POPCORN EXERCISE #1

What jumped out to you

= Soil carbon is constant across all land types - surprise

= Biomass (above-ground) 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 ~~mar~~ bars on flux were large

- Difference btw. USFS (⊖ carbon) and other federal (⊕ carbon) 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 live tree carbon

While Note Cards - What jumped out? [redacted] ✓

- Major (= Incorrect) Part of carbon in (4) Harvested forest products
  + Full lifecycle of FWP
  + Substitution value
- Methodology not clear (2)

- Flux based on biomass changes + including
  e.g. VOC, Isoprenes

- Reported in MT & CO2E difficult

- Concern about LT support of data collection

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

- Owner type & Country for GRM

(P2) Jumped Out ✓

- well studied & sold methodology

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

- Owner type (Mgt app) → major determinants of stock/flux (3)

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

- CXN blem FL & carbon pools
  → Acre of Development → < Δ (3)
  → could be underestimating carbon loss

(P3) Jumped out ✓

→ Mortality / Removal → Similar (2)

→ State level →

→ Surprised by Ea & W Regions (4)

→ 2/3 sets of projects based on region b/c of flux

— Per Acre rate for soil were similar across (3)

→ Surprised!