Glenn E. Futrell Distinguished University Professor, Department of Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Dr. Steven Hamburg, Chief Scientist, Environmental Defense Fund, Boston, MA

Dr. Cynthia M. Harris, Director and Professor, Institute of Public Health, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL

Dr. Robert J. Johnston, Director of the George Perkins Marsh Institute and Professor, Department of Economics, Clark University, Worcester, MA

Dr. Kimberly L. Jones, Professor and Chair, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Howard University, Washington, DC

Dr. Catherine J. Karr, Associate Professor - Pediatrics and Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences and Director - NW Pediatric Environmental Health Specialty Unit, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Dr. Madhu Khanna, ACES Distinguished Professor in Environmental Economics, Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL

Dr. Francine Laden, Mark and Catherine Winkler Associate Professor of Environmental Epidemiology, Harvard School of Public Health, and Channing Division of Network Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

Dr. Lois Lehman-McKeeman, Distinguished Research Fellow, Discovery Toxicology, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Princeton, NJ

Dr. Robert E. Mace, Deputy Executive Administrator, Water Science & Conservation, Texas Water Development Board, Austin, TX

Dr. Mary Sue Marty, Senior Toxicology Leader, Toxicology & Environmental Research, The Dow Chemical Company, Midland, MI

Dr. Denise Mauzerall, Professor, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ

Dr. Kristina D. Mena, Associate Professor, Epidemiology, Human Genetics, and Environmental Sciences, School of Public Health, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, El Paso, TX

Dr. Surabi Menon, Director of Research, ClimateWorks Foundation, San Francisco, CA

Dr. James R. Mihelcic, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Dr. H. Keith Moo-Young, Chancellor, Office of Chancellor, Washington State University, Tri-Cities, Richland, WA

Dr. Kari Nadeau, Naddisy Family Foundation Professor of Medicine, Director, FARE Center of Excellence at Stanford University and Sean N. Parker Center for Allergy and Asthma Research at,

Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA

Dr. James Opaluch, Professor and Chair, Department of Environmental and Natural Resource Economics, College of the Environment and Life Sciences, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI

Dr. Thomas F. Parkerton, Senior Environmental Associate, Toxicology & Environmental Science Division, ExxonMobil Biomedical Science, Houston, TX

Mr. Richard L. Poirot, Independent Consultant, Burlington, VT

Dr. Kenneth M. Portier, Vice President, , Department of Statistics & Evaluation Center, American Cancer Society, Atlanta, GA

Dr. Kenneth Ramos, Associate Vice-President of Precision Health Sciences and Professor of Medicine, Arizona Health Sciences Center, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

Dr. David B. Richardson, Associate Professor, Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

Dr. Tara L. Sabo-Attwood, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Environmental and Global Health, College of Public Health and Health Professionals, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Dr. William Schlesinger, President Emeritus, Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY

Dr. Gina Solomon, Deputy Secretary for Science and Health, Office of the Secretary, California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, CA

Dr. Daniel O. Stram, Professor, Department of Preventive Medicine, Division of Biostatistics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

Dr. Jay Turner, Associate Professor, Department of Energy, Environmental & Chemical Engineering, Campus Box 1180, Washington University, St. Louis, MO

Dr. Jeanne M. VanBriesen, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

Dr. John Vena, Professor and Founding Chair, Department of Public Health Sciences, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC

Dr. Elke Weber, Jerome A. Chazen Professor of International Business, Columbia Business School, New York, NY

Dr. Charles Werth, Professor and Bettie Margaret Smith Chair in Environmental Health Engineering, Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, Cockrell School of Engineering, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX

Dr. Peter J. Wilcoxen, Professor, Public Administration and International Affairs, The Maxwell School, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY

Dr. Robyn S. Wilson, Associate Professor, School of Environment and Natural Resources, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF

Mr. Thomas Carpenter, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Science Advisory Board, Washington, DC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS XII

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

2. INTRODUCTION 11

2.1. BACKGROUND 11
2.2. CHARGE TO THE SAB 11

3. OVERARCHING COMMENTS 12

3.1. POLICY CONTEXT 12
3.2. FUTURE ANTICIPATED BASELINE APPROACH 13
3.3. MODELING APPROACH 14
3.4. ALTERNATE FATE APPROACH FOR WASTE-DERIVED FEEDSTOCKS 17
3.5. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE TIME HORIZON FOR BAF EVALUATION 18

4. RESPONSES TO EPA'S CHARGE QUESTIONS 20

4.1. TEMPORAL SCALE FOR BIOGENIC ACCOUNTING 20
4.2. SCALES OF BIOMASS USE 36

REFERENCES 41

APPENDIX A: CHARGE TO THE SAB A-1

APPENDIX B: CHANGES IN CARBON STOCKS B-1

APPENDIX C: A GRAPHICAL COMPARISON BETWEEN BAF_T AND $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ C-1

APPENDIX D: EXAMPLES OF WAYS THAT HARVEST CAN INFLUENCE THE STOCK OF CARBON D-1

APPENDIX E: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STAND AND LANDSCAPE LEVELS E-1

List of Figures

Figure 1: Illustration of Carbon Differences Over Time versus at a Single Point in Time 30

Figure 2: Illustration of Net Biogenic Emissions Over Time 30

Figure 3: Illustration of Potential Gross Emissions Over Time 31

Figure 4: Illustration of Long-Term Trend in BAF for a case of decreasing carbon stocks 33

Figure 5: Illustration of Long-Term Trend in BAF for a case of increasing carbon stocks 34

Figure C-1: A graphical illustration of Net Biogenic Emissions at any time (t), when differences cease to increase (T) and over time (∑T) C-2

Figure C-2: The carbon stock differences (NBEt) between the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenarios as a function of time t C-3

Figure C-3: The annual change in NBEt (called $NBE_{\Delta t}$ and depicted by solid line) C-4

Figure C-4: BAF's calculated by dividing the Net Biogenic Emissions (NBE) by the Potential Gross Emissions (PGE) associated with burning biogenic carbon for energy. C-5

Figure C-5: The cumulative effects of a policy represented at a point in time (T) or over a period of time (ΣT). C-6

Figure C-6: The results of various ways BAFs can be calculated. C-7

Figure D-1: Carbon Loss Case D-2

Figure D-2: Rate at which differences between reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing ($NBE_{\Delta t}$) and annual potential gross emissions $PGE_{\Delta t}$). D-3

Figure D-3: Time course of the difference between scenarios (NBE_t) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGE_t). D-4

Figure D-4: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case in which biofuel harvest reduces carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario. D-5

Figure D-5: Carbon gain case D-6

Figure D-6: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year when there is a gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. D-7

Figure D-7: The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when there is a gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. D-8

Figure D-8: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case in which biofuel harvest increases carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario. D-9

Figure D-9: Carbon loss then gain case D-10

Figure D-10: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential grow emission from biofuel use each year when there is a loss then a gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario D-11

Figure D-11: The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when there is a loss then gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. D-12

Figure D-12: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case in which biofuel harvest decreases and then increases carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario. D-13

Figure D-13: The landscape level average carbon stocks for the case in which harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decrease in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario, but both scenarios have increasing carbon stocks relative to time 0. ..... D-14

Figure D-14: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have an increase in input related to an environmental change. D-15

Figure D-15: The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have an increase in input related to an environmental change. D-16

Figure D-16: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have an increase in input related to an environmental change. D-17

Figure D-17: The landscape level average carbon stocks for the case when increased harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decrease in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario, but both scenarios have decreasing carbon stocks relative to time 0 caused by an environmentally driven decline in inputs. D-18

Figure D-18: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have a decrease in input related to an environmental change. D-19

Figure D-19:. The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have a decrease in landscape input related to an environmental change D-20

Figure D-20: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have a decrease in input related to an environmental change. D-21

Figure E-1: Stand level changes in ecosystem carbon stoocks for the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.....E-2

Figure E-2: Landscape level changes in ecosystem carbon storesstocks for the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.....E-2

Figure E-3: Ecosystem carbon storesstocks at landscape level that were simulated at stand level but scaled to the landscape level for the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.....E-2

Figure E-4: Stand level stock differences between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios (i.e., NBE) the annual biofuel emissions, and cumulative emissions (i.e., PGE). E-2

Figure E-5: Landscape level difference in ecosystem carbon stocks (NBE) between the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios, the annual biofuel carbon emission, and the cumulative emissions (PGE).....E-2

Figure E-6: Difference in ecosystem carbon storesstocks (NBE) between the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios, the annual biofuel carbon emission, and the cumulative emissions (PGE) simulated at the stand-level, but scaled to the landscape level.....E-2

Figure E-8: Temporal pattern of BAFs at the landscape level.....E-2

Figure E-9: Temporal pattern of BAFs simulated at the stand level but scaled to the landscape level…E-2

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AVOIDEMIT	Avoided Emissions
BAF	Biogenic Assessment Factor
BAU	Business As Usual
CH4	Methane
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO_2e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Department of Energy
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FASOM	Forestry and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GROW	Term in EPA's BAF equation representing net feedstock growth (or removals)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
N2O	Nitrous Oxide
SAB	Science Advisory Board
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The EPA requested the SAB to peer review a revised science-based framework for accounting for biogenic carbon emissions, which the agency defines as "CO_2 emissions related to the natural carbon cycle, as well as those resulting from the combustion, harvest, digestion, fermentation, decomposition, or processing of biologically based materials."[1] The EPA's November 2014 *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources* is a sequel to its 2011 Framework which the SAB reviewed in 2012. The goal of the 2011 Framework was to provide the analytical foundation for making determinations about the estimated net atmospheric CO_2 contribution from the production, processing and use of biogenic feedstocks at stationary sources. The goal of the 2014 Framework is to evaluate biogenic CO_2 emissions from stationary sources that use biogenic feedstocks, given the ability of plants to remove CO_2 from the atmosphere through photosynthesis.

Importance of the Policy Context

For its review of the 2011 Framework, the SAB requested and was given a policy context for the biogenic CO_2 accounting framework. The SAB was told that the 2011 Framework was intended to guide the determination of CO_2 emissions from regulated stationary sources under the Clean Air Act, specifically those facilities receiving a prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) air permit that were required to conduct a best available control technology (BACT) analysis for CO_2 emissions. The question before the agency and hence the SAB, was whether and how to consider biogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in reaching thresholds for permitting and decisions about BACT for CO_2 emissions from bioenergy. The agency has removed this policy context from its 2014 Framework and the EPA's charge questions seek general guidance on issues related to the choice of temporal, spatial and production scale for determining Biogenic Assessment Factors (BAFs) in a policy-neutral context. This change hampered the ability of the SAB to assess the suitability of the 2014 Framework for use as a science-based regulatory framework. In fact, the lack of information in both Frameworks on how the EPA may use potential BAFs made it difficult to fully evaluate these frameworks. As we stated in our 2012 report and we reiterate here: this SAB review would have been enhanced if the Agency offered a specific regulatory application that, among other things, provided explicit proposed BAF calculations and defined its legal boundaries regarding upstream and downstream emissions in the feedstock lifecycles. A policy context would have provided information on the boundaries regarding upstream and downstream emissions in the feedstock life cycles, the spatial boundaries for assessing emissions associated with a stationary facility; the potential scale of demand for biogenic feedstocks, the time profile for that demand and whether to incorporate the emissions of all greenhouse gases or only CO_2 emissions.

If the purpose of performing carbon accounting with the proposed Framework is to account for the emissions of all greenhouse gases then it will be important to account for the effect of biogenic feedstocks on non-CO_2 gases such as N_2O and CH_4, and to examine how these effects differ across feedstocks and influence their BAF values. Estimates of the BAFs will also depend on projections of the additional demand for biomass relative to a reference baseline scenario (i.e., a baseline without increased demand for bioenergy). This additional demand could be generated by various renewable

[1] http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/biogenic-emissions.html

energy and low carbon regional and federal regulations within the US. Outside the U.S., policies such as renewable and low carbon regulations in Europe and other countries that create a demand for biomass exports from the U.S. would be represented in the reference scenario.

Region- and Feedstock-Specific BAF Calculation

As recommended previously by the SAB, BAFs should be feedstock-specific and region-specific and not facility-specific. Facility-specific BAFs are conceptually and practically challenging to estimate due to the absence of well-defined spatial boundaries for feedstock supply to a facility and the potential for market-induced spillover (indirect) effects on land use, biomass production and diversion from non-energy uses and carbon stocks across space. To obtain a region-specific BAF for a feedstock, it will be necessary to project region-specific, feedstock-specific demand for biomass and to assess the impact of this increased demand for biomass on net carbon stocks. These projections can be obtained from simulation models that integrate biophysical and economic models and can capture behavioral and biophysical dynamics and their interactions.

This integrated approach is particularly appropriate for land that is managed to maximize the returns to land by its owner for commercial purposes. Since demand for bioenergy can be met by a wide range of agricultural and forest feedstocks that have long life-spans, a dynamic, integrated model that includes both the agricultural and the forestry sectors, competition between land use activities, investment decisions that consider potential future returns (especially for slower growing, long rotation feedstocks) and a large number of spatially distinct regions (while keeping the model tractable) would be appropriate. An integrated model would allow for land use to change in response to changes in the relative returns to land. This model can be used to construct an anticipated baseline that simulates the future “without” increased bioenergy scenario and to compare it with the projected effects of an increased demand for biomass on CO_2 emissions. The Forestry and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model (FASOM) used by the EPA for its illustrative BAF estimates in the 2014 Framework has the above features. The model can incorporate the effects of export and import of biogenic feedstocks on crop and forest biomass production and land use in the US. In general, the land base covered by the model is the one that responds to market signals. For feedstocks obtained from land managed with other objectives, ecological models may suffice to assess the effects of using those feedstocks for bioenergy on carbon stocks.

In general, the BAF of a feedstock should be estimated for the average effect of the last increment of demand for that feedstock. To be consistent with reality, changes in aggregate demand for biomass feedstocks should be bounded by historical data on resource use, observed information on current and planned expansions to facilities using biogenic feedstocks, and information about existing and projected establishment of stationary facilities likely to use biogenic feedstocks. Modeling exercises could also be undertaken to determine feedstock-specific demands and BAF thresholds for different levels of the demand for a feedstock.

Since the BAF for a feedstock could differ depending on the method of production (for example, the soil carbon implications of corn stover will depend on the type of tillage practice used and the amount of residue harvested), it will be appropriate to have the BAF for a feedstock in a region vary by feedstock production method. To the extent that BAFs depend on technology and emissions control regulations at a stationary facility in a region, they could be made technology specific.

Future Anticipated Baseline Approach

To compare changes in any system over time there must be a reference scenario (without demand for bioenergy) against which to assess changes due to increased demand for bioenergy, so that two distinct scenarios can be compared. In our 2012 SAB report, the SAB stated that the reference point baseline approach is inadequate in cases where feedstocks accumulate over long time periods because it does not estimate the *additional* effect of a stationary facility's combustion of biomass on carbon emissions over time. The reference point baseline approach takes a given initial carbon stock level and simply compares "before" and "after" carbon levels over time without attributing carbon stock changes to particular causes. In 2012, the SAB recommended a future anticipated baseline approach to capture the *additional* CO_2 emissions to or uptake from the atmosphere created by any increased use of biomass for energy (i.e., the "increased biomass feedstock demand scenario"). The EPA acknowledged this limitation of its earlier approach and now includes a future anticipated baseline analysis along with a reference point approach in its 2014 Framework. The SAB remains concerned that the reference point approach has important limitations and should not be the preferred approach.

The SAB's 2012 advice on the anticipated baseline approach recognized that sophisticated modeling is needed to capture the interaction between the market, land use, investment decisions, emissions and ecosystem feedbacks and to construct a counter-factual reference scenario. For some of its alternative BAF calculations, EPA's 2014 Framework employs a future anticipated baseline approach consistent with our earlier recommendations. In the 2014 Framework, the EPA has offered illustrative simulations of future biophysical and economic conditions employing the Forestry and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model (FASOM) to determine the incremental GHG emissions of increased biomass feedstock demand compared to a "business as usual" approach (i.e., the reference baseline scenario without demand for bioenergy). The EPA's case studies applied the future anticipated baseline approach on a regional basis to Southeastern roundwood, Corn Belt corn stover and Pacific Northwest logging residues, however none of its charge questions were feedstock specific.

Modeling Approach

The EPA used the FASOM model for its illustrative BAF estimates in the 2014 Framework. While this model has the appropriate features for calculating region-specific, feedstock-specific BAFs, the agency should provide more details regarding its plans to conduct model validation, evaluation, justification, and sensitivity analysis. Regardless of the model chosen, model validation and evaluation will be critical. Model validation is informative about the model's ability to replicate observed phenomenon at the starting point of the study period. Model validation should also be conducted to understand the model sensitivity to input parameters and assumptions as well as to provide insight into the time frame for BAF updates within different policy frameworks. Illustrative analyses in Appendix E show that the BAFs are fairly robust to assumptions that affect both the reference scenario and the increased biomass demand scenario because they are based on the difference of the two scenarios and any trends they share are cancelled out. BAFs are also somewhat insensitive to the magnitude of the loss of carbon caused by harvests. This is due to the fact the BAFs are ratios (of the net biogenic carbon effect to the gross emissions by the facility) and increased loss of carbon is related to the emissions from feedstock combustion: while more harvest can mean more net loss of carbon, it also means more gross emissions.

Model evaluation can usefully elucidate the role of model features, such as spatial scope and resolution, linked agricultural and forest markets and land use change, economic dynamics (time frame, anticipatory planting/management), commodity resolution (where the ability to model feedstock types is affected), and biological dynamics (agricultural crops and productivity, forest biology, forest management practices) in influencing the BAF obtained. For example, a feature of intertemporal optimization models like FASOM that could have implications for BAF estimates is that landowners are assumed to make investment decisions based on expected current and future economic returns and engage in anticipatory planting and management if economical to do so given expected future biomass demand. This assumption could imply that an increase or decrease in demand for biomass feedstocks translates into increased or decreased investments in feedstock production that satisfy expected demand in the future. Accordingly, an increase in demand for a long-rotation feedstock may lead to a low BAF with the analytic assumption of long planning horizons. This assumption, along with other model features listed above, should be evaluated when justifying alternative modeling approaches; thus assessing the actual planning horizon of landowners is important. Other assumptions that should be examined include those related to productivity growth, the dynamics of carbon in various pools, the modeling of agriculture-forest land competition, and the disaggregation and characterization of biomass feedstocks. Over time, the model selected for estimating BAFs should be reviewed and updated periodically using observed changes in economic and land use conditions due to increased biomass demand, and the latest scientific information on biophysical and biogeochemical properties of feedstocks.

Alternate Fate Approach for Waste-Derived Feedstocks

In 2012, the SAB recommended that the EPA consider the alternate fate of waste-derived feedstocks diverted from the waste stream, whether they might decompose over a long period of time, whether they would be deposited in anaerobic landfills, whether they are diverted from recycling and reuse, etc. In the 2014 Framework, the agency has conducted extensive alternate fate calculations (in Appendix N); however, the EPA drew a narrow boundary around point source emissions and neglected other significant considerations that affect the greenhouse gas footprint of alternative municipal solid waste (MSW) management scenarios. Specifically, the EPA neglected to recognize and quantify a potential alternate fate of MSW, in particular, its current use for electrical energy generation by capturing landfill gas or direct combustion. EPA also failed to consider carbon storage associated with landfills, and selected a landfill baseline that is inconsistent with regulatory practice. The relative rankings of BAF values across waste treatment options in the 2014 Framework would change considerably if current energy recovery uses were considered. The 2014 Framework clearly includes methane associated with municipal solid waste feedstocks but it omits current electrical energy recovery from both landfills and combustion, as well as carbon storage associated with landfills. While we recognize that inclusion of electrical energy offsets would be inconsistent with the system boundaries described by EPA in the 2014 Framework, failure to account for these offsets has the potential to lead to inferior technology choices in consideration of all greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, when non-CO_2 greenhouse gases (such as methane) are a part of any projections of carbon emissions into the future, as may be the case for waste feedstocks, estimation of the BAF could be modified to account for the cumulative effect of these gases as with CO_2. For example, the BAF could be modified to account for methane emissions for woody mill residuals.

Temporal Scale and the Future Anticipated Baseline Approach (Charge Question 1)

Charge question 1 and its subparts pertain to the temporal scale and the anticipated baseline approach to calculating a BAF. The 2014 Framework is an improvement over the 2011 Framework with respect to the treatment of temporal issues and the development of the future anticipated baseline approach.

A sustained increased demand for bioenergy by stationary facilities in a region is likely to trigger changes in carbon stocks through one or more pathways that could generate a new (steady-state) equilibrium stock of carbon in the long run that may be higher or lower than the current stock of carbon on the land. The demand for biomass for bioenergy can affect carbon stocks by increasing harvesting intensity for standing biomass, diverting biomass from other non-energy products and landfills, converting land from other uses to plant feedstocks for biomass in the future, and utilizing residues that might otherwise decay. The overall impact of all these responses to the increase in demand for biogenic feedstocks by stationary facilities on carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the reference scenario could vary over time, depending on factors such as the mix of feedstocks demanded, the scale of demand, the ease of land conversion from one use to another. The use of each of these sources of biomass for bioenergy may differ in the direction of their impact on carbon stocks depending on whether one focuses on the near term or the long term. To capture these time varying impacts of a feedstock on carbon stocks, we recommend an approach for computing a cumulative BAF that accounts for the positive and negative impacts on emissions over time to determine the net biogenic effect. A cumulative BAF is preferable to an instantaneous (or annual) BAF for several reasons: (i) the use of biogenic feedstocks can trigger changes in carbon stocks that can last longer than the period in which the feedstock is consumed by a stationary facility and (ii) it is cumulative changes in emissions (and thus carbon stocks) over a long period that affect the climate system.

Charge question 1 posed by the EPA asks what criteria to use for selecting the time horizon over which to cumulate the effects of biogenic feedstocks demanded by stationary facilities to obtain an estimate of the BAF. We believe the time horizon should be long enough to capture both the positive and the negative effects of the increased demand for all biogenic feedstocks in the increased biomass demand scenario relative to a reference scenario. As described above, a given level of increased demand for biogenic feedstocks is likely to be met by a mix of agricultural, forestry and waste feedstocks and by diversion of biomass from non-energy to energy uses. Similar to the EPA's concept of an "emissions horizon," we recommend defining the time horizon, T, for calculating a BAF as the period of time over which nearly all (e.g., >95%) terrestrial effects on carbon stocks occur in response to an increase in biomass demand. The carbon stock changes will include both positive and negative effects and the time horizon T is defined as one where the net biogenic effect of the combined use of all biogenic feedstocks stabilizes. Factors that could influence the length of this time horizon include the mix of feedstocks demanded, the scale of demand for feedstocks, the biophysical response of carbon stocks in the ecosystem and the management practices implemented for feedstock production.

To ensure comparability of BAFs across all feedstocks and regions we recommend using the same time horizon, T, for all feedstocks and regions. The scientifically appropriate temporal scale would be determined by modeling the mechanisms by which increased demand for bioenergy by all stationary facilities in a region affects carbon stocks. The net biogenic effect will be the difference in carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the reference scenario. By arbitrarily selecting a shorter time horizon than this, the cumulative effects on carbon stock would be truncated, and could be over-estimated or under-estimated relative to those at the steady-state level. This could

result in an upward or downward bias to the cumulative BAF of all feedstocks. Selecting different time horizons for different feedstocks would also be an arbitrary choice that is inconsistent with the fact that carbon emissions generated by all feedstocks are equivalent in their impact on the climate.

In selecting the time horizon, T, it is important to clearly differentiate scientific criteria from policy considerations. BAF calculations are fundamentally a carbon accounting tool to measure expected future changes in carbon stocks due to increases in demand for bioenergy. Therefore, BAFs should be carbon science based and derived to inform policy decisions on potential biophysical carbon implications. Concerns about the impacts of carbon emissions on the climate or other systems (e.g., oceans) should affect the choice of policy, such as emissions caps, carbon pricing and technology standards, as well as the stringency of the carbon mitigation targets. As explained in the sections below, we suggest two alternatives for calculating cumulative BAFs, both of which would use the time horizon that incorporates the large majority of carbon-stock effects over time. We do not believe that carbon science supports selecting the time horizon for calculating a BAF to fit a policy horizon (i.e., the EPA's so-called "assessment horizon"). Rather the time horizon should be chosen to capture nearly all (e.g., >95%) carbon stock effects and be the same across all feedstocks, regions and policies. Using the same time horizon for different feedstocks and regions allows one to compare the BAF across regions and feedstocks and will provide incentives to use low carbon feedstocks in all regions. Allowing the time scale to be determined by a policy horizon leaves open the possibility that it can differ from one administration to another rather than be determined based on scientific principles.

Stock-Based Accounting Preferred to Emissions-Based Accounting

Before discussing two cumulative BAFs, we first propose a shift to carbon accounting based on changes in carbon stocks on the land rather than changes in carbon emissions (as used in EPA's 2011 and 2014 Frameworks). The SAB's proposed alternative formulation offers a prototype equation with terms for stocks in biomass (i.e., live stocks), dead stocks, soil stocks, product stocks and waste stocks. A key feature of using carbon stocks is that all terms can be readily aggregated or disaggregated and are still subject to mass balance. The new stock-based framework presented in Appendix B and graphically illustrated in Appendices C and D would be scale and process invariant as it could be used for a stand, plot, fuel shed, landscape, or region (see Appendix E for how the stand and landscape levels relate to each other). It would comport with the current conventions in carbon accounting which essentially use input-output tracking of carbon throughout the system with well-defined boundaries. In contrast to the 2014 Framework equation which mixed together net fluxes and correction terms, a stock-based approach is based on the stocks in terrestrial pools such as the live, dead, soil, products, material lost in transport, and waste. These stocks can be aggregated and rearranged as needed or further subdivided, but regardless will still follow conservation of mass and are subject to mass balance. In theory, a stock-based formulation should yield the same BAF as an emissions-based approach but the stock-based approach is simpler and more transparent, while avoiding some of the problems of emissions accounting. We conclude a BAF formulation based on carbon stocks is preferred over an emissions-based approach. While this alternative formulation provides benefits, there are still general issues that remain in estimating a BAF, including selecting appropriate temporal or spatial boundaries, considering variability within a class of feedstocks, the possibility of irreversible land use change, accounting for non-CO_2 greenhouse gases such as nitrous oxide and methane, and quantifying stocks and fluxes that are difficult to measure or estimate.

Two Cumulative BAF Approaches

We recommend consideration of two alternative approaches to calculating a cumulative BAF calculation (Appendix B). The first is EPA's cumulative BAF (which we designate as BAF_T) that computes the difference in carbon stocks *at the end of the time horizon T*. The second alternative was developed by members of the Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel. It takes account of the time course of CO_2 emissions by accumulating the annual differences in carbon stocks on the land *over the time horizon T*. By accumulating annual differences across the projection period, the alternative cumulative BAF metric (which we designate as $BAF_{\sum T}$) attempts to incorporate "residence time" in the sense that it is a proxy for the amount of time carbon stays in the atmosphere until it is modified by changing stocks of carbon on the land. Mathematically, the $BAF_{\sum T}$ formulation can be thought of as "ton-years" to account for changes in carbon stocks *year to year*.

The appropriate biophysical measure of BAF can be informed by the scientific assessment of the dynamics of additions to atmospheric carbon stocks and mechanisms by which changes in atmospheric carbon stock affect the climate (assuming that is the effect of interest). The effect of changes in long run equilibrium carbon stocks can be captured by BAF_T while the transitional effects on carbon stocks are proxied by $BAF_{\sum T}$. Consideration of the effect of timing of biogenic emissions on the climate hinges on the scientific assessment of the mechanisms by which carbon emissions affect global temperature, sea-level rise, oceanic acidification and other natural systems. Climate focused studies conclude that it is cumulative emissions over a very long period that determine the climate response and that different emissions pathways with the same cumulative emissions are likely to produce to a similar global temperature response (Allen, et. al. 2009; Matthews, et. al. 2009). Effects of rising carbon stocks in the atmosphere on other natural systems, such as ocean acidification, may occur over different time scales. Carbon cycle dynamics and uncertainties (e.g., decay, uptake, feedbacks, and transient climate response) are important issues in choosing between the two cumulative BAFs.

Both cumulative BAFs attempt to capture net biogenic carbon emissions in a biophysical sense only. Neither metric provides information on the optimal path of mitigation over time. Although we recommend that the BAF be calculated for a time horizon long enough to account for the large majority of changes in terrestrial carbon stocks, we note that both BAF measures (BAF_T and $BAF_{\sum T}$) should be calculated for varying levels of T to examine their time paths. If the time path of carbon stock changes between the reference scenario and increased biomass feedstock demand scenario is of particular interest, then $BAF_{\sum T}$ will provide this information for any time horizon of interest. The SAB acknowledges the difficult questions raised by public commenters who pointed out the uncertainties associated with future sequestration (carbon uptake), the possibility of tipping points, irreversibilities and feedback effects and the need to provide incentives for technological change. We acknowledge these issues as valid considerations when assessing policy options; however our charge was narrower. We were not asked to determine climate policy objectives or emissions goals. The policy urgency of greenhouse gas reductions should be reflected in the selection of policy tools that directly target emissions and the stringency of those policies. Such policy tools include emissions caps, technology standards, efficiency standards, carbon pricing and other approaches. By contrast, we were asked to advise EPA on emissions accounting, specifically scientific considerations that should guide the estimation of the BAF for bioenergy feedstocks. We have presented two versions of the cumulative BAF; both capture the dynamics of carbon stock changes but differ in their temporal emphasis. It is

important to note that the BAF is not a complete carbon accounting method and that neither BAF approach offers a complete life cycle assessment of the climate effects of biomass use.

Scales of Biomass Use and the Future Anticipated Baseline Approach (Charge Question 2)

Charge question 2 and its subparts were entirely devoted to very narrow technical considerations concerning how to select model perturbations in biomass demand ("shocks") for the anticipated future baseline simulations to estimate the net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO2 emissions. Some of these questions were difficult to answer in the absence of information about programmatic goals, legal boundaries and implementation details and specific BAF calculations. Some questions in this section would have been better framed by specifying a policy context that could be indicative of the likely scale of aggregate demand for biomass which could, in turn, influence the methods for producing feedstocks. Noting these limitations, our responses are highlighted below.

The EPA asked for general recommendations on the scale of demand change that should be used in a model for the future anticipated baseline approach. Typically, biomass demand changes should be modelled in response to particular policy scenarios like the Clean Power Plan or multiple policies likely to be implemented simultaneously that create incentives to use biogenic feedstocks, e.g. the Renewable Portfolio Standard, the Renewable Fuel Standard, etc. One approach would be to model the aggregate demand for biomass and the feedstock and region specific demands for biomass likely to be generated by a specific policy (or policy mix). Alternatively, the aggregate demand for biomass could be specified in a policy neutral context at various incremental levels (e.g., 1 million tons, 2 million tons, 3 million tons) and in each case the feedstock-specific and region-specific demands and corresponding values of the BAF could be determined by the simulation model.

In general, the BAF of a feedstock in a region should be estimated for the average effect of the last increment of demand for biomass from that feedstock in that region. To be consistent with reality, projections for aggregate demand for all biomass changes should be bounded by historical data on resource use, observed information on current and planned expansions to facilities using biogenic feedstocks, and reasonable projected cost-effective deployment of bioenergy consistent with the policy. Modeling exercises could also be undertaken to determine feedstock-specific BAF thresholds for different levels of the size of the total change in demand.

For any given change in total demand for biomass, the demand for individual feedstocks should be determined endogenously so that it is economically viable and constrained by the joint production function that determines the supply of a feedstock produced jointly with another crop with a market-determined demand. An analysis of the implications of assigning BAFs to feedstocks on the mix of feedstocks demanded and its ex-post implications for BAFs should be conducted to determine the robustness of the BAFs assigned to specific feedstocks.

In addition, a retrospective evaluation of the observed level of demand and mix of feedstocks would allow revisions to EPA's estimates of feedstock demand changes based on updated data. To evaluate the performance of a BAF retrospectively, quantities of biomass feedstock used by stationary sources could be updated and projections about biomass demand could be revised based on actual outcomes. While a BAF may be calculated using a long time horizon (e.g., multiple decades), assuming that forest and land

management practices will be maintained over that period, it will need to be updated periodically to incorporate changes in market conditions, land use and land cover and policies over time.

Summary of Major Conclusions and Recommendations

The EPA's 2014 Framework has advanced biogenic carbon accounting and offered improvements over its 2011 Framework. As captured in the 2014 Framework, the anticipated baseline approach to calculating BAFs, while subject to implementation difficulties and all the uncertainties associated with modeling the future, represents an advance in biogenic carbon accounting. In the hopes of further advances in biogenic carbon accounting, the SAB offers the following summary of our conclusions and recommendations.

1. For full scientific evaluation of a biogenic carbon accounting approach, beyond our recommendations for the basic form of the BAF metric and time scale, the EPA should specify a specific policy context in which BAFs will be used, propose specific BAF calculations and values, and specify its legal authorities over upstream and downstream emissions as well as the spatial boundaries for assessing emissions associated with a stationary facility. It is also important to have more clarity on underlying expectations about other prevailing land use management, renewable energy and carbon policies both in the US and in other countries that could impact the demand for and choice of feedstocks and their production methods and thus the estimates of their BAF.

2. The SAB recommends a BAF formulation based on changes in carbon stocks (terrestrial pools such as live, dead, soil, products, material lost in transport and waste), rather than an emissions (flux-based) approach, because it comports with conventional carbon accounting, has well-defined boundaries and follows conservation of mass as well as mass balance.

3. The direction and magnitude of the impact of a feedstock on terrestrial carbon stocks depends on the time horizon considered. A cumulative BAF is preferred because it will capture and integrate all expected negative and positive carbon effects. Based on carbon cycle science, we recommend that the time horizon for calculating a cumulative BAF is the time period over which nearly all (e.g., >95%) of terrestrial effects on the stock of carbon are expected to occur in response to a sustained increase in the demand for bioenergy and the net change in carbon stock stabilizes. Choosing a shorter time horizon will truncate carbon stock effects.

4. The SAB suggests consideration of two cumulative BAF metrics—that proposed by EPA and an alternative metric that takes into account the changes in terrestrial carbon stocks over time. The appropriate cumulative metric for calculating BAF will depend on the understanding of the carbon system and climate response for which there is uncertainty. We have presented two versions of the cumulative BAF that both capture carbon stock changes but differ in their temporal emphasis.

5. EPA should identify and evaluate its criteria for choosing a model and modeling features that affect BAF outcomes, including both model structure and assumptions about economic and biophysical parameters. EPA should explore the sensitivity of BAF to different modeling

assumptions. EPA should also update and validate the model to incorporate the latest scientific knowledge while ensuring that the model outcomes are consistent with the observed reality.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Background

EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) was asked by the EPA Office of Air and Radiation to review and comment on its *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources* (U.S. EPA 2014). The 2014 Framework considers the scientific and technical issues associated with accounting for emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2) from biogenic feedstocks used at stationary sources.

The purpose of the 2014 Framework is to develop a method for calculating the adjustment, or BAF, for CO_2 emissions associated with the use of biogenic feedstocks, taking into account the biological carbon cycle effects associated with their growth, harvest and processing. This mathematical adjustment to stack emissions is needed because of the unique ability of biogenic material to sequester CO_2 from the atmosphere, in biomass and soil, over relatively short time frames through the process of photosynthesis. It is also needed because of the emissions that are avoided when certain feedstocks are used for bioenergy (e.g., wood mill waste) rather being disposed of in uncapped industrial landfills or left to decay on the ground (e.g., logging residuals). The BAF is an accounting term developed in the Framework to denote the offset to total emissions that reflects a biogenic feedstock's net carbon emissions after taking into account its sequestration of carbon, in biomass or soil, and so-called avoided emissions.

The 2014 Framework is a revision of the 2011 Framework (U.S. EPA 2011) which the SAB previously reviewed (U.S. EPA SAB 2012). To conduct the present review, the SAB Staff Office reconstituted the Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel with its experts in forestry, agriculture, greenhouse gas measurement and inventories, land use economics, ecology, climate change and engineering. The panel held a face-to-face meeting in Washington, D.C. on March 25 – 26, 2015, followed by four teleconferences over the summer of 2015 to draft and finalize its report. During the course of deliberations, the panel considered written and oral comments from members of the public. The panel's report was reviewed by the chartered SAB on March 31, 2016 and April 1, 2016. Subsequently, the Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel met on October 12, 2016 to consider comments from the chartered SAB. A revised draft report was considered by the chartered SAB on [insert date].

2.2. Charge to the SAB

The EPA's charge to the SAB (Appendix A) requests advice and recommendations on its revised 2014 Framework, which was developed with consideration of the SAB's 2012 recommendations as well as the latest information and input from the scientific community and other stakeholders. The EPA asked the SAB to review and offer recommendations on specific technical elements of the 2014 Framework for assessing the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions.

3. OVERARCHING COMMENTS

This section addresses issues that lie outside the scope of EPA's charge questions.

3.1. Policy Context

For its review of the 2011 Framework, the SAB requested and was given a policy context for the biogenic CO_2 accounting framework. The SAB was told that the 2011 Framework was intended to guide the determination of CO_2 emissions from regulated stationary sources under the Clean Air Act, specifically those facilities receiving a prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) air permit that were required to conduct a best available control technology (BACT) analysis for CO_2 emissions. The question before the agency, and hence the SAB, was whether and how to consider biogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in reaching thresholds for permitting and decisions about BACT for CO_2 emissions from bioenergy.

The agency has removed this policy context from its 2014 Framework and the EPA's charge questions seek general guidance on issues related to the choice of temporal, spatial and production scale for determining BAFs in a policy-neutral context. This change hampered the ability of the SAB to assess the suitability of the 2014 Framework for use as a science-based regulatory framework. In fact, the lack of information in both Frameworks on how the EPA may use potential BAFs made it difficult to fully evaluate these frameworks. As we stated in our 2012 report and we reiterate here: this SAB review would have been enhanced if the agency offered a specific regulatory application that, among other things, provided explicit proposed BAF calculations and defined its legal boundaries regarding upstream and downstream emissions in the feedstock life cycles. A policy context would have provided information on the boundaries regarding upstream and downstream emissions in the feedstock life cycles, the spatial boundaries for assessing emissions associated with a stationary facility; the potential scale of demand for biogenic feedstocks, the time profile for that demand and whether to incorporate the emissions of all greenhouse gases or only CO2 emissions. The lack of this information in the 2014 Framework hampered the ability of the SAB to evaluate and assess its suitability as a science-based framework.

It also would have been useful to know more about the regulated entities that would be responsible for GHG emissions from biogenic feedstocks. A broadly defined policy context, including policies for sustainable land management and biomass production and use established by other agencies and other countries is also relevant for evaluating the impact on the carbon cycle of using biogenic feedstocks.

In addition to the policy context, specific BAF calculations are also absent from the 2014 Framework. The 2014 Framework instead offers a large variety of possible BAF calculation options that suggest significant flexibility with all alternatives presented as equally legitimate. However, all these options are not scientifically equal and the EPA needs to make some decisions and offer justification for those choices. For proper scientific evaluation, the Framework needs to be applied in a specific policy context with specific BAF calculations and clearly defined boundaries for the EPA's regulatory authority. In the absence of these specifics, our report discusses in general terms the ways to address the temporal and spatial scale issues associated with estimating BAF values for different feedstocks.

A policy context would also be helpful in clarifying if the purpose of performing carbon accounting with the proposed Framework is to account for the emissions of all greenhouse gases that alter the climate. If this is the case, then it will be important to account for the effect of biogenic feedstocks on non-CO_2 gases such as N_2O and CH_4, and to examine how these effects differ across feedstocks and influence their BAF values. The 2014 Framework mentions that methane emissions from biogenic feedstocks are relatively small compared to those from other sources in the United States and also illustrates the implications of accounting for N_2O emissions in BAF calculations. However, for many feedstocks, the global warming potential attributable to N_2O or CH_4 is greater than from CO_2 (Shoemaker, et. al., 2013). For example, non-CO_2 gases are particularly important for feedstocks grown with nitrogen fertilizer and for waste materials from landfills, as well as the development and delivery of fossil fuels to stationary sources, which would need to be considered for emissions accounting consistency across all fuel types. This issue was raised previously by the SAB (U.S. EPA SAB 2012), however the EPA's response did not clarify their approach to account for such emissions from landfills and other biomass production, or associated fossil fuel activities, nor did it provide an adequate rationale for not acknowledging the importance of all GHG emissions in the Framework (U.S. EPA 2015). Even if an accounting framework is limited to CO_2 only, it is important to recognize and analyze the situations in which CO_2 emissions do not represent overall GHG emissions because of substantial emissions of N_2O and/or CH_4.

Recommendation

- For proper scientific evaluation of a biogenic carbon accounting approach, the EPA should specify a specific policy context in which BAFs will be used, propose specific BAF calculations and values, and specify its legal authorities over upstream and downstream emissions as well as the spatial boundaries for assessing emissions associated with a stationary facility. The Framework should be explicit about underlying expectations about other prevailing land use management, renewable energy and carbon policies that could impact the choice of feedstocks and their production methods and thus the estimates of their BAF.

3.2. <u>Future Anticipated Baseline Approach</u>

To compare change in any system over time, there must be a baseline or reference scenario against which to assess changes due to an incremental and sustained demand for biogenic feedstocks so that two distinct scenarios can be compared. The EPA's reference point baseline approach simply assesses the estimated net change in land-based biogenic CO_2 fluxes and/or carbon stocks between two points in time. In our 2012 SAB report, we stated that the reference point baseline approach is inadequate in cases where feedstocks accumulate over long time periods because it does not estimate the *additional* effect of a stationary facility's combustion of biomass on carbon emissions over time. The EPA has acknowledged this limitation in its 2014 Framework and now includes a future anticipated baseline analysis alternative along with a reference point approach. The SAB remains concerned that the reference point approach has important limitations and should not be the preferred approach.

The SAB's 2012 advice on the anticipated baseline approach recognized that sophisticated modeling is needed to capture the interaction between the market, land use, investment decisions, emissions and ecosystem feedbacks and to construct a counter-factual scenario without increased bioenergy use. In the case of long rotation feedstocks, bioenergy demand can affect carbon stocks in many ways including the harvest ages of trees, the diversion of forest biomass from traditional forest product markets to

bioenergy and rates of afforestation and deforestation. Estimating the net effect of these changes on carbon stocks requires a model that integrates market demand and supply conditions with biophysical conditions that determine growth of forest biomass, losses via decomposition, carbon sequestration and fluxes due to harvests and land use change and incorporates the spatial variability in these effects across the U.S.

Also consistent with our 2012 recommendations, the EPA has now moved toward a "representative factor" approach that would include an assessment of the biogenic landscape attributes (type of feedstock, region where produced) as well as the process attributes, based on the stationary source process and types of biomass handling, that could be calculated using various spatial and temporal scales. The EPA initially considered calculating a BAF for an individual stationary facility; however, the data needs for a facility-specific approach were daunting. This approach would require case-specific measurements and calculations of carbon stocks and fluxes and chain-of-custody carbon accounting while ignoring land use changes at a broader landscape level that may mitigate or exacerbate the effects within a "fuel-shed."

Although EPA's use of a representative factor approach is an advance in its accounting methodology, we note some concern about factors that could be missed with overly-broad feedstock categories. In particular, the broad feedstock categories cited in the 2014 Framework (e.g., roundwood in the Southeast, logging residues in the Pacific Northwest, and corn stover in the Corn Belt) may not reflect extant or likely future variation in feedstock production or processing. Caution is advised that a priori aggregation of feedstocks into such overly-broad categories may overlook important variation in management practices in feedstock production and in the treatment of waste in storage and transport. The EPA may wish to evaluate the "representativeness" of the factors and refine the approach over time.

Some of our 2012 statements bear repeating because they remain relevant. We recognized (then and now) the tradeoffs between simplicity, scientific rigor and policy effectiveness. We recognized (then and now) the difficulty of undertaking an anticipated baseline approach and we said that practical considerations must weigh heavily in the agency's decision making. We said that any method that might be adopted should be subject to an evaluation of the costs of implementation and compliance against any savings in carbon emissions, and we maintain that caution in this Advisory.

In the 2014 Framework, the EPA has offered illustrative simulations of future biophysical and economic conditions employing the Forestry and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model (FASOM) to determine the additional net GHG emissions or sequestration from increased biomass feedstock demand compared to a "business as usual" scenario (i.e., the reference scenario). The EPA's case studies applied the future anticipated baseline approach on a regional basis to Southeastern roundwood, Corn Belt corn stover and Pacific Northwest logging residues, however, none of its charge questions were feedstock or model-specific. Instead, the EPA posed very narrow technical charge questions to the SAB about its anticipated baseline modeling. Below, we have highlighted our responses to EPA's charge questions followed by our more general comments and recommendations.

3.3. <u>Modeling Approach</u>

The EPA did not ask for feedback on its modeling approach but, given that alternative approaches can yield alternative results, we think this was an oversight. For greater public confidence in results, there is, in general, a need for more model validation, evaluation, justification, and sensitivity analysis. Model

validation and evaluation will help the public understand model behavior and sensitivity. Model validation should also be conducted to understand the model sensitivity to input parameters and assumptions as well as to provide insight into the time frame for BAF updates within different policy frameworks. Explicit justification for the modeling approach derived from articulated criteria and discussion of alternatives will give the public greater confidence in the approach chosen. Well-designed sensitivity analysis that captures BAF sensitivity and uncertainty will help establish the robustness of estimates and legitimacy of the BAF values used.

Increased demand for bioenergy by stationary facilities can be expected to affect markets for biomass and land, leading to behavioral responses that affect the allocation of land across sectors, the use of land and biomass for conventional products vs. bioenergy, and land management practices. These changes will depend on the mix of feedstocks demanded as well as the location and scale of demand. Large scale demand for bioenergy by stationary facilities can affect markets for products that compete with biomass and lead to diversion of biomass from non-energy uses to energy products. Economic incentives can also determine the extent to which demand for bioenergy will be met by harvesting more standing biomass or through changes in land use (additional planting of bioenergy crops, afforestation or deforestation). Analyzing the carbon implications of all of these impacts on carbon stocks requires integrating an economic model (that incorporates behavioral assumptions about decision making by landowners operating within markets for conventional agricultural and forest products that compete for land with bioenergy) with biophysical models of crop/forest growth that influence biological responses to changes in land use and land cover. This integrated approach will incorporate the effects on carbon stocks of positive and negative leakage that arise due to changes in biomass price and returns to land due to the increased demand for bioenergy.

An integrated approach that combines economic models with ecological models is needed to capture the system-wide ecosystem response to the direct and indirect market-induced changes in land use and management caused by the demand for bioenergy. This approach is particularly appropriate for land that is managed to maximize the returns to land by its owner for commercial purposes. Since demand for bioenergy can be met by a wide range of agricultural and forest feedstocks that have long life-spans, a dynamic, integrated model that includes both the agricultural and the forestry sectors, competition between land use activities, investment decisions that consider potential future returns (especially for slower growing, long rotation feedstocks) and a large number of spatially distinct regions (while keeping the model tractable) would be appropriate. An integrated model would allow for land use to change in response to changes in the relative returns to land. This model can be used to construct an anticipated baseline that simulates the future “without” increased bioenergy scenario and to compare it with the projected effects of an increased demand for biomass on CO_2 emissions. The Forestry and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model (FASOM) used by the EPA for its illustrative BAF estimates in the 2014 Framework has the above features. The model can incorporate the effects of export and import of biogenic feedstocks on crop and forest biomass production and land use in the US. In general, the land base covered by the model is the one that responds to market signals.

For feedstocks that might be derived from other land that is not managed for to produce bioenergy feedstocks, but from which feedstocks might be produced as a byproduct or a residue when managing for other purposes, ecological models may suffice to capture the impact of using those feedstocks on the carbon cycle. This would be the case for feedstocks harvested for ecological reasons—such as removal of invasive plant species, beetle-infested trees, biomass cleared to reduce threat of wildfires, and forest

thinnings—because they reduce other environmental harms such as biodiversity loss, forest fires and loss of ecosystem services. Since the availability of these types of biomass depends mostly on factors other than economic demand for bioenergy, greater reliance on ecological models may be necessary to determine the supply of biomass from such sources and the carbon implications of using them for bioenergy. Additionally, it would be necessary to consider the alternative fate of these sources of bioenergy in determining their BAF.

An anticipated future baseline approach, whether implemented using an integrated economic-ecological model or a stand-alone ecological model is based on a large number of assumptions about current and future conditions. Uncertainties that affect both the 'with' and 'without' increased biomass scenarios similarly are unlikely to affect the BAF because they affect both projected scenarios similarly. For example, fluctuations in natural gas prices will affect demand for natural gas vs. coal for electricity generation. This will affect both the "with" and "without" projections in a comparable way. Likewise, carbon policies in Europe and elsewhere would affect both scenarios in a similar fashion. Moreover, since the BAF is a ratio, factors that affect both the net biogenic emissions in the numerator and gross emissions in the denominator of the BAF similarly will have little effect on the BAF estimate. For example, conditions influencing the productivity of forests that affect the net impact of bioenergy on carbon stocks and the total amount of carbon in the biomass will likely not have much impact on the BAF estimate. Illustrative analyses in Appendix E shows that the BAFs are fairly robust to assumptions that affect both the reference scenario and the increased biomass demand scenario because they are based on the difference of the two scenarios and any trends they share are cancelled out. BAFs are also somewhat insensitive to the magnitude of the loss of carbon caused by harvests. This is due to the fact the BAFs are ratios (of the net biogenic carbon effect to the gross emissions by the facility) and increased loss of carbon is related to the emissions from feedstock combustion: while more harvest can mean more net loss of carbon, it also means more gross emissions.

Regardless of the model chosen, model validation, evaluation and sensitivity analysis is needed. Model validation is informative about the model's ability to replicate observed phenomenon at the starting point of the study period. Model evaluation can usefully elucidate the role of model features, such as spatial scope and resolution, linked agricultural and forest markets and land use change, economic dynamics (time frame, anticipatory planting/management), commodity resolution (where the ability to model feedstock types is affected), and biological dynamics (agricultural crops and productivity, forest biology, forest management practices) in influencing the BAF obtained. For example, a feature of intertemporal optimization models like FASOM, that could have implications for BAF estimates, is that landowners are assumed to make investment decisions based on expected current and future economic returns and engage in anticipatory planting and management if economical to do so given expected future biomass demand. This assumption could imply that an increase (decrease) in demand for biomass feedstocks translates into increased (decreased) investments in feedstock production that satisfy expected demand in the future. Accordingly, an increase in demand for a long-rotation feedstock may lead to a low BAF with the analytic assumption of long planning horizons. Using an integrated forest carbon and economic model at the U.S. scale, Wang et al. (2015) have shown that a key determinant of the impact of demand for biomass on forest carbon stock is the assumption about the length of planning horizon of forest landowners. Wang et al. (2015) further showed significantly lower carbon storage in forests with an assumption of a 15-year planning horizon compared to a 50-year planning horizon. This assumption, along with other model features listed above, should be evaluated when justifying alternative modeling approaches; thus assessing the actual planning horizon of landowners is important.

Other assumptions that should be examined include those related to productivity growth, soil carbon dynamics, the modeling of agriculture-forest land competition, and the disaggregation and characterization of biomass feedstocks.

Model evaluation will also usefully inform sensitivity analysis and uncertainty characterization. The latter includes model parameter and model selection (i.e., structure) uncertainty. The models should be sensitive to certain driving variables and processes. The EPA's approach should be able to provide some estimate of uncertainty. Sensitivity of the BAF to modeling assumptions and modeling structure should be evaluated to assess the robustness of the BAF estimates and to identify those features of the model that can significantly affect outcomes and, therefore, need close scrutiny to determine their reliability Sensitivity analysis could also be used to determine the extent to which different production methods for a feedstock lead to meaningful differences in BAF estimates and therefore should be delineated. An uncertainty analysis may also be conducted, if feasible, to determine the plausible range of BAF estimates for a feedstock and to assess the relative confidence in the accuracy of the estimate of a BAF assigned to a feedstock. Finally, over time, the model selected for estimating BAFs should be reviewed and updated using observed changes in economic and land use conditions due to increased biomass demand, and the latest scientific information on biophysical and biogeochemical properties of feedstocks.

Recommendation

- The EPA should identify and evaluate its criteria for choosing a model and modeling features that affect BAF outcomes, including both model structure and assumptions about economic and biophysical parameters. EPA should also explore the sensitivity of the BAF to different modeling assumptions. In addition, the EPA should periodically update and validate the model to incorporate the latest scientific knowledge while ensuring that the model outcomes are consistent with the observed reality.

3.4. Alternate Fate Approach for Waste-Derived Feedstocks

Although there were no charge questions on the alternate fate approach for waste-derived feedstocks, we address it here because of its importance. In 2012, the SAB recommended that the EPA consider the alternate fate (i.e., if not used as fuel) of waste-derived feedstocks diverted from the waste stream, whether they might decompose over a long period of time, whether they would be deposited in anaerobic landfills, whether they are diverted from recycling and reuse, etc.

In the 2014 Framework, the EPA has conducted extensive alternate fate calculations in Appendix N; however, the agency drew a narrow boundary around point source emissions and neglected other significant considerations that affect the GHG footprint of alternative municipal solid waste (MSW) management scenarios. Specifically, the EPA neglected to recognize and quantify a potential alternate fate of MSW, in particular, current use in electrical energy recovery from both landfills and combustion. EPA also neglected to quantify carbon storage associated with landfills, and selected a landfill baseline that is inconsistent with regulatory practice. Under the Clean Air Act New Source Performance Standards, EPA requires landfills above a certain size to, at a minimum, collect and control (e.g., flare) landfill gas. This standard was written to apply to more than half of the waste disposed in landfills. As such, a baseline of direct venting is misleading. Finally, some states regulate gas collection more strictly than the federal standard and this too must be recognized.

The relative rankings of BAF values across waste treatment options in the 2014 Framework would change considerably if current energy recovery uses were considered. The 2014 Framework clearly includes methane associated with municipal solid waste feedstocks, while neglecting to quantify current electrical energy recovery from both landfills and combustion, and neglecting to quantify carbon storage associated with landfills. While we recognize that inclusion of electrical energy offsets would be inconsistent with the system boundaries described by EPA in the 2014 Framework, failure to account for these offsets has the potential to lead to inferior technology choices in consideration of all GHG emissions. In addition, when non-CO_2 greenhouse gases (such as methane) are a part of any projections of carbon emissions into the future, as may be the case for waste feedstocks, estimation of the BAF could be modified to account for the cumulative effect of these gases as with CO_2. One public commenter provided an example showing the effect on BAF of incorporating methane emissions for woody mill residuals (National Council for Air and Stream Improvement 2015).

3.5. General Comments on the Time Horizon for BAF Calculations

Public commenters have pointed out the dangers of using a long time horizon to assess the effects of long rotation feedstocks on the carbon cycle due to the uncertainties associated with future sequestration (carbon uptake); the possibility of tipping points, irreversibilities and feedback effects; and the need to provide incentives for technological change. These public comments highlight the intertemporal tradeoffs with the use of long rotation feedstocks when carbon accounting is conducted at the stand level and there is a time lag between emissions (through combustion) and sequestration (through regrowth) (Appendix E). This view of carbon accounting invariably leads to a carbon debt in the short term followed by carbon dividends in the long run and concerns about the potential for adverse impacts of using long rotation feedstocks on the climate in the near term. We briefly discuss the relevance of these issues for assessing the time horizon for BAF calculations in our report.

First, the goal of the Framework reviewed by the SAB is to account for effects of biogenic feedstocks on terrestrial carbon stocks while taking into account the carbon cycle. BAF calculations are fundamentally a carbon accounting activity based on expected future changes in carbon stocks (measured in tons of carbon) due to the use of biogenic feedstocks by a stationary facility. They are a measure of the contribution of a stationary facility to carbon stocks as a result of using biogenic feedstocks adjusted for carbon sequestration through the carbon-cycle. The time scale for assessing these carbon impacts should therefore be chosen to account for all (or nearly all) positive and negative impacts on carbon stocks through the carbon cycle instead of arbitrarily truncating the time horizon. Climate impacts and intertemporal tradeoffs with the use of fossil vs biogenic feedstocks are independent considerations that should affect the selection and stringency of policy tools that directly target greenhouse gas emissions. Such policy tools include emissions caps, technology standards, efficiency standards, carbon pricing and other approaches. All of these policy tools can be designed to achieve a particular timeline of emissions reductions or reflect changing policy objectives andperceptions of climate risk. However, the BAF values should be unaffected by climate policy objectives because they represent physical changes in carbon stocks (measured in tons of carbon), not the damages wrought by carbon emissions.

Second, since stationary facilities are likely to require a continuous supply of feedstock, a landscape approach for accounting for impacts on carbon stocks is more appropriate than a stand level approach. A landscape approach expands the boundaries of analysis to include all effects. In the case of long rotation

feedstocks, under a landscape approach, an increase in biomass feedstock demand leads to multiple stands being disturbed in a coordinated manner leading to concurrent losses and gains associated with harvesting and planting, respectively. It is the overall balance of losses and credits that determine carbon effects. The order in which losses and gains occurs becomes meaningless at the landscape level because both occur simultaneously. Moreover, by integrating economic considerations in the choice of feedstock production, the size of the landscape becomes dynamic and includes the potential for land use changes that can also affect carbon stocks. To the extent that private forest landowners respond to bioenergy related policy incentives and modify forest management and operations and land use decisions, carbon stocks in long rotation feedstocks could increase in the near term in anticipation of meeting future demands. As noted by Cintas et al., (2016) "assessment at the landscape scale integrates the effects of all changes in the forest management and harvesting regime that take place in response to – experienced or anticipated –bioenergy demand. Taken together, these changes may have a positive, negative or neutral influence on the development of forest carbon balances." Landscape level accounting of effects of forest based feedstocks on carbon stocks can result in a net gain or loss of carbon stocks in the near term; a carbon debt could be followed by a carbon dividend or the other way around. That said, illustrative analysis conducted by the Panel and discussed below, shows that the BAFs are very similar irrespective of whether a stand level or a landscape level perspective is applied (see Appendix E).

Third, the length of the temporal scale for calculating BAFs being recommended by the SAB is determined at the systems level and not at a feedstock specific level. As discussed in responses to the charge questions and the Appendices, carbon accounting at the landscape level using the integrated economic-biophysical model integrates the effects of changes due to all feedstocks demanded in the increased biomass demand scenario. As a result, the length of the time horizon for BAF calculations will depend on various factors, including the mix of (short rotation and long rotation) feedstocks demanded in the future, the speed with which those feedstocks grow, the rate at which soil carbon stocks change and the scale of demand for biogenic feedstocks. The length of the time horizon for calculating BAFs will be determined by an integration of carbon stock effects of the combination of feedstocks demanded and not the length of rotation of the slowest growing feedstock. We note that we recommend applying the same time horizon for calculating BAFs of all feedstocks, irrespective of the length of rotation of the individual feedstocks. Despite using the same T for all feedstocks, the resulting BAFs can still be expected to differ across feedstocks due to differences in the biophysical characteristics and in the time profile of their impact on carbon stocks.

Finally, we note that BAFs are an incomplete carbon accounting of emissions from biomass and that they are not life cycle assessments of net greenhouse gas emissions or their climate change effects. We also underscore our caution that the net accumulation of forest and soil carbon over time should not be assumed to occur automatically or to be permanent; rather, growth and accumulation should be monitored and evaluated for changes resulting from management, policy, market forces or natural causes.

4. RESPONSES TO EPA'S CHARGE QUESTIONS

4.1. Temporal Scale for Biogenic Accounting

Charge Question 1: What criteria could be used when considering different temporal scales and the tradeoffs in choosing between them in the context of assessing the net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions from the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources using a future anticipated baseline?

There are several factors that need to be considered in selecting a temporal scale for assessing the impact of using biogenic feedstocks at a stationary facility on carbon stocks using a future anticipated baseline. The first is that the increased demand for bioenergy by stationary facilities in a region is likely to be met by a variety of feedstocks obtained from the agricultural and forestry sectors, including annual and perennial agricultural crops, short rotation woody biomass and pulpwood, crop and forest residues. It is also likely to be met by diverting biomass from non-energy products and landfills to bioenergy and by converting land from other uses to plant feedstocks for biomass in the future, and utilizing residues that might have otherwise decayed. The effect of increased demand for biomass on carbon stocks will depend on the mix of these feedstocks demanded and the scale of demand for these feedstocks. The mix of feedstocks and their shares in the biomass demanded will depend on market forces, behavioral responses by producers of biomass and consumers (stationary facilities). The second factor in determining the impact of this demand on carbon stocks is the biophysical response of the forest and agricultural production systems to increased production and harvest of biomass. Third, different feedstocks differ in their impact on the carbon cycle depending on their rate of regrowth, yield, potential to sequester carbon in biomass and soils, decay rates after harvest and the type of land use change that accompanies their production. Lastly, the effects of increased demand for biogenic feedstocks on carbon stocks will vary over time depending on factors such as the mix of feedstocks demanded, the scale of demand, the ease of land conversion from one use to another. These effects could continue to occur in the future even after the feedstock has been consumed by a stationary facility. Since the demand for biogenic feedstocks can trigger change in carbon stocks that occur in the future, it would be appropriate to capture these time varying impacts of a feedstock on carbon stocks by estimating the cumulative impact on carbon stocks over time. We therefore recommend an approach for computing a cumulative BAF that accounts for the positive and negative impacts on emissions over time to determine the net biogenic effect. This cumulative BAF would be based on the estimate of net biogenic emissions, defined as the difference in carbon stocks between the reference (baseline) scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and would vary with the time horizon. Using a carbon stock formulation, we show below how the estimate of cumulative changes in carbon stocks and the BAF due to increased demand for biogenic feedstocks is affected by the time horizon over which the carbon impact is computed.

Key principles for choosing the temporal scale for assessing the impact of increased demand for biomass by stationary facilities on carbon stocks are (i) it should account for nearly all the positive and negative impacts of demand for biomass over time, (ii) it should be determined at a system-wide level to account for direct and indirect effects of aggregate feedstock demand on carbon stocks in a region and (iii) it should be the same for all feedstocks and regions. Selecting different time horizons for different feedstocks would also be an arbitrary choice that is inconsistent with the fact that carbon emissions generated by all feedstocks are equivalent in their impact on the climate.

These principles are consistent with the anticipated baseline approach that involves comparing the carbon stocks under a reference scenario with those under an increased biomass feedstock demand scenario to determine how these changes influence net carbon stocks across the entire system. This approach can be implemented using an integrated, dynamic, economic-biophysical model to assess the mix and share of different feedstocks in a region and the combined effect of a given level of increased demand for biomass on carbon stocks in that region over time. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate cases where the net biogenic effect of increased demand for biomass on carbon stocks can be positive or negative and varying over time. Appendices C and D illustrate other cases. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate how a BAF of a feedstock may also change over time; it could be increasing or decreasing over time and stabilize after T. As a result, use of a shorter time horizon than T would truncate effects on carbon stocks and could lead to a BAF that either under- or over-estimates net carbon stock effects relative to that evaluated at T. It should be noted that Figures 1-5 are illustrative examples developed using a forest carbon model assuming increased demand for a single feedstock.

In view of the above and to fully account for all positive and negative terrestrial effects over time, we recommend using the "emissions horizon" as described by the 2014 Framework. As defined by the EPA, this "emissions horizon" is the period of time during which the carbon fluxes resulting from actions taking place today actually occur …" (U.S. EPA 2014). In the context of an anticipated baseline approach, this emissions horizon would be the length of time it would take for the effect of increased demand for biogenic feedstock on the carbon cycle to reach a steady-state. This occurs when the difference in carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the reference scenario is no longer changing or when the difference is approaching an asymptote. Defining the emissions horizon to be long enough to achieve a state where the difference in carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the reference scenario stabilizes or approaches stabilization (e.g., >95%) will ensure that nearly all of the losses and gains in carbon stocks attributable to increased use of a bioenergy feedstock have been accounted for. By determining the steady state at the system-wide level, both direct and indirect effects of the increased demand for all biogenic feedstocks on carbon stocks will be incorporated and the same T can be applied to all feedstocks for determining feedstock specific BAFs.

Several factors determine when the difference in carbon stocks between the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario stabilizes. At this point, T has been reached (see Appendices B, C, D for more information on these factors). A major factor is the "speed" with which carbon stocks respond after harvest; this is determined, for example, by the speed with which a feedstock regrows and can be harvested again, the mix of feedstocks produced and the rate at which soil carbon stocks change. Thus the mix of feedstocks that are demanded by stationary facilities can influence the time horizon T. If the mix of feedstocks consists of agricultural and short rotation trees then T is likely to be relatively short. Other factors could include the scale of the demand for biogenic feedstocks, the rate at which that demand will grow in the future and the anticipation period available to landowners during which they can plan to meet expected demand. In addition, system response time could also be determined by underlying changes in the environment, particularly if those changes interact more with the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario than the reference scenario (see Cases 4 and 5 in Appendix D). We discuss some of the feedstock specific dynamics that can affect their impact on carbon stocks. Estimates of the effects of forest biomass on carbon stocks has been shown by previous studies to depend on the spatial scale (stand level or landscape level) at which effects are accounted, the initial

conditions of carbon stock on the land (for example old growth forestland or agricultural land), the management practices used and the time horizon over which effects are measured (Walker et al., 2010; Jonker et al., 2014; Mitchell et al., 2012; Galik and Abt, 2012; Ter-Mikaelian et al., 2015). Harvest of an existing forest stand for use as a feedstock results in an immediate loss of carbon from the system; the amount of carbon lost at the stand level is directly related to the severity of the disturbance. At a stand level, harvest followed by replanting and regrowth can result in a cycle of loss followed by gain. If plants are restored after the disturbance, by either natural or artificial processes, the ecosystem has the potential to regain carbon over time at the stand level (Appendix E). However, the amount regained can vary: in some cases, all the carbon can be regained, but in other cases only part of the carbon can be regained, and in yet other cases more carbon can be gained than is released. Thus, while it is true biogenic carbon is renewable in a general sense, it may be completely or partially renewed and in some case it may be "more" than renewed.

Since stationary facilities are likely to require a continuous supply of feedstock, multiple stands will be disturbed in a regulated manner (i.e., completely asynchronously), and the order in which losses and gains occurs becomes meaningless at the landscape level because both simultaneously occur; rather the critical issue is the overall balance between losses and gains of carbon. If harvest does not exceed the rate of carbon accumulation, the landscape net carbon stock change is zero because losses are offset by gains throughout the landscape. However, there could be a net loss of carbon to the atmosphere at the landscape level if trees are harvested at younger ages or if trees that would otherwise have been unharvested are harvested due to increased demand for biomass. Biomass, particularly from forest sources, is also used for producing non-energy products. The demand for bioenergy can lead to a diversion of biomass from those products to energy use and lead to an immediate reduction in carbon stocks in products rather than a gradual decay as those products are consumed and decayed in landfills. It is also possible that anticipation of future demand for biomass by stationary facilities can lead to afforestation and accumulation of carbon stocks in a growing forest that will be harvested in the future. In very general terms, the amount of either net loss or net gain of carbon is influenced by the changes in factors controlling carbon gain (i.e., net primary production) versus out (i.e., the relative leakiness) of ecosystems (Appendix B) and this net effect can be expected to vary over time.

In Appendix E, we explored the implications of these factors on the BAF of a feedstock using a forest carbon model. Our analysis illustrated that the time trend in the estimate of BAF obtained using a landscape scale is very similar to that obtained using a stand level approach. This trend is also relatively invariant to whether the biomass is obtained from old growth forests or a forest managed as a plantation. This is because the BAF is a ratio of the difference in carbon stocks between two scenarios to the gross emissions. Thus any trends shared by both scenarios and by the numerator and denominator of the BAF are cancelled out. We find that BAFs are sensitive to relatively small changes in harvest intensity (Appendix E). These findings should only be treated as illustrative, since a more complete assessment of BAFs should be obtained from an integrated economic-ecological model as discussed below.

With agricultural feedstocks that are harvested annually from land under continuous production, the time lag between harvest, CO_2 emissions from conversion to energy, and regrowth on land is likely to be close to one year, and the harvested carbon will be fully regained, with no net impact on above-ground carbon stocks. The production of these feedstocks may directly affect carbon stocks below-ground by increasing or decreasing soil carbon stocks relative to the use of the land in the reference scenario. The demand for bioenergy can also affect carbon stocks by leading to a change in the use of land which

could either release carbon stored in the land (for example if permanent grasslands are converted to annual agricultural production) or accumulate carbon on the land (for example through afforestation as annual cropland is converted to forests).

As stated above, the time horizon, T, would need to be identified through an integrated modeling analysis that incorporates the market determinants of the mix and sources of feedstock and the determinants of the systems-wide change in net carbon stocks over time.

Recommendation

- The impact of a feedstock on terrestrial carbon stocks depends on the time horizon considered. A cumulative BAF is preferred because it will capture and integrate all expected negative and positive carbon effects. Based on carbon cycle science, we recommend that the time horizon for calculating a cumulative BAF is the time period over which nearly all (e.g., >95%) terrestrial effects on the stock of carbon are expected to occur in response to an increase in the demand for bioenergy and the net change in carbon stock stabilizes. Choosing a shorter time horizon will truncate carbon stock effects.

Charge Question 1(a): Should the temporal scale for computing biogenic assessment factors vary by policy (e.g., near-term policies with a 10-15 year policy horizon vs. mid-term policies or goals with a 30-50 year policy horizon vs. long-term climate goals with a 100+ year time horizon), feedstocks (e.g., long rotation vs. annual/short-rotation feedstocks), landscape conditions, and/or other metrics? It is important to acknowledge that if temporal scales vary by policy, feedstock or landscape conditions, or other factors, it may restrict the ability to compare estimates/results across different policies or different feedstock types, or to evaluate the effects across all feedstock groups simultaneously.

Charge Question 1(a)(i). If temporal scales for computing biogenic assessment factors vary by policy, how should emissions that are covered by multiple policies be treated (e.g., emissions may be covered both by a short-term policy, and a long-term national emissions goal)? What goals/criteria might support choices between shorter and longer temporal scales?

Charge Question 1(a)(ii). Similarly, if temporal scales vary by feedstock or landscape conditions, what goals/criteria might support choices between shorter and longer temporal scales for these metrics?

Charge Question 1(a)(iii). Would the criteria for considering different temporal scales and the related tradeoffs differ when generating policy neutral default biogenic assessment factors versus crafting policy specific biogenic assessment factors?

Charge Question 1(b). Should the consideration of the effects of a policy with a certain end date (policy horizon) only include emissions that occur within that specific temporal scale or should it consider emissions that occur due to changes that were made during the policy horizon but continue on past that end date (emissions horizon)?

We have combined our responses to questions 1(a), 1(a)(i), 1(a)(ii), 1(a)(iii), and 1(b) because these questions all relate to goals or criteria that may support choices related to differing temporal scales for calculating BAFs.

The 2014 Framework refers to an "assessment horizon" which may be specified by a particular policy. We recommend using the broader definition of the "emissions horizon" rather than the assessment horizon described in the 2014 Framework.

As described in the overall response to Charge Question 1 (above), we do not support the use of multiple time horizons that vary across feedstocks or regions. We also do not find carbon science supports selecting the time horizon for calculating a BAF to fit a policy horizon (i.e., the EPA's so-called "assessment horizon"). All of the carbon stock effects (both short-term and long-term) should be considered during the emissions horizon, and the effects of a policy should not be limited to an arbitrary policy horizon that may be shorter or longer than the emissions horizon. We conclude that the time horizon, T for scientific consideration of carbon stock changes should be chosen to capture nearly all of the effects on carbon stocks over time and it should not vary by policy, feedstock or landscape conditions. The criteria for selecting a time horizon T, to compute the BAFs should be based on the period of time over which the system-wide carbon stock effects are expected to occur. The same T should then be used for all feedstocks and regions to allow comparability of BAFs across feedstocks and regions.

BAF calculations are fundamentally a carbon accounting tool to measure expected future changes in carbon stocks due to increases in demand for bioenergy. Therefore, BAFs should be carbon science based and should not be calculated based upon policy objectives, and BAFs should be derived to inform policy decisions on potential biophysical carbon implications. We recognize that the agency may wish to focus its policy on a time horizon different from T. However, the BAF on its own is not a policy tool. It is an estimate of net emissions (tons of carbon) adjusted for carbon sequestration and alternate fates, not a full life cycle accounting of biomass use.

A sustained increased demand for bioenergy by stationary facilities in a region is likely to trigger changes in carbon stocks through one or more pathways that could generate a new (steady-state) equilibrium stock of carbon in the long run that may be higher or lower than the current stock of carbon on the land. The demand for biomass for bioenergy can affect carbon stocks by increasing harvesting intensity for standing biomass, diverting biomass from other non-energy products and landfills, converting land from other uses to plant feedstocks for biomass in the future, and utilizing residues that might otherwise decay or be incorporated into soils. The overall impact of all these responses to the increase in demand for biogenic feedstocks by stationary facilities on carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the reference scenario could vary over time, depending on factors such as the mix of feedstocks demanded, the scale of demand, the ease of land conversion from one use to another. The use of each of these sources of biomass for bioenergy may differ in the direction of their impact on carbon stocks depending on whether one focuses on the near term vs. the long term.

To capture these time varying impacts of a feedstock on carbon stocks, we recommend an approach for computing a cumulative BAF that accounts for the positive and negative impacts on emissions over time to determine the net biogenic effect. These positive and negative effects on carbon stocks stem from an increase in the demand for biogenic feedstocks. To ensure comparability of BAFs across all feedstocks and regions, we recommend an approach that computes a cumulative BAF using the same time horizon, T, that should be used for all feedstocks and regions. Because various feedstocks might have different response times, the dynamics of the time varying effects of a feedstock on carbon stocks may play out

over different temporal scales for different feedstocks and regions. Calculating a BAF requires an integrated biophysical-economic model that projects the mix of feedstocks and land use changes due to the increased demand for bioenergy and incorporates the mechanisms by which increased demand for bioenergy by all stationary facilities in a region affects carbon stocks. This can be used to determine the scientifically appropriate system-wide T at which the difference in carbon stocks between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenario stabilizes. The increased biomass feedstock demand scenario is expected to include multiple sources of biogenic feedstock with the shares of these feedstocks depending on various economic and ecological factors. A system-wide T would be used to estimate the BAFs for each of the specific feedstocks demanded in all regions in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario.

The net biogenic effect will be the difference in carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenarios. The time horizon should be chosen to capture nearly all (e.g., >95%) of carbon stock effects and be the same across all feedstocks and regions. Using the same time horizon for different feedstocks and regions allows one to compare the BAF across regions and feedstocks and will provide incentives to use low carbon feedstocks in all regions. By arbitrarily selecting a shorter time horizon than this, the cumulative effects on carbon stock would be truncated, and could be over-estimated or under-estimated relative to those at the steady-state level. This could result in an upward or downward bias to the cumulative BAF.

The SAB emphasizes the importance of clearly differentiating policy from scientific considerations in developing BAFs. It is important to clearly differentiate policy from scientific considerations in evaluating BAFs. BAF calculations are fundamentally a carbon accounting activity of expected future changes in carbon stocks due to increases in demand for bioenergy. BAFs and their evaluation should therefore be carbon science-based and derived to assess the implications of policy decisions on carbon stocks. The stringency of greenhouse gas reduction policy targets should not affect the methods and time-scale used to calculate BAFs.

As explained further under the response to Charge Question 1(c), we suggest two alternatives for calculating cumulative BAFs. Both of these alternatives use the time horizon that incorporates the large majority of carbon-stock effects over time.

Charge Question 1(c). Should calculation of the biogenic assessment factor include all future fluxes into one number applied at time of combustion (cumulative – or apply an emission factor only once), or should there be a default biogenic assessment schedule of emissions to be accounted for in the period in which they occur (marginal – apply emission factor each year reflecting current and past biomass usage)?

Accumulating all effects of the use of a biogenic feedstock over a time horizon is preferred to a marginal or instantaneous ("per period") BAF. (For the purposes of answering this question, the SAB interprets "marginal" to mean "annual" or "per period" so as to distinguish it from the meaning of "marginal" that typically refers to the last unit of emissions or the additional effect of the last unit of biomass.)

As described in the overall response to Charge Question 1 (above), the SAB recommends a cumulative carbon accounting metric, however, there are alternative ways to calculate a cumulative BAF. EPA's cumulative BAF metric (BAF_T) is one option that reflects the carbon stocks at the end of the time

horizon—specifically, changes in carbon stocks by T. Below we describe an alternative approach for calculating a cumulative BAF that is based on the accumulation of annual differences in carbon *stocks* on the land *over the time horizon* to T ($BAF_{\sum T}$).

The choice of appropriate cumulative BAF metric should be informed by a scientific assessment of the dynamics of additions to atmospheric carbon stocks, uncertainties (e.g., decay, uptake, feedbacks, and transient climate response) and mechanisms by which changes in atmospheric carbon stocks affect the climate and other ecosystem functions, such as ocean acidification (assuming that is the effect of interest). Both cumulative BAFs attempt to capture net biogenic carbon emissions in a biophysical sense only. Neither metric provides information on the optimal path of mitigation over time. Effects of rising carbon stocks in the atmosphere on other natural systems, such as ocean acidification, may occur over different time scales. Consideration of the effect of timing of biogenic emissions on the climate hinges on the scientific assessment of the mechanisms by which carbon emissions affect global temperature, sea-level rise, oceanic acidification and other natural systems. For one of these effects, namely global temperature, studies show that it is likely to be affected by cumulative emissions over a long time period and that it is not likely to differ much across different scenarios of emissions pathways over the next several decades as long as there are equivalent changes in cumulative emissions in the long run. These studies conclude that it is cumulative emissions over a very long period that determine the climate response and that different emissions pathways with the same cumulative emissions are likely to produce to a similar global temperature response (Allen, et. al. 2009; Matthews, et. al. 2009). The climate effect of cumulative changes in carbon stocks in the long run is therefore likely to be captured by EPA's cumulative BAF while the effect of transitional changes in carbon stock in the near term on the climate is more likely to be captured by the alternative approach for calculating a cumulative BAF described below.

The SAB's proposed alternative formulation offers a prototype equation with terms for stocks in biomass (i.e., live stocks), dead stocks, soil stocks, product stocks and waste stocks. A key feature of using carbon stocks is that all terms can be readily aggregated or disaggregated and are still subject to mass balance. The new stock-based framework presented in Appendix B and graphically illustrated in Appendices C and D would be scale and process invariant as it could be used for a stand, plot, fuel shed, landscape, or region (see Appendix E for how the stand and landscape levels relate to each other). It would comport with the current conventions in carbon accounting which essentially use input-output tracking of carbon throughout the system with well-defined boundaries. In contrast to the 2014 Framework equation which mixed together net fluxes and correction terms, a stock-based approach is based on the stocks in terrestrial pools such as the live, dead, soil, products, material lost in transport, and waste. These stocks can be aggregated and rearranged as needed or further subdivided, but regardless will still follow conservation of mass and are subject to mass balance. In theory, a stock-based formulation should yield the same BAF as an emissions-based approach but the stock-based approach is simpler and more transparent, while avoiding some of the problems of emissions accounting. While this alternative formulation provides benefits, there are still general issues that remain in estimating a BAF, including selecting appropriate temporal or spatial boundaries, considering variability within a class of feedstocks, the possibility of irreversible land use change, accounting for non-CO_2 greenhouse gases such as nitrous oxide and methane, and quantifying stocks and fluxes that are difficult to measure or estimate.

Although we recommend that the BAF be calculated for a time horizon long enough to account for the large majority of changes in terrestrial carbon stocks, we note that both BAF measures (BAF_T and $BAF_{\sum T}$) should be calculated for varying levels of T to examine their time paths. If the time path of carbon stock changes between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is of particular interest, then $BAF_{\sum T}$ will provide this information for any time horizon of interest. The SAB acknowledges the difficult questions raised by public commenters who pointed out the uncertainties associated with future sequestration (carbon uptake), the possibility of tipping points, irreversibilities and feedback effects and the need to provide incentives for technological change. We acknowledge these issues as valid considerations when assessing policy options; however, our charge was narrower. We were not asked to determine climate policy objectives or emissions goals. The two ways to calculate a cumulative BAF both capture the dynamics of carbon stock changes but differ in their temporal emphasis. It is important to note that the BAF is not a complete carbon accounting method and that neither BAF approach offers a complete life cycle assessment of the climate effects of biomass use.

With either approach to evaluating BAF (EPA's cumulative BAF metric or the alternative approach for calculating a cumulative BAF described below), caution is advised with projections into the future. For example, a BAF calculation is based on modeling that employs two assumptions: (1) it assumes feedstock regrowth following an assumed rotation length; and (2) it assumes that carbon sequestered in soils would continue indefinitely. The SAB recognizes that BAF values calculated along a long time frame are based on models with underlying assumptions that may not hold for long time frames or have comparable effects on base and policy cases over long time frames. Given the uncertainty about the maintenance of our forests and agricultural land use policies and practices, the BAF needs to be updated periodically to reflect the latest data and trends. A one-time cumulative BAF will need to be revised periodically to reflect changing conditions. Therefore, the model used to determine the BAF needs to be updated and validated periodically to ensure that the underlying information on which it is based is still valid. Additionally, the likelihood of a cumulative BAF being realistic also depends on whether assumptions associated with the cumulative BAF calculation actually occur (e.g., assumptions associated with long term sustainable land and forest management).

These and other factors for consideration regarding EPA's cumulative BAF metric and the alternative approach for calculating a cumulative BAF are further described in Appendices B, C, and D.

An Alternative Cumulative BAF Formula: $BAF_{\sum T}$

Carbon accounting for biogenic emissions can either be framed using differences in carbon in the atmosphere or using differences in carbon stocks on the land and in water. Since carbon that is not stored on the land is emitted to the atmosphere, conservation of mass dictates that any carbon taken from the land (through increased harvests in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) will result, in the near-term, in equivalent increases of carbon in the atmosphere, followed by longer-run changes in water and land carbon. Thus these approaches are compatible. However, both approaches must account for changes that occur due to the boundaries of the analysis, such as import and export of biogenic feedstocks and use of feedstocks.

The use of biogenic feedstocks can affect the time sequence of emissions in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario relative to the time sequence of emissions in the reference scenario, and each affects the time sequence of terrestrial carbon stocks. Moreover, near-term removal of biomass can have

feedback effects on biomass growth potential in the future and affect the entire trajectory of carbon on the land and water in the future. The atmospheric effects of biogenic feedstock removal may play out over many years to many decades.

At any point in time over a projection period, the effect on the atmosphere (what the atmosphere sees) from the sequence of biogenic emissions will be the difference in carbon stocks on the land and water. (Here we include water because of the possibility of water-based feedstocks like algae.) This might be more properly phrased "what the atmosphere initially sees." Neither the EPA's framework nor any modifications we offer take into account the decay of carbon molecules in the atmosphere over time or oceanic uptake of carbon. Thus all BAF calculations are based only on emissions of carbon added to the atmosphere or the sequestration on land, rather than any atmospheric decay or oceanic uptake.

Considering the sum of all of these differences in carbon stocks at each point in time, and not just the difference in carbon stocks at a single point in time, is an attempt to estimate the effect of the use of biogenic feedstocks over a time period, noting the important caveat in the previous period about carbon cycle omissions. Denoted as $BAF_{\sum T}$, this modification to the EPA's approach proxies for the "residence time" of emissions which is an integral part of radiative forcing. For each year that a ton of CO_2 emissions resides in the atmosphere, it contributes to radiative forcing or the difference between incoming sunlight absorbed by the Earth and energy radiated back into space. This modification to the BAF formula, as explained further below, would yield a measure of "ton-years" to attempt to capture differences in carbon stocks *each year*.

Derivation of $BAF_{\sum T}$

We define net biogenic emissions (NBE) aggregated over time as:

$$NBE_{\sum T} = \sum_{t=0}^{T}(TC_{Reference}(t) - TC_{Policy}(t)) \qquad \text{(Eq. 1)}$$

Where:

$TC_{policy}(t)$ = the total stock of land carbon in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario in year *t* with increased demand for a biogenic feedstock; and

$TC_{Reference}(t)$ = the total stock of land carbon in the reference scenario in year *t*.

While our anticipated baseline approach is consistent with the EPA's, $BAF_{\sum T}$ would accumulate the annual differences in carbon stocks on the land, which accounts for the time path of net difference in CO_2 emissions over time. To do this, NBE and potential gross emissions (PGE) would reflect the differences in carbon stocks between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the reference scenario. We can interpret $NBE_{\sum T}$ as the sum of the annual differences in carbon stock in the atmosphere from time t=0 to T associated with biogenic feedstock use. This term is the numerator of the $BAF_{\sum T}$ ratio.

The denominator of the $BAF_{\sum T}$ formula should also be measured in terms of the difference in carbon stocks in the atmosphere due to the use of the biogenic carbon at the stationary facility. Specifically, for the denominator we first define PGE_t to be the sum of annual emissions from a biogenic feedstock from time 0 up through time t, where each annual emission is denoted by $PGE_{\Delta t}$. This term represents the gross amount of carbon stock in the atmosphere at time t due to stationary source emissions.

The accumulated annual amounts of gross emissions from time 0 to the time horizon *T* is represented by:

$$PGE_{\sum T} = \sum_{t=0}^{T} PGE_t \qquad \text{(Eq. 2)}$$

We now define $BAF_{\sum T} = \frac{NBE_{\sum T}}{PGE_{\sum T}}$ (Eq. 3)
for a given time horizon T.

The numerator represents the accumulated annual differences in the carbon stock over a total period of time T between the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario (with increased demand for biogenic carbon) and the counterfactual reference baseline. It also represents the corresponding difference in C the atmosphere initially sees over the projection period. This ratio takes into account the effect on the atmosphere of periods of time when differences in carbon stocks may be large as well as periods when they may be small.

After subtracting the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario from the reference scenario, a loss in carbon stocks in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario relative to the reference scenario would lead to a positive sign for $NBE_{\sum T}$. Conversely a gain in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario would lead to a negative sign. If this approach for calculating the BAF is utilized for long rotation feedstocks, it could also be used for all other feedstocks to allow for comparability.

In Figure 1 below, the dashed line represents the scenario of increased use of biomass for energy (the "increased biomass feedstock demand scenario") and the solid line represents business as usual (the "reference scenario"). The reference scenario projects current trends forward without any policy intervention that might increase the use of biomass for energy. Thus the difference between these two scenarios is the difference between current use (projected forward) and increased use of biomass (projected forward). EPA's cumulative BAF is based on the NBE_T which is the vertical difference between the two scenarios at a single point in time (time T). By contrast, $NBE_{\sum T}$ captures the accumulated difference between the two scenarios over time to time T as shown by the shaded area.



Figure 1: Illustration of Carbon Differences Over Time versus at a Single Point in Time

Figure 1 is illustrative of a case in which carbon stocks in the reference scenario (business as usual) are higher than in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario but this is not the only scenario. It also illustrates the difference between NBE_T and $NBE_{\Sigma T}$. Appendix D illustrates different cases. These cases provide examples with carbon stocks in the reference scenario being larger or smaller than the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario over the entire time horizon. We also provide examples where total carbon stocks reach a new steady state, as well as scenarios in which equilibrium is not reached.



Figure 2: Illustration of Net Biogenic Emissions Over Time



Figure 3: Illustration of Potential Gross Emissions Over Time

Figures 1 and 2 above demonstrate how the cumulative effects of a policy can be represented at a point in time (T) or over a period of time (∑T). Since both are "cumulative," we need a way to distinguish them and the versions of BAF stemming from then, hence the different subscripts. If the timeframe being used is at a point in time, then the BAF is calculated by dividing the distance B in Figure 2, by distance D in Figure 3,. By contrast, to consider the effect that each ton of carbon has in the atmosphere each year, $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ is calculated by dividing the area A on the upper graph by the area C on the lower graph.

The algebra below further clarifies how $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ differs from the approaches presented in the 2014 Framework, which describes two different ways to calculate the BAF: a cumulative BAF and a per-period BAF (U.S. EPA 2014). EPA's cumulative BAF in the 2014 Framework is based on the difference in emissions between the reference scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario as follows:

$$NBE_t = \sum_{t=0}^{T} \Delta TC_{\mathrm{Re}\,ference}(t) - \Delta TC_{Policy}(t) = \mathrm{TC}_{\mathrm{Re}\,ference}(T) - TC_{Policy}(T) \qquad \text{(Eq. 4)}$$

where ΔTC is the change in carbon stocks at time *t* relative to *t-1* and equal to the net emissions at time *t*. Here NBE_t is the NBE at a point in time and equals the sum of the annual changes in emissions. Mathematically, NBE_t adds up to the difference in stocks at time t. This cumulative BAF as defined in the 2014 Framework as:

$BAF_t = NBE_t/PGE_t$ where PGE_t is gross emissions at time *t*. Note this is different from our proposed alternative definition of PGE given above in which it is the accumulation of annual gross emissions each year $t=0,\ldots T$. The EPA's cumulative BAF is also shown graphically in Appendix C and referred to as BAF_t. If the time period at which the BAF is measured is $t=T$ then $BAF_T = NBE_T/PGE_T$.

The per-period BAF in the 2014 Framework is based on the change in emissions at a point in time.

$$\Delta TC_{Reference}(t) - \Delta TC_{Policy}(t) \qquad \text{(Eq. 5)}$$

$$BAF_{\Delta t} = \frac{\Delta TC_{Reference}(t) - \Delta TC_{Policy}(t)}{PGE_{\Delta t}} \qquad \text{(Eq. 6)}$$

This is shown graphically in Appendix C as well. Additionally, averages of the per-period BAF at each point in time as well as a moving average of the per-period BAF also are computed and included in the graphs for comparison.

Long-Term Trends in BAF

Some of the discussions concerning BAFs have suggested that cumulative BAFs might approach zero as T is reached. However, that is only true for $BAF_{\Delta t}$ and not the cumulative BAFs. Mathematically cumulative BAFs are hyperbolic functions once T is reached and have extremely long "tails".



Figure 4: Illustration of Long-Term Trend in BAF for a case of decreasing carbon stocks

Figure 4 demonstrates the long-term trends in BAFs for the case of decreasing carbon. This is the relatively simple case in which harvest in a forest landscape is increased to provide biogenic feedstock through more frequent harvesting or more intensive harvesting over time or a diversion of harvested wood to biofuel. As a result of a policy to increase the use of bioenergy, removals of carbon from the land are higher than that for the reference scenario. The time at which annual changes approach zero is indicated by T. Once T is reached, the $BAF_{\Delta t}$ approaches a value of zero, but BAFt and $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ are ≈25-35% of their peak value, respectively. Doubling the value of time used for evaluation (i.e., 2 X T) would lead to a BAF being selected that is half that at time T. Thus while of time scale is critical in defining the value of the BAF, systems that lose carbon will have a positive cumulative BAF for a considerable period.



Figure 5: Illustration of Long-Term Trend in BAF for a case of increasing carbon stocks

The same is true for a system that increases carbon stocks as illustrated in Figure 5. Increased input of carbon might occur through the use of a feedstock that grows faster, practices that improve productivity such as irrigation or fertilization and/or planting on lands that previously had shorter-lived plants. At time T, the $BAF_{\Delta t}$ approaches zero, however, the cumulative BAFs are 25-40% of the maximum value. As with the decreasing case doubling the time for evaluation (i.e., 2 X T) reduces the cumulative BAFs to roughly half that value because of the hyperbolic nature of the BAF calculation once T is reached (NBE becomes a constant and PGE continues to increase at a constant rate). The time horizon of evaluation would have to be extremely long for the cumulative BAFs to approach zero. Figures 4 and 5 also illustrate the problems with picking different time horizons for different feedstock systems: picking a long time horizon for one case and a short one for another would completely distort the temporal effects of the two systems.

In the cumulative BAF framework, there are several possible general rules to determine T. Theoretically T is reached when the $NBE_{\Delta t}$ asymptotes. In many cases, $NBE_{\Delta t}$ will asymptote at zero, but may be a very small non-zero value for a considerable time. When there is random variation from year to year, it will average zero. When there are changes in the landscapes' inherent productivity (e.g., net primary productivity) that continue longer than the "assessment" window, then it is possible for the $NBE_{\Delta t}$ to asymptote at a positive or negative value (see cases 4 and 5 in Appendix C). Hence, the total amount of carbon gained or lost in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario relative to the reference scenario may be substantially but not fully reflected at time T defined by an asymptote. There is no scientific way to determine after this point (i.e., when $NBE_{\Delta t}$ asymptotes at a non-zero value) the degree to which the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario or the external changes in the environment are most responsible for the changes after time T. For cases where there is a non-zero asymptote the EPA will need to make a policy decision as to whether the BAF used will be assumed to account for just the period up to T or to extend beyond that period to include the interaction of environmental changes

and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. Another consideration is that the error bounds on predictions of $NBE_{\Delta t}$ will increase with t (indicated by sensitivity tests) and could eventually include zero. This result would indicate one could no longer accept the hypothesis that there is a change in difference in land carbon between the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenarios. This uncertainty could be considered in identifying when $NBE_{\Delta t}$ is effectively zero. Given these concerns, T could be defined operationally as the time by which some very high percentage of the difference in carbon stocks has occurred (e.g., >95%). Alternatively, it could also be operationally defined as a very small fraction (e.g., <1%) of the maximum value of $NBE_{\Delta t}$.

The examples in Appendix C also show that different measures of BAF can lead to widely different values for any particular case. For the range of examples we present, $BAF_{\sum T}$ is generally larger in absolute terms than the cumulative emission-based BAF and the per-period BAF in cases where the stock of carbon in the reference scenario is higher than that in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario.

There are at least three uses of a carbon accounting metric that uses an approach similar to $BAF_{\sum T}$, i.e., one that equally weights yearly differences in carbon stocks over time to measure impact on the atmosphere. The California Air Resources Board in their Compliance Offset Protocol for U.S. Forest Projects calculates credit for carbon stored in harvested wood products as the equally weighted (average) annual carbon storage over a 100-year period (California Air Resources Board 2014). This is the same method used for $BAF_{\sum T}$ which calculates the effect of biogenic emissions as the equally weighted annual carbon not stored over a time, from t=0 to T. In addition, U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines for agricultural and forest entity reporting of GHG sources and sinks in managed forests also gives credit for carbon stored in harvested wood products using this method (Hoover et al. 2014). The U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines also use equal time weighting of carbon stored on the land to credit carbon storage in biomass crops grown on agricultural land (Ogle 2014).

With either approach to calculating BAF, caution is advised with projections into the future. For example, a BAF calculation is based on modeling that employs two assumptions: (1) it assumes feedstock regrowth following an assumed rotation length; and (2) it assumes that carbon sequestered in soils would continue indefinitely. Given the uncertainty about the maintenance of our forests and agricultural land use policies and practices, the BAF needs to be updated periodically to reflect the latest data and trends. A one-time cumulative BAF will need to be revised periodically to reflect changing conditions. Therefore, the model used to determine the BAF needs to be updated and validated periodically to ensure that the underlying information on which it is based is still valid. Additionally, the likelihood of a cumulative BAF being realistic also depends on other policies in place that encourage or, at least, do not discourage long term sustainable land and forest management.

A shifting projection of the reference baseline that includes a historical period could be used to reset the baseline periodically based on re-measuring carbon stocks on the landscape, using data from existing inventory programs, and thus effectively improving the accuracy of the baseline over time. Future changes in growth-to-harvest ratios could be used to inform the model assumptions and modify the BAF that would be applicable going forward. This would create long-term incentives for sustainable management of land resources. In any accounting framework that assumes future regeneration and regrowth, it is important to periodically test this assumption against actual data as they become available.

Recommendations

- The SAB recommends a BAF formulation based on changes in carbon stocks (terrestrial pools such as live, dead, soil, products, material lost in transport and waste), rather than an emissions (flux-based) approach, because it comports with conventional carbon accounting, has well-defined boundaries and follows conservation of mass as well as mass balance.

- The SAB suggests consideration of two cumulative BAF metrics—that proposed by EPA and an alternative metric that takes into account the changes in terrestrial carbon stocks over time. The appropriate cumulative metric for calculating BAF will depend on the understanding of the carbon system and climate response for which there is uncertainty. We have presented two versions of the cumulative BAF that both capture carbon stock changes but differ in their temporal emphasis.

Charge Question 1(d). What considerations could be useful when evaluating the performance of a future anticipated baseline application on a retrospective basis (e.g., looking at the future anticipated baseline emissions estimates versus actual emissions ex post), particularly if evaluating potential implications for/revisions of the future anticipated baseline and alternative scenarios going forward?

It is appropriate to periodically revise the modeling and BAF estimates. The goal would be to update underlying economic and biophysical assumptions and modeling trends in light of new data. An update would require a review of current model assumptions and outputs relative to observations and new scientific knowledge.

A retrospective comparison would compare model projected behavior to newly available historical observations and estimates, such as regional feedstock demand, land use changes (e.g., afforestation and conversion of land to dedicated energy crops), and forest carbon measurements and estimates (both level and composition). To the extent that there are differences between modeled and observed metrics it would be practical to re-examine parameters, functional forms and other assumptions of the modeling approach. However, caution is merited. Observations, for example of land use and land management change, are the result of many factors and drivers, including potentially increased biomass demand. The goal of an ex post evaluation should be to make adjustments to the key parameters, functional forms and assumptions that can be improved with hindsight, thus improving the estimated impact of increased demand for biomass for the future. Beyond economic dynamics, forest carbon dynamics should also be examined including not only the extensive margin (land use change), but also changes in management intensity, forest rotations and other forest dynamics. (For additional comments on the EPA's modeling approach, see section 3.3.)

4.2. <u>Scales of Biomass Use</u>

Charge Question 2: What is/are the appropriate scale(s) of biogenic feedstock demand changes for evaluation of the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO2 emissions using a future anticipated baseline approach? In the absence of a specific policy to model/emulate, are there general recommendations for what a representative scale of demand shock could be?

Charge Question 2(a). Should the shock reflect a small incremental increase in use of the feedstock to reflect the marginal impact, or a large increase to reflect the average effect of all users?

Charge Question 2(b). What should the general increment of the shock be? Should it be specified in tons, or as a percentage increase?

We have combined our responses to questions 2(a) and 2(b) because both questions relate to the size of the simulated "shock" in biomass feedstock demand.

If the EPA's goal is to obtain a region-specific BAF for a feedstock, it will be necessary to project region-specific, feedstock-specific demand for biomass. Since the BAF for a feedstock could differ depending on the method of production (for example, the soil carbon implications of corn stover will depend on the type of tillage practice used and the amount of residue harvested), it will be appropriate to have the BAF for a feedstock in a region vary by feedstock production method. To the extent that BAFs depend on technology and emissions control regulations at a stationary facility in a region, they could be made technology specific.

Instead of setting the quantity of demand for each feedstock in each region exogenously (as questions 2a and 2b suggest), it would be preferable to use a model to simulate the impact of a given level of increased aggregate (national-level) demand for biomass to determine the mix of feedstocks and the quantity of each feedstock likely to be demanded, and the methods of producing it and using it in a representative facility in each region in equilibrium. The (increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) equilibrium level of each feedstock in each region will provide the economically viable mix and level of demand for each feedstock in each region that will meet that aggregate demand. To the extent that feedstock production methods and technology choices by a stationary facility are guided by policies, these policies should be incorporated in the economic model used to determine feedstock mix both in the reference scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. It is important to note that this could result in multiple BAFs for a feedstock due to the diversity in production practices in a given region, rather than a single BAF; this could be used to define an upper and lower bound to the BAF and provide incentive for facilities to achieve the lower bound BAF.

The carbon implications of using feedstocks in each region to get region-specific, feedstock-specific BAFs can be determined either by (1) applying the equilibrium quantity of demand separately for each feedstock in a region determined above as the change in demand for those feedstocks alone relative to the reference scenario; or (2) increasing demand separately for each feedstock in a region by a marginal (incremental) level relative to the equilibrium (increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) level for that region determined above and simulating its effect on emissions; the latter approach would serve to isolate the effect of the last unit of those feedstocks on carbon emissions compared to the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario while keeping total national demand for all other feedstocks at the equilibrium (increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) level.

The second estimation method above would provide BAFs based on the impact on carbon emissions of the marginal increase in demand for feedstocks in a region while taking into account its effect on all other regions. BAFs calculated for the marginal impact of the last increment could be used to provide the appropriate signal of the carbon impact of using one more incremental unit of that feedstock in a region to a facility in that region.

Since there is uncertainty about the aggregate demand for biomass likely to emerge at the national level due to a policy, this analysis could be conducted for various hypothetical levels of aggregate demand. In

this manner, BAFs for feedstocks for each region could be obtained. This approach could be used to determine the sensitivity of the feedstock-specific BAFs to the level and time-path of the change in aggregate demand for biomass relative to the reference scenario.

Charge Question 2(c). Should the shock be from a business as usual baseline, or from a baseline that includes increased usage of the feedstock (i.e., for a marginal shock, should it be the marginal impact of the first ton, or the marginal impact of something approximating the last ton)?

Since the goal is to quantify the carbon implications of a future scenario with demand for biogenic feedstock use relative to a scenario without increased demand for biogenic feedstock use, the reference scenario should be one with no or limited demand for biomass. Projection of future demand for biomass due to a policy could specify an increase in aggregate demand for bioenergy in the next 5-10 years based on an assessment of announced/anticipated facility capacity for consuming biogenic feedstocks and evaluate its BAF implications for specific feedstocks assuming that aggregate demand remains fixed at that level over a time horizon T after that. This would imply that the feedstock and region specific BAFs will need to be updated periodically to correspond to different levels of aggregate demand for biomass and to converge to the reality observed as the feedstock market develops.

In addition to selecting the aggregate level of demand for biogenic energy, assessment of the BAF due to a marginal increase in the demand for a specific feedstock in a region also requires selecting the size of the marginal unit. A challenge in determining the size of the marginal unit is that it should be large enough to provide a statistically significant signal. The market and resource impact of a small marginal change on BAF would likely be statistically insignificant. Instead, modeling exercises could be undertaken to determine BAF thresholds (scales of consumption of an individual feedstock that shift the BAF) so that a “marginal” shift becomes a demand shift large enough to cross a BAF threshold.

The BAF of the marginal demand shock should be based on the average effect of the last increment of biomass above the reference scenario that includes the increased usage of the feedstock. The average value of the BAF of the last increment of biomass from a specific feedstock in a region will provide the relevant signal of its carbon impact and provide the correct signals to influence feedstock choices towards those with relatively lower BAFs in a region. This reinforces the importance of calculating multiple BAFs for a single feedstock (e.g., corn stover) that reflect the diversity in production and use in a given region; signals should be provided to move to feedstocks with lower BAFs—which may include both within a general feedstock type (corn stover produced more efficiently than another way of producing corn stover) and among general feedstock types (corn stover to roundwood)—towards those with relatively lower BAFs in a region. It may not be appropriate to assign different BAF values to different methods of producing a feedstock if a sensitivity evaluation indicates the BAF estimates are not significantly different.

Charge Question 2(d). Should shocks for different feedstocks be implemented in isolation (separate model runs), in aggregate (e.g., across the board increase in biomass usage endogenously allocated by the model across feedstocks), or something in between (e.g., separately model agriculture-derived and forest-derived feedstocks, but endogenously allocate within each category)?

Charge Question 2(e). For feedstocks that are produced as part of a joint production function, how should the shocks be implemented? (e.g., a general increase in all jointly produced products; or, a

change in the relative prices of the jointly produced products leading to increased use of the feedstock, and decreased production of some other jointly produced products, but not necessarily an overall increase in production).

We have combined our responses to questions 2(d) and 2(e) because both questions relate to modeling feedstocks in isolation or jointly.

In the absence of a mandate for use of specific feedstocks or incentives for specific types of bioenergy production which could inform the structure of feedstock specific demand shocks that should be modelled, the most economically sensible approach is to model the aggregate demand for feedstocks because facilities are constantly seeking their least-cost feedstock. An aggregate demand shock could be imposed on the model and be used to determine demand for different feedstocks in different regions endogenously by the model. This would endogenously allocate demand across feedstocks as well as within each category to simulate a given target aggregate demand determined by the market's ability to draw from the least cost combination of feedstocks.

A joint production function is relevant for feedstocks like corn stover (which is driven by corn production) and forest residue (which is driven by saw timber harvests). For such feedstocks, if the model is used to endogenously determine the demand for those feedstocks as part of the overall mix of feedstocks to meet aggregate demand for biomass, then it will determine an economically viable quantity of those feedstocks to be produced while recognizing the practical limits on demand for the primary product. This approach would avoid possibly perverse results in which high levels of exogenously specified demand for residues drives the demand for the primary marketable product even though it is not economically viable to increase production of the primary product. However, this would allow the possibility that if one of these joint products has high market value then it could drive production of the primary product because returns from the biogenic feedstock more than compensate for the loss in returns from the primary product.

Charge Question 2(f). How should scale of the policy be considered, particularly for default factors? (e.g., can a single set of default factors be applied to policies that lead to substantially different increases in feedstock usage)?

Default BAFs would likely vary by the scale of demand. In fact, a single set of default BAFs is unlikely to be robust across a wide range of scales of demand. The scale of demand is likely to influence the mix of feedstocks that is viable to produce because it can be expected to affect the market price of biomass. Low levels of demand for biomass may be met relatively easily by crop residues, forest residues and mill residues; high levels of demand could lead to production of dedicated energy crops. The BAF of a feedstock in a region can be expected to vary depending on whether there is a 1-million-ton increase in biomass or a 1-billion-ton increase in biomass.

In the absence of information about the scale of demand, BAFs could be determined for different threshold levels of aggregate demand for biomass and consequent feedstock/region-specific demand.

Charge Question 2(g). Would the answers to any of the above questions differ when generating policy neutral default factors, versus generating factors directly tied to a specific policy?

It is impossible to determine without specific contexts to evaluate and compare. While the methodological framework for different policies could be similar, we expect differences as follows: (1) BAFs that are tied to a particular policy would be based on simulating the aggregate and feedstock-specific demand shock that is expected to emanate from a specific policy, while policy neutral factors would be based on various exogenously specified quantities of demand for biomass and corresponding endogenously determined levels of feedstock specific demand, and (2) different policies may require different production and use practices, and thus result in different BAFs. Isolating the extent to which expected increase in demand for biomass and its consequences for CO_2 emissions can be attributed to a specific policy (when there are multiple policies inducing a shift to renewable energy) is likely to be complicated and challenging to convert into policy-specific BAFs. It could also create perverse incentives for feedstock choice to comply with various policies.

Charge Question 2(h). What considerations could be useful when evaluating the performance of the demand shock choice ex post, particularly if evaluating potential implications for/revisions of the future anticipated baseline and alternative scenarios going forward?

A key consideration that could affect the performance of the demand shock ex post is that the ex-ante allocation of feedstock-specific and region-specific demand determined endogenously did not incorporate the role of BAFs in influencing demand. It is likely that the observed reality of feedstock demand after a policy using BAFs is implemented will differ from that determined ex ante because the policy can be expected to increase demand for feedstocks with lower BAF and decrease demand for feedstocks with a high BAF. Since feedstock-specific demand and the feedstock BAF are likely to be jointly determined in reality, while the approach proposed above determines them sequentially, some divergence between model simulated demand for feedstocks and observed reality is inevitable.

One option to reduce the extent of divergence between ex-ante and ex-post results on feedstock demand would be to run several iterations of the model after inserting the estimated BAFs in the model and re-simulating the allocation of aggregate biomass demand across different feedstocks and re-calculating the BAFs and so on until the ex-ante and the modeled ex-post solutions converge.

An ex post evaluation would also allow revisions to the EPA's estimates of feedstock demand changes (as discussed in response to Question 1d) based on updated data. To improve the performance of the model for assessing a BAF retrospectively, quantities of biomass feedstock (by feedstock category) demanded could be updated with actual outcomes. Ex post, new data should improve the estimate of the portion of total biomass demand that is attributable to stationary facilities. This information could be used to improve BAF estimates prospectively for the future.

REFERENCES

Allen, M. R., Frame, D. J., Huntingford, C., Jones, C. D., Lowe, J. and Meinshausen, M. (2009). Warming Caused by Cumulative Carbon Emissions toward the Trillionth Tonne. *Nature* 1163 - 1166.

California Air Resources Board. (2014). *Compliance Offset Protocol, U.S. Forest Projects.* Retrieved from http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2014/capandtrade14/ctusforestprojectsprotocol.pdf.

Cherubini, F., Guest, G. and Stromman, A. (2012). Application of Probability Distributions to the Modeling of Biogenic CO2 Fluxes in Life cycle Assessment. *Global Change Biology Bioenergy* 1 - 15.

Cintas, Olivia, Göran, B., Cowie, A., Egnell, G., Holmstrom, H., Marland, G and Ågren, G. (2017). Carbon balances of bioenergy systems using biomass from forests managed with long rotations: bridging the gap between stand and landscape assessments. *Global Change Biology Bioenergy*. Retrieved from doi: 10.1111/gcbb.12425, 2017

Galik, C.S. and Abt. R.C. (2012). The effect of assessment scale and metric selection on the greenhouse gas benefits of woody biomass. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 44:1–7.

Galik, Christopher S, and Robert C. Abt. (2012). "The Effect of Assessment Scale and Metric Selection on the Greenhouse Gas Benefits of Woody Biomass." *Biomass and Bioenergy* 44 (September): 1–7. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.04.009.

Hoover, C., Birdsey, R., Goines, B., Lahm, P., Marland, G., Nowak, D., . . . Woodall, C. (2014). *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Agriculture and Forestry: Methods for Entity-Scale Inventory.* Retrieved from http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/Quantifying_GHG/Chapter6S.pdf.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). (2007). *Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing. In: Climate Change 2007.* Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-chapter2.pdf.

Jonker, Jan G.G., Junginger, M. and Faaij, A. (2014). "Carbon Payback Period and Carbon Offset Parity Point of Wood Pellet Production in the South-Eastern United States." *Global Change Biology Bioenergy* 6 (4): 371–89. doi:10.1111/gcbb.12056.

Kirschbaum, M.U.F. (2003). Can Trees Buy Time? An Assessment of the Role of Vegetation Sinks as Part of the Global Carbon Cycle. *Climatic Change* 58: 47-71.

Kirschbaum, M.U.F. (2006). Temporary Carbon Sequestration Cannot Prevent Climate Change. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 11: 1151-1164.

Matthews, H.D., Gillett, N.P., Stott, P.A. and Zickfeld, K. (2009). The proportionality of global warming to cumulative carbon emissions. Nature (Vol. 459). doi:10.1038/nature08047: 829-832.

McCabe, J. G. (2014). *Addressing Biogenic Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Stationary Sources*. Memo to Air Divison Directors, Region 1 – 10. Retrieved from http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/downloads/Biogenic-CO_2-Emissions-Memo-111914.pdf.

Mitchell, S.R., Harmon, M.E. and O'Connell, K.E.B. (2012). Carbon debt and carbon sequestration parity in forest bioenergy production. *Global Climate Change Bioenergy*, doi: 10.1111/j.1757-1707.2012.01173.x

Mitchell, Stephen R., Harmon, M.E. and O'Connell, K.E.B. (2012). "Carbon Debt and Carbon Sequestration Parity in Forest Bioenergy Production." *GCB Bioenergy* 4 (6): 818–27. doi:10.1111/j.1757-1707.2012.01173.x.

National Council for Air and Stream Improvement. (2015). Comment to the Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel of the EPA Science Advisory Board. August 5, 2015. Retrieved from http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/254A0104C4745E5785257E98006493E4/$File/NCASI+comments+for+Aug.+6,+2015.pdf

Neumann, J. (2011). *Documentation of Peer Review Process for the FASOM-GHG Model for Climate Change Analysis.* Memo to Sara Ohrel, EPA Climate Change Division. Retrieved from http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/EPAactivities/peerreview_FASOM.pdf.

Ogle, S. P. (2014). *Chapter 3: Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks in Cropland and Grazing land Systems. In Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Agriculture andForestry: Methods for Entity-Scale Inventory.* Vol. Technical Bulletin Number 1939. (U. S. Office of the Chief Economist, Ed.) Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.usda.gov/oce/climate_change/Quantifying_GHG/Chapter3S.pdf.

Shoemaker, J.K., Schrag, D.P., Molina, M.J. and Ramanathan, V. (2013). "What Role for short-Lived Climate Pollutants in Mitigation Policy?" *Science* 342: 1323-1324.

Ter-Mikaelian, Michael T., Colombo, S.J. and Chen, J. (2015). "The Burning Question: Does Forest Bioenergy Reduce Carbon Emissions? A Review of Common Misconceptions about Forest Carbon Accounting." *Journal of Forestry* 113 (1): 57–68.

U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). (2011). *Accounting Framework for Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources.* Office of Atmospheric Programs. Retrieved from http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/Biogenic-CO2-Accounting-Framework-Report-Sept-2011.pdf.

U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). (2014). *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources.* Retrieved from http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/biogenic-emissions.html.

U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). (2015). *Response to the SAB Panel Peer Review Advisory*. Retrieved from SAB Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel Meeting Webpage. Retrieved from http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/SABPRODUCT.nsf/5295DAC6053510F285257DFD0075C181/$File/OAR+Response+to+SAB's+2012+Advice.pdf.

U.S. EPA SAB (U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board). (2012). *SAB Review of EPA's Accounting Framework for Biogenic CO2 Emissions from Stationary Sources*. Retrieved from SAB website : http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/57B7A4F1987D7F7385257A87007977F6/$File/EPA-SAB-12-011-unsigned.pdf.

Walker, Thomas, Cardellichio, P., Colnes, A., Gunn, J., Kittler, B. Perschel, B., Recchia,C. and Saah, D. (2010). "Massachusetts Biomass Sustainability and Carbon Policy Study: Report to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources." Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, no. June: 182. doi:NCI-2010-03.

Wang, W., Dwivedi, P. Abt, R. and Khanna, M. (2015). Carbon Savings with transatlantic trade in pellets: accounting for market-driven effects. *Environmental Research Letters.* 10 , 114019; doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/11/114019

APPENDIX A: CHARGE TO THE SAB

February 25, 2015

MEMORANDUM

To: **Holly Stallworth, Designated Federal Official**
Science Advisory Board Staff Office

From: **Paul Gunning, Director**
Climate Change Division

Subject: **Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources and Charge Questions for SAB peer review**

The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit the revised *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources*, related documentation and charge questions for consideration by the Science Advisory Board (SAB) during your upcoming peer review.

In January 2011, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a series of steps it would take to address biogenic CO_2 emissions from stationary sources. EPA committed to conduct a detailed examination of the science and technical issues related to assessing biogenic CO_2 emissions from stationary sources and to develop a framework for evaluating those emissions. The draft study was released in September 2011 and subsequently peer reviewed by the SAB Ad-Hoc Panel on Biogenic Carbon Emissions (SAB Panel). The final peer review report was published September 2012.

To continue advancing the agency's technical understanding of the role that biomass use can play in reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions, the EPA released a second draft of the technical report, *Framework for Assessing Biogenic Carbon Dioxide for Stationary Sources*, in November 2014. This revised report presents a methodological framework for assessing the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions. The revised report takes into account the SAB Panel's peer review recommendations on the draft 2011 Framework as well as the latest information and input from the scientific community and other stakeholders.

The revised framework addressed many of the SAB Panel's key concerns and recommendations by incorporating: an anticipated baseline approach analysis, including an alternative fate approach for waste-derived feedstocks and certain industrial processing products and byproducts; an evaluation of tradeoffs from using different temporal scales; an improved representation of the framework equation; and illustrative case studies demonstrating how the framework equation can be applied, using region-feedstock combinations to generate regional defaults per different baseline approaches and temporal scales.

We ask the SAB to review and offer recommendations on specific technical elements of the revised framework for assessing the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions, as identified in the charge accompanying this memo. We look forward to the SAB's review.

Please contact me if you have any questions about the attached study and charge.

Attachments:

1) *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources*
2) Technical Appendices
3) Response to the 2011 SAB Panel Peer Review Advisory

Peer Review Charge on the Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources

To improve the quality, utility, and scientific integrity of the Framework, EPA is providing this study, *Framework for Assessing Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources* (November 2014) and related materials to the Science Advisory Board (SAB). The revised report takes into account the SAB Biogenic Carbon Emissions Panel's ("SAB Panel") peer review recommendations[2] on the draft 2011 Framework[3] as well as the latest information and input from the scientific community and other stakeholders. The "Response to SAB" document included in the materials provided for this review discusses and responds to the SAB Panel key points and recommendations, serving as a guide to how the revised framework incorporates their recommendations. This charge narrowly focuses on a few specific remaining questions that were not explicitly addressed in the initial SAB Panel peer review report.

The revised 2014 framework report identifies key scientific and technical factors associated with assessing biogenic CO_2 emissions from stationary sources using biogenic feedstocks, taking into account information about the carbon cycle. It also presents a methodological framework for assessing the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources for energy production results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions.

The revised framework and the technical appendices address many of the SAB Panel's key concerns and recommendations by incorporating: an anticipated baseline approach analysis (Appendices J-L); an alternative fate approach for waste-derived feedstocks (Appendix N); and certain industrial processing products and byproducts (Appendix D Addendum); an evaluation of tradeoffs from using different temporal scales (Appendix B); an improved representation of the framework equation (Appendix F); and illustrative case studies demonstrating how the framework equation can be applied, using region-feedstock combinations to generate regional defaults per different baseline approaches and temporal scales (Appendices H-N).

[2] The final peer review report from the SAB Panel on the draft 2011 framework was published on September 28, 2012 (Swackhamer and Khanna, 2011). Information about the SAB peer review process for the September 2011 draft framework is available at http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/0/2F9B572C712AC52E8525783100704886.

[3] The 2011 *Draft Accounting Framework for Biogenic CO_2 Emissions from Stationary Sources* is available at www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/biogenic-emissions.html.

As explained in the revised framework introduction and accompanying SAB response document, the revised framework maintains the policy neutral approach from the 2011 draft Framework. It is a technical document that does not set regulatory policy nor does it provide a detailed discussion of specific policy and implementation options. Ultimately, the framework provides a methodological approach for considering, and a technical tool (the framework equation) for assessing, the extent to which there is a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions from the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources. The revised framework details technical elements that should be considered as appropriate per specific policy applications or biogenic carbon-based feedstock assessments. Therefore, this charge excludes policy and regulatory recommendations or legal interpretation of the Clean Air Act's provisions related to stationary sources.

The revised report does not provide any final values or determinations: it offers indications of different biogenic feedstock production effects per research and analyses conducted, including illustrative example results per specific case study parameters. As discussed by the previous SAB Panel, this report also finds that biophysical and market differences between feedstocks may necessitate different technical approaches. Even using a future anticipated baseline approach, forest- and agriculture-derived feedstock characteristics, and thus analyses and results, may vary per region and per feedstock, and may be influenced by land use change effects. Illustrative analyses conducted for specific waste-derived feedstock case studies using a counterfactual anticipated baseline, as recommended by the SAB Panel, yielded minimal or negative net emissions effects.

This charge focuses on questions that remain regarding whether there are more definitive technical determinations appropriate for parameterizing key elements of the revised framework, regardless of application to a specific policy or program. Specifically, we ask that the SAB Panel examine and offer recommendations on future anticipated baseline specification issues in the context of assessing the extent to which the production, processing, and use of forest- and agriculture-derived biogenic material at stationary sources for energy production results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions – such as appropriate temporal scales and the scale of biogenic feedstock usage (model perturbations or 'shocks') for analyzing future potential bioenergy production changes.

Technical approaches, merits and challenges with applying a future anticipated baseline

Establishing a baseline creates a point of comparison necessary for evaluating changes to a system.[4] Baseline specification can vary in terms of what entity or groups of entities are being analyzed (e.g., industries, economic sectors), temporal and spatial scales, geographic resolution, and, depending on context, environmental issues/attributes (EPA, 2010).[5] The choice of baseline approach can also depend on the question being asked and the goal of the analysis at hand. For example, some GHG analysis may require a baseline against which historic changes of landscape carbon stocks can be measured. Other applications may necessitate a baseline against which the estimated GHG emissions and sequestration associated with potential future changes in related commodity markets and policy arenas. Analyses of

[4] Definitions for baseline vary, including "the reference for measurable quantities from which an alternative outcome can be measured" (IPCC AR4 WGIII, 2007) or "the baseline (or reference) is the state against which change is measured. It might be a 'current baseline,' in which case it represents observable, present-day conditions. It might also be a 'future baseline,' which is a projected future set of conditions excluding the driving factor of interest. Alternative interpretations of the reference conditions can give rise to multiple baselines" (IPCC AR4 WGII, 2007).

[5] Guidelines for Preparing Economics Analyses (NCEE), Chapter 5: http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eerm.nsf/vwAN/EE-0568-05.pdf/$file/EE-0568-05.pdf

the estimated GHG emissions and sequestration effects from changes in biomass use have used different baseline approaches, as well as a wide range of different temporal scales and alternative scenario parameters (Sohngen and Sedjo, 2000; Fargione, 2008; UNFCCC, 2009; Walker et al., 2010; Cherubini et al, 2011; Galik and Abt, 2012; Latta et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2013; AEO, 2014; U.S. EPA, 2014; Miner et al., 2014).

The draft 2011 framework had discussed three different potential baseline approaches – reference point, future anticipated and comparative – and used the reference point baseline in its hypothetical case study applications of the Framework. The SAB Panel in its review stated that "the choice of a fixed reference point may be the simplest to execute, but it does not actually address the question of the extent to which forest stocks would have been growing/declining over time in the absence of a particular bioenergy facility" (SAB Advisory, p. 29). The SAB Panel expressed concern that the reference point baseline does not address the important question of additionality, or what would have been the trajectory of biogenic CO_2 stocks and fluxes in the absence of an activity or activities using biogenic feedstocks for energy, especially in the context of forest-derived feedstocks.[6] "Estimating additionality, i.e., the extent to which forest stocks would have been growing or declining over time in the absence of harvest for bioenergy, is essential, as it is the crux of the question at hand. To do so requires an anticipated baseline approach" (SAB Letter, p. 2).

Through public comments to the SAB Panel during the 2011-2012 SAB peer review process, various stakeholders expressed divergent perspectives on the appropriate baseline for the draft 2011 framework report.[7] The revised 2014 framework retains the reference point baseline and adds the anticipated baseline in order to retain adaptability for potential applications, and discusses both approaches at length in the revised report and several technical appendices. However, as the SAB Panel was clear in its previous review of the reference point baseline, EPA has no outstanding technical questions for the SAB Panel on that baseline approach. This charge focuses specifically on remaining technical questions that EPA has on the future anticipated baseline approach.

Part 1 – Future anticipated baseline approach and temporal scale

It is important to consider possible treatments of time and the implications of these treatments in developing strategies for long-term and short-term emissions assessment, because the choice of treatment may have significant impacts on the outcome of an assessment framework application. For the intended use of the revised Framework – assessing the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2

[6] The difference in net atmospheric CO_2 emissions contributions with and without changes in biogenic feedstock use is known as additionality (Murray et al., 2007). Additionality can be determined by assessing the difference in potential net atmospheric CO_2 emissions of a specific level of biogenic feedstock use over a certain period of time (in many cases the business-as-usual [BAU] baseline) versus the net atmospheric CO_2 emissions contributions that would have occurred over the same time period with a different level of biogenic feedstock use (counterfactual scenario), holding other factors and assumptions consistent between scenarios.

[7] The American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA) supported the reference point baseline (e.g., comments submitted October 2011, March 2012) applied historically (January 2012, March 2012). The National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) stated if certain feedstocks weren't categorically excluded, then the historical reference point baseline should be used (e.g., March 2012, August 2012). The U.S. Department of Agriculture stated preference for a historic baseline approach (May 2012). The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) (January 2012, May 2012) and NCASI (October 2011, March 2012) both supported the retrospective reference point approach, though also both offered recommendations if an anticipated baseline approach was included (EDF for future anticipated and NCASI for counterfactual). Others, such as Green Power Institute (March 2012), the National Resource Defense Council (NRDC, August 2012), Becker et al. (August 2012), Biomass Energy Resource Center et al. (February 2012), and a group scientists letter to EPA (June 2014) all support some form of the anticipated baseline approach (future anticipated and/or counterfactual).

emissions – there are different elements of time to consider when using a future anticipated baseline approach. These elements can include:

- Emissions horizons, assessment or policy horizons, and reporting periods (i.e., fluxes related to feedstock production may occur over many years to decades, whereas reporting may be the current year and policies may cover only a few years or decades), and
- Differences in temporal characteristics of different feedstocks (i.e., annual crops, short rotation energy crops, and longer rotation forestry systems).
- Changes in biophysical and economic conditions over time may affect or differ from those in future anticipated baseline and scenario estimates.

The SAB Panel in its previous peer review noted that "this is a complicated subject because there are many different time scales that are important for the issues associated with biogenic carbon emissions" (Advisory, page 13). They discussed multiple temporal scales associated with mixing of carbon throughout the different reservoirs on the Earth's surface at the global scale (Advisory, page 13) and climate responses to CO_2 and other greenhouse gases (Advisory, page 15), implications of temporal scales greater and shorter than 100 years, and those related to the growth cycles of different feedstock types (Advisory, page 15). The SAB Panel specifically highlighted considerations for using a 100-year or longer temporal scale for evaluating climate impacts and radiative forcing[8] as well as decay rates and carbon storage in forest ecosystems in the main text as well as in Appendices B-D. However, in its recommendations, including those for developing default BAFs per region, the SAB Panel did not offer recommendations per what temporal scale to use in the specific context of the Framework for its intended use and scope. Instead, the SAB Panel stated that "there is no scientifically correct answer when choosing a time horizon, although the *Framework* should be clear about what time horizon it uses, and what that choice means in terms of valuing long term versus shorter term climate impacts (Advisory, page 15) and recommended that a revised framework "incorporate various time scales and consider the tradeoffs in choosing between different time scales" (Advisory, page 43).

Multiple stakeholders have also weighed in on temporal scales, some with specific recommendations on what temporal scale should/could be used for framework assessments, others with no specific recommendations but emphasizing the importance of time. In various comments submitted during the 2011-2012 SAB process, NAFO supported a 100-year timeframe (March 2012). The National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI) in October 2011 comments suggested "the need for considerable flexibility in setting the temporal scales for determining the stability of forest carbon stocks. There are a range of circumstances that can cause transient trends in carbon stocks that can obscure the more relevant long-term picture."

Other groups, such as The Wilderness Society (TWS), NRDC, EDF and others, submitted comments supporting consideration of shorter temporal scales. In its comments and example calculations, TWS (in

[8] EPA acknowledges that the long-term climate impacts of shifting from fossil fuel to biogenic energy sources is an important topic for climate change mitigation policy and also recognizes the extensive work being conducted by EPA and throughout the research community on this question. However, EPA's focus here is on a narrower, more targeted goal of developing tools to assess the extent to which there is a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO_2 emissions from the production, processing, and use of biogenic feedstocks at stationary sources. This more narrowly defined assessment is anticipated to be a better fit for the types of program and policy applications in which this framework may potentially be applied.

October 2011 comments) implied support for shorter temporal scales, and stated in later comments that the SAB "text appears biased toward ignoring effects that occur within a 100-year period" (May 2012). NRDC (August 2014) implied support for shorter temporal scales: "even if near-term carbon emissions increases are eventually 'made up' by regrowth over the very long term, the carbon emission from these types of biomass actually exceed those from fossil fuels for decades. This puts use of these types of biomass fuels in conflict with the urgent need for near-term carbon emissions reductions. The time profile of the carbon emission from biogenic fuel sources matters because it is critical to limit near-term global GHG emissions." This perspective was similar to that shared by Becker et al. in their August 2012 comments. EDF (January 2012) suggested a very short temporal scale (in the context of supporting a retrospective reference baseline). Others, such as the Biotechnology Industry Organization (October 2011) simply asked for "clarification on the methodology used to identify the time scale of carbon cycles."

Per the various recommendations above, the revised framework report and the technical appendices include a more detailed discussion of intertemporal tradeoffs inherent in various options for treating emissions over time in the context of assessing biogenic CO_2 emissions from stationary sources. Specifically, the revised report has: a section on key temporal scale considerations (pages 33-38); an appendix dedicated to temporal scale issues (Appendix B), which includes further discussion of temporal scales in the context of future anticipated baselines and decay rates for feedstocks that would have otherwise decayed if not used for energy, and; an appendix describing the background of and modeling considerations for constructing an anticipated baseline approach (Appendix J). Also, illustrative calculations using the future anticipated baseline estimates use future simulations and thereby explicitly incorporate temporal patterns of different feedstocks (e.g., feedstock growth rates, decay rates) into the analysis and shows how results can vary per temporal scale used (as seen in Appendices K and L). The revised framework does not recommend specific temporal scales for framework applications, but rather identifies different elements of and considerations concerning time to provide insights into the potential implications of using different temporal scales.

EPA seeks guidance on the following issues regarding appropriate temporal scales for assessing biogenic CO_2 emissions using a future anticipated baseline, using the above referenced components of the revised framework report as the starting point for the SAB Panel's discussion. As the previous SAB Panel recommended developing default assessment factors by feedstock category and region that may need to be developed outside of a specific policy context, and as the framework could be also be used in specific policy contexts, the questions below relate to the choice of temporal scale both within and outside of a specific policy context.

Part 1 – Future anticipated baseline approach and temporal scale

1. What criteria could be used when considering different temporal scales and the tradeoffs in choosing between them in the context of assessing the net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO2 emissions from the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources using a future anticipated baseline?

    a. Should the temporal scale for computing BAFs vary by policy (e.g., near-term policies with a 10-15 year policy horizon vs. mid-term policies or goals with a 30-50 year policy horizon vs. long-term climate goals with a 100+ year time horizon), feedstocks (e.g.,

long rotation vs. annual/short-rotation feedstocks), landscape conditions, and/or other metrics? It is important to acknowledge that if temporal scales vary by policy, feedstock or landscape conditions, or other factors, it may restrict the ability to compare estimates/results across different policies or different feedstock types, or to evaluate the effects across all feedstock groups simultaneously.

i. If temporal scales for computing BAFs vary by policy, how should emissions that are covered by multiple policies be treated (e.g., emissions may be covered both by a short-term policy, and a long-term national emissions goal)? What goals/criteria might support choices between shorter and longer temporal scales?

ii. Similarly, if temporal scales vary by feedstock or landscape conditions, what goals/criteria might support choices between shorter and longer temporal scales for these metrics?

iii. Would the criteria for considering different temporal scales and the related tradeoffs differ when generating policy neutral default BAFs versus crafting policy specific BAFs?

b. Should the consideration of the effects of a policy with a certain end date (policy horizon) only include emissions that occur within that specific temporal scale or should it consider emissions that occur due to changes that were made during the policy horizon but continue on past that end date (emissions horizon)?

c. Should calculation of the BAF include all future fluxes into one number applied at time of combustion (cumulative – or apply an emission factor only once), or should there be a default biogenic assessment schedule of emissions to be accounted for in the period in which they occur (marginal – apply emission factor each year reflecting current and past biomass usage)?

d. What considerations could be useful when evaluating the performance of a future anticipated baseline application on a retrospective basis (e.g., looking at the future anticipated baseline emissions estimates versus actual emissions *ex post*), particularly if evaluating potential implications for/revisions of the future anticipated baseline and alternative scenarios going forward?

Part 2 – Scales of biomass use when applying future anticipated baseline approach

EPA seeks guidance on technical considerations concerning how to select model perturbations ('shocks') for future anticipated baseline simulations estimating the net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO2 emissions from the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources, using the above referenced components of the revised framework report as the starting point for the SAB Panel's discussion. As the SAB Panel recommended developing default assessment factors by feedstock category and region that may need to be developed outside of a specific policy context, and as the framework could be also be used in specific policy contexts, the questions below relate to the choice of model shocks both within and outside of a specific policy context.

2. What is/are the appropriate scale(s) of biogenic feedstock demand changes for evaluation of the extent to which the production, processing, and use of biogenic material at stationary sources results in a net atmospheric contribution of biogenic CO2 emissions using a future

anticipated baseline approach? In the absence of a specific policy to model/emulate, are there general recommendations for what a representative scale of demand shock could be?

a. Should the shock reflect a small incremental increase in use of the feedstock to reflect the marginal impact, or a large increase to reflect the average effect of all users?
b. What should the general increment of the shock be? Should it be specified in tons, or as a percentage increase?
c. Should the shock be from a business as usual baseline, or from a baseline that includes increased usage of the feedstock (i.e., for a marginal shock, should it be the marginal impact of the first ton, or the marginal impact of something approximating the last ton)?
d. Should shocks for different feedstocks be implemented in isolation (separate model runs), in aggregate (e.g., across the board increase in biomass usage endogenously allocated by the model across feedstocks), or something in between (e.g., separately model agriculture-derived and forest-derived feedstocks, but endogenously allocate within each category)?
e. For feedstocks that are produced as part of a joint production function, how should the shocks be implemented? (e.g., a general increase in all jointly produced products; or, a change in the relative prices of the jointly produced products leading to increased use of the feedstock, and decreased production of some other jointly produced products, but not necessarily an overall increase in production).
f. How should scale of the policy be considered, particularly for default factors? (e.g., can a single set of default factors be applied to policies that lead to substantially different increases in feedstock usage)?
g. Would the answers to any of the above questions differ when generating policy neutral default factors, versus generating factors directly tied to a specific policy?
h. What considerations could be useful when evaluating the performance of the demand shock choice *ex post*, particularly if evaluating potential implications for/revisions of the future anticipated baseline and alternative scenarios going forward?

APPENDIX B: CHANGES IN CARBON STOCKS

Introduction

The following appendix describes the alternative biogenic carbon accounting formulation being proposed by the SAB. Example cases of how the formulation might be used are provided in Appendix D. The goal of this alternative formulation is to create a transparent and intuitive system that clearly incorporates the timeframe being used and the system boundary used to solve it. Before describing the calculations, the key improvements are described below.

To make the formulation transparent and intuitive it is directly based on EPA's own words in the 2014 Framework where the basic question involved in the use of biogenic feedstocks is posed:

"Is more or less carbon stored in the system over time compared to what would have been stored in the absence of changes in biogenic feedstock use?" (U.S. EPA 2014).

We interpret system to mean the terrestrial system and loss of carbon stocks from the terrestrial system implies, if conservation of mass is to be observed, that there is an increase of carbon emitted to the atmosphere. To follow the conventions in the 2014 Framework, it is assumed that the atmosphere is the reference point for carbon changes which means that a loss from the terrestrial system is viewed as a positive gain to the atmosphere and therefore adding carbon to the atmosphere is given a positive sign. In contrast, removing carbon from the atmosphere is given a negative sign.

The question posed by the EPA could be examined at multiple landscape levels: a stand or plot, a small landscape, a very large area or region comprised of multiple landscapes, or a set of regions. The proposed alternative formulation can be applied to each of these, however, following earlier SAB recommendation (U.S. EPA SAB 2012) it is assumed that it would be applied to the landscape to regional level. Further, it is assumed that the carbon stocks represent the average landscape or regional value at a given time. Although we analyze the BAF and related terms at the landscape to regional level, we present an analysis that compares these calculations to what would be found at the stand level in Appendix E. We also demonstrate how stand level results can readily be scaled to the landscape or regional level.

In contrast to the 2014 Framework equation which contains terms such as GROW, AVOIDEMIT, SITETNC, LEAK, P, and L which is a mixture of net fluxes and correction terms (i. e., LEAK, P, and L) the proposed alternative is based on the stocks in terrestrial pools such as the live, dead, soil, products, material lost in transport, and waste (i.e., disposed carbon that is generally not deliberately used). These carbon stock terms are based on what the stocks are and not necessarily where the stocks came from or where they are going, or the processes that might influence them. They are also the stocks that are typically inventoried and/or modeled. These stocks can be aggregated and rearranged as needed or further subdivided, but regardless will still follow conservation of mass and are subject to mass balance. In addition, all the terms would be analogous input-output systems although the actual processes causing input and output change. Finally, these carbon stock terms could potentially capture all the so-called upstream and downstream effects of biogenic feedstock use. However, if there is a policy decision to not include downstream effects on material lost in transport and products, then those stocks would be

omitted. If the policy decision is to account for these downstream effects, then they would be included. If additional terms are required to account for substitution effects (i.e., displacement of fossil carbon due to biogenic fuel use) then they can be added. In sum, the "new" terms are flexible, readily understood, transparent, and commonly used in many contexts.

The EPA question implies the comparison of two scenarios: one in which there is an increased use of biogenic feedstocks and one in which there is not (or at least no new additional increased use of these feedstocks). The scenario in which biogenic feedstock use is increased is the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario and the one without this increased use is the reference scenario. Note that this does not represent a comparison of stocks at the stand level at the start and at the end of a harvest rotation, a relationship that is often used to illustrate the "effects" of biofuel harvest. It is often assumed that if the carbon stocks at the start of the harvest rotation is regained at the end of the rotation there is no effect of biogenic carbon harvest on terrestrial carbon stocks because the system is in a steady-state over time. This stand level "internal" comparison is irrelevant in the newly proposed formulation because it is entirely possible for the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios to both eventually be in a steady-state condition, but to have different carbon stocks (see Appendix D for multiple examples).

The proposed formulation would specify the system boundaries used to make the calculations, for example whether it included "direct" biophysical or "indirect" market effects or was expanded to include atmospheric effects. Note that the system boundaries in the proposed alternative formulation are not the geographical boundaries of the system. They are the sets of processes that are considered to be inside versus outside the system. The 2014 Framework mixed this concept of system boundaries and net fluxes (i.e., emissions) by the inclusion of the LEAK term. The conceptual problem introduced by the mixing of system boundaries and net fluxes is that whether or not market effects are included in the analysis, the stocks and processes controlling these processes remain the same. Understanding the additional amount caused by the inclusion of market effects in the current framework means one has to separate that part of the stock or net flux that was influenced by market effects versus the part that was not. This would prove extremely difficult in practice. In contrast, if one changes the system boundaries to include or exclude market effects, then one can make inferences about the impacts market effects have on each of the stocks and their net fluxes.

Finally, the proposed alternative formulation uses new terminology to describe the multiple timeframes that could be used to solve the equations. The 2014 Framework proposed three timeframes: 1) per period (the change in the net emissions at any time); 2) cumulative emissions-based (the total amount up to a time point); and 3) average per period-based (the average over a time period). These terms are ambiguous (for example there are various levels that emissions could be cumulative) and non-intuitive because they mix the aspect of time being considered (i.e., a time point versus a time period) and the way the data are being treated (i.e., differenced, summed, or averaged). The subscripts described below are used in the alternative framework to indicate the timeframe being used and how the primary information (which for NBE or net biogenic emissions is the difference in stocks between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios) is being treated:

1. To represent the value at any point in time the subscript t is used. This is verbally referred to as "small" or "little" t. If the BAF is determined at time point t, then it uses the NBE and PGE

(potential gross emissions) at time t. This would the same as the EPA's cumulative emissions-based concept.

2. Time zero is defined as the time point when the policy has been started (i.e., t=0).

3. To indicate the time point at which the effects of the biogenic harvest ceases to change, the letter T is used. This is verbally referred to as "big" or "cap" t. If T is used as a subscript it indicates values at time point T. If the BAF is determined at time point T, then it uses the NBE and PGE at time point T.

4. To represent the rate of change at a particular time (i.e., the marginal rate of change or what the 2014 Framework referred to as the per period value) the subscript Δt is used to signify the change between two times (e.g., t1 and t2). If the time being considered is T, the time when the effects of the biogenic harvest ceases to increase, then the subscript is ΔT, which by definition would be zero mass difference per area per time.

5. To indicate the sum of the values over a time interval 0 to t years the subscript Σt is used and the subscript ΣT is used it indicates the sum of values over the interval from time 0 to T. This timeframe was not included in the 2014 Framework, but we find that it should be considered as it reflects the long-term effect of all the net carbon fluxes to and from the atmosphere caused by biogenic carbon harvest.

6. BAF is dimensionless regardless of the timeframe being used. For either the t or the Σt timeframe the units would be difference in stocks per area for NBE and cumulative emissions per area for PGE. The units of Δt terms would be in stocks difference per area per time.

7. In addition to clarifying the concepts concerning time, the new terminology makes the relationship of the processes used in treating the data mathematically clearer. If one starts at the t level, then going to the Δt level is analogous to solving the differential at time t. Conversely going to the Σt level from t is analogous to solving the integral over time period 0 to t. One also goes from the Δt to the t level by "integration" and the Σt to the t level by solving the "differential." Hence all the terms become clearly related to one another in the new system.

The NBE, PGE and BAF Equations

The generic formula for calculating BAF from NBE (net biogenic emissions) and PGE (potential gross emissions) is the same as in the 2014 Framework regardless of the system boundaries and timeframe used:

$$BAF_x = NBE_x / PGE_x \qquad \text{(Eq. B-1)}$$

To keep the versions separate requires that the timeframe and system boundaries be indicated by a subscript (indicated in this case by x). All are ultimately derived from the differences in carbon stocks between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. The following sections describe the equations for each timeframe, how they are used and how they relate to one another starting with the version for a time point.

Equations using the t (any point in time) timeframe

The timeframe most closely related to the differences in carbon stocks between the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario uses t. If the BAF is calculated for any point in time (t) for system boundary B the BAF equation is:

$$BAF_{Bt}=NBE_{Bt}/PGE_{Bt} \qquad \text{(Eq. B-2)}$$

where NBE_{Bt} and PGE_{Bt} represent the carbon stocks difference at time t and the cumulative potential gross emissions up to time t, respectively. The difference in carbon stocks between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios at time t represents the cumulative net biogenic emissions up to time t and is therefore equivalent to cumulative net biogenic emissions-based concept presented in the 2014 Framework.
The sum of potential gross emissions using the t timeframe is:

$$PGE_{Bt} = \sum_{t=0}^{t} PGE_{\Delta t} \qquad \text{(Eq. B-3)}$$

where $PGE_{\Delta t}$ is the annual release of carbon related to biogenic carbon combustion for energy or heat.

NBE_t is based on the difference in carbon stocks between the reference scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario at time t. At the most aggregated level the NBE formula for time t and boundary condition B would be:

$$NBE_{Bt}=TC_{reference\ t} - TC_{policy\ t} \qquad \text{(Eq. B-4)}$$

where TC stands for terrestrial carbon and NBE_{Bt} represents the difference in carbon stocks between reference scenario (reference) and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario (policy) at time t. The reason the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario is subtracted from reference scenario is to provide the correct sign: a loss of carbon stocks caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario would lead to an addition to the atmosphere and hence is given a positive NBE. Conversely a gain in carbon stocks caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario would lead to a loss from the atmosphere and hence is given a negative NBE.

If the terrestrial carbon is subdivided then:

$$NBE_{Bt}= (CL_{reference\ t}- CL_{policy\ t}) + (CD_{reference\ t}- CD_{policy\ t}) + (CS_{reference\ t}- CS_{policy\ t}) + (CP_{reference\ t}- CP_{policy\ t}) + (CW_{reference\ t}- CW_{policy\ t}) + (TL_{reference\ t}- TL_{policy\ t}) \qquad \text{(Eq. B-5)}$$

where carbon is tracked as separate live (CL), dead (CD), soil (CS), products (CP), waste stocks (CW), and transportation loss (TL) stocks.

If the BAF is solved at time T, the point at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenario ceases to grow, then the equations are the same but the subscript used changes to T.

Equations using the Δt (change at any point in time) timeframe

As noted above the annual release of carbon related to biogenic carbon combustion for energy or heat is defined as $PGE_{\Delta t}$. This term can be summed to represent the cumulative PGE up to time t (i.e., PGE_t). To determine T it is necessary to determine when the difference in carbon stocks between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenario ceases to change. This is best done by calculating the annual rate at which the difference in scenarios is changing analogous to determining the derivative of the carbon stocks difference. When this rate of increase in the difference is equal to zero (or for practical purposes approaches zero), then the "full" effects of the policy must have become evident and time T has been reached. The rate of change (Δ) in the difference in carbon stocks between the reference scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario at time t for a given system boundary B can be computed as:

$$NBE_{B\Delta t} = \Delta(TC_{reference\ t} - TC_{policy\ t}) \qquad \text{(Eq. B-6)}$$

Expanded out, assuming a time step of one year it would be: $\Delta(TC_{reference\ t} - TC_{policy\ t}) = (TC_{reference\ t} - TC_{policy\ t}) - (TC_{reference\ t-1} - TC_{policy\ t-1})$ (Eq. B-7)

which is the change in the carbon stocks difference between scenarios between time t and t-1. If a time step other than one year, for example 5 years, is used then it would be the rate of change over that interval (e.g., Δ/5 years) instead.

The annual change (i.e., Δt) equation can be converted to the NBE at time t for boundary condition B as follows:

$$NBE_{Bt} = \sum_{t=0}^{t} \Delta(TC_{reference\ t} - TC_{policy\ t}) = \sum_{t=0}^{t} NBE_{B\Delta t} \qquad \text{(Eq. B-8)}$$

which is the sum of the annual change in difference in the terrestrial carbon stocks between the reference scenario and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario from year zero to year t.

If terrestrial carbon been subdivided into major stocks of carbon (e.g., stocks of live (CL), dead (CD), soil (CS), products (CP), waste stocks (CW), and transportation loss (TL) stocks) it can be summed into an overall rate of change using:

$$NBE_{B\Delta t} = \Delta(CLrt - CLpt) + \Delta(CDrt - CDpt) + \Delta(CSrt - CSpt) + \Delta(CPrt - CPpt) + \Delta(CWrt - CWpt) + \Delta(TLrt - TLpt) \qquad \text{(Eq. B-9)}$$

Where r indicates the reference and p the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.

To "integrate" the subdivided stocks to the t timeframe and terrestrial stocks level, then the following equation can be used:

$$NBE_{Bt} = \sum_{t=0}^{t} \Delta((CLrt + CDrt + CSrt + CPrt + CWrt + TLrt) - (CLpt + CDpt + CSpt + CPpt + CWpt + TLpt)) \quad \text{(Eq. B-10)}$$

Other variations of the equations are possible, but the point is that these sets of formulae can be subdivided or aggregated and moved between timeframes readily.

The BAF for this annualized change (Δt) timeframe for a given system boundary B is:

$$BAF_{B\Delta t} = NBE_{B\Delta t} / PGE_{B\Delta t} \quad \text{(Eq. B-11)}$$

This version of the BAF is useful to examine the time course of how potential gross emissions and the differences in carbon stocks between the two scenarios relate to one another. Typically the magnitude of $BAF_{B\Delta t}$ is highest immediately following implementation of the policy and when T is reached $BAF_{B\Delta t}$ approaches zero whether or not the policy causes a carbon gain or a carbon loss relative to the reference scenario. On its own, $BAF_{B\Delta t}$ fails to represent the long-term effect of biogenic carbon use.

It is possible to scale $BAF_{B\Delta t}$ to BAF_t by assuming that the $PGE_{B\Delta t}$ is constant. Although this is not precisely true, examination of the cases in Appendices C and D indicates that it is a good first approximation of the temporal pattern of $PGE_{B\Delta t}$. Further, $PGE_{\Delta t}$ can be assumed to be equal to 1.

Since $BAF_{\Delta t}$ is the ratio of the $NBE_{\Delta t}$ and $PGE_{\Delta t}$ terms and the latter has a value of 1, one can derive the $NBE_{\Delta t}$ term from $BAF_{\Delta t}$ as follows:

$$BAF_{\Delta t} = NBE_{\Delta t} / PGE_{\Delta t} \quad \text{(Eq. B-12)}$$

which since $PGE_{\Delta t}$ is assumed to be 1 is:

$$NBE_{\Delta t} = BAF_{\Delta t} \quad \text{(Eq. B-13)}$$

The final equation approximating BAF_t is therefore:

$$BAF_t = \sum_{t=0}^{t} BAF_{\Delta t} / t \quad \text{(Eq. B-14)}$$

This means that $BAF_{B\Delta t}$ can be scaled to BAF_t using a moving or running average of $BAF_{B\Delta t}$ from time 0 to time t. This is equivalent to EPA's proposed average per time period BAF.

Equations using the Σt (sum over time period) timeframe

An additional timeframe not considered in the 2014 Framework is to consider the sum of the stock differences and potential gross emissions over a time period as opposed to a single point in time. This is signified by the Σt subscript. The BAF using this timeframe for system boundaries B is:

$$BAF_{B\Sigma t} = NBE_{B\Sigma t} / PGE_{B\Sigma t} \quad \text{(Eq. B-15)}$$

where

$$NBE_{B\Sigma t} = \sum_{t=0}^{t} NBE_{Bt} \qquad \text{(Eq. B-16)}$$

and

$$PGE_{B\Sigma t} = \sum_{t=0}^{t} PGE_{Bt} \qquad \text{(Eq. B-17)}$$

or alternatively the area under the NBE_{Bt} and PGE_{Bt} curves.

It is possible to scale BAF_t to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ by assuming that the PGE_t is constant. Although this is not precisely true, examination of the cases in Appendices C and D indicates that it is a good first approximation of the temporal pattern of PGE_t. Further, $PGE_{\Delta t}$ can be assumed to be equal to 1 and PGE_t is therefore equal to t.

Since BAF_t is the ratio of the sum of the NBE_t and PGE_t terms and the latter is the time t, one can derive the NBE_t term from BAF_t as follows:

$$BAF_t = NBE_t / PGE_t \qquad \text{(Eq. B-18)}$$

which can be rearranged as:

$$NBE_t = BAF_t * PGE_t \qquad \text{(Eq. B-19)}$$

or since PGE_t can be represented by time t:

$$NBE_t = BAF_t * t \qquad \text{(Eq. B-20)}$$

The final equation approximating $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ is therefore:

$$BAF_{\Sigma t} \approx \sum_{t=0}^{t} BAF_t * t / \sum_{t=0}^{t} t \qquad \text{(Eq. B-21)}$$

The rationale for computing $BAF_{\Sigma t}$: Residence time

$BAF_{\Sigma t}$ is a modification to the BAF formula that represents a significant departure from any of EPA's approaches. Given that a ton of carbon contributes to radiative forcing every year it resides in the atmosphere, this modified $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ takes account of when emissions were contributed to the atmosphere. In some ways, we can think of this as "residence time." Initial biogenic emissions are modified over time by changes in carbon on the land. Their contribution to radiative forcing at any given point in time

is a function of when those emissions took place. To take account of this time course of emissions, the proposed $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ would accumulate the annual differences in carbon stocks on the land over the entire time horizon. By contrast, the EPA's approach to a cumulative BAF would simply account for the difference in carbon *stocks by the end of the time horizon*. By cumulating annual differences across the entire projection period, the proposed $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ would yield a measure of "ton-years" as a proxy for differences in carbon stocks each year. It can also be thought of as a "total, cumulative" BAF. By taking the time path and "residence times" of emissions into account, this total cumulative BAF is a measure that provides an indicator of the contribution of biogenic emissions to radiative forcing or the overall balance between incoming solar radiation and energy radiated back to space.

Another way to explain the rationale for computing $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ is that it represents the *average effect* of harvesting a ton of biogenic feedstock over the entire time period t. After cumulating all the differences in carbon stock, the resulting sum is divided by T. This is opposed to the EPA's approach of taking the effect of harvesting carbon *at time t* (i.e., what is represented by BAF_t). While $BAF_{\Delta t}$ can be approximately scaled to BAF_t, by computing a running average, this methodology does not work particularly well when scaling BAF_{Bt} to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$. See Appendix C for a graphical examples.

Note that this method ignores other aspects of the carbon cycle. Neither the EPA's framework nor any modifications we offer take into account the decay of carbon molecules in the atmosphere over time or oceanic uptake of carbon. Thus all BAF calculations are based only on "debits" or tons of carbon added to the atmosphere or the "credits" removed by the land, rather than any "credits" associated with atmospheric decay or oceanic uptake.

Analytical solutions to Net Biogenic Emission (NBE) equations

While simulation models could be used to estimate the temporal changes in NBE_{BT}, the fact that the formulation is based on stocks that have inputs and outputs has major advantages and would allow one to intuitively check the sign and magnitude of NBE_{BT} without elaborate modeling, particularly in the case that the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios eventually reach a steady-state.

Under steady-state conditions the input (I) and output (O) of carbon is equal. I=O

Where both I and O have units of mass per area per time. The output is determined by the proportion being lost per unit time (*k*) and the amount stored when the system is in steady-state (TCss):

$$O = k\, TC_T \qquad \text{(Eq. B-22)}$$

Where TCss has units of mass per area. Therefore, the steady-state achieved at time T can be predicted as:

$$TC_T = I/k \qquad \text{(Eq. B-23)}$$

This simple formulation applies to all the stocks storing carbon (and the virtual stocks related to substitutions if that is added) and can be used to test whether the reference scenario or the increased

biomass feedstock demand scenario will store more carbon. In the case of increased harvest intensity, k must increase by n and since:

$$TC_{reference\ T} = I/k > TC_{policy\ T} = I/(k(1+n)) \quad \text{(EQ. B-24)}$$

then NBE_T must be positive. Conversely, if the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario also includes an increase in I equal to n then it is possible for there to be no loss in carbon because:

$$TC_{reference\ T} = I/k = TC_{policy\ T} = I(1+n)/(k(1+n)) \quad \text{(Eq. B-25)}$$

In the case in which I and k do not change, for example when the losses in two cases are equivalent (e.g., burning in a power plant versus burning in the field), then there is also no new net loss of carbon.

$$TC_{reference\ T} = I/k = TC_{policy\ T} = I/k \quad \text{(Eq. B-26)}$$

Finally, when there is just an increase in I then there is a gain of carbon in the system since:

$$TC_{reference\ T} = I/k < TC_{policy\ T} = I(1+n)/k \quad \text{(Eq. B-27)}$$

This might reflect the case of negative leakage, e.g. if new forest area is increased and effectively increases I. Examples of how these calculations can be used are illustrated in Appendix C.

System Boundaries

The alternative framework equations could be used for several sets of systems boundaries:

1. Direct biophysical effects which would consider the direct effects of harvest on the area harvested for biofuels within a region.

2. Indirect effects mediated through market signals which considers responses outside the areas not directly harvested for biofuels. Using this boundary condition would essentially deal with the leakage question without confounding stocks or emissions with system boundaries.

3. Atmospheric responses in which the temporal effects on greenhouse gas warming of the atmosphere of net carbon added or removed by biofuels activity would be considered.

4. Full life cycle in which the effects of substitution for fossil fuels would be considered. While this might be handled by including a substitution stock, it would be specified in the NBE and BAF terms as a change in the system boundary.

Subdividing Terrestrial Carbon Stocks

Although one could consider all terrestrial carbon stocks in aggregation, the different controls and timing of sub-stocks suggests that it may be better to treat each separately. To address the stocks in the original framework the following carbon stocks (or something like these) would be needed: live, dead, soil, products, waste stocks, and transportation loss stocks. These stocks could be subdivided further as

needed. The leakage term would not be needed because it is addressed by changing the system boundaries. This would avoid the current confounding of stocks and system boundaries (i.e., the LEAK term influences the live, dead, soil, products, waste, and loss stocks; it not a separate kind of stock or flux as indicated in the 2014 Framework).

The inclusion of product stocks is necessary because the current framework treats all products as having the same infinite life-span, a scientifically unjustifiable assumption. The decision to not include product life-spans appears to be related to a concern that power plants using biogenic carbon should not be responsible for the actions of those creating products because this is an indirect effect. However, leakage is also an indirect effect and is being considered; if indirect effects are considered, then all indirect effects should be considered: the boundary conditions should be consistent once specified. It is not clear that the use of fate of products is beyond the control of the power plant in that the power plant can select products to which the carbon is sent. By not discriminating among products, the use of a long lasting product will have same consequences as a short lasting product. The current framework also ignores the potential effects of biogenic carbon harvest on past accumulations of product stocks. If harvest is diverted into biofuel feedstocks, then the size of the products carbon stock accumulated from past harvests would have to decrease, leading to a net emission of carbon to the atmosphere. However, the current framework cannot detect such an emission.

The inclusion of transportation losses as a stock would address another problem with the current framework which assumes that all losses are instantaneous. This simplifying assumption has no basis in science and inflates the PGE term, but does not address the stocks. By tracking the changes in this stock, the NBE equation would be more consistent.

While most of the stocks can be dealt with on a carbon dioxide basis, the waste stock (i.e., carbon that is disposed of and not deliberately used) involves the release of methane. This is problematical in that methane has a higher greenhouse gas warming potential than carbon dioxide. This could be dealt with in several ways. Waste carbon that is subject to loss via methane could be tracked separately from waste carbon that is lost as carbon dioxide. This would include both woody waste, depending on the manner in which it is disposed, and municipal solid waste. The stocks of these two waste stocks could be adjusted to reflect difference in stocks in terms of greenhouse gas warming. An alternative would be solve the waste carbon contribution not as a change in stocks, but as a change in fluxes. However, this would also require separating waste into the portion generating carbon dioxide versus methane and would introduce non-analogous terms into the NBE formula.

APPENDIX C: A GRAPHICAL COMPARISON BETWEEN BAF_T AND $BAF_{\Sigma T}$

This appendix provides a series of graphs to allow a visual comparison of $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ to the EPA's BAF_T. As shown in Figure C-1, $NBE_{\Sigma t}$ includes the shaded area between the average landscape carbon stocks for the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario vis-à-vis the reference scenario. By contrast, the EPA's concept of NBEt is shown as the vertical distance between these two lines, meaning they looked at the cumulative difference *only at time t*. The $NBE_{\Sigma t}$ is again shown in Figure C-2 as the shaded area under the orange line which represents the cumulative difference in stocks. Figure C-4 plots the $NBE_{\Delta t}$ and $PGE_{\Delta t}$ curves to indicate the timing of emissions and identify T, the time when the policy effect is completed. Summing the values under each of these curves results in Figure C-5 which dramatically shows the difference between carbon stocks *over a period of time (ΣT)* versus *at a point in time (T).*

It is necessary to distinguish between these cumulative measures and the versions of BAF stemming from them, hence the different subscripts. EPA's "cumulative" BAF is by *a point in time*. In the case shown in Figure C-5 for time T, EPA's BAF_T is calculated by dividing the distance B on the upper graph by distance D on the lower graph (i.e., BAF_T = B/D or $BAF_T = NBE_T/PGE_T$). This represents the net effects *at time T.* To estimate long-term average effects on what might be considered on a ton-year basis, one could use the areas under the NBEt and PGEt curves as represented by areas A on the upper graph and C on the lower graph to determine the BAF (i.e., $BAF_{\Sigma T}$= A/C or $BAF_{\Sigma T}= NBE_{\Sigma T}/PGE_{\Sigma T}$).

For each figure below, an explanation of how the terms are used and what they represent is provided.



Figure C-1: A graphical illustration of Net Biogenic Emissions at any time (t), when differences cease to increase (T) and over time (∑T)

In Figure C-1 the average landscape carbon stocks for the policy (which includes additional biofuel-related harvests) and the reference scenario are represented over time by the dashed and solid lines, respectively. The difference between these two scenarios at any time t (i.e., little t) is indicated by the distance between the scenarios indicated by NBE_t. The time when the difference in the carbon stocks between the two scenarios ceases to increase is indicated by T (i.e., capital T). The difference between these two scenarios at time T is indicated by NBE_T. The sum of all the differences up to time T (the time the differences in carbon stocks ceases to grow) is represented by the shaded area and is termed $NBE_{\Sigma T}$ (i.e., the sum of NBE_t up to time T). For a fuller examination of Case 1 see Appendix D.



Figure C-2: The carbon stock differences (NBEt) between the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenarios as a function of time t

In Figure C-2 the carbon stock difference between the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenarios is represented by the orange line and can be thought of as the cumulative emission to the atmosphere caused by the policy. That is because conservation of mass suggests that if the carbon is not stored in the landscape, it has been released to the atmosphere. Therefore, the difference in stocks between the two scenarios is caused by emission to the atmosphere. Since the atmosphere is the reference point a loss of carbon caused by the policy is assigned a positive value (as in this case); whereas a gain of carbon in the landscape would be assigned a negative value (see Case 2 in Appendix D). The rate at which this difference is growing each year is represented by $NBE_{\Delta t}$ which might be thought of as the marginal rate of change of the stocks differences. The sum of all the differences up to time T (the time the differences in carbon stocks ceases to grow) is represented by the shaded area and is termed $NBE_{\Sigma T}$ (i.e., the sum of NBE_t up to time T) and is sometimes called the "wedge".



Figure C-3: The annual change in NBEt (called NBE$_{\Delta t}$ and depicted by solid line)

Figure C-3 shows that as the policy is implemented NBE$_{\Delta t}$ steeply rises but gradually falls off approaching zero by year 90. This indicates that effects of the policy have been largely realized by this time which is represented by T (i.e., big or cap T). The dashed line represents arithmetic average NBE and is calculated by dividing the difference in stocks between the two scenarios at time T by T (i.e., NBE$_T$/T). For this example, the average does not adequately portray the time course that carbon is being added to the atmosphere. In contrast, NBE$_{\Delta t}$ indicates the largest additions to the atmosphere occur immediately after the policy is implemented and the additions largely cease after time T.



Figure C-4: BAF's calculated by dividing the Net Biogenic Emissions (NBE) by the Potential Gross Emissions (PGE) associated with burning biogenic carbon for energy.

In Figure C-4 the annual changes in $NBE_{\Delta t}$ and $PGE_{\Delta t}$ are represented by the dashed and solid lines, respectively). One can see that if the BAF is calculated at 5 years it is considerably higher) than if it is calculated at T years (. Examining BAF using this timeframe does not reflect the overall effect of the policy over time period T, the value of which lies somewhere between these extremes. The utility of examining NBE and PGE using the Δt timeframe is that it indicates the timing of the emissions (or uptake) and can be used to identify T, the time when the policy effect is completed. Summing the values under each of these curves results in the curves depicted in Figure C-5.



Figure C-5: The cumulative effects of a policy represented at a point in time (T) or over a period of time (ΣT).

As depicted in Figure C-5, the cumulative effects of a policy can be represented at a point in time (T) or over a period of time (ΣT). Since both are "cumulative" we need a way to distinguish them and the versions of BAF stemming from them, hence the different subscripts. If the timeframe being used is at a point in time, in this case time T, then the BAF is calculated by dividing the distance B on the upper graph by distance D on the lower graph (i.e., BAF_T = B/D or BAF_T = NBE_T/PGE_T). This results in a value of 0.211 and while this represents the net effects at time T, it does not represent the net effects over time period T. To estimate these long-term average effects on what might be considered on a ton-year basis, one would use the areas under the NBE_t and PGE_t curves as represented by areas A on the upper graph and C on the lower graph to determine the BAF (i.e., $BAF_{\Sigma T}$= A/C or $BAF_{\Sigma T}$=

$NBE_{\Sigma T}/PGE_{\Sigma T}$). This results in a value of 0.334, which reflects the fact that the policy released most of the carbon long before T is reached.



Figure C-6: The results of various ways BAFs can be calculated.

Figure C-6 shows the results of the various ways that BAFs can be calculated. These BAF are calculated for a range of times (i.e., t), but the value at T can be determined using the vertical arrow. $BAF_{\Delta t}$ reflects the year to year changes and is useful in identifying time T. However, because it is an "instantaneous" variable it does not represent the long-term effect of the policy. Solving the BAF at time T captures some aspects of the cumulative effects of the policy (BAF_T) as does an approximation of BAF_T using a running average of $BAF_{\Delta t}$ which indicates $BAF_{\Delta t}$ can be "scaled" up to BAF_t. This version of BAF appears to be similar that proposed in the 2014 EPA Framework documents and referred to there as the cumulative BAF. Solving the BAF over the time period T as represented by $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ results in a higher value at time T reflecting the fact that the carbon release to the atmosphere are not all at time T, but occur gradually over time period T. Another way to address this gradual release is to approximate $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ from BAF_T using the method described in Appendix B. This approximation is quite similar to $BAF_{\Sigma T}$.

APPENDIX D: EXAMPLES OF WAYS THAT HARVEST CAN INFLUENCE THE STOCK OF CARBON

This appendix provides illustrative examples of various ways that additional biogenic carbon harvest could influence the stocks of carbon in a landscape over time. These examples range from relatively simple cases in which biogenic carbon harvest leads to a loss or gain of carbon in the landscape to a complex case in which an initial decline is followed by an eventual increase in carbon stocks. More complexity is added for two cases in which an environmental driver either leads to an increase or decrease in productivity over time. There are many other possible examples that could be explored, but these five examples provide insights into how the various PGE, NBE, and BAF relate to each other and respond to different situations.

While each case is described, one case (i.e., carbon loss) has been used in Appendix C to provide a graphical illustration of the various terms being proposed in the new formulation equations.

The terms proposed are derived and fully explained in Appendix B; however, a short summary follows:

PGE, NBE, and BAF are potential gross emissions, net biogenic emissions, and biogenic accounting factor, respectively. Each of these terms can be considered in multiple ways with respect to time and that is indicated by a subscript. To represent the value at any time the subscript t is used. To represent the rate of change at a particular time (i.e., the marginal rate of change) the subscript Δt is used. To indicate the time at which the effects of the biogenic harvest ceases to increase, the letter T is used. If T is used as a subscript it indicates values at time point T. To indicate the sum of the values over the interval T, the subscript ΣT is used. If the sum over an interval over t years is used, the subscript Σt is used to indicate that sums at various time intervals are being used. It is acknowledged that it would be simpler to not indicate which specific time concept is used; however not specifying the differences leads to confounding related concepts that need to be kept separate.

The following cases were generated using a simple input-output model programmed in Stella with one stock that represented the average stocks in the landscape. More complex models could have been used, however, the intent was not to be hyper-realistic—it was to provide illustrations of very general types of situations. For example, the carbon loss case could represent a situation in which harvest interval is shortened or harvest intensity is increased to provide more material for biogenic feedstock. It could also represent an increase in thinning or a diversion of long-live wood products into biofuels or many other situations. Examples of what the cases represent are provided as each case is described, but these examples are not intended to be exhaustive. It should also be borne in mind that these cases do not represent **what will** happen when biogenic carbon is harvested. They should be thought of as a sensitivity analysis to explore **what might** happen and how the various formulation terms that are being proposed might play out.

The illustrative simulations conducted here represent a landscape and the biogenic feedstock harvest is maintained over the entire 100 year period simulated to assess the policy effect. The units on the vertical axes are expressed in the average stock per area (i.e., Mg/ha or metric tonnes/ha). In addition, a 50 year period prior to biofuel harvest was also simulated. Year zero is defined as the year the policy of increased biofuel harvest was initiated. All the numbers generated for these cases started with the stocks

of carbon in two cases: a reference scenario to represent "business as usual" conditions without policy-induced feedstock harvesting and a increased biomass feedstock demand scenario to represent policy-induced increases in harvests of biogenic feedstocks. The model was parameterized to represent a hypothetical system dominated by a long-lived perennial such as trees. The absolute values of stocks should be taken as rough numbers and they are not intended to represent any particular system. Moreover, the relative response of many feedstocks (at least ones with harvest rotations over 20 years) are quite similar. Which means that if one wants to envision how a system with a 20 year response time acts one can divide the time axis by 4. Or if one wants to envision how a system with a 320 year response time acts one can multiply the time axis by 4.

Case 1: Loss of Carbon

This is a relative simple case in which harvest in a forest landscape is increased to provide biogenic feedstock. The input (i.e., the net primary production (NPP) or alternatively gross growth) to both the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios remains the same. The difference is that the outputs (i.e., removal of carbon from the land) from the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario are 20% higher than that for the reference scenario. Specifically, the rate-constant defining output (i.e. the annual carbon loss) was increased from 0.05 (≈5%) per year in the reference scenario to 0.06 (≈6%) per year in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario to represent an increased harvest rate. This general case could represent a number of specific situations including: a decrease in the harvest interval; an increase in harvest intensity (additional thinnings or salvage); or alternatively it could represent a diversion of harvested wood from long-term wood products that stock carbon to biofuel use that does not, essentially shortening the life-time of terrestrial carbon.

Because this is the first case examined, additional details on terms and calculations is provided here.



Figure D-1: Carbon Loss Case

Figure D-1. shows that the landscape level average carbon stocks when harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decreases in stocks compared to the reference scenario. Capital T indicates the time at which the differences between the scenarios ceases to change. The difference between scenarios at time T is NBE_T, the sum of the differences (i.e., the "wedge") is indicated by the shaded area and $NBE_{\Sigma T}$.

Since the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario results in a higher proportion of carbon being harvested, the carbon stock of the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario declines relative to the reference scenario (Figure D-1). In theory an increase in losses from the landscape from 0.05 per year to 0.06 per year should lead to the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario eventually storing 0.05/0.06=83% of the carbon of the reference scenario. The simulations resulted in exactly the same difference. This difference does not expand endlessly, but appears to cease growing 80-90 years after the policy in introduced.

The time course of $NBE_{\Delta t}$ indicates that the differences between the two scenarios largely ceases to grow at 80 years, which, as discussed in Appendix B, indicates that T is 80 years (Figure D-2). It is also evident that the greatest loss of carbon in this case occurs immediately after the policy is adopted. The annual potential gross emissions does not stay constant. This slight decline in the absolute amount harvested and used as biofuel is caused by the negative feedback present between harvest and the landscape. If a constant proportion of the landscape carbon stock is harvested and this harvest reduces the stock to be harvested, then absolute amount harvested must decline somewhat as a new age structure is imposed on the landscape.



Figure D-2: Rate at which differences between reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing ($NBE_{\Delta t}$) and annual potential gross emissions $PGE_{\Delta t}$).

Figure D-2 shows the rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing ($NBE_{\Delta t}$) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year ($PGE_{\Delta t}$) when there is a loss of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario.

When the differences in scenario stocks and the cumulative potential emissions at any time is examined the differences (i.e., the wedge) between the scenario ceases to grow, but the cumulative potential gross emissions continues to increase as long as harvests occur (Figure D-3). This indicates that if one were to use the ratio of the NBE_t and PGE_t terms to calculate the BAF_t, then its value decreases over time.



Figure D-3: Time course of the difference between scenarios (NBE_t) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGE_t).

The BAF term can be calculated using different temporal concepts, the result of these calculations is shown in Figure D-4. Regardless of how the BAF is calculated, the value rises and then declines over time. Considered over a long enough time period, all these BAFs would approach zero. The marginal rate that the BAF changes, as indicated by $BAF_{\Delta t}$, approaches zero at 80 years, reflecting the fact that the difference in stocks between the two scenarios ceases to change at this point. This $BAF_{\Delta t}$ value corresponds to EPA's "per-period" BAF because it takes into account only changes in emissions at a single point in time. However, using $BAF_{\Delta t}$ values during the latter part of the time period would ignore the times when by $BAF_{\Delta t}$ was a positive number. Calculating the BAF at the end of a time period is represented by the BAF_t curve. This value corresponds to EPA's "cumulative" BAF and equals 0.235 at time T. BAF_t reflects some of the "cumulative" effects as it is based on the cumulative difference in stocks and the cumulative emissions (the ratio of NBEt and PGEt) at a given time. However, it does not represent all the cumulative effects on the atmosphere (see below). It can be approximated by calculating a running average of $BAF_{\Delta t}$ over a time period which at time T has a value of 0.225.

The SAB is proposing that EPA consider the "total cumulative" effects of the differences of atmospheric carbon for each year over the entire time period T to account for both the long-term outcome as well as

the time path of biogenic carbon emissions in which initial emissions are modified over time by changes in carbon on the land. To calculate $BAF_{\Sigma T}$, one sums the NBE_t and PGE_t values over time period T as represented by the $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ curve. This version of the BAF does not rise as high as the BAF_t curve but it is considerably higher at time T (0.362). An approximation of $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ that scales BAF_t behaves similarly to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ for the later times, but it is slightly higher early on; it has a value of 0.357 at time T.



Figure D-4: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case in which biofuel harvest reduces carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario.

Case 2: Gain of Carbon

This is another simple case and although there is an increase in carbon losses similar to Case 1 due to increased harvesting, there is also an increase in the input in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario of 50%. This increased input of carbon could derive from a range of specific situations: use of a growing stock that grows faster; practices that improve productivity such as irrigation or fertilization; and planting on lands that had shorter-lived plants. Theoretically the greater increase in inputs (50%) relative to outputs (20%) should lead to the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario eventually storing 25% more carbon than the reference scenario (specifically the ratio of inputs to outputs for the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario are 1.5/0.06=25 and that for the reference scenario is 1/0.05=20).

In the case in which the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario gains carbon relative to the reference scenario, the timing of the changes is similar to that observed in Case 1 with the differences between the scenarios ceasing to change in 80-90 years; however, the carbon stocks in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario are 24.9% higher than that for the reference scenario (Figure D-5).



Figure D-5: Carbon gain case

Figure D-5 shows the landscape level average carbon stocks for the case when harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a increases in stocks compared to the reference scenario. Capital T indicates the time at which the differences between the scenarios ceases to change. The difference between scenarios at time t is NBE_t, the sum of the differences (i.e., the "wedge") is indicated by the shaded area and $NBE_{\Sigma T}$

The time course of $NBE_{\Delta t}$ indicates that the differences between the two scenarios ceases to grow at 78 years, which indicates that T is 78 years (Figure D-6). It is also evident that the greatest gain of carbon in this case occurs immediately after the policy is adopted. Note that a gain in landscape carbon is represented as a loss to the atmosphere; therefore $NBE_{\Delta t}$ is a negative number. The annual potential gross emissions does not stay constant in this case. There is an increase in the absolute amount harvested and used as biofuel that is caused by the fact that if the actions are taken in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario to, for example, increase growth rates which results in more carbon to harvest.



Figure D-6: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year when there is a gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario.

While the differences in scenario stocks (NBE_t) stabilizes (i.e., ceases to grow), the cumulative potential gross emissions continues to increase as long as harvests occur (Figure D-7). This indicates that if one were to use the ratio of the NBE_t and PGE_t terms to calculate the BAF_t, then its value decreases as time increases. Note that this also occurs in Case 1 when carbon losses are induced by biofuel harvest.



Figure D-7: The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when there is a gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario.

As displayed in Case 1, the BAF term can be calculated using different temporal concepts. For the carbon gain case, the result of these calculations is shown in Figure D-8. Regardless of how the BAF is calculated, the value falls and then rises over time and considered over a long enough time period all these BAFs would approach zero. The marginal rate that the BAF changes, as indicated by $BAF_{\Delta t}$, approaches zero (-0.011) at 78 years, reflecting the fact that the difference in stocks between the two scenarios ceases to grow at this point. However, using $BAF_{\Delta t}$ values during the latter part of the time period would ignore the times when by $BAF_{\Delta t}$ was a negative number. The BAF_t curve and its approximation using a running average of $BAF_{\Delta t}$ over a time period does not equal zero at time T (-0.262and -0.279)). While these BAFs reflect some of the "cumulative" effects at a given time, it does not address the "total cumulative" effects over the entire time period T as represented by the $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ curve. The $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ version of the BAF does not fall as low as the BAF_t curve and it is considerably lower at time T (-0.422). An approximation of $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ that scales BAF_t behaves similarly to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ and has a value of -0.423 at time T.



Figure D-8: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case in which biofuel harvest increases carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario.

Case 3: Complex Response: Loss then Gain of Carbon

This case is more complex than Cases 1 and 2 because it indicates what might happen if there is an initial loss of carbon, but this is countered by practices that eventually increase the productivity of the landscape in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario. This might include planting additional area, using faster growing plants, or fertilization. The difference relative to Case 2 is that there is a 5 year lag between the initial increase in harvest and subsequent increases in the landscape inputs due to human intervention.

In the case in which the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario initially loses and then eventually gains carbon relative to the reference scenario, the differences between the scenarios is a combination of Cases 1 and 2, with a short period of carbon loss followed by a longer period of carbon gain that ceases at 80 years (Figure D-9). For this case the timeframe used to evaluate the policy effect is absolutely crucial: too short a period would indicate a loss, but ignoring the short-term loss would overestimate the net gain over the time period T. The longer the lag in the practices leading to the ultimate gain, the more important the timeframe likely becomes.



Figure D-9: Carbon loss then gain case

Figure D-9 shows the landscape level average carbon stocks for the case in which harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to an initial decrease, but an eventual increase in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario. Capital T indicates the time at which the differences between the scenarios ceases to change. The difference between scenarios at time t is NBE_t, the sum of the differences (i.e., the "wedge") is indicated by the shaded area and $NBE_{\Sigma T}$.

The time course of $NBE_{\Delta t}$ indicates that the differences between the two scenarios ceases to grow at 84 years, which indicates that T is 84 years (Figure D-10). The greatest loss of carbon in this case occurs immediately after the policy is adopted, but the greatest gain is immediately after the practices that increase landscape inputs is implemented. The annual potential gross emissions does not stay constant and reflects a combination of what happened in Cases 1 and 2. The slight decline in the absolute amount harvested and used as biofuel is caused by the negative feedback present between harvest and the landscape. However, the slight increase in potential gross emissions each year is caused by the fact that increasing input leads to more carbon to be harvested from the landscape.



Figure D-10: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential grow emission from biofuel use each year when there is a loss then a gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario

While the differences in scenario stocks (NBE_t) stabilizes (i.e., ceases to grow), the cumulative potential gross emissions continues to increase as long as harvests occur (Figure D-11). This indicates that if one were to use the ratio of the NBE_t and PGE_t terms to calculate the BAF_t, then its value decreases over time. Note that this also occurs in Cases 1 and 2.



Figure D-11: The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when there is a loss then gain of carbon caused by the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario.

As in the other cases the BAF term can be calculated using different temporal concepts, the result of these calculations for the carbon gain case is shown in Figure D-12. Regardless of how the BAF is calculated the value rises, falls and then rises over time and considered over a long enough time period all these BAFs would approach zero. In this particular case the values of the BAFs are similar at time T. The marginal rate that the BAF changes, as indicated by $BAF_{\Delta t}$, approaches zero (-0.007) at 84 years, reflecting the fact that the difference in stocks between the two scenarios ceases to grow at this point. However, using this term as the BAF is very misleading because it ignores the times when by $BAF_{\Delta t}$ was a very different number. The BAF_t curve and its approximation using a running average of $BAF_{\Delta t}$ over a time period does not quite equal zero at time T (-0.00917 and -0.0922, respectively). While these BAFs reflect some of the "cumulative" effects at a given time, it does not address the "total cumulative" effects of the additions over the entire time period T as represented by the $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ curve. The $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ version of the BAF is more dampened than the BAF_t curve but is about the same value at time T (-0.116). An approximation of $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ that scales BAF_t behaves similarly to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ and has a value of -0.1117 at time T.



Figure D-12: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case in which biofuel harvest decreases and then increases carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario.

Case 4: No Steady-State-Increasing System Input

Cases 1-3 represented situations in which the underlying environmental controls of the landscape were constant (e.g., temperature, precipitation, nutrient availability). In Case 4, the environment is changing in a way that enhances the ability of system to remove carbon from the atmosphere over time. This might represent a situation in which nitrogen availability is increasing due to atmospheric inputs related to pollution which would in turn lead to an increase in net productivity and hence carbon inputs to both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios. It might also represent the effect of carbon dioxide fertilization due to increasing concentrations of this gas in the atmosphere.

In this case a difference in carbon stocks develops between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios; however, the carbon stocks of both scenarios is increasing over time (Figure D-13). Unlike Cases 1-3, defining T is challenging, in part because the difference between the scenarios continues to expand even at the end of the simulation period. However, after 90 years the difference between scenarios is not growing at a fast rate, and we have assumed that T would be 90 years in this case. However, defining T in a case such as this remains an open question.



Figure D-13: The landscape level average carbon stocks for the case in which harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decrease in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario, but both scenarios have increasing carbon stocks relative to time 0.

Figure D-13 shows the landscape level average carbon stocks for the case in which harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decrease in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario, but both scenarios have increasing carbon stocks relative to time 0. Capital T indicates the time at which the differences between the scenarios ceases to change. The difference between scenarios at time t is NBE_t, the sum of the differences (i.e., the "wedge") is indicated by the shaded area and $NBE_{\Sigma T}$.

The time course of $NBE_{\Delta t}$ indicates that the differences between the two scenarios continues to grow after the approximation of T is reached at 74 years, but that the rate at which the difference is increasing is relatively constant. This is indicated by the fact that $NBE_{\Delta t}$ asympotes to a value of 0.034 MgC/ha/year by 90 years (Figure D-14). This may indicate when the effect caused by the policy has been completely realized; however, it is the interaction of the policy with the underlying environmental driver that prevents $NBE_{\Delta t}$ from reaching zero. If the environment stabilizes, then one would expect $NBE_{\Delta t}$ to eventually reach zero. In this case we have assumed that T is 74 years, but one could argue it is never reached as long as the environment keeps changing in one direction relative to productivity controls. The greatest loss of carbon in this case occurs immediately after the policy is adopted, but loss continues the entire 100 year simulation period. The annual potential gross emissions does not stay constant and in fact steadily increases over time because increasing input leads to more carbon being harvested from the landscape.



Figure D-14: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have an increase in input related to an environmental change.

When the differences in scenario stocks and the cumulative potential emissions at any time is examined the differences between the scenarios continues to grow over the simulation period, but the cumulative potential gross emissions continues to increase at a much faster rate (Figure D-15). This indicates that if one were to use the ratio of the NBE_t and PGE_t terms to calculate the BAF_t, then its value decreases over time although not as quickly as in Cases 1-3.



Figure D-15: The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have an increase in input related to an environmental change.

As in the other cases the BAF term can be calculated using different temporal concepts, the result of these calculations for the case when landscape input steadily increase is shown in Figure D-16. Regardless of how the BAF is calculated the value rises and then falls over time. Unlike Cases 1-3 it is not clear that any of the BAFs will reach zero as long as the environment is causing landscape input to increase. In this particular case the values of the BAFs are very different at time T. The marginal rate that the BAF changes, as indicated by $BAF_{\Delta t}$, approaches 0.0751 at 74 years. The BAF_t curve and its approximation using a running average of $BAF_{\Delta t}$ over a time period are 0.271 and 0.279, respectively at time T. $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ curve is more dampened than the BAF_t curve and it has a higher value at time T (0.39). An approximation of $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ that scales BAF_t behaves similarly to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ for the later times, but it is slightly higher early on; it has a value of 0.39 at time T.

Despite the fact that inputs are changing the BAFs resulting from this case are only 9 to 15% higher than those for Case 1 for $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ and BAF_t , respectively This may indicate, that despite some underlying environmental changes and uncertainty about T, the BAF is similar to within 1 decimal place. It should be noted that some of this difference was due to a lower value of T being selected (although the rule to determine T was similar).



Figure D-16: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have an increase in input related to an environmental change.

Case 5: No Steady-State-Decreasing System Input

Case 5 represent a situation in which the environment for both scenarios is changing; however in this case the environment is becoming *less* favorable for landscape input and hence carbon storage. This might represent a case in which available moisture is decreasing due to climate change, leading to a decrease in NPP in both scenarios.

In this case a difference in carbon stocks develops between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios; however, the carbon stocks of both scenarios is decreasing over time (Figure D-17). As with Cases 4, defining T is challenging, in part because the difference between the scenarios continues to contract even at the end of the simulation period. However, after 90 years the difference between scenarios is not growing at a fast rate, and we have assumed that T would be 90 years in this case. However, how to define T in a case such as this remains an open question.



Figure D-17: The landscape level average carbon stocks for the case when increased harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decrease in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario, but both scenarios have decreasing carbon stocks relative to time 0 caused by an environmentally driven decline in inputs.

Figure D-17 shows the landscape level average carbon stocks for the case when increased harvest for biofuels (the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario) leads to a decrease in carbon stocks compared to the reference scenario, but both scenarios have decreasing carbon stocks relative to time 0 caused by an environmentally driven decline in inputs. Capital T indicates the time at which the differences between the scenarios ceases to change. The difference between scenarios at time t is NBE_t; the sum of the differences (i.e., the "wedge") is indicated by the shaded area and $NBE_{\Sigma T}$.

The time course of $NBE_{\Delta t}$ indicates that the differences between the two scenarios continues to shrink after T is reached, but that the rate at which the difference is decreasing is relatively constant. This is indicated by the fact that $NBE_{\Delta t}$ asympotes to a value of -0.0121 MgC/ha/year by the end of the 100 year simulation period (Figure D-18). As in Case 4 this may indicate that this when the effect caused by the policy has been completely realized; however, it is the interaction of the policy with the underlying environmental driver that prevents $NBE_{\Delta t}$ from reaching zero. If the environment stabilizes, then one would expect $NBE_{\Delta t}$ to eventually reach zero. In this case we have assumed that T is 76 years, but one could argue it is never reached as long as the environment keeps changing in one direction relative to productivity controls. much later. The greatest loss of carbon in this case occurs immediately after the policy is adopted and the loss starts to shrink 55 years after the policy is adopted and it continues the rest of the 100 year simulation period. The annual potential gross emissions does not stay constant and in fact steadily decreases over time because decreasing input leads to less carbon to be harvested from the landscape as time progresses.



Figure D-18: The rate at which the difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is growing (NBEΔt) and the potential gross emissions from biofuel use each year when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have a decrease in input related to an environmental change.

When the differences in scenario stocks and the cumulative potential emissions at any time is examined the differences (i.e., the wedge) between the scenarios continues to grow until 55 year after the policy shift, but after this point it decreases. This is caused by the fact that decreasing inputs are impacting both scenarios and they are converging on the same lower value. In contrast the cumulative potential gross emissions continues to increase the entire period although not as quickly as in Case 4 (Figure D-19).



Figure D-19:. The time course of the difference between scenarios (NBEt) and cumulative potential gross emissions (PGEt) when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have a decrease in landscape input related to an environmental

As in the other cases the BAF term can be calculated using different temporal concepts, the result of these calculations for the carbon gain case is shown in Figure D-20. Regardless of how the BAF is calculated the value rises and then falls over time. Unlike Cases 1-3, but similar to Case 4 it is not clear that any of the BAFs will reach zero as long as the environment is causing landscape input to decrease. In this particular case the values of the BAFs are very different at time T. The marginal rate that the BAF changes, as indicated by $BAF_{\Delta t}$, approaches -0.0504 at 76 years. The BAF_t curve and its approximation using a running average of $BAF_{\Delta t}$ over a time period are 0.231 and 0.202, respectively at time T. $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ curve is more dampened than the BAF_t curve and it has a higher value at time T (0.368). An approximation of $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ that scales BAF_t behaves similarly to $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ for the later times, but it is slightly higher early on; it has a value of 0.359 at time T. Despite the fact that inputs are changing the BAFs resulting from this case are ±2% of those for Case 1. This may indicate, that despite some underlying environmental changes and uncertainty about T that the BAF is similar to case within at least 2 decimal places.



Figure D-20: Comparison of BAF calculation methods for the case when both the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario have a decrease in input related to an environmental change.

Summary of Cases Regarding BAF

For the simple cases of decreasing or increasing carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario caused by the policy, the BAFs are consistently positive or negative depending on the case (Table 1). When there is an underlying change in the environment, then the sign of the BAF can change particularly when the $BAF_{\Delta t}$ (the marginal or EPA's per-period) rate is used. However, for the other forms of BAF, the sign is consistent across the different methods for calculating the BAF, which indicates that at least the sign of the BAF is stable regardless of the timeframe used and the changing ability of the landscape to input carbon. It also seems to be the case these underlying environmental changes may not be changing the magnitude of the BAF at least to one decimal point. For example, for the $BAF_{\Sigma T}$ value all the values when there is an increase in harvested related to biofuels are in the range of 0.36 to 0.39. The same insensitivity to the degree of environmental change appears for BAF_t which ranges from 0.23 to 0.27. For Case 3, which had a complex response, the BAF terms (except the marginal rate represented by $BAF_{\Delta t}$) are somewhat similar. This may indicate that when the net differences in scenarios is small, there is little difference in the terms as long as they are not based on the marginal changes.

Table 1 also shows that for given case, the value of the BAF differs widely depending on the method used for calculating it. In cases in which the BAF is positive and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario leads to a decrease in carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario, both the BAF_T and the $BAF_{\Delta t}$ tend to be lower than the proposed $BAF_{\Sigma T}$. In the cases in which the BAF is negative and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario leads to an increase in carbon stocks relative to the reference scenario, both the BAF_T and the $BAF_{\Delta t}$ tend to be higher (e.g., less negative) than the proposed $BAF_{\Sigma T}$.

Table 1. Summary of BAF values for using different timeframes for the five cases examined. The reported value is for T which in most cases is 90 years after the policy was implemented.

BAF term	Case 1: Decrease	Case 2: Increase	Case 3: Decrease-Increase	Case 4: Increasing inputs	Case 5: Decreasing Inputs
$BAF_{\Delta t}$ (EPA's Per-Period rate)	0.011	-0.011	-0.007	0.075	-0.05
BAF_t (EPA's Cumulative Emission-Based rate)	0.236	-0.262	-0.092	0.271	0.231
$BAF_{\Delta t}$ running average (EPA's Average Per-Period rate)	0.225	-0.279	-0.092	0.279	0.202
$BAF_{\Sigma T}$ approximation using BAF_t	0.357	-0.423	-0.117	0.390	0.359
$BAF_{\Sigma T}$ Cumulative Stock Difference-Based rate	0.362	-0.422	-0.116	0.390	0.368
T years	80	78	84	≈74	≈76

APPENDIX E: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STAND AND LANDSCAPE LEVELS

Although the examples of how the various BAF-related terms in the other appendices examine possible responses at the landscape to regional level, the proposed BAF calculations used can also be conducted at a "stand" level. This appendix provides examples in which the effects of biofuel related forest harvest is assessed at both the stand and the landscape level. To make the comparison the stand level treatments were also implemented at the landscape level assuming a regulated harvest system using the LandCarb model (http://landcarb.forestry.oregonstate.edu/). The landscape differs from the stand in that it is comprised of multiple stands (i.e., 260 of them) that are managed on different harvest schedules. At both the stand and the landscape level a reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenario was used as the basis of the calculations. The figures illustrate the differences in stocks between these two scenarios, the emissions (PGE), difference between the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenarios (NBE), as well as the BAF_t and $BAF_{\Sigma t}$.

To illustrate the equivalence of the stand and landscape levels, the stand level results were scaled to the landscape level by averaging over a moving window the length of the primary treatment's (e.g., clear-cut harvest) rotation interval (RI). This is possible because in a landscape managed under a regulated system each stand represents 1/RI of the landscape. This is compared to a landscape simulation where multiple stands were simulated, each comprising 1/RI of the total landscape.

Three of the examples involve forests that were converted from an old-growth condition and one examines a forest that has been under plantation management long enough that carbon stocks have stabilized. In all cases the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario involves an increase in harvests to supply feedstock for bioenergy in the year 2000. The "extra" harvest from thinning and increased utilization were assumed to be allocated to biofuels.

1. In old-growth conversion 1 both the increased biomass feedstock demand and reference scenario were first harvested in 1950 with a 50 year clearcutting rotation and a medium level of utilization (80% of cut wood removed). In 2000 a new system was used in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario in which the utilization was increased to remove all the cut aboveground biomass and in addition a 25% thinning was undertaken at 10 and 35 years with a very high level of utilization. This example mimics a typical situation in the Pacific Northwest in which forests were converted to plantations in the recent past and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario increases the intensity of the harvest to supply biogenic carbon for fuel.

2. In old-growth conversion 2 only the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario involved a harvest and the reference scenario was an old-growth forest that was not harvested. The increased biomass feedstock demand scenario involved a clear-cut harvest every 50 years was well as a 25% thinning was undertaken at 10 and 35 years. Each harvest removed all cut aboveground biomass and it is used as a fuel. This represents an extreme case in which an old-growth forest is converted to biomass fuel plantation.

3. In old-growth conversion 3 the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario involved a harvest, but in the form of 25% thinnings at a 10 and 35 year interval. Thus it matches the additional harvest imposed for old-growth conversion 1. As with old-growth conversion 2 the reference

scenario was an old-growth forest without harvest. This example mimics a situation in which forests are thinned to reduce wildfire impacts and the harvest is used as a supply of biogenic carbon for fuel.

4. In the plantation example, the reference scenario represents a forest clear-cut harvested every 50 years with a medium level of stem utilization. In the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario the forest is clear-cut harvested every 50 years, but all the cut aboveground biomass is removed. In addition, a 25% thinning was undertaken at 10 and 35 years with a very high level of utilization. This example represents a system in which there is no underlying change as in old-growth conversion 1, but there is an increased harvest. It would be typical of regions where plantation forestry has been present long enough that the original origin of the forest system is not evident.

Effects on forest ecosystem carbon stocks. At the stand level the additional harvest in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario at year 2000 causes carbon stocks to be lower in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario than the reference scenario (Figure E-1). For the old-growth conversion 1 example (Figure E-1 panel A) there is a decrease in carbon stocks in both scenarios caused by the long-term loss associated with the conversion of old-growth forests to short rotation forestry. For the plantation example (Figure E-1 panel B), the amount of carbon stored goes through recurring cycles until 2000 when the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario exhibits a decrease relative to the reference scenario. In old-growth conversions 2 and 3 (Figures E-1 panels C and D, the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario declines at year 2000 while the reference scenario maintains its carbon stocks. The decline in the increased biomass feedstock demand scenario for old-growth conversion 2 is higher than that for old-growth conversion 3 because the former includes a clear cut harvest in which 100% of the stand is cut; in contrast in old-growth conversion 3 has 25% of the stand cut. In all examples harvests cause forest carbon stocks to decline temporarily. The declines associated with clear-cut harvest are greater than the thinnings and the year 10 thinning is not as evident as the 35 year one. While all these declines are temporary, there are long-term trends whenever harvests increase.

Similar effects of additional harvest associated with biofuel occur at the landscape level (Figure E-2), however, the peaks and valleys evident at the stand level have been smoothed out. The difference between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios is largest when old-growth forest is the reference scenario. As with the stand level, clear-cut harvesting reduces the landscape stock the most when clear-cut harvesting is used to remove biofuels. In all these examples, the divergence of the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios stabilizes by year 2150, more than a century after the policy was imposed.

Scaling stand level results to the landscape level results in a very similar temporal pattern to what was observed at the landscape level: a steady divergence in the two scenarios starting in year 2000 that ceases to increase after year 2150 (Figure E-3). Not only is the general trend the same in the scaled and actual landscape simulations, but subtle changes caused by the addition of thinnings at 10 and 35 years is also evident in both approaches.



Figure E-1: Stand level changes in ecosystem carbon stoocks for the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.



Figure E-2: Landscape level changes in ecosystem carbon storesstocks for the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.



Figure E-3: Ecosystem carbon storesstocks at landscape level that were simulated at stand level but scaled to the landscape level for the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.

Stock differences and biogenic fuel emissions. At the stand level the difference in carbon stocks between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios (i.e., NBE) starts in year 2000 and generally increases each harvest, although the difference is largest immediately after harvest and lowest just before harvest (Figure E-4). After year 2150 there is a suggestion that a recurring cycle has been created for each of the examples. Annual emissions from biogenic fuels spike each year of a harvest, but viewed cumulatively these emissions take on a stair-step pattern that rises each time a biogenic fuel harvest occurs.

At the landscape level the cycles, spikes, and step increases observed at the stand level are not evident (Figure E-5). Instead the difference carbon stocks between the scenarios increases and then stabilizes after year 2150. The cumulative emissions steadily increase (although the first 50 years after the policy is implemented for Figures E-5 panels A-C there is a steeper rate of increase). The annual emissions generally rise and fall back to a lower level after the first harvest cycle is completed (year 2050). This decrease is caused by that fact that additional harvests eventually lower the amount of carbon that can be harvested. There is some degree of random variation in annual emissions because the harvest is not a constant amount due to the fact that a rotation of 50 years cannot be divided uniformly into a landscape

with 260 stands. That is while a 50 year harvest interval can be implemented, in some years a few more stands are harvested than in others.

Scaling the stand level results to the landscape level results in a very similar temporal pattern in the stocks difference, the annual emissions, and the cumulative emissions (Figure E-6). One difference is that the scaling method, which involves averaging generally removes year to year variation in annual emissions. However, the underlying trend in both Figures E-5 and E-6 are similar.

At both the stand and landscape levels the temporal patterns of stocks differences (i.e., NBE) and emissions for old-growth conversion 1 and the plantation examples A and B) are very similar despite the different origins of the forest. That is because the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios are undergoing similar changes prior to 2000 and these trends are cancelled out. Since both the old-growth conversion to plantation and the plantation have a similar increase in harvest associated with biofuels, the differences in stocks and emissions are very similar. This suggests that these terms are not sensitive to the underlying pattern of change as long as both scenarios are undergoing these changes. Instead they respond to the differences in the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios.



Figure E-4: Stand level stock differences between the reference and increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios (i.e., NBE) the annual biofuel emissions, and cumulative emissions (i.e., PGE).



Figure E-5: Landscape level difference in ecosystem carbon stocks (NBE) between the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios, the annual biofuel carbon emission, and the cumulative emissions (PGE).



Figure E-6: Difference in ecosystem carbon storesstocks (NBE) between the reference and the increased biomass feedstock demand scenarios, the annual biofuel carbon emission, and the cumulative emissions (PGE) simulated at the stand-level, but scaled to the landscape level.

BAF_t time trends. At the stand level the BAF_t is highly variable over time, increasing after each biogenic fuel harvest and then falling as the stand recovers carbon (Figure E-7). $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ is less variable than BAF_t because is it integrating (i.e., averaging) over time. Overall there is a downward trend in the stand level BAFs, caused by the fact that eventually the carbon difference between the two scenarios (NBE) stabilizes, but the cumulative biogenic emissions continues to increase. A comparison of Figures E-7 panels A and B indicate a very similar temporal pattern. This is caused by the fact that the calculations are based on the difference in the two scenarios. This cancels out the effect of any underlying trends both scenarios share. It is also evident that the BAFs for all the examples are similar despite the fact that the carbon stocks difference in the scenarios for old-growth conversion 1 and the plantation is roughly an order of magnitude less than old-growth conversions 2 and 3. This is because the BAFs are ratios. Harvesting more means a larger change in carbon stocks between the two scenarios, but it also means more emissions. Thus the differences between the examples is somewhat cancelled out. The higher values of BAFs for old-growth conversions 2 and 3 may be due to the fact that these examples involve the reduction of the growing stock associated with reducing the age of the forest.

At the landscape level there is generally a downward trend once the initial peak occurs (Figure E-8). The initial peak in BAFs is caused by the first harvest which by definition causes BAF_t and $BAF_{\Sigma t}$ to be 1. That is because the harvest equals the amount removed as well as the amount burned. Secondary peaks in BAFs are caused when a new kind of harvest is added. For example, in 2035 an additional 25% thinning is added and this causes the old-growth conversion 1 and plantation examples to exhibit a secondary peak. Subtle variations are also evident for old-growth conversions 2 and 3 particularly for BAF_t caused by additional intensification of harvests. This indicates that while these BAFs are insensitive to underlying changes both scenarios are experiencing, they are sensitive to increases in harvest intensity.

When the stand level results are scaled to the landscape level, the temporal pattern of BAFs is very similar to that observed at the landscape level (Figure E-9). This follows from the fact that the stocks differences and the cumulative biogenic fuel emissions are very similar for the landscape and the stand scaled to the landscape level.



Figure E-7: Temporal pattern of BAFs at the stand level.



Figure E-8: Temporal pattern of BAFs at the landscape level.



Figure E-9: Temporal pattern of BAFs simulated at the stand level but scaled to the landscape level.

Conclusions

While it is possible to analyze the effects of biogenic fuel harvest at the stand level, this introduces a series of transient responses that can mask the overall trends. Analyzing at the landscape level eliminates these transient responses and makes the overall trend clear. The landscape trends are completely consistent with the overall stand level trends as evidenced by the fact that stand level results scaled to the landscape level are very similar to the landscape level trends when multiple stands are simulated together.

In addition these examples indicate that BAFs are relatively robust for cases in which harvest is intensified to supply biogenic fuels. This is because they are based on the difference of the two scenarios and any trends they share are cancelled out. BAFs are also somewhat insensitive to the magnitude of the loss of carbon caused by harvests. This comes from the fact the BAFs are ratios and increased loss of carbon is related to the emissions from fuel combustion: more harvest means more loss, but it also means more emissions. Nonetheless BAFs are sensitive to relatively small changes in harvest intensity.