

**Dr. Beverly Law
Professor Emeritus
College of Forestry
Oregon State University**

May 10, 2021

Re: Redirecting Funding to Support Science Informed Management

Dear Chair Nathanson and members of the Committee:

Thank you for having me here today. For the record, my name is Dr. Beverly Law, and I am Professor Emeritus of Global Change Biology & Terrestrial Systems Science at the College of Forestry, Oregon State University.

I am testifying in support of 2357 A, which would better support science-based actions regarding forests for climate mitigation, adaptation and resilience. I have 230 refereed publications on carbon cycle science in forests, focusing on the effects of climate, wildfire and management on forest carbon, and I am a Fellow of the American Geophysical Union.

We have just a short window to change our land use and management practices to address climate change. Supporting dis- and misinformation interferes with our ability to have educated decision makers and an informed public to help us deal with the *serious issues of climate change and biodiversity losses. Loss of critical habitat in forests is a major cause of the extinction.*

I recently gave testimony to the United States House of Representatives on forest carbon, resilience and wildfires. I have attached a copy of it to my submission today. My testimony explains the status of science on these topics. My testimony reflects the best available science, and stands in stark contrast to the slanted, selective picture that OFRI presents to Oregonians of all ages on this important subject.

The Oregon Forest Resources Institute does not use sound science for their actions. I provided detailed testimony on March 2, 2021 before the Oregon House Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources. As has been reported by OPB and the Oegonian, OFRI's staff actively tried to stop university researchers from publishing their work on wildfires and on aerial spraying of herbicides. For these reasons and based on my own experience, I support the idea of reforming OFRI by prohibiting them from "generalized advertising for public education."

To meet current and future challenges from climate change, we need major changes in how we manage our forests. The bill indicates half of the harvest tax should go to the Department of Forestry to support climate science, enhance reporting and monitoring of pesticide use in forest operations, and adaptive management driven by research and amending forest practices over time to achieve sustainably managed forests. All these priorities are worthy of significant funding.

These priorities also require change starting at the top, and training and hiring of qualified and committed staff to carry out these goals. I have the following comments:

- **Support for climate science and climate smart forestry.** I know what this will take and ODF does not currently have qualified staff to estimate forest-sector carbon emissions and

strategies to reduce these emissions. Nonetheless, ODF has been assigned this role for state reporting. Climate mitigation and adaptation means protecting critical habitat and biodiversity of plant and animal species while preserving forest carbon in mature and old forests with relatively low to medium vulnerability to future climate. Taking this seriously would be a major change for ODF, and they will need proper funding and clear direction to do so.

- **Enhanced reporting and monitor use of pesticides in forests, which are primarily herbicides and other toxic chemicals.** ODF is one of the biggest users of toxic chemicals in forest operations, and applies these chemicals from helicopters across hundreds of thousands of acres of land. The use of these chemicals is harmful to avian and aquatic life, and human health. Recently, a report showed that the chemicals bioaccumulate in aquatic life in estuaries. I question whether ODF, as a significant users of toxic chemicals, can be responsible for robust monitoring and reporting on the impacts of these practices or whether independent oversight is needed here.
- **Adaptive management driven by research and amending forest practices over time.** An important role of the Department of Forestry is to help landowners create science-based defensible space in fire prone regions, especially when existing communities are adjacent to or embedded in forest areas. California has excellent guidelines that can be used here in Oregon, and ODF could be more active in helping communities. It also means that in some fire prone areas, use of prescribed burning and removal of small trees in the crowns of larger trees, will help protect the larger trees that are more fire- and climate-resilient. Adaptive management needs to be strategic management, and these actions need to be focused near homes and communities. ODF is the State of Oregon's lead agency on forest management yet it has significant room and potential for improvement. Achieving science-informed policy goals will require oversight that ensures they are in fact using the best available science to address climate change, wildfire and community safety.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, I am happy to answer any questions or provide further information.

Sincerely,



Dr. Beverly Law
Professor Emeritus
Global Change Biology & Terrestrial Systems Science
Oregon State University

**STATEMENT OF
DR. BEVERLY LAW
PROFESSOR EMERITUS
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS
APRIL 29, 2021
CONCERNING
“WILDFIRE IN A WARMING WORLD: OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE COMMUNITY COLLABORATION,
CLIMATE RESILIENCE, AND WORKFORCE CAPACITY”**

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for inviting me today to discuss wildfires and opportunities to improve climate resilience. I am Professor Emeritus of Global Change Biology & Terrestrial Systems Science at Oregon State University, where I have been working for 25 years. I am appearing today in my person capacity, not representing OSU. I am a Fellow of the American Geophysical Union. I served on the US Carbon Cycle Science Steering Group, and on IPCC expert panels. I was an editor for 8 years with Global Change Biology, one of the leading peer-reviewed journals. I have been a lead author of the National Climate Assessment, and co-author of National Research Council reports on verifying greenhouse gas emissions and air quality management. My research topics include multi-scale analysis of the effects of drought, fire and management on forest carbon and water processes, and land use strategies to mitigate climate change and benefit biodiversity. I will focus my remarks on forest carbon and biodiversity conservation for climate resilience and effects of fire and management on carbon.

Forest carbon stocks and accumulation have an important role in climate mitigation

Atmospheric carbon dioxide is 50% higher than preindustrial levels. The next 10 to 30 years are a critical window for climate action (IPCC 2018). We need to simultaneously reduce carbon dioxide emissions and increase carbon accumulation in land reservoirs of forests and other terrestrial ecosystems. Annual emissions from forest harvesting are slightly greater than emissions from the entire building sector in the U.S. Reducing this source of emissions could help the U.S. meet its climate goals.

Further, regional studies have shown that preserving western U.S. temperate forest with high carbon density and lower vulnerability to mortality would account for about 8 years of the region’s fossil fuel emissions, supporting US climate goals (Buotte et al. 2019). This provides near-term opportunities to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and increase carbon storage and accumulation.

Forest protections are part of Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) strategies, recognizing that increasing forest carbon stocks is important to the intent of the Paris climate treaty. The goal is “...

stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system” [Article 2 UNFCCC 1992]. When allowed to grow longer, natural forests do more to mitigate climate than management activities that keep forest carbon stocks at a level below the potential carbon stock over time; a level that is insufficient to meet climate goals.

The ability of forests to pull carbon from the atmosphere and accumulate it in living trees and soil for decades to centuries will continue to play a major role in reducing the severity of climate consequences. Preserving high carbon density forests like those of the Pacific Northwest, and allowing them to continue to accumulate carbon could increase forest carbon stocks substantially by 2100 (Hudiburg et al. 2009, Law et al. 2018, Buotte et al. 2020). A comparison of strategies showed that restricting harvest by 50% on public forests to allow them to continue growing while lengthening current harvest cycles in forests with low vulnerability to drought and fire under future climate conditions contribute the most to increasing forest carbon and reduce emissions. Less effective are reforestation and lastly afforestation, which can have competing land uses for agriculture and urban development (Law et al. 2018). Thus, temperate forests with high carbon density and lower vulnerability to mortality have substantial potential for climate mitigation.

Reforestation can be part of the climate solutions, but is not the only solution. Young trees will eventually grow to have large carbon stocks that contribute to climate mitigation, but allowing some existing forests with their large carbon stocks to continue to accumulate carbon will accumulate far more carbon out of the atmosphere during the critical coming decades. It is also far more difficult and expensive to initiate a forest than to grow additional carbon stocks in existing forests.

Harvesting forests for wood products and bioenergy that is as carbon intensive as coal results in depletion of ecosystem carbon stocks and the regrowth of these stocks takes many decades to centuries into the future, creating a long-term carbon debt. More carbon is stored longer in forests than in wood products because about half of the harvested carbon is emitted soon after logging (Harmon 2019, Hudiburg et al. 2019, Harris et al. 2016). Of the accumulated carbon harvested from west coast U.S. forests since 1900, 65% has returned to the atmosphere while only 19% is in long-lived wood products, and the remaining 16% is in landfills. That is, 81% of the wood removed from west coast forests since 1900 has been emitted to the atmosphere as carbon dioxide or is in landfills (Hudiburg et al. 2019). Increased harvesting adds additional carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, accelerating climate change.

Forests with medium and high carbon per acre also have medium and high biodiversity, promoting ecosystem resilience to climate change

We are in the midst of an emergency to address both climate change and biodiversity loss (Ripple et al. 2019). We must consider both forest carbon *and* biodiversity when determining management strategies in forests. Studies estimate that at least one-third of American wildlife, more than 12,000 species, are at increased risk of extinction, with extinction risk being highest in the largest and smallest vertebrates (Ripple et al. 2017).

Under future climate projections, medium to high carbon density western U.S. forests with relatively low to moderate vulnerability of mortality from fire or drought also have high amounts of critical habitat and high species diversity (Buotte et al. 2020). If protected, these forests have a strong potential to support biodiversity into the future and to promote ecosystem resilience to a changing climate. These

areas are primarily in the Pacific Northwest and northern Rocky Mountains in Idaho and Montana. A recent global study also strongly confirmed the spatial coincidence of areas important for carbon storage and biodiversity protection (Dinerstein et al. 2020).

Vulnerability to wildfire varies across the western US region in the next decades. Broad-scale thinning to reduce severity results in more carbon emissions than would be released by fire, creating a multi-decade carbon deficit that conflicts with climate goals.

Forests account for only about 40% of the area burned in wildfires in the U.S. Wet forests like the coastal forests of the PNW have longer fire return intervals (100-300 years). Strategically focusing on homes and communities is a smart place to start in fire-prone areas. At subregional to regional levels, roughly 1% of treatments (thinning, prescribed fires) experiences wildfire each year, and the effectiveness of treatments is only 10-20 year, so the treatments likely have little effect on wildfire (Campbell et al. 2012, Schoennagel et al. 2017).

Vulnerability of forests to wildfire varies spatially in the next decades. Wildfire is mainly a function of dryness, heat and wind. The warm, dry regions are expected to get warmer and drier. Projections show that burn area is expected to increase in the next few decades. Vulnerability to future fire is projected to be highest in the Sierra Nevada and portions of the Rocky Mountains, while high carbon-density forests in the coastal forests are expected to experience low vulnerability to fire (Buotte et al. 2018).

Wildfires have relatively little impact on forest carbon stocks as fires mainly combust surface litter and duff. If trees are killed, most of the carbon remains in the forest as dead wood that takes decades to centuries to decompose. Only a small portion of the total forest carbon is emitted to the atmosphere in wildfires – less than 10% of the total ecosystem carbon in live and dead trees, litter and soils combined has been found to enter the atmosphere as carbon dioxide in Pacific Northwest forest fires (Campbell et al. 2012; Law & Waring 2015).

Thinning to reduce fire severity or intensity is usually 30-50% of live tree biomass, and it puts much of the harvested carbon into the atmosphere quickly. A thinning study in a drought-prone young ponderosa pine plantation in Idaho found that removal of 40% of the live biomass from the forest would subsequently release about 60% of that carbon over the next 30 years (Stenzel et al. 2021). Enlarging the treated area more than would burn would further increase the carbon losses.

Local reduction of seedlings and saplings may be useful to protect the large trees in some fire-prone dry forests with high future vulnerability to fire. It will reduce whole ecosystem carbon, but can protect the large trees that store and accumulate the most carbon and are more drought- and fire-resistant than young trees (Irvine et al. 2004, Hurteau et al. 2019). Increasing the use of prescribed fires and managing wildland fires may promote resilience to more frequent fire (Schoennagel et al. 2017). Because climate change mitigation is expected to be part of decision-making, potential impacts of treatment options on forest carbon stocks should be assessed as part of a strategic decision-making process.

Broad-scale thinning of forests conflicts with carbon climate goals. The amount of carbon removed by thinning is much larger than that saved, and more area is harvested than would actually burn (Mitchell et al. 2009, Rhodes et al. 2009, Law & Harmon 2011, Campbell et al. 2012). The multi-decadal biomass carbon deficit following moderate to heavy thinning is supported by most analyses of mid to long-term thinning impacts on forest structure and carbon storage (Zhou et al. 2013). *There is no evidence that thinning forests increases biomass stored.*

Fire emissions are small relative to harvest emissions. Harvest-related emissions in the Oregon, Washington and California average about 5 times fire emissions (Hudiburg et al. 2019). In California, fire emissions are just a few percent of California's fossil fuel emissions.

Post-fire reforestation. Many western US forest fires are mixed-severity, meaning that a large portion of the fire burns at low and moderate severity in patches and a smaller portion burns at high severity where a majority of trees are killed (Law & Waring 2015). After fires, remaining trees and those on the periphery of burn areas provide seed source for natural regeneration (Donato et al. 2009). It is important to allow natural regeneration to occur because it provides the genetic and species diversity that existed prior to the fire, and that diversity makes the ecosystem more resilient. The complex early seral forest habitat that develops in the high severity patches is important to a host of species associated with these conditions (Donato et al. 2012). That is, both early- and late-successional forest canopies can support equally complex functioning and biodiversity. We can supplement with planting where regeneration fails.

Summary

The next 10 to 20 years are a critical window for climate action. Wildfires are an essential ecological process. They have relatively little impact on the total ecosystem carbon stock as fires mainly combust surface litter and duff, and if there is tree mortality the deadwood takes decades to centuries to decompose. In dry fire-prone forests projected to be vulnerable to fire-related mortality under future climate, it may be necessary to remove small trees in places. It would decrease ecosystem carbon but protect the large trees that are more fire-resistant and accumulate the most carbon. Impacts of tree removals on forest carbon stocks should be assessed as part of a strategic decision-making process. Preemptive broad-scale thinning will create a multi-decade carbon deficit that conflicts with carbon climate goals.

Deforestation and degradation reduce carbon stocks and other ecosystem benefits, create habitat loss that is a major cause of species extinctions, and are major sources of greenhouse gas emissions that further contributes to warming that amplifies risk of species extinction. Mature and old forests store more carbon in trees and soil than do young forests, and continue to accumulate it over decades to centuries making them the most effective forest-related climate mitigation strategy. High carbon density forests also have high biodiversity (species, critical habitat), promoting resilience to climate change.

Forest carbon, biodiversity and ecosystem type and integrity need to be considered concurrently when determining what to do with forests in the face of climate change. To meet zero net carbon goals and eventually halt climate change while also meeting biodiversity goals, some forests need to be protected.

Citations

Buotte, P.C., B.E. Law, W.J. Ripple, L.T. Berner. 2020. Carbon sequestration and biodiversity co-benefits of preserving forests in the western United States. *Ecol. Applic.* 30(2):e02039. Doi: 10.1002/eap.2039

Buotte, P.C., S. Levis, B.E. Law, T.W. Hudiburg, D.E. Rupp, J.J. Kent. 2018. Near-future vulnerability to drought and fire varies across the western United States. *Global Change Biol.* 25:290-303. Doi:10.1111/gcb.14490

- Campbell, J., M.E. Harmon, S.R. Mitchell. 2012. Can fuel-reduction treatments really increase forest carbon storage in the western US by reducing future fire emissions? *Front. Ecol. Env.* Doi:10.1890/110057
- Dinerstein, E., A.R. Joshi, C. Vynne, A.T.L. Lee, F. Pharand-Deschenes, et al. 2020. A “global safety net” to reverse biodiversity loss and stabilize Earth’s climate. *Science Adv.* 6 no. 36, eabb2824. Doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abb2824.
- Donato, D., J.B. Fontaine, J.L. Campbell, W.D. Robinson, J.B. Kaufmann, B.E. Law. 2009. Conifer regeneration in stand replacement portions of a landscape-scale mixed-severity fire. *Can. J. For. Res.* 39:823-838.
- Donato, D., J.L. Campbell, J.F. Franklin. 2012. Multiple successional pathways and precocity in forest development: Can some forests be born complex? *J. Veg. Sci.* 23: 576-584.
- Griscom, B.W., J. Adams, P.W. Ellis, R.A. Houghton, G. Lomax, D.A. Metiva, W.H. Schlesinger et al. 2017. Natural climate solutions. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 114:11645-11650. Doi:10.1073/pnas.1704651114.
- Harmon, M.E. 2019. Have product substitution carbon benefits been overestimated? A sensitivity analysis of key assumptions. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 14: 065008.
- Harris, N.L., Hagen, S.C., Saatchi, S.S. et al. 2016. Attribution of net carbon change by disturbance type across forest lands of the conterminous United States. *Carbon Bal. Manage.* 11, 24. Doi: 10.1186/s13021-016-0066-5
- Hudiburg, T.W., B.E. Law, W.R. Moomaw, M.E. Harmon, J.E. Stenzel. 2019. Meeting GHG reduction targets requires accounting for all forest sector emissions. *Env. Res. Lett.* 14: 095005.
- Hudiburg, T., B.E. Law, D.P. Turner, J. Campbell, D. Donato, M. Duane. 2009. Carbon dynamics of Oregon and Northern California forests and potential land-based carbon storage. *Ecol. Applic.* 19:163-180.
- Hurteau, M., M.P. North, G.W. Koch, B. Hungate. 2019. Managing for disturbance stabilizes forest carbon. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. Opinion* 116: 10193-10195.
- IPCC. 2018. Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C. [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, et al. (eds.)].
- Irvine, J., B.E. Law, M. Kurpius, P. Anthoni, D. Moore, P. Schwarz. 2004. Age related changes in ecosystem structure and function and the effects on carbon and water exchange in ponderosa pine. *Tree Physiol.* 24, 753-763.
- Kline, J.D., M.E. Harmon, T.A. Spies, A.T. Morzillo, R.J. Pabst, B.C. McComb, F. Schneckenger, K.A. Olsen, B. Csuti, J.C. Vogeler. 2016. Evaluating carbon storage, timber harvest, and habitat possibilities for a western Cascades (USA) forest landscape. *Ecol. Applic.* 26:2044-2059.
- Law, B.E. and M. Harmon. 2011. Forest sector carbon management, measurement and verification, and discussion of policy related to climate change. *Carbon Management* 2:73-84.

- Law, B.E., T.W. Hudiburg, L.T. Berner, J.J. Kent, P.C. Buotte, and M. Harmon. 2018. Land use strategies to mitigate climate change in carbon dense temperate forests. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 115:3663-3668. Doi: 10.1073/pnas.1720064115
- Law, B.E., R.H. Waring. 2015. Carbon implications of current and future effects of drought, fire and management on Pacific Northwest forests. *For. Ecol. Manag.* 355:4-14.
- Mitchell, S., M.E. Harmon, K.B. O'Connell. 2009. Forest fuel reduction reduces both fire severity and long-term carbon storage in three Pacific Northwest ecosystems. *Ecol. Applic.* 19: 643-655.
- Ripple, W.J., C. Wolf, T.M. Newsome, P. Barnard, W.R. Moomaw. 2019. World scientists' warning of a climate emergency. *BioSci.* 70:8-12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biz088>
- Ripple, W.J., C. Wolf, T.M. Newsome, M. Hoffmann, A.J. Wirsing et al. 2017. Extinction risk is most acute for the world's largest and smallest vertebrates. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 114:10678-10683. Doi:10.1073/pnas.1702078114
- Rhodes, J.J., W.I. Baker. 2009. Fire probability, fuel treatment effectiveness and ecological tradeoffs in Western US public forests. *Open Forest Sci. J.* 1: 1-7.
- Schoennagel, T., J.K. Balch, H. Brenkert-Smith, P.E. Dennis,, et al. 2017. Adapt to more wildfire in western North American forests as climate changes. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 114:4582-4590. Doi:10.1073/pnas.1617464114
- Stenzel, J.E., D.M. Berardi, E.S. Walsh, T.W. Hudiburg. 2021. Restoration thinning in a drought-prone Idaho forest creates a persistent carbon deficit. *JGR Biogeosci.* Doi:10.1029/2020JG005815
- Zhou, D., S. Liu, S. Zhao, J. Oeding. 2013. A meta-analysis on the impacts of partial cutting on forest structure and carbon storage. *Biogeosci.* 10:3691-3703. Doi: 10.5194/bg-10-3691-2013