Governor's Task Force on the Creation of a Forest Carbon Program

Draft Report

August 25, 2021

Forest Carbon Program Task Force

Co-Chairs

Tom Abello, Governor's Office, Co-chair

Amanda Beal, DACF Commissioner, Co-chair

Members

Mark Berry, The Nature Conservancy

Barrie Brusila, Mid-Maine Forestry

Adam Daigneault, University of Maine

Tom Doak, Maine Woodland Owners

Dana Doran, Professional Logging Contractors of Maine

Ivan Fernandez, University of Maine Climate Change Institute

Alec Giffen, New England Forestry Foundation

Stacy Knapp, Maine DEP

Donald Mansius, Maine Forest Service

Ryan Robicheau, Maine IF&W

Melissa Shea, Mountain Farm

Patrick Strauch, Maine Forest Products Council

Karin Tilberg, Forest Society of Maine

Facilitator

Jo D. Saffeir, Consultant

The Governor's Task Force on the Creation of a Forest Carbon Program was established by Executive Order on January 13, 2021. The Executive Order directs the Task Force to develop incentives to encourage forest land management practices that increase carbon storage specifically on ownerships of 10 to 10,000 acres while maintaining harvest levels overall. It notes the negative impacts climate change is having on Maine, and recognizes that Maine's forests, which cover 89% of the state, currently sequester an amount of carbon equal to at least 60% of the state's annual carbon emissions, or 75% when durable forest products are included. It also notes that Maine is losing an estimated 10,000 acres of natural and working lands to development each year, and that this development is a direct source of carbon emissions and hinders the growth of natural climate solutions. Developing incentives that increase carbon storage on this forest land ownership category while maintaining harvest levels was a recommendation of the Maine Climate Council's Natural and Working Lands Work Group, and this Task Force's work advances that recommendation.

This report is structured primarily according to the nine directives outlined in the Governor's Executive Order. These directives describe the actions the Task Force is recommending be taken to develop a voluntary, incentive-based program for woodland owners of 10 to 10,000 acres and forestry practitioners to increase carbon storage in Maine's forests.

The Task Force also identified certain overarching principles that are foundational to the success of Maine's forests in sequestering more carbon. These include:

- Maintaining existing forestland ("keeping forests as forests") is fundamentally important if forests are to make a growing contribution toward achieving the state's climate goals. The Task Force supports increasing state, federal, and private funding for forestland protection, including funding for conservation easements or fee purchase. To monitor Maine's progress in this regard, the Task Force recommends that the Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry be permanently tasked with tracking the amount of conserved land in Maine (including municipal, NGO, state, and federal lands), and also tracking forest land loss.

- It is equally important to increase forest carbon on existing forestland by improving forest condition through the widespread adoption of forest practices that increase carbon sequestration, both through more intensive silvicultural management of stands that will increase forest growth, and by delayed harvests that allow trees to mature into older forest, resulting in greater carbon storage, which also increases the opportunity to store more carbon in long-lived forest products.

- The adoption of carbon-enhancing forest practices depends on the existence of adequate markets for low-grade wood that allow for improved silviculture, and this is a particular and ongoing challenge for Maine woodland owners and loggers. While markets alone do not inherently produce climate benefits, they are a necessary part of the equation as they can either reduce the costs of climate-beneficial practices or even make them profitable. Expanded, financially viable markets for low-grade wood will help to counteract pressures to convert forestland to non-forest uses.

1. Review current harvest levels and carbon stocking data on woodland owners of 10 to 10,000 acres.

To better understand current harvest levels and carbon stocking on 10-10,000-acre woodland ownerships, the Task Force first sought information from University of Maine representatives and the Maine Forest Service (MFS) on the distinction between carbon storage and sequestration, how and where carbon is stored in forests, and the capacity of Maine's forests to sequester more carbon. [Carbon storage is the amount (stock) of carbon stored in the forest ecosystem and in harvested wood products at a specific point in time. Carbon sequestration is the change in that stock over a given period of time, typically 1 year.]

Non-profit and state agency personnel next provided the Task Force with an understanding of Maine woodland owner demographics. Maine woodland owners with 10-10,000 acres comprise a very diverse group. There are approximately 86,000 Maine family woodland owners of 10 acres or more, and according to the USDA Forest Service's National Woodland Owner Survey (NWOS), family woodland ownerships (10+ acres) represent 29% of Maine's private land base. In addition, there are some corporate owners that fall into this size class category too. Sixty percent of landowners with between 10 to 10,000 acres are individuals 65 years or older, while only 4% is owned by individuals 45 years or younger. Only 27% of landowners with 10-10,000 acres have a management plan, but 90% of those with a plan report they have implemented at least part of their plan. This points to the importance of helping more woodland owners develop forest management plans as an effective step toward the adoption of forest stewardship practices that increase carbon sequestration and storage.

Active forest stewardship is considerably less prevalent on the smaller end of the 10-10,000- acre ownership spectrum than on its larger end. Yet taken as a whole, 10-10,000-acre ownerships, which account for at least 24% of the private land area and 27% of the standing aboveground carbon, produce at least 24% state's annual wood harvest (Table 1). Estimates of acres, standing aboveground biomass, and harvest vary greatly depending on which data source is being used, highlighting that more definitive data are needed to better understand this ownership class. Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (FIA) data on all small private ownerships (family and corporate) estimate that the area may comprise 43% of the private forest. However, the ownership data that are presently available are incomplete, leaving many acres that could not be assigned to an appropriate ownership size class (see Appendix B). Despite the variation between data sources, it is apparent that small woodland owners make up a sizable amount of Maine's forest area, carbon, and harvest base. These data also support conducting further analysis to estimate how improving forest stewardship for this ownership size class could influence the state's forest carbon sequestration.

Table 1. Task Force estimates of acres owned, stocking, removals, and potential harvested wood in long-term storage for Maine's 10 - 10,000 acres forest ownership size class.

Estimate	Low End	High End	Best Guess	All Private Forest	% Total Private – Best Guess (low, high)
Total Acres Owned (million acres)					
NWOS Acres (family forests only)	N/A	N/A	4.7	16.1	29%
FIA Acres (family and corporate)	3.9	10.9	6.9	16.1	43% (24%, 68%)
Total Carbon Stock (million metric tons of carbon)					
FIA aboveground carbon	78.1	199.3	134.3	289.5	46% (27%, 69%)
Total Harvest (million dry tons)					
FIA bole removals (2019)	2.2	6.0	3.8	9.1	42% (24%, 66%)
*Total Long-Term Harvested Wood Product Storage (green tons)**					
Sawlog wood products	0.8	1.2	1.0	2.3	44% (36%, 51%)

NWOS: National Woodland Owners Survey; FIA: Forest Inventory and Analysis
*Sawlogs account for 31% of harvest; assume 60% of sawlog volume at time of harvest goes into long-term storage. Accounting for sawlog product decay over time would reduce this figure.

Additional data on the known area of small woodland owners provided by the US Forest Service's FIA program (i.e., 4.0 million acres) can be used to better understand how the metrics presented above vary by stocking and stand size class, as listed in Table 2. These estimates highlight how different combinations of stand classifications have varying levels of biomass (and carbon) stock and density as well as their relative contribution to the total annual removals across this specific landowner size. This information can be used to help identify how forest carbon could be enhanced by making changes to the landscape, such as thinning overstocked stands or planting poorly stocked forests. As an illustrative example based on these data, the Task Force roughly estimates that implementing management practices that shift all 1.5 million acres of poorly and moderately stocked stands to well stocked could increase the FIA's reported estimate of small woodland owners forest aboveground carbon stocks by about 57 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MtCO_2e$), a gain of 20% compared to their current state. Assuming this transition would occur over 30 years, this could result in about 1.9 $MtCO_2e$/yr in additional forest carbon sequestration. The Task Force cautions that the data used to derive these estimates have high uncertainty, and thus should not be used to derive a specific mitigation target. Rather, it supports the idea that improving forest stewardship and stocking levels should result in increased carbon sequestration and storage in Maine's small woodlands.

Table 2. FIA reported estimates for aboveground biomass, removals, and area organized by stocking class and stand size class for all known ownerships of 10-10,000 acres

FIA Size Class*	Area (Acres)	Aboveground Biomass (dry tons)^	Biomass Density (dry tons/ac)	Annual Removals (dry tons/yr)	% Total Removals	Opportunity to Increase Forest C
			Overstocked			
Large	51,713	5,720,547	111	13,359	1%	
Medium	74,820	4,976,064	67	0	0%	Thin
Small	216,187	4,616,750	21	104,496	5%	Thin
Total	342,720	15,313,361	45	117,855	5%	
			Well stocked			
Large	777,686	54,957,311	71	145,667	6%	
Medium	844,108	42,568,368	50	62,570	3%	
Small	427,575	8,891,641	21	322,435	14%	
Total	2,049,369	106,417,320	52	530,672	23%	
			Moderately Stocked			
Large	522,934	23,364,121	45	627,561	28%	
Medium	613,812	19,576,937	32	332,761	15%	
Small	150,097	2,696,456	18	317,020	14%	Enrich. Plant
Total	1,286,843	45,637,513	35	1,277,341	56%	
			Poorly stocked			
Large	104,419	3,032,178	29	121,441	5%	
Medium	155,394	3,135,600	20	190,770	8%	
Small	16,288	123,273	8	21,559	1%	
Total	276,100	6,291,051	23	333,769	15%	Enrich. Plant
			Non-stocked			
Large	291	0	0	0	0%	
Medium	1,157	857	1	0	0%	
Small	1,785	0	0	0	0%	Plant
Non-stocked	10,006	55,304	6	2,124	0%	Plant
Total	13,239	56,160	4	2,124	0%	Plant
			10-10,000 Acre Landowner Total			
Large	1,457,043	87,074,157	60	908,027	40%	
Medium	1,689,290	70,257,825	42	586,101	26%	
Small	811,932	16,328,120	20	765,510	34%	
Non-stocked	10,006	55,304	6	2,124	0%	
Total	3,968,272	173,715,406	44	2,261,762	100%	

* FIA classification of the predominant (based on stocking) diameter class of live trees, where at least 10% of stand is forested. For large and medium classification, at least 50% of the stand is in large and medium trees, and classification is based on the highest proportion of those two size classes.

Large diameter: trees at least 11" diameter for hardwoods, 9" for softwood

Medium diameter: trees at least 5" in diameter but less than the large diameter trees

Small diameter: less than 5" in diameter trees

Non-stocked: less than 10% of stand is forested

^ dry biomass weight can be converted to carbon by multiplying the value by 0.5

2. Review available data for practice-based carbon programs throughout the United States.

With information provided by non-profit and University representatives, the Task Force considered the essential elements of carbon offsets, the history of carbon offset projects in Maine, and the general nature of voluntary and regulatory U.S. carbon markets. In particular, information on the following programs was reviewed and discussed: American Forest Foundation and The Nature Conservancy's Family Forest Carbon Program; FiniteCarbon's Core Carbon Program; SilviaTerra's Natural Capital Exchange; Vermont's Cold Hollow Carbon; Land Trust Alliance's Forest Carbon Offset Pilot Program; Maine's Forest Carbon for Commercial Landowners Project; Maine Mountain Collaborative's Exemplary Forestry Investment Fund; Northeast Wilderness Trust's Wild Carbon Program; Georgia's Sustainable Development Carbon Registry; and Nova Scotia's Forest Sustainability regulations. This analysis contributed to the specific recommendations contained in Sections #3 and #4 below which identify a priority suite of climate-friendly forest management practices that could be adopted, and technical assistance and financial incentives that could be implemented, to maximize carbon sequestration and storage on Maine woodlands of 10-10,000 acres.

3. Identify a suite of climate-friendly forest management practices that improve carbon stocks and maintain current timber harvest levels.

As noted in Section #1 above, the 10-10,000 acre ownership range includes a very diverse group of landowners with significantly different levels of engagement with and management of their lands, including different harvesting practices. Though sufficient detail is lacking, the Task Force believes that significantly more harvesting occurs on ownerships of 1,000 acres and larger, and that smaller ownerships, particularly in the southern half of the state, are generally less likely to have been harvested in recent decades. The Task Force believes more active forest management on lands of 10-10,000 acres is an important strategy to achieve increased carbon sequestration and storage while maintaining harvest. Given this, the Task Force interprets the Executive Order directive of "maintaining current harvest levels" to mean "at a minimum," and that it is therefore necessary to 1) establish what the baseline harvest level is for logical acreage segmentations within this broad size class, and 2) identify practices that improve carbon stocks while maintaining or increasing harvest levels (at a broad scale, as opposed to on each specific parcel).

After reviewing the wide range of emerging voluntary forest carbon programs throughout the U.S. as described in Section #2 above, the Task Force concluded that consensus is building around the following forest practices having the greatest potential to achieve carbon benefits. More research is needed to understand the implementation costs and relative benefits associated with each practice. However, Maine's forest carbon program should focus on incentivizing some portion of this suite of forest practices:

Avoid Forest Conversion

- Avoid forestland loss/incentivize forest conservation (through conservation easements or fee purchases) to maintain forest ecosystem carbon and the potential for continued sequestration.

Enhance Forest Resiliency

- Manage competition from invasives and undesirable tree species.
- If relying on natural regeneration, plan the harvest to regenerate the site quickly with desired species.
- When planting, select species well-suited to the site and a changing climate.
- Plan to reduce the risk of carbon losses from disturbances (e.g., wildfire, exotic and endemic insect infestations, etc.).

Conduct Intermediate Treatments

- Increase stocking in understocked stands.
- Conduct thinning in immature and/or overstocked stands to stimulate growth of the remaining trees and increase the yield of useful material from the stand (evaluate short-term carbon losses against longer term forest and forest product carbon benefits):
- Precommercially thin saplings and small poles.
- Commercially thin (uniform thinnings or crop tree releases).
- Retain more carbon in thinnings (retain large-diameter live trees, snags, and species diversity).

Practice Sustainable Harvesting

- Seek to increase the proportion of harvested materials likely to be used in long-lived wood products.
- Manage partial harvests thoughtfully to minimize stand damage and soil disturbance.
- Focus investments in intensive silvicultural treatments on sites with high carbon value potential (superior soils, drainage, aspect).
- Extend harvest cycles to grow larger trees that are more likely to be used in long-lived wood products.
- Utilize timber harvesting professionals trained in climate-friendly harvesting practices.

Establish Forest Reserves

- Establish forest reserves on sites with high carbon density and in areas of special ecological value to allow the development of late successional forest.

This suite of forest practices should be encouraged, promoted, and/or incentivized through existing voluntary state forest management programs to incorporate climate objectives into these programs. This includes the Forest Stewardship Program and the Open Space Current Use Taxation Program (see Section #6 below).

Efforts should be made to similarly implement these practices through U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) programs. To accomplish this, NRCS program funding needs to be increased, with programs achieving higher visibility and reaching a much broader cross-section of small woodland owners through targeted outreach and technical assistance. NRCS cost-share practices should be developed that are specifically aimed at increasing carbon sequestration and storage, and administrative requirements must be simplified in order for programs to appeal to small landowners. Toward this end, the NRCS program should build off the successes of the NRCS Regional Conservation Partnership Program's efforts nationwide to simplify, streamline and supplement traditional NRCS approaches which have not reached most small private landowners in Maine. This will require engagement with Maine's Congressional delegation, the Chief of the NRCS, and the State Conservationist.

4. Identify a suite of financial incentives and technical assistance activities to increase carbon sequestration on woodland owners of 10 to 10,000 acres, and carbon sinking in wood products, through active forest management.

The Task Force recognizes that landowners within as broad an acreage category as 10-10,000 acres invariably exhibit a wide range of levels of engagement with their forests. Research on this population, largely comprised of family woodland owners, indicates that they can be reliably segmented according to their motivation for owning forest land. "Woodland Retreat Owners" make up 48% of this population, and care primarily about the beauty, nature, and recreational value of their woodland. "Working the Land Owners" (19%) value aesthetics and recreation, but are pragmatic in that they see the land as an economic asset as well. "Supplemental Income Owners" (14%) own land primarily for timber income and investment. And" Uninvolved Owners" (19%) tend not to care about their woodland, are most apt to be willing to sell their land, and are least likely to want to see it remain as woodland. *

Given this range in ownership motivations, it is important to provide technical assistance and financial incentives that are relevant to these varying types of landowners. Landowners first need to become meaningfully engaged in the management of their forests before they can take steps toward implementing carbon enhancing forest management practices. As a result, the Task Force recommends a two-pronged approach to developing a forest carbon program:

- Significantly increase technical assistance to woodland owners to rapidly expand the number of landowners adopting practices that increase carbon sequestration and storage; and
- Offer financial incentives to engaged landowners to implement carbon-enhancing forest management practices, including long-term agreements that can encourage practices that continue over time.

*Butler, B. et. al., *Understanding and Reaching Family Forest Landowners: Lessons from Social Marketing Research*, Society of American Foresters Journal of Forestry, Oct/Nov. 2007.

Technical Assistance

Numerous studies over the years have found that family woodland owners place a high value on one-on-one access to state forestry agency professionals to walk their land with them and discuss their management alternatives. Engaging as many landowners as possible to work with knowledgeable forestry professionals can yield positive results with regards to carbon sequestration and storage on their woodlands. Dedicated boots-on-the-ground landowner education and engagement can make this happen.

Maine Forest Service (MFS) data show that, by providing dedicated individualized guidance, coupled with practice and plan incentives, the potential number of landowners reached is substantial. In the late 1990's, due to an increase of federal funding, 4,000 forest management plans were completed representing 500,000 acres of family woodlands. Today, due to federal funding reductions, MFS now provides cost-share assistance for landowners to engage consulting foresters to prepare 100 plans per year, representing approximately 7,600 acres. The exponential growth of real estate transfers over the past two years points to the need for increased landowner engagement that is also longer in duration, in order to retain and increase forest carbon benefits.

The following actions include two key elements: on-the-ground capacity improvement, and "cost share" funding for carbon friendly practices for landowners and loggers. They provide practical and relatively quickly implemented climate solutions, and provide stewardship progress for small woodland owners who otherwise have not been engaged in forest management. They also take steps towards preventing further annual loss of forestland.

Action items:

- Increase capacity within the Maine Forest Service by hiring a Forest Carbon Specialist (Senior Planner). This person, knowledgeable in forest carbon, will be a centralized source for forest carbon information for stakeholders and the general public. Duties would include training for landowners, loggers, and foresters, and potentially playing a yet-to-be-determined role in a forest carbon program described in the Financial Incentives section directly below.
- Increase District Forester capacity within the Maine Forest Service. MFS currently has 10 District Foresters. This compares to past staffing levels of 18 Service Foresters, 4 Regional Foresters, 2 Watershed Foresters and a Marketing and Utilization Forester. Increasing current forester staffing by 5 would allow for greater outreach to landowners. This number includes a Senior Planner position specializing in marketing and utilization to work with loggers, foresters and landowners. The District Foresters would also receive training for consistent carbon messaging, building off learnings from Forest Opportunity Roadmap/Maine's (FOR/Maine's) small landowner engagement survey. They would serve as a clearinghouse for information and education and would provide on-the-ground statewide field visits, general advice and educational services such as a social media presence, and workshops on climate-friendly practices for every sector of forestry.
- The above actions align with the Maine Climate Action Plan recommendation to, "Increase technical service provider capacity by 2024 to deliver data, expert guidance, and support for climate solutions to communities, farmers, loggers, and foresters at the Department of

Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry, Maine Forest Service, Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of Marine Resources, and University of Maine." The Plan also states, "Increasing the number of field foresters at Maine Forest Service should support landowner and land-manager adoption of climate-friendly practices, as well as efforts to support good forest-management practices."

- Provide adequate funding for the Maine Forest Service to market the benefits of implementing climate-beneficial forest stewardship practices, participating in carbon markets, and engaging qualified natural resource professionals
- Increase alignment with NRCS to implement forest carbon practice incentives. NRCS has already offered to fund half a dedicated position to work with landowners to encourage participation in NRCS forestry programs. This will include identifying the list of EQIP practices that most closely align with the menu of forest practices listed in Section #3 above and working with NRCS to fund those practices at a meaningful level.
- Increase allotted amounts for the Maine Forest Service's WoodsWise program by $50,000 to $100,000/year (this program provides cost-share to landowners to work with a professional forester to develop a management plan). This amount could possibly also support cost sharing for carbon friendly practices as well and would include a carbon planning component to the management plan incentives. This would also include working with NRCS for input and alignment of their CAP-106 plans (Conservation Activity Plans within EQIP) to include carbon planning.
- As part of the duties of the new MFS Marketing and Utilization Forester, support the creation of improved markets for low grade wood through public and private business efforts.

Outcomes of these actions include:

- Given the current acreage covered by forest management plans, an increase in cost-share funding by $50,000/year could significantly increase the acreage impacted annually and include carbon inventories, expanding beyond timber resources to cover other forest characteristics, including forest biomass and ecosystem carbon content. The current acreage for which forest management plans are developed annually using the WoodsWISE program is approximately 7,600 acres and does not include a carbon inventory.
- Increased acreage treated with climate-friendly forest management practices that are not economically feasible in today's markets, contingent upon NRCS investment in carbon friendly practice incentive funding.
- Measurable increase in awareness of woodland owners, foresters, loggers, and the public about the benefits of climate-friendly forest management.

Financial Incentives

The Task Force recognizes that there are many innovative voluntary carbon programs currently being developed by the private and non-profit sectors throughout the U.S, and that this landscape of program offerings is evolving and expanding rapidly. Diverse approaches to incentivize forest carbon sequestration are being piloted or otherwise tested. **The existence of this dynamic environment suggests that the state of Maine may be well served by working in partnership**

with one or more external entities to develop a voluntary credit-based and/or practice-oriented carbon program, tailored specifically to Maine's unique landowner demographics and land ownership patterns.

The Task Force recommends that the Maine Forest Service:

- Facilitate the development and/or adoption of a program to enable small woodland owners to store more carbon on their forest lands while maintaining or increasing harvest levels, and invite parties interested in partnering with the State on such an effort to make themselves known

- Create an advisory committee to interview external entities expressing an interest to solicit their feedback on:

    - What the State role should be to increase landowner participation, and increase the value of any "offsets" created

    - Alternatives for funding such a program, noting advantages and disadvantages of recommended options

    - How such a program would be made available to landowners, including the program's structure and format

    - How carbon storage could be increased while maintaining harvest levels

    - How forest carbon measuring and monitoring would be conducted

    - How harvest levels could be maintained system-wide (not necessarily parcel by parcel)

    - How a program could be implemented to maximize its impact, including bridging between the current generation of older landowners and the younger generation who will be inheriting the land.

- Convene structured discussions with potential partners to explore ideas for how such a program might be designed

- Select a partner (or partners) to work with in designing and establishing a program (or programs)

In this regard the Maine Forest Service could, for example, work with the partner(s) selected to:

A. Define what business-as-usual management actually is for various ownership size subclasses (e.g., 10-100, 100-500, 500-1000, 1000+ acres) or geographic regions. This could be determined via a field survey of landowner practices over the last X years, could include both harvest and stand-tending activities, and could document harvest and residual stocking volumes.

B. Determine what outcomes are possible under different circumstances regarding increased stocking and harvest volumes given improved silviculture (e.g., thinning in the stands where

growth rates on the most desirable trees could be enhanced, or another carbon-enhancing management practice identified in Section #3 above). This should result in predictions regarding outcomes, e.g. if practice W is implemented in circumstances X, it will result in Y for growth and Z for harvest.

C. Set a numeric target for additional tons of carbon storage by small woodland owners and document how this will be verified. Note: This target is likely to be only a portion of total potential as it will be influenced by program design.

D. Determine the manner of delivery of the program to landowners (agreements, contracts, other) and duration.

E. Determine what it would cost to implement the practices that would increase carbon storage (in the forest and in durable wood products) and substitution benefits.

F. Determine what it would cost to subsidize the productive use of small diameter and low-quality trees by mills.

G. **Conduct a detailed program design effort based on learnings from A.-E., identify the types of policy instruments that best target the kinds of landowners whose behavior can be changed cost-effectively, and detail how these would actually work in terms of permanence, leakage, reversal, monitoring and verification.**

This could result in a recommendation to focus on a narrower subset of small woodland owners (for example, those open to practice changes and who have lands where carbon stocks could be increased substantially through management that increases biomass while improving stocking). The program might also include:

- an element focused on wood processors to increase their use of small diameter materials, for instance via practice-based incentives like those currently used in Nova Scotia;
- some variant of carbon offsets that addresses the transaction cost issue (perhaps through aggregation across smaller ownerships); and/or
- a focus on logging contractors to incentivize high quality harvesting practices as this has a direct bearing on stand quality and ultimately on forest carbon storage capacity.

H. Secure funding from private parties (e.g., corporations with obligations to reduce emissions), federal or state programs, or other states to implement a program to achieve the target for additional carbon storage while maintaining harvest. If funds are generated either in full or in part via payments for carbon offsets, the state should ensure that offsets issued meet an approved standard that includes third-party verification (ensuring that the offsets are real, additional, verifiable and lasting), and are recorded in a registry. The State should also consider whether it will have standards for the purchasers of offsets, such as whether they are executing a plan to reduce their own emissions.

I. Authorize the private partner to implement the program by enrolling landowners, either paying landowners for practices or paying contractors directly to implement them on lands enrolled. In addition, the private partner could, depending on program design, act as a carbon broker, or distribute funds to forest products companies using wood that would not normally

be part of their feed stocks (e.g., small diameter or low value trees coming off the lands enrolled).

J. Through sampling and statistical analysis, accurately document the results of the program in terms of additional carbon stored and emissions avoided by substituting wood for other materials and harvest levels by comparison to business-as-usual management.

The possible approach articulated in A.-J. above is intended as initial guidance only, with the expectation that this could and likely would evolve as the concept is further refined.

5. Identify incentives for high-quality, on-the-ground performance by loggers and promote the use of low-impact harvesting equipment.

The Task Force recommends various actions that are intended to directly support logging contractors' ability to contribute to carbon benefits that will have positive outcomes for landowners. These include:

- The proposed Maine Forest Service Forest Carbon Specialist (Senior Planner) is envisioned as including loggers among its target stakeholders for technical assistance and training on climate-friendly management and harvesting practices.
- Support higher level on-the-ground performance to encourage climate-friendly timber harvesting with verifiable outcomes by promoting voluntary use of third-party certified harvesting companies**.** Third-party certification provides verification that high standards are being met at the point of harvest, by utilizing independent licensed foresters as verifiers, ultimately providing a verification model for landowners that participate in a carbon program and utilize the services of timber harvesting companies.
- Provide financial cost-share resources for harvesting companies to become third-party certified in a similar manner as cost-share resources are provided by the state (i.e. Maine Forest Service's WoodsWise program) to landowners who create a forest management plan.
- Increase funding for the Direct Link (Clean Water State Revolving Fund) program and reassess the elements of the program so as to provide greater availability of reduced interest loans for equipment that will minimize soil compaction and disturbance of forest soils.
- Provide cost-share resources for landowners and contractors to purchase and implement carbon-enhancing best management forest practices (i.e. portable bridges, culvert pipes, grass seed, hay, skid trail regrading, road relocation, post-harvest stabilization, corduroy, gravel, silt fencing, etc.).

Outcomes of these actions include:

- Currently, there are approximately 300 logging companies in Maine and just over one-third are third-party certified. Cost share resources to support more companies becoming certified will increase landowner awareness and provide greater verification of climate-friendly harvesting practices.
- Significant increase in the use of trained loggers, logging equipment, and best management practices that promote climate-friendly harvesting practices.

6. Recommend updates to the Open Space Current Use Taxation program including in a manner that incentivizes climate-friendly land management practices.

Note: Outreach is underway to Maine Municipal Association members and municipal assessors to solicit feedback on this set of recommended changes to the Open Space Current Use Program before formal inclusion in the final report. At this time, these recommendations are aspirational and will require further dialogue with affected entities.

One charge for the Maine Forest Carbon Program Task Force is to "*Recommend updates to the Open Space Current Use Taxation program including in a manner that incentivizes climate-friendly land management practices.*" The Task Force has been meeting since early 2021 and is charged with delivering recommendations to the Governor by November 1, 2021.

Task Force members have prepared initial concepts for revision of the Open Space Current Use Tax program, and in late June, met with representatives of Maine Revenue Services and the Maine Municipal Association to gather feedback. The summary below is not an attempt to provide complete language for update and revision of the program, but instead focuses on key program elements.

We are now seeking additional feedback from the Maine Municipal Association and municipal assessors, who we hope will consider and respond to the following questions:

- Do you have any concerns with the Open Space program as it exists today?
- Are there concepts or potential program revisions presented here that you support or you think would be beneficial? Which components seem most important or most helpful?
- Are there concepts or potential program revisions presented here that concern you? Please explain your concerns.
- Are there ideas for streamlining and improving the Open Space program to make it more attractive to landowners that you would suggest we consider, but which are not presented below?

Priority Concepts:

- **Update the Open Space program, streamlining it and adding an emphasis on climate benefit.**
- The Open Space program should **contribute to maintaining forest land and reducing forestland loss** in the state**.**
- We seek a **more efficient program** that will be of value to the public, attract more landowner participation, and be simple to administer by municipalities, with reduced financial burden.
- The Open Space program should **accommodate a wide range of potential land management practices,** from intensive silviculture and production of forest products to development of old forest and maximizing carbon storage.
- The Open Space program **should not create a fiscal burden for municipal budgets** and may require state reimbursement (noting complexity in this determination and that municipalities may

benefit from reduced costs of providing services when lands remain undeveloped and from increased revenue sharing as a result of reduced valuation).

Potential Program Revisions:

A. Provide state reimbursement to municipalities, following the same formula used for state reimbursement under the Tree Growth Current Use Tax program. [This change is intended to reduce the burden on municipalities.]

B. Revise Open Space Program valuation reductions to:

- **Open Space (no development): 50%** [Currently 30%. This increase is intended to encourage greater participation in the OS program and emphasize its core value of helping to keep land undeveloped. The increase (plus new options below) also offsets elimination of separate discount options for permanent protection (30%), forever wild (20%), and managed forest (10%).]
- **Public Access: 25%** [No change from current program.]
- **Wildlife Habitat Management: 15%** [New option not in existing program.] Implementation of a wildlife enhancement practice approved by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife in alignment with State Wildlife Action Plan or of mapped Beginning with Habitat features, with landowner attestation of practice implementation.

Or

- **Carbon Management: 15%** [New option not in existing program. This could serve as a replacement for the existing elements of permanent protection (30%), forever wild (20%), and/or managed forest (10%).]

  Forested land (properties with 10 or more forested acres and greater than 70% forested) may qualify with any of the following options, and any qualifying property shall automatically be considered to provide a public benefit and be eligible for enrollment in the Open Space program:

  Adoption of a 10-year forest management plan signed by a licensed forester that includes strategies to increase forest carbon and considers carbon stored in forest products; or [This is essentially the same requirement for Tree Growth eligibility, but the plan here can prioritize forest carbon.]

  Implementation of a forest carbon practice approved by the Maine Forest Service, qualifying for this Forest Carbon Management reduction for 10 years, with landowner attestation of practice implementation; or [This option for practice implementation and landowner attestation without a full forest management plan may appeal to owners of smaller properties.]

  Permanent ecological reserve restrictions shall qualify for forested reserves. [Forest carbon benefits of ecological reserves are clear; eligibility for this carbon management category is a reduced discount from the permanent protection and ecological reserve discounts in the current program.]

Non-forested land (properties not qualifying as Forested Land above) may qualify for 10 years based on implementation of carbon management practices approved by the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry, with landowner attestation of practice implementation. [Non-forested land would also have the option to either: 1) choose the wildlife habitat management option, or 2) be eligible for the Farmland current use program.]

- **Maximum discount of 90%** *(current program maximum is 95%)***, reduction no greater than available through Tree Growth** *(no change from existing program)* [Maximum discount could be achieved with OS + Public Access + Forest Carbon, OR with OS + Public Access + Wildlife Habitat.]

C. Streamline program to rely on % reductions and eliminate the alternative approach of individual discretionary assessment based on assumed impacts of enrollment on valuation. [This is intended to provide greater clarity and certainty for landowners interested in enrolling and to reduce complexity for assessors and municipalities.]

D. Allow any landowner to transfer their property from Tree Growth to Open Space without penalty, for properties in Tree Growth prior to 2021.

7. Explore opportunities for partnerships with large, commercial forestland owners.

The Maine Climate Table, a nonpartisan effort to create a state-based model for climate initiatives, has been hosting convenings of commercial forestland owners since March, 2020, to explore whether large commercial forest landowners in Maine can store more carbon in the forest and in forest products while maintaining harvest rates. Its efforts to date, under a program titled Forest Carbon for Commercial Landowners (FCCL), have been focused on whether the commercial forest could be managed to store more carbon without constraining, or, perhaps while even enhancing, a landowner's financial performance, and if so, using what specific "instruments" (e.g., the carbon offset market, tax policy, payments from corporations interested in securing carbon).

The Maine Forest Carbon Task Force acknowledges that this parallel process is exploring comparable issues to its own charge, though for a larger landowner size class, and with a more explicit focus on economic objectives. The Task Force recommends ongoing monitoring of FCCL's work and research outcomes, to potentially inform the design of a forest carbon program for family woodland owners as described in Section #4. At the same time, FCCL is not the only other process underway that is exploring the potential of large forest ownerships to sequester and store more carbon. The Task Force recommends tracking these other emerging efforts as well.

Clearly, the development of markets for low quality timber, the importance of which is emphasized at the outset of this report, would benefit woodland owners of all sizes, including large commercial forestland owners. In addition, the recommended additional Maine Forest Service staff (Forest Carbon Specialist, Marketing and Utilization Forester, and District Foresters) would support all Maine forestland owners regardless of size. And the development of a forest carbon program as envisioned under Section #4 could conceivably result in a program that is accessible to large landowners as well.

8. Consider opportunities for Maine to participate in multi-state forest carbon initiatives.

The Co-chairs of the Task Force have been engaged in ongoing discussions with the Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future, the U.S. Climate Alliance, and the states of Massachusetts, Vermont, and New York to identify opportunities and issues related to the initiation of a regional collaboration to increase investment in forest carbon sequestration and storage. To date, these discussions have focused on financing mechanisms that could support forest conservation and management at scales aligned with each state's greenhouse gas mitigation targets, and the infrastructure that would be necessary to support a regional carbon market, including offset protocols, a registry, and accounting frameworks. The Task Force supports the continuation of these discussions (including examination of the potential to expand the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative) that could advance a regional initiative that is complementary to or ultimately replaces individual state-based programs, assuming it proves the most efficient way of enabling Maine's forests to help achieve the state's greenhouse gas reduction goals.

9. Recommend a numeric goal or targets for increased carbon sequestration in Maine over time.

Maine's forests as a whole (i.e., including all landowner sizes and types) have sequestered an average of 9 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year ($MtCO_2e$/yr) over the past decade (Bai et al., 2020; Domke et al., 2021). An additional 3 $MtCO_2e$/yr has been sequestered on average in harvested wood products manufactured in the state (Bai et al., 2020; Daigneault and Frank, 2021). Combined, Maine's forest sector has been sequestering an average of 12 $MtCO_2e$/yr, equivalent to removing about 65% of the state's reported gross GHG emissions (DEP, 2020) over the past decade (Figure 1).

The state's forest carbon sequestration values have been historically high over the past decade as well, averaging nearly double the amount of sequestration in the 1990s. There is no guarantee that the current levels will hold indefinitely into the future. Continuing to sequester carbon at similar levels is an ambitious goal that will play a significant part in helping Maine achieve its 2045 net zero GHG emissions target, especially as the state continues to reduce its gross GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

The Task Force recognizes that there is a balance between achieving the goal of maintaining or increasing timber harvests to help grow the forest economy and accumulating carbon on the stump as well as minimizing carbon leakage. In addition, the Task Force also recognizes that the state's forests are also vulnerable to future impacts from pests, disease, climate extremes, and wildfire, which could have a negative impact on the ability to sequester carbon.

Figure 1. Maine GHG emissions and forest sector carbon sequestration (Sources: DEP, 2020; Domke et al., 2021; Daigneault and Frank, 2021).



The Task Force recommends the following:

- **A statewide total forest sector carbon sequestration target of no less than 12 $MtCO_2e$/yr through 2045, maintaining the past decade's historically high carbon sequestration level.**

- **This forest sector target includes carbon sequestered in forest ecosystems (e.g., aboveground live, dead wood, soils, etc.) as well as harvested wood products.**

- **The target should be measured using a 5-year rolling average, recognizing the interannual variability in forest carbon sequestration that occurs in natural systems.**

- **The target should be re-evaluated by an advisory committee every 5 years as new data and knowledge about Maine's forests and harvested wood products become available, while retaining the goal of maintaining or increasing total carbon sequestration.**

The several million acres of Maine's small forest landowners (10 to 10,000 acre ownerships) can play an important role in helping Maine achieve the Task Force's recommended forest sector-

wide target. Doing so will require investment in technical assistance and improved forest management. Any program needs to be able to demonstrate success and monitor progress over time with whatever metrics are used. Increasing the number of MFS district foresters by 50% will have a corresponding impact on the number of landowner contacts and forest management plans they assist with. Providing information and technical assistance for Maine forest owners to improve management of Maine forests on a voluntary basis will enhance their ability to achieve landowner objectives while often enhancing rates of carbon sequestration over the next several decades. Forests managed based on the best available science will also be more resilient to stressors that include a changing climate, enhancing their ability to retain carbon that would otherwise be lost back to the atmosphere. Further, the state should utilize other mechanisms for developing forest management plans such as the Tree Growth Tax and NRCS cost-share programs to increase carbon sequestration and storage through more targeted improvements in forest management.

The Task Force also conducted a preliminary analysis using secondary data sources to estimate the carbon sequestration potential if Maine's small woodland owners implemented a mix of the recommended practices (Appendix A). The preliminary analysis identified a number of key uncertainties, including the total ownership area, landowner participation, current distribution of practices, harvest and carbon leakage impacts, and mitigation potential for each of the recommended management practices. As a result, the Task Force was unable to provide a specific numerical target for this specific ownership type.

Appendix A

Preliminary Analysis of Maine's Small Landowner Forest Carbon Mitigation Potential

(Note: The information which follows is the best available on this topic but is considered preliminary. Efforts are already underway to refine it.)

Methodology[2]

A literature review was conducted of nearly a dozen studies examining management implications on forest carbon in the Northeastern U.S to produce estimates of the carbon sequestration potential if Maine's "best guess" estimate of 6.9 million acres of small woodland owners implemented the recommended practices (see Table A-1). The collective findings – which are considered a rough approximation due to data limitations – indicate that implementing various forest management practices could result in a mean/median sequestration rate of about 0.25-0.5 tCO_2e per acre, per year (Figure A-1). Using these studies and other relevant sources, carbon sequestration and cost estimates were approximated by practice (see below) and by overarching practice categories (Table A-1).

The Task Force's ***15 recommended practices*** (Table A-1) were synthesized into five overarching forest carbon management categories or goals (Table A-2) and average costs and sequestration rates were reported. The 5 categories were grouped by similarity according to:

- Secondary benefits *(*habitat preservation, increasing value of standing timber, transition to old growth, etc.)
- Likelihood of implementation by small woodland owners (i.e., participation)
- Land scale applicability (6.9 million acres for management versus 5,150 acres/yr for avoided conversion)

The aggregate potential for implementing these practices was then estimated by proportioning out each of the practice categories. This analysis took a conservative approach but assuming that none of the practice groups could be jointly implemented, while in some cases (e.g., enhanced forest resiliency and intermediate treatments), more than one recommendation could be done on the same forest area.

This preliminary analysis has several uncertainties and limitation due to variability across studies and data used to derive the estimates for Maine's small landowners:

- **Methodologies.** The studies used for this assessment used a mix of data, models, and methodologies to quantify the impacts of varying management on forest carbon sequestration. This included FIA, remote sensing, Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS), LANDIS, and stand and landscape level bookkeeping models.

- **Study area and time length**. Each study had a unique study area (966 to 17.6 million acres) and length of time (20-160 years) over which it estimated changes in forest carbon. The study-specific estimates were normalized by converting forest carbon metrics to a per acre per year basis.

- **Biophysical v. socioeconomic impacts.** All studies assessed the biophysical and carbon impacts of different practices, but less so the socio-economic effects. These include costs associated with changes in management or the opportunity costs from changes in harvest revenue. Cost estimates were utilized from other studies or calculated as a rough estimate based on other sources like NRCS.

- **Carbon stocks and fluxes.** Each study measured a unique set of forest carbon stocks (e.g., aboveground, soil, etc.) While all looked at aboveground growing stock, while others also examined storage in harvested wood products and substitution of more GHG-intensive products such as steel and concrete. To account for this, outliers were removed, particularly those with high values due to product substitution.

- **Baselines/Business as Usual**. All sequestration estimates were based on comparing the effect of a given practice on the study-specific baseline. This can vary based on when and what data were collected and the study assumptions about future stand growth, wood product demand, etc.

- **Harvest and carbon leakage effects**. Many data sources used for this analysis did not report changes in harvest levels or the associated carbon leakage effects that could occur should harvests decline relative to the baseline. Any management practice that results in a reduction in harvest is likely to result in increased timber harvests and carbon emitted outside of the study area. This effect would reduce the overall amount of carbon sequestration from some of the practices considered (e.g., set-asides).

- **Climate impacts**. Most studies assumed a constant climate that reflected historical trends in forest growth and yield changes in future climate conditions have differing levels of impact across different forest compositions and age classes impacting management decisions. For example, a large increase in climate variability has a larger impact on unmanaged forest land than an actively managed forest.

- **Natural disturbance regimes**. As with climate, most studies did not explicitly account for a potential change in the frequency or impact of natural disturbances over time.

Despite the noted uncertainties, there is some confidence in the mean-level estimates that are presented in Table A-1. More details on the references used, data collected, and how estimates vary across study and practice can be found here: https://umainesystem-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/g/personal/adam_daigneault_maine_edu/ESVrH-RDnzBFuqUD984vq1QBqbcm0B4iEqOLH-UPl2n8Ow?e=HVL4Ej

Figure A-1. Histogram of carbon sequestration estimates ($tCO_2e/ac/yr$). relative to baseline for all management practices (n=98)



Table A-1. Preliminary Analysis of Quantified Impacts of Forest Carbon Task Force Recommended Practices and Metrics

#	***Recommended Practice***	*Annual Forest C Seq ($tCO_2e/ac/yr$)*	*Break-even C Price ($/tCO₂e$)*	*Cost ($/ac)*	*Annualized Cost ($/ac/yr)*	*NRCS Scenario*	*C Seq Source*	*C Price Source*
	Avoided Forest Conversion							
1	Avoid forestland loss/incentivize forest conservation (through conservation easements or fee purchases) to maintain forest ecosystem carbon and the potential for continued sequestration	212	$17.00	$3,604	$256	N/A	1	1
	Enhanced Forest Resiliency							
2	When planting, select species well-suited to the site and a changing climate.	0.46	$18.40	$546	$39	N/A	2,7	1,7
3	If relying on natural regeneration, plan the harvest to regenerate the site quickly with desired species.	0.19	$6.11	$453	$32	Competition Control	6	5,6
4	Manage competition from invasive and undesirable tree species.	0.49	$9.41	$240-630	$31	Brush management (chemical or mechanical)	2,4	1,4,5

5	Plan to reduce the risk of carbon losses from disturbances (e.g. wildfire, exotic and endemic insect infestations, etc.)	0.15	$16.00	$947	$67	Forest slash treatment	1	1, 5
	Intermediate Treatments							
6	Retain more carbon in thinnings (retain large-diameter live trees, snags, and species diversity).	0.49	$9.41	$640	$45	Thinning for wildlife and forest health	2,4	4, 5
7	Pre-commercially thin saplings and small poles	0.49	$13.69	$640	$45	Pre-commercial thinning	2,4	4, 5
8	Commercially thin (uniform thinnings or crop tree releases)	0.49	$9.41	$440	$31	Crop/mast tree release	2,4	4,5,6
9	Increase stocking in understocked stands	0.60	$17.40	$804	$57	hardwood hand planting	7,8,9	4,5
10	Focus investments in intensive silvicultural treatments on sites with high carbon value potential (superior soils, drainage, aspect).	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Sustainable Harvesting							

11	Extend harvest cycle to grow larger trees that are more likely to be used in long-lived wood products.	0.51	$9.86	N/A	N/A	N/A	1, 2	1
12	Seek to increase the proportion of harvested materials likely to be used in long-lived wood products.	0.51	$9.86	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,2	1
13	Manage partial harvests thoughtfully to minimize stand damage	0.04	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	N/A
14	Utilize timber harvesting professionals trained in climate-friendly harvesting practices	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Establish Forest Reserves							
15	Establish forest reserves on high carbon density and special ecological value sites to allow the development of late successional forest.	0.64	$12.14	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,2,3	1

Notes: Carbon (C) Seq: Mean annual amount of forest carbon sequestration above baseline practice. Break-even C price: value on a ton per CO_2e basis that the mean landowner would need to be paid to be indifferent between their baseline practice and the recommended practice. Cost: initial cost on a per acre basis that the mean landowner would face to implement the recommended practice. Annualized cost: Total annual cost of implementing recommended practice over 25 years using a discount rate of 5%. NRCS Scenario: Natural Resource Conservation Service scenario most aligned with recommended practice.

Sources: 1. Daigneault et al (2021); 2. Dugan et al. (2021); 3. Gunn and Bucholtz (2018); 4. Russell-Roy et al (2014); 5. NRCS (2021); 6. Nunnery and Keaton (2009); 7. Cook-Patton et al. (2020); 8. NEFF (2020); 9. Hoover and Heath (2011)

Table A-2. Aggregate Impacts of Forest Carbon Task Force Recommended Practices

Forest Carbon Practice Category	Max Acres (per year)*	Mean Annual Sequestration (tCO_2e/ac/yr)	Break-even cost ($/$tCO_2e$)	Recommended Practice (based on Table A-1 practice numbers)
A. Avoided Forest Conversion	5,150	212	$17	#1
B. Enhanced Forest Resiliency	6,900,000	0.32	$12	#2-5
C. Intermediate Treatments	6,900,000	0.52	$12	#6-10
D. Sustainable Harvesting	6,900,000	0.35	$10	#11-14
E. Establish Forest Reserves	6,900,000	0.64	$12	#15

* 6.9 million acres based on preliminary analysis 'best guess' in Table 1. Subject to revision as more data becomes available.

Descriptions of each of the five categories and how it relates to the specific 15 recommendations set forth by the Task Force are included below.

A. Avoided Forest Conversion (Forest Practice #1)

Identified as a critical management strategy of the Task Force, this practice seeks to incentivize landowners to maintain Maine's forests as forests. Between 2001 and 2016, land in Maine was converted from forests to development or other uses at a rate of 5,150 acres per year (Homer et. al. 2020). By ***avoiding forestland conversion (#1)*** of at-risk forest land, and incentivizing forest conservation through conservation easements or fee purchases, forest ecosystems maintain carbon stocks on the margin of 5,150 acres per year, equating to 212 tons of avoided carbon-dioxide emissions per acre per year. Other benefits of this practice include increased wildlife and habitat preservation, in addition to supporting Maine's forest economy.

B. Enhance Forest Resiliency (Forest Practices #2-5)

Forest resilience ensures forest health and longevity for future generations so Maine's forests can continue sequestering carbon. The Task Force's recommends ***selecting species well-suited to the site and a changing climate (#2)*** thereby expanding the carbon holding potential on an adaptive forest landscape. Other recommendations that serve as strategies to enhance forest resiliency include: ***assisting post-harvest sites for resilient forest regeneration (#3)***, ***managing for competitive undesirable and invasive species (#4)***, and ***reducing carbon losses from destructive disturbances (#5)*** such as wildfire, exotic and endemic insect damage, and ice damage. These strategies enhance carbon storage by managing forest health, resulting in bigger, stronger trees that increase the quality and value of standing timber. Woodland owners are more likely to adopt these resilience strategies with technical and financial support.

C. Intermediate Treatments (Forest Practices #6-10)

Intermediate treatments maximize forest carbon sequestration while reinforcing forest structure and composition. The task force recommends conducting thinning in immature and/or overstocked stands to stimulate growth of the remaining trees and increase the yield of useful material from the stand (i.e., evaluate short-term carbon losses against longer term forest and forest product carbon benefits). These practices include ***retaining large diameter trees, snags, and species diversity (#6),*** and ***pre-commercial thinning (#7), commercial thinning (#8)***. Thinning practices remove unwanted or poor-quality vegetation, shrubs, and saplings around the healthiest trees, therefore maximizing the growth rates and increasing the amount of carbon available on the stand. Intermediate treatments also include a variety of silvicultural prescriptions and planting fast-growing or understocked species to ***increase forest stocking in understocked stands (#9).*** These treatments should ***steer investment to sites with high carbon value potential (#10)*** including superior soils, draining, etc. Specific intermediate treatments should be selected by landowners and foresters with specific goals in mind such as restoring or maintaining wildlife habitats, diversifying forest species and composition, increasing the health of the forest, and enhancing the aesthetic of the woodlot. Much of the success of small woodland owners implementing these practices is dependent on the strength and presence of low-grade markets for

forest thinning residuals. Without these markets, financial support and cost-sharing services are crucial.

D. Sustainable Harvesting (Forest Practices #11-14)

Implementing sustainable harvest practices ensure minimal disturbance while enhancing the longevity of the forest ecosystem. Landowners should consider ***extending or delaying harvest cycles (#11)*** beyond 50 years to allow trees to grow larger, increasing the likelihood that more harvest material will be used in long-lived wood products. Likewise, ***increasing the proportion of harvested materials likely to be used in long-lived wood products (#12)*** reduces carbon emissions in comparison to carbon-intensive products like concrete and steel**.** Encouraging ***partial harvesting practices (#13)*** as opposed to high grading, sustains the health of the forest and furthers its regeneration, especially if residual stand damage is minimized. As recommended by the Task Force, all aforementioned sustainable harvesting practices should be performed by ***timber harvesting professionals trained in climate-friendly harvesting practices (#14)***. Woodland owners are likely to implement sustainable harvesting practices with additional technical and financial support.

E. Establish Forest Reserves (Forest Practice #15)

The Task Force recommends ***expanding the amount of forestland in reserves (#15)***, especially on sites with high carbon density and in areas of special ecological value. It is important to note that carbon efficient areas are those forests with a high carbon density and may have old growth characteristics or sustain critical wildlife habitat. Additionally, forestland under reserves should be allowed to mature to a late successional forest to store as much carbon as possible. Forest set-asides promote the transition to old-growth forests while maintaining ecosystem services such as habitat conservation; soil health and nutrient cycling; water quality; and cultural/spiritual social values. Forest set-asides require low-intensity, passive management and therefore many small woodland owners are likely to adopt this management strategy.

Total mitigation potential by participation rate

The metrics presented in Table A-2 can be used to estimate the forest C sequestration and potential from the Task Force's "best guess" of Maine's 6.9 million acres of small forestland owners (see Table 1) based on the level of participation, assuming that this entire area currently follows baseline management practices (Figure A-2). Figure A-3 shows the mitigation potential by specific forest practice grouping (A-E) and participation rates (0-100%). Note: option A (avoided conversion) can be exclusive of options B-E, while implementing option E (establish reserves) would likely eliminate implementing B-D. Further, B-D could be potentially implemented jointly on some forestland. For simplicity, Figure A-3 was developed based on the conservative assumption that option A could be fully implemented with a 100% participation rate, while a full participation rate would result in landowners implementing 30% each of B, C, and D (90% in aggregate), and 10% of landowners implementing E. As a result, the estimate is that if all of Maine's small forestland owners participated in a forest carbon sequestration program, about 4 $MtCO_2e$/yr of additional forest carbon could be accrued annually, costing upwards of $54 mil/yr. This estimated cost is the equivalent of $13.50/$tCO_2e$.

Figure A-2. Preliminary, rough approximation of Maine's small landowner carbon sequestration potential and total cost of implementing a combination of enhanced forest resiliency, intermediate treatments, sustainable harvesting and establishing forest reserves across different participation rates. (100% = 6.9 million acres).



Figure A-3. Preliminary, rough approximation of Maine's small landowner annual carbon sequestration potential across different practice groupings and participation rates. (100% = 6.9 million acres).



For comparison, the 2004 climate action plan evaluated the mitigation potential for 10 forest management practices if they were implemented across the entire state (DEP, 2004). That report noted that implementing individual practices could increase forest carbon sequestration by 72,300 to 531,700 tCO_2e/yr. If all practices were jointly implemented, then the 2004 analysis estimated that Maine's forests could sequester an additional 2.4 million tCO_2e/yr over the baseline. This figure is close to the above estimate if about 60% of Maine's small landowners participated in a forest carbon sequestration program.

References

Bai, X., Daigneault, A. J., Fernandez, I. J., Frank, J., Hayes, D., Johnson, B., Wei, X., & Weiskittel, A. (2020). *Maine's Carbon Budget v1.0*. Center for Research on Sustainable Forests. https://crsf.umaine.edu/forest-climate-change-initiative/carbon-budget/

Cook-Patton, S. C., Gopalakrishna, T., Daigneault, A., Leavitt, S. M., Platt, J., Scull, S. M., Amarjargal, O., Ellis, P. W., Griscom, B. W., McGuire, J. L., Yeo, S. M., & Fargione, J. E. (2020). Lower cost and more feasible options to restore forest cover in the contiguous United States for climate mitigation. *One Earth*, *3*(6), 739–752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.11.013

Daigneault, A., Simons-Legaard, E., Birthisel, S., Carroll, J., Fernandez, I., & Weiskittel, A. (2020). *Maine Forestry and Agriculture Natural Climate Solutions Mitigation Potential* (p. 77) [Interim Report]. The University of Maine. https://crsf.umaine.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/214/2020/09/UMaine-NCS-Interim-Report_1Sept20.pdf

Daigneault, A., Simons-Legaard, E., Birthisel, S., Carroll, J., Fernandez, I., & Weiskittel, A. (2021). *Maine Forestry and Agriculture Natural Climate Solutions Mitigation Potential (Revised)*. The University of Maine. https://crsf.umaine.edu/forest-climate-change-initiative/ncs/

Department of Environmental Protection. (2004). *Maine Climate Action Plan 2004*. https://www.maine.gov/dep/sustainability/climate/MaineClimateActionPlan2004.pdf

Domke, G. M., Walters, B. F., Nowak, D. J., Smith, J. E., Nichols, M. C., Ogle, S. M., Coulston, J. W., & Wirth, T. C. (2021). *Greenhouse gas emissions and removals from forest land, woodlands, and urban trees in the United States, 1990-2019*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station Resource Update FS-307. https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/62418

Dugan, A. J., Lichstein, J. W., Steele, A., Metsaranta, J. M., Bick, S., & Hollinger, D. Y. (2021). Opportunities for forest sector emissions reductions: A state-level analysis. *Ecological Applications*. https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2327

Homer, C. G., Dewitz, J., Jin, S., Xian, G. Z., Costello, C., Danielson, P., Gass, L., Funk, M., Wickham, J., Stehman, S., Auch, R. F., & Riitters, K. H. (2020). Conterminous United States land cover change patterns 2001–2016 from the 2016 National Land Cover Database. ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, 162, 184–199. USGS Publications Warehouse. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2020.02.019

Hoover, C. M., & Heath, L. S. (2011). Potential gains in C storage on productive forestlands in the northeastern United States through stocking management. Ecological Applications, 21(4), 1154–1161. https://doi.org/10.1890/10-0046.1

Nunery, J., & Keeton, W. (2010). *Forest carbon storage in the northeastern United States: Net effects of harvesting frequency, post-harvest retention, and wood products*. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FORECO.2009.12.029

NRCS (2021) Maine Payment Schedules. USDA. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/programs/financial/?cid=nrcseprd1328241

NEFF (2021). Exemplary Forestry Growth and Yield Modeling and Link to Financial Modeling (DRAFT). New England Forestry Foundation.

Russell-Roy, E. T., Keeton, W. S., Pontius, J. A., & Kerchner, C. D. (2014). Rehabilitation forestry and carbon market access on high-graded northern hardwood forests. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, *44*(6), 614–627. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2013-0437

Appendix B

Acres, Harvest Levels, and Carbon Storage within 10-10,000-acre Ownerships

To examine the question of how many acres, how much volume/biomass is harvested, and how much live above-ground carbon is standing on small woodland ownerships (10-10,000 acres) in Maine three resources were examined: 1) The National Woodland Owner Survey (NWOS, Butler et al. 2021); 2) The MFS Silvicultural and Landowner Reports; and 3) The USFS FIA Database in conjunction with a digital map ownership product purchased from a private source that uses public tax lot data to assign ownerships. This appendix provides additional details on each of those data sources and assumptions behind the estimates listed in the main report.

National Woodland Ownership Survey (NWOS) Data

According to the National Woodland Owner Survey (NWOS), family ownerships (10+ acres) represent 4.7 million acres or 29% of the private land base (Butler et al., 2021). The NWOS reports that 345,000 out of the 4.7 million acres are in holdings greater than 5,000 acres. If so, 27% could be considered an extreme low-end estimate, and that accounting for small corporate ownerships could raise this estimate considerably. Using the USFS digital map product (DMP) in conjunction with FIA data on all small private ownerships (family and corporate), this figure increased to 43% where ownership was known. However, the DMP that was used in the process likely needs to be refined (see FIA DMP section below).

Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) & Digital Map Product (DMP)

Additional insight was gleaned using a combination of data sources. A digital map product (DMP) provided landowner data for a given parcel and parcel size. This layer was combined with the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) Tree Canopy Cover (TCC) map to assign land cover status (forested or non-forested) to the DMP. Acreages were summed by unique owners to assign an ownership size class to each parcel. Each FIA plot was assigned an ownership size class using the spatial intersect tool. The 2019 evaluation of the USFS-FIA database (i.e., the complement of data collected from FIA plots inventoried between 2015 and 2019; 2010 and 2019 for removals) was used to estimate area, above-ground biomass, and harvest removals. For more technical details, please see the USFS Spatial Data Services response to MFS Data Request section.

A key issue that emerged is that the DMP was ‘incomplete’ (i.e., many parcels did not have ownership information – particularly in Central Maine); as such ownership size class attributes could not be calculated for all of Maine’s forest area. This problem stems in part from incomplete taxlot records and maps. A brief examination of some of the data in the DMP suggested that some large ownerships were contributing to a significant volume of unknown acres. It is also possible that some of the known ownerships may have additional parcels that were not being picked up (i.e., were unknown) and summing the knowns with the unknowns could move these into the larger size class. In addition, some ownerships names may have been entered incorrectly or inconsistently. Both of these items would lead to an overestimate of the acres in the 10-10,000 acre ownership size class (e.g. A parcel of 9,000 acres owned by John

Smith might not have been merged with a parcel owned by either J. Smith or unknown of 1,001 acres). Lastly, it was noted that some FIA plots ownership class codes did not align with the DMP assessment.

Due to the quality of this dataset, the Task Force presented ranges of values (see Table 1), where the low-end estimate assumes all unknown parcels belong to large landowners and the high-end estimate assumes that all unknown parcels belong to small woodland owners. For the private forests in Maine, the 10 to 10,000 acres size class likely represents at least 24%, and certainly less than 68% of the forested acres; at least 27% and certainly less than 69% of the live above-ground carbon; and at least 24%, but certainly not more than 66% of the harvest removals. The best guesses of 43% of the acreage; 46% of the carbon; and 43% of the harvest removals would assume that (1) the proportion of small acres in the known category holds for unknown, and (2) it is unlikely that unknown parcels would add to smaller ownerships to move them into the larger ownership class.

Considering that FIA data are collected on a 5-year cycle, it is important to recognize that an ownership may have been harvested and transitioned between ownership size classes between "time 1" and "time 2" when calculating removals. The DMP only has data for time 2 (i.e., the most recent sample year). As such, the FIA-DMP removal estimates would include cases where a parcel was in a larger ownership at time 1 and smaller ownership class at time 2 but not the alternative. This would suggest that less harvest would actually be coming off of small woodland ownerships. Again, the high proportion of unclassified parcels in the DMP leaves us uncertain of the actual estimate. It may be possible to reduce this uncertainty in the near future by using other ownership layers to help clarify some of the gaps in the DMP, by identifying where the large (over 10,000 acres) ownerships are.

Table B-1. Acreage, aboveground biomass (inventory and annual removals); merchantable biomass (inventory and removals) and merchantable bole volume (inventory) using FIA data and DMP[1]

Landowner size class (acres)	Forest Area (acres)	Aboveground Biomass Live Stock (dry tons)	Aboveground Biomass Removal (dry tons/yr)	Net Merchantable Biomass (dry tons)	Net Merchantable Biomass Removals (dry tons/yr)	Net Merchantable Bole Volume (dry tons)
0-10 acres	384,406	26,115,505	235,969	18,782,787	164,756	1,047,649,490
10-100 acres	1,497,263	72,856,845	1,019,777	49,305,553	774,712	2,912,962,393
100-1000 acres	1,378,871	60,469,585	1,214,833	39,443,893	862,732	2,367,142,812
1000-5000 acres	512,545	20,052,331	430,755	12,719,236	317,659	774,755,465
5000-10000 acres	554,273	20,087,672	403,551	11,661,761	280,263	734,555,991
10000+ acres	4,877,217	174,317,030	4,178,557	101,561,777	2,979,036	6,324,457,697
10-10000 acres (known) subtotal	**3,942,952**	**173,466,433**	**3,068,916**	**113,130,443**	**2,235,366**	**6,789,416,661**
Total known landowner size	9,204,575	373,898,968	7,483,442	233,475,007	5,379,158	14,161,523,848
Unknown landowner size	**6,921,742**	**269,423,972**	**5,123,411**	**167,245,233**	**3,716,509**	**10,272,498,660**
Total known & unknown size	**16,126,317**	**643,322,940**	**12,606,853**	**400,720,240**	**9,095,667**	**24,434,022,508**

[1] Disclaimer pertaining to FIA summary data completed as part of the MFS data request described in the "MFS Data Request: Forest Metrics by Landowner Size Class and Private Landowner Class" (supplemental document available on request):

Please NOTE: for the enclosed report (or other title) Title 17 U.S.C. §105 states that copyright protection is not available for any work of the United States Government. This includes any authorship and/or editorial work performed by an employee of the United States Government as part of their official duties. The data are provided "as is", without warranty of any kind, express or implied, including but not limited to the fitness for a particular purpose and no infringement. In no event shall the Forest Service be liable for any claim, loss, damages or other liability, whether in an action of contract, tort or otherwise, arising from, out of or in connection with this data. The Forest Service does not support and has no connection to any results obtained by using the data obtained outside of the specific conditions described in the Forest Service specifications. The RECIPIENT agrees to ACKNOWLEDGE the contribution of the FS Forest Inventory & Analysis program (FIA) in all written, or oral disclosures containing/or using the FS DATA.

MFS Landowner Report

The MFS landowner survey records data on volume (or tonnage) and acres harvested by ownership size class. In 2018, 3.8 million green tons were reported harvested on 138,001 acres. Since stumpage estimates are only reported on a subset of sales, this number was adjusted based on the total acres harvested as reported in the silvicultural report resulting in 9.3 million green tons. Two problems remain with these data: 1) Ownership holdings are reported in the following classes 1-100; 101-1,000; 1,001-100,000 and 100,000+ which does not allow for direct estimate of acres in holdings of 10-10,000 acres and 2) the total tonnage reported on the landowner report is nearly 30% less than that on the wood processor report. Using FIA data, the percentage of harvest in the 1-10 acre class was estimated to be no more than 3% of the total statewide harvest. Estimates of harvest would then range from 26% (10-1,000 acres) to 37% (10-100,000 acres) reflecting the harvest adjusted by silvicultural acres alone to 35 (10-1,000 acres) up to 48% (10-100,000 acres) after adjusting harvest up to reflect the harvest reported in the wood processor reports.

Table B-2. MFS harvest volume and acre estimates based on stumpage, silvicultural, and wood processor report data.

AcreageClass	Stumpage Acres Reporting	Stumpage Volumed Reported	Silv. Acres Reported	Volume Adjusted by Silvicultural Report Acres	10-100 acre class corrected using FIA data	Volume Adjusted to Match Wood Processor Report	Percent of Harvest on a wood processor report basis	Percent of Harvest on a stumpage basis
1 to 10 acres	24,751	758,994	51,140	1,568,215	266,597	359,095	2	3
10-100 acres					1,301,618	1,753,229	10	14
101 to 1,000 acres	30,056	890,998	65,983	1,956,017	1,956,017	2,634,678	16	21
1,001 to 100,000 acres	26,032	717,649	48,135	1,326,998	1,326,998	1,787,415	11	14
100,000 + acres	57,162	1,426,991	177,988	4,443,304	4,443,304	5,984,956	61	48
Totals	138,001	3,794,633	343,247	9,294,534	9,294,534	12,519,373	100	100

FIA Definitions Supporting Table 2 (Burrill et al. 2021)

FIA Stand-size class code: Table 2 of the main report includes references to stand-size and growing-stock classification categories that are based on FIA definitions listed in Burrill et al. (2021) and based on Asner et al (2001). Stocking is an expression of stand density that may be expressed in absolute terms, such as basal area per acre, volume per acre, number of trees per acre, or in relative terms, as a percent of some previously defined standard. The FIA stand-size class is based on the dominant (based on stocking) diameter class of live trees in a measured plot, which is defined in section 2.5.20. The FIA all live stocking code description indicates the stocking condition by all live trees, including seedlings (section 2.5.37), while the FIA growing-stock stocking code description indicates the stocking of the condition of only the growing-stock trees and seedlings, as defined in section 2.5.36 (Table B-3).

Table B-3. FIA growing-stock stocking description

Code	Description
1	Overstocked (density of a stand of average maximum competition >100%)
2	Fully stocked (60 - 99% density of a stand of average maximum competition)
3	Medium stocked (35 - 59% density of a stand of average maximum competition)
4	Poorly stocked (10 - 34% density of a stand of average maximum competition)
5	Nonstocked (0 - 9% density of a stand of average maximum competition)

Literature Cited

Burrill, Elizabeth A., Andrea M. DiTommaso, Jeffrey A. Turner, Scott A. Pugh, Glenn Christensen, Carol J. Perry, Barbara L. Conkling. 2021. "The Forest Inventory and Analysis Database: Database Description and User Guide for Phase 2 (version 9.0.1)." https://www.fia.fs.fed.us/library/database-documentation/current/ver90/FIADB%20User%20Guide%20P2_9-0-1_final.pdf

Butler, Brett J., Sarah M. Butler, Jesse Caputo, Jacqueline Dias, Amanda Robillard, and Emma M. Sass. 2021. "Family Forest Ownerships of the United States, 2018: Results from the USDA Forest Service, National Woodland Owner Survey." Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-199. Madison, WI: USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. https://doi.org/10.2737/NRS-GTR-199.

Appendix C

Abbreviations

CAP - Conservation Activity Plans within EQIP

DMP - digital map product

EQIP - USDA NRCS Environmental Quality Incentive Program

FIA - USDA Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis Program data

FOR/Maine - Forest Opportunity Roadmap/Maine

GHG - greenhouse gas

LANDIS - Landscape Disturbance and Succession Model

MFS - Maine Forest Service

MMTC - million metric tons of carbon

$MtCO_2e$ - million tons carbon dioxide equivalent

NGO - non-governmental organization

NRCS - USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service

NWOA - National Woodland Owners Association

NWOS - National Woodland Owners Survey

USDA - U.S. Department of Agriculture