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Consortium for Research on Renewable Industrial Materials
A non-profit corporation formed by 15 research institutions to conduct cradle to grave environmental studies of wood uses
Road Map for Main Points:

• Forests can store carbon or pump it into products
• To understand best options requires life cycle analysis across many carbon pools
• Each wood use has a different impact: displacing fossil intensive building products has the highest leverage
• The most obvious policy options are likely counterproductive – be smarter in what we ask for
Carbon in USFS Western Washington Standing Inventory by Age

- Max forest carbon
- Max sustained growth & carbon removed from atmosphere: pumping carbon into product and substitution storage
Need to track the carbon impact across every stage of processing and use:

**LCI/LCA** is the accepted method

- ISO standards have been established
- Principles accepted by IPCC
- EPA is now *emphasizing* the importance of LCI

- **US EISA 2007** sets GHG thresholds for biofuels requiring LCA
  - a Congressional mandate
CORRIM:  
Consortium for Research on Renewable Industrial Materials  
- a 15 research institution non-profit corporation –  
Measure environmental burdens for every stage of processing and product use.

Water & Land Removals & Emissions
CORRIM’s Research Protocol

- Developed a comprehensive Research Plan - 22 modules

- Research guidelines follow LCI and LCA international protocol of ISO 14040’s Standards

- Reviewed by International LCI/LCA experts
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9 Product LCIs in 4 Supply Regions; LCAs for 4 Construction Sites (with different materials)

- Seattle Res&Non-Res Wet with Seismic Codes
- Minneapolis House Cold Climate
- Atlanta House Warm Climate
- S. Cal. Res&Non-Res Dry with Seismic Codes
9 Product LCIs in 4 Supply Regions; LCAs for 4 Construction Sites (with different materials)

- Seattle Res&Non-Res Wet with Seismic Codes
- Minneapolis House Cold Climate
- Atlanta House Warm Climate
- S. Cal. Res&Non-Res Dry with Seismic Codes

In process: Biofuel LCIs (from 3 feedstock sources) for 3 Virtual Bioprocessing Plants
Primary data manufacturing survey’s
of 9 wood products covering 4 regions:

- Mill surveys at **unit process level** (saw, dry, plane, energy, etc.)
- Non-wood inputs (energy by source, raw materials)
- Emissions and solid waste outputs

- Yields, flows (co-products) and mass balances
- *Calculate unit factor estimates* (raw materials, air, water, and solid emissions, energy, carbon)
Could be biofuel

More resin

Some resin feedstock

Total Energy for Life Cycle Stages (MJ/m³) SE/PNW ave.
Product Manufacturing Carbon Emissions

- NW KD Lumber
- NW Plywood
- SE OSB
- Concrete floor area eq.

Carbon neutral biofuel

Fossil emissions
Life Cycle Assessment of Buildings

Performance Indices:

• Embodied & Fossil Energy
• Global Warming Potential (GWP/GHG)
• Air Pollution
• Water Pollution
• Solid Waste
• Ecosystem Health
Representative Houses Designed to Local Code

**Minneapolis House**
**Cold Climate**

*Wood vs. steel framed*
designed to same R code

*Concrete basement, sheetrock, insulation, wood trusses, vinyl windows, vinyl siding and asphalt roofing.*

**Atlanta House**
**Warm Climate**

*Wood framed vs. concrete block exterior walls* designed to same R code.

*Slab on grade, sheetrock, insulation, wood trusses, vinyl windows, stucco/vinyl siding and asphalt roofing.*
Material Design Differences:
Minneapolis Steel Frame minus Wood Frame Extraction
(materials in kg)
6-8% of house mass
Summary Performance Indices
Minneapolis House

- Embodied Energy: +17%
- Global Warming: +26%
- Air Emissions: +14%
- Water Emissions: +312%
- Solid Waste: -1%
Summary Performance Indices
Atlanta House

Concrete vs Wood Design

- Embodied Energy: 16%
- Global Warming: 31%
- Air Emissions: 23%
- Water Emissions: 0%
- Solid Waste: 51%
With Carbon in Products

Steel vs Wood Frame: Minneapolis code
Concrete vs Wood Frame: Atlanta code
GWP per Building Assembly
including product carbon storage
Displacing Carbon Emissions

Substituting wood for energy intensive materials can be more effective

![Graph showing GHG stored in wood product & non-wood substitute displacement.](image)
More Direct Substitution
No limits on potential design: *even from reclaimed wood*
Sustainable Forest, Product and Substitution Pools
(e.g. concrete frame displaced by wood frame)
What Future Carbon Prices Will Do:

• Pay to collect forest residuals & waste

• Pay to use more wood in construction or other fossil substitutes (furniture etc.)

• Should pay to grow it faster & use it sooner, not grow it longer (*with correct accounting*)
Forest, Product and Substitution Pools with Higher Carbon Prices

With $50/ton C

With carbon price on collectables 1%/yr

.5%/yr

2%/yr
Residuals for Biofuel

Load of forest residuals and hauling to biomass facility

Residuals piles at processing yard

Ground Slash Feedstock = 50% of merch logs
Research Gaps that need filling

• Using forest residuals
• Avoiding fires
• Growing biomass faster (short rotation crops)
• Biofuel processing and displacement (selected feedstock)

• Substitution for fiber products (furniture, pallets, et al)
• Recycling & collecting wood & mixed wastes
• Avoiding or capturing landfill emissions
• Environmental performance product development
• Reducing barriers (policy conflicts & disincentives)
• More and effective Education
The Future Will Be Different

Architects, builders, product developers are beginning to see the potential for designing for sustainable living buildings:

• Structures/materials with lower carbon footprint
• Cladding designed for durability & thermal adaptability
• Architecture for low energy livability and recyclability

The search is just beginning
Counterproductive Policy Traps?

- Offering credits to one pool (like forestry) independent of all others. Yet that is what carbon exchanges do.
  - Forest carbon credits will likely reduce harvests increasing the use of fossil intensive products.

- Ethanol credits subsidize diverting feedstock away from best mitigation uses.

- Renewable energy standards fragment supply, a barrier to efficient production & divert feedstock from better uses.
Counterproductive Policies (CONT)

- A tax on fossil extraction would be allocated efficiently in the market and could be tax neutral with offsetting tax cuts.
  - But fails to tax all emissions at the border reducing competitiveness
  - Inflationary bias unless CPI adjusted for carbon value as quality
- A cap increases fossil prices for some suppliers like a fossil tax but reduces prices for others: economic distortion.
  - Reduces open market oil prices promoting accounting fraud at the border
  - Cannot credit the many alternative carbon pools involved
  - Instability between constrained and unconstrained markets (multiple tier pricing)
More Productive Policies

- A credit for reduced emissions from new structures (highest carbon offset leverage) could increase substitution leverage and bid the value back through the supply change.
  - Non-LCA based criteria like LEED are partially if not mostly counterproductive.
Conclusions

• We can assess the environmental performance of products. Guessing cannot.

• There are many potential improvements by using less fossil intensive products and more wood products.

• Energy for heat production remains the driving factor in wood processing energy, but could be bioenergy (if fuel costs or incentives were higher).

• The opportunity exists to steer the trend of product and design standards to LCA performance measures.

• Increasing fossil fuel prices i.e. carbon, will increase product substitution, collection of wastes and improve efficiencies in processing including biofuel collection and processing.

• Wood used in long term products provides the greatest reduction in fossil fuel use & emissions.

• Wood residuals used in biofuels should reduce emissions further but could displace products with greater leverage on GHG. Barriers are evident.

• Forest fires reduce carbon storage, a lost opportunity.

• Carbon cap and trade cannot emulate efficient markets: we need more LCA labeling and LCA based fossil taxes.
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More Details

CORRIM:  www.CORRIM.org
Athena:  www.athenaSMI.ca
LMS:  http://LMS.cfr.washington.edu
USLCI database:  www.nrel.gov/lci