POPCORN EXERCISE #1

What jumped out to you

- Soil carbon is constant across all land types - surprise.
- Above-ground biomass and mortality on differently managed forests was not surprising.
- Adding harvest and live-tree numbers is huge.
- Declining live forests in Eastern WA becoming a trend.
- Error bars on flux were large. Difference btw. USFS and other federal land.
Nat. mortality is high
- wildfire aspect jumps out
- data from fires not captured
- level of extraction and mortality is similar

- terminology was helpful 😊
- are results different (e.g., net flux by ownership) between reports?
- declining flux in CA
- variation in flux across ownership was greater than by pool

- recognize HWP info. is coming
- lots of variables drive flux
- non-corporate and corporate have the same amount of olive tree carbon
- Whole Note Cards - What jumped out?

  - Increased
  - Major Put of carbon in (4)
  - Harvested Forest Products
  - Full Lifecycle of FWP
  - Sensation Value

- Methodology not clear (2)

- Flux based on biomass changes + inclusion of VOC, Isoprenes (3)

- Reported in MT's Core Dataset

- Concern about LT support of data collection

- Can we have yield table by region? (2)
  - GRM approach further back

- Owner type & country for GRM
- Well studied & sold methodology

- Corporate had highest carbon stock & tree growth & carbon removal (2) 
  → opportunity for Stage 3

- Owner type (not app) → major determinant of stock/FI
  nx (3)

- FTA only focused on forest lands
  → what is the source of "Natural & other used lands"

- CRN blem FL's Carbon Pools
  → Acre & Decrease → < A (3)

- Could be understated carbon loss
Mortality Remoral ≈ Similar (2)

State Level =

Surprised by East West Regions (4)

2/3 sets of projects based on year 6/2 of flux

Per Acre Value for Soil were similar across two

→ Surprised!