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Some History

Source: EPA (2005)
Some History

- Waxman-Markey comprehensive climate legislation bill (HR 2454) in 2009
- Key potential role for agriculture and forestry offsets
What happened after HR 2454?

- Biogenic CO2 debate
- Paris Agreement
- Clean Power Plan
  - limited role for land use sectors
- Mid-Century Strategy
- US out of the Paris Agreement
2016 US Biennial Report

Figure 6  U.S. Emissions Projections—2016 Current Measures Compared with Potential Reductions from Additional Measures Consistent with the Climate Action Plan

Also shown are previous projections from the 2006, 2010, and 2014 U.S. Climate Action Reports, which demonstrate the dramatic ratcheting down of projected U.S. emissions over the past decade.

Bioenergy with CCS an important abatement source

Substantial role for afforestation
Global Warming of 1.5 Degrees – IPCC Special Report

- 2018 report suggests near-term climate action is needed to avoid severe climate impacts

- Also offered several “pathways” for climate change stabilization
Global Warming of 1.5 Degrees – IPCC Special Report

- Pathways show large potential role for the land use sectors (AFOLU)
  - Increased sequestration and supply of bioenergy feedstock for BECCs
Natural Climate Solutions (Griscom et al., 2017)

- Assessment of global mitigation potential from various NCS (or land-based mitigation activities)
- **Key result:**
  - NCS can provide $\sim 11.3 \text{ PgCO}_2\text{e year}^{-1}$ of abatement for $<100/\text{tCO}_2\text{e}$
- The NCS paper renewed focus on land-based mitigation strategies
  - New fundraising push by donor governments and foundations

Source: Griscom et al. (2017)
Natural Climate Solutions

- NCS could supply ~1/3 of mitigation needed by 2030 for high probability of stabilization (<2 degree increase)
- However…
  - Assumes activities are mutually exclusive
  - No market feedback
  - Ignores role of management and interactions with bioenergy
  - Costs are average and constant over time
Current State of Policy

• Re-emergence of interest in carbon offsets, even without a national cap-and-trade scheme
  – private sector-led; role for federal govt?
• Wood pellet production continues to expand
  – Potential for domestic market?
• Complementary federal policies (e.g., REPLANT Act)
Some Economic Considerations

- Global perspectives may not capture nuance of regional market systems and mitigation opportunities
- NCS frameworks do not reflect market opportunity costs of mitigation investments
- *Economic modeling can offer insight into mitigation opportunities, costs, and tradeoffs in US forestry*
Importance of Economic Modeling

- Captures market opportunity costs of mitigation investments

Source: Ohrel, 2019
Importance of Economic Modeling

- Socioeconomic developments can alter land management and production patterns, affecting:
  - Baseline emissions
  - Marginal abatement costs

- We can use models to assess mitigation potential under alternative futures, while recognizing market tradeoffs
Modeling Approach

- Updated dynamic model of the U.S. ag and forestry sectors

Source: Adapted from Latta et al. (2018)

Source: Adapted from Jones et al. (2019)
Scenario Design

• Five alternative baselines aligned to Shared Socioeconomic Pathways:
  – **SSP1**: Sustainability
  – **SSP2**: Middle of the Road
  – **SSP3**: Regional Rivalry
  – **SSP4**: Inequality
  – **SSP5**: Fossil-fueled Development

• Mitigation scenarios:
  – $5, $20, $30, $50/tCO2e rising at 1% and 3%
Scenario Design

Sources of Variation across SSPs
- Income-driven demand growth for forest and agricultural products
- Dietary preferences
- Urban development
- Crop productivity growth
- Use of public lands

Mitigation Activities being Incentivized
- Increased forest C sequestration through preservation, expansion, and management
- Reduced non-CO2 emissions from crop and livestock production
- Increased soil carbon sequestration through management and land use
Shared Socioeconomic Pathways

Figure 4: Demand curves for U.S. Softwood lumber (million m3) and paper product (million tons) across SSPs from 2015 to 2065.
Key Findings

• Substantial mitigation potential from U.S. forestry and agriculture
  – Ranging ~160-750 MtCO2e per year by 2050
  – 5%-14% of total mitigation needed to hit new US NDC targets in 2030

• Variation in projected mitigation driven by future socioeconomic development and policy assumptions

• Forest carbon sinks are closely linked demand growth
Baseline Comparison

• Land use and production trends vary substantially
• Higher income growth drives investment in new forests
Cumulative Mitigation Potential (2030)

- Single baseline (SSP2), across price scenarios

- Projected mitigation for SSP2 ranges:
  - 150-450 MtCO$_2$e yr$^{-1}$
Cumulative Mitigation Potential (2030)

- All SSPs, single mitigation price $20/tCO$_2$e

- Projected mitigation across SSPs:
  - 110-330 MtCO$_2$e yr$^{-1}$
Key Takeaways

• Mitigation rises over time and at higher price incentives
• Range of mitigation across SSPs is substantial
  – Highest potential for pessimistic case (SSP3), lowest for high income and emissions case (SSP5)
• Greatest mitigation potential from forest management and afforestation (>60%)
Forestry dominates the mitigation portfolio
Source of Additional Forest C Sequestration
Market and Policy Induced Change in Forest C

Demand driven

Policy driven
Key Takeaways

• Demand an important driver of forest C storage under high income growth scenarios
  – More than 50% of C stock change is demand-driven in SSP5 by 2050

• Mitigation policy supports continued sequestration once demand-driven C sequestration plateaus
  – Demand-side policies can complement payments for carbon sequestration (Baker et al., 2019).
Conclusions

• Socioeconomic developments could influence future emissions and mitigation portfolios

• US AFOLU sectors are an important mitigation source
  – Ranging ~160-750 MtCO2e per year by 2050
  – 5%-14% of total mitigation needed to hit new US NDC targets in 2030

• Stimulating forest product demand in the U.S. can increase carbon storage and complement mitigation
Thank You!
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Updated Regional Abatement Costs

- Regional afforestation cost curves
- Regional livestock sector MACCs

Source: adapted from Nielsen et al. (2014) and presented in Cai et al. (2018)

Source: adapted from EPA (2016), represents MACC curves for enteric fermentation abatement
Baseline Emissions Projections

Forest C sequestration increases with income growth (SSP1, SSP5)
Cumulative Mitigation Potential (2050)

- Single baseline (SSP2), across price scenarios

- Projected mitigation for SSP2 ranges:
  - 190-540 MtCO$_2$e yr$^{-1}$
Mitigation Potential across Socioeconomic Futures

- All SSPs, single mitigation price
- By 2050, projected mitigation across SSPs:
  - $216-460 \text{MtCO}_2\text{e yr}^{-1}$