




United States
Department of
Agriculture

Office of the
Chief Economist

Global Change
Program Office

Technical Bulletin 1907

U.S. Agriculture and Forestry Greenhouse Gas Inventory: 1990-2001



Smith, James E.; Woodbury, Peter B.; Heath, Linda S. 2004. Forest carbon sequestration and products storage, and Appendix C-1. In: U.S. Agriculture and Forestry Greenhouse Gas Inventory: 1990-2001. Tech. Bull. 1907. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture: 80-93, C-1, References.

U.S. Agriculture and Forestry Greenhouse Gas Inventory: 1990-2001. Global Change Program Office, Office of the Chief Economist, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Technical Bulletin No. 1907. 164 pp. March 2004.

Abstract

The U.S. Agriculture and Forestry Greenhouse Gas Inventory: 1990-2001 (USDA GHG Inventory) is a comprehensive assessment of greenhouse gas emissions and sinks in U.S. agriculture and forests. The USDA GHG Inventory provides extensive, in-depth emissions and sinks estimates for livestock, cropland, and forests, as well as energy consumption in livestock and cropland agriculture. Estimates are provided at State, regional, and national scales, categorized by land ownership and management practices where possible. Information in the report can be used to identify opportunities to reduce emissions and enhance sinks through agriculture and forest management. The report was prepared collaboratively with contributions from the United States Department of Agriculture (Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Agricultural Research Service, Office of Energy Policy and New Uses, and the Global Change Program Office), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and researchers at Colorado State University. The estimates in the USDA GHG Inventory are consistent with those published by the EPA in the official Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2001 and submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in April 2003.

Keywords: greenhouse gases, land use, land use change, carbon stocks, carbon sequestration, enteric fermentation, waste management, soil management, residue burning, rice cultivation, energy consumption.

Contributors

Kathryn Bickel (editor), Global Change Program Office, USDA
John Brenner, Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA
James Duffield, Office of Energy Policy and New Uses, USDA
Ron Follett, Agricultural Research Service, USDA
Linda Heath, Forest Service, USDA
John Kimble, Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA
Dina Kruger, Office of Atmospheric Programs, EPA
Joe Mangino, Office of Atmospheric Programs, EPA
Arvin Mosier, Agricultural Research Service, USDA
Stephen Ogle, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University
Keith Paustian, Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University
Hosein Shapouri, Office of Energy Policy and New Uses, USDA
James Smith, Forest Service, USDA
Tom Wirth, Office of Atmospheric Programs, EPA
Peter Woodbury, Forest Service, USDA

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Boxes, Maps, Tables, and Figures _____	v-vi
Acknowledgments _____	vii
Glossary of Terms and Units _____	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction _____	1
1.1 Purpose of this Report _____	1
1.2 Overview of the Report Structure _____	2
1.3 Global Change and Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Agriculture and Forestry _____	3
1.4 Summary of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Agriculture and Forestry: 1990-2001 _____	5
Chapter 2: Livestock Emissions _____	8
2.1 Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Livestock _____	8
2.2 U.S. Livestock Populations _____	11
2.3 Summary of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Livestock _____	12
2.4 Enteric Fermentation _____	13
2.5 Methods for Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation _____	14
2.6 Uncertainty in Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Enteric Fermentation _____	21
2.7 Livestock Waste _____	22
2.8 Methods for Estimating CH ₄ and N ₂ O Emissions from Livestock Waste _____	27
2.9 Uncertainty in Estimating CH ₄ and N ₂ O Emissions from Livestock Waste _____	41
2.10 Mitigating Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Livestock _____	43
Chapter 3: Cropland Agriculture _____	45
3.1 Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Cropland Agriculture _____	45
3.2 Summary of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Cropland Agriculture _____	48
3.3 Residue Burning _____	48
3.4 Methods for Estimating CH ₄ and N ₂ O Emissions from Residue Burning _____	50
3.5 Uncertainty in Estimating CH ₄ and N ₂ O Emissions from Residue Burning _____	53
3.6 Rice Cultivation _____	54
3.7 Methods for Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation _____	55
3.8 Uncertainty in Estimating CH ₄ Emissions from Rice Cultivation _____	56

Table of Contents

	Page
3.9 Agricultural Soils _____	57
3.10 Methods for Estimating N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soils _____	62
3.11 Uncertainty in Estimating N ₂ O Emissions from Agricultural Soils _____	68
3.12 Mitigating N ₂ O and CH ₄ Emissions from Cropland Agriculture _____	69
3.13 Carbon Stock Changes in Agricultural Soils _____	70
3.14 Methods for Estimating Carbon Stock Changes in Agricultural Soils _____	74
3.15 Uncertainty in Estimating Carbon Stock Changes in Agricultural Soils _____	76
3.16 Alternative Approaches for Estimating Carbon Stock Changes _____	77
3.17 Summary and Recommendations _____	78
Chapter 4: Forest Carbon Sequestration and Products Storage _____	80
4.1 Net Sequestration of CO ₂ in Forest Ecosystems and Forest Products _____	80
4.2 Method for Estimating Forest Carbon Mass _____	82
4.3 Forest Carbon Stocks and Stock Changes, 2001 _____	87
4.4 Uncertainty of the Estimates _____	92
4.5 Summary of Current Net CO ₂ Sequestration for U.S. Forests and Forest Products _____	93
Chapter 5: Energy Use in Agriculture _____	94
5.1 Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Energy Use on Agricultural Operations _____	94
5.2 Summary of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Energy Use in Agriculture _____	95
5.3 Long-term Trends in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Energy Use in Agriculture _____	96
5.4 Methods for Estimating CO ₂ Emissions from Energy Use in Agriculture _____	98
References _____	101
Appendix A _____	A-1
Appendix B _____	B-1
Appendix C _____	C-1

List of Boxes, Maps, Tables, and Figures

	Page
Boxes	
Box 1-1 GHG emissions units _____	4
Box 3-1 National inventory development and assessment of soil-atmosphere exchange of N ₂ O, NO _x , and CH ₄ _____	57
Maps	
Map 2-1 Methane emissions from enteric fermentation in 2001 _____	14
Map 2-2 GHG emissions from livestock waste in 2001 _____	22
Map 3-1 State carbon stock changes in agricultural soils, 1997 _____	71
Map 4-1 Regions used for carbon stock summaries _____	84
Map 4-2 Average non-soil forest carbon stock density over all forestland _____	91
Tables	
Table 1-1 Summary of agriculture and forestry GHG emissions and sinks, 1990, 1995-2001 _____	6
Table 2-1 Description of livestock waste deposition and storage pathways _____	10
Table 2-2 U.S. GHG emissions by livestock and source in 2001 _____	11
Table 2-3 U.S. methane emissions from enteric fermentation, 1990-2001 _____	15
Table 2-4 GHG emissions from livestock waste, 1990-2001 _____	23
Table 2-5 GHG emissions from livestock waste by livestock category, 1990-2001, excluding indirect emissions from unmanaged waste _____	24
Table 3-1 Summary of GHG emissions from cropland agriculture, 1990, 1995-2001 _____	48
Table 3-2 Greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture burning, by crop type, 1990-2001 _____	49
Table 3-3 Change in methane emissions from rice cultivation, 1990-2001 _____	55
Table 3-4 Nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural soil amendments, 1990-2001 _____	60
Table 3-5 Cultivated histosol areas _____	63
Table 3-6 Net carbon dioxide flux from agricultural soils, 1990, 1995-2001 _____	70
Table 3-7 Areas in each land-use and management system for all U.S. land areas categorized as an agricultural use in 1992 or 1997 in the NRI _____	72
Table 4-1 Summaries of forest area, carbon stocks for 1987, 1997, and 2002; and average net annual stock change for the intervals 1987-1996 and 1997-2001 _____	85
Table 4-2 Forest carbon stocks, area, and net annual stock change by forest type, 2001 _____	86
Table 5-1 Energy use and carbon dioxide emissions by fuel source on U.S. farms, 2001 _____	95
Table 5-2 CO ₂ emissions from energy use in agriculture, by region, 2001 _____	97

List of Boxes, Maps, Tables, and Figures

	Page
Table 5-3 Average emission factors for 1998-2000 by utility and non-utility generators by USDA NASS regions _____	99

Figures

Figure 1-1 Agricultural sources of greenhouse gas emissions in 2001 _____	5
Figure 1-2 Agriculture and forestry greenhouse gas emissions and sinks, 1990, 1995-2001 _____	7
Figure 2-1 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from livestock, 2001 _____	13
Figure 2-2 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from livestock waste by livestock type, 2001 _____	25
Figure 2-3 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from beef cattle waste, 2001 _____	26
Figure 2-4 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from dairy cattle manure, 2001 _____	27
Figure 2-5 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from swine waste, 2001 _____	28
Figure 2-6 U.S. greenhouse gas emissions from poultry waste, 2001 _____	29
Figure 2-7 U.S. estimated capture of methane emissions from anaerobic digesters, 1900-2001 _____	44
Figure 3-1 Trends in greenhouse gas emissions from cropland agriculture, 1990-2001 _____	47
Figure 3-2 Greenhouse gas emissions from burning by crop type, 2001 _____	50
Figure 3-3 Greenhouse gas emissions from burning by crop type, 1990 _____	51
Figure 3-4 Change in commodity production, 1990-2001: (A) absolute; (B) percent _____	52
Figure 3-5 Methane from rice cultivation by State, 1990 and 2001 _____	54
Figure 3-6 Nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural soils by source and process, 2001 _____	59
Figure 3-7 (A) Commercial synthetic fertilizer consumption, 1990-2001 _____	61
Figure 3-7 (B) Livestock manure applied, 1990-2001 _____	61
Figure 3-7 (C) Commercial organic fertilizer and sewage sludge applied, 1990-2001 _____	62
Figure 3-8 Components of carbon stock changes in agricultural soils, 1997 _____	73
Figure 4-1 Summary diagram of forest carbon stocks and carbon transfer among stocks _____	81
Figure 4-2 Forest ecosystem carbon stocks and average stock density according to region and carbon pool, 2001 _____	88
Figure 4-3 Net annual forest carbon stock change summarized according to region and carbon pool, 1997-2001 _____	89
Figure 5-1 Energy use in agriculture, by source, 1965-2001 _____	96
Figure 5-2 Gasoline and diesel fuel used on farms, 1965-2001 _____	98

Acknowledgments

This report was made possible by contributions from a number of individuals and collaboration between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The U.S. Agriculture and Forestry Greenhouse Gas Inventory: 1990-2001 (USDA GHG Inventory) is supplemental to the official Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks (U.S. GHG Inventory) submitted by EPA to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change each April. We would like to acknowledge the contribution of Tom Wirth, Joe Mangino, and Dina Kruger of EPA's Office of Atmospheric Programs, who provided detailed emissions data for the agricultural sources of methane and nitrous oxide reported in Chapters 2 and 3. The methodological discussions for agricultural sources of methane and nitrous oxide draw directly from the official U.S. GHG Inventory. The Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory (NREL) of Colorado State University prepares the agricultural soil carbon estimates for the official U.S. GHG Inventory. NREL also provided the analysis for this report, including State-level estimates of soil carbon stock changes and supporting text.

Several individuals in the U.S. Department of Agriculture contributed to this report. John Kimble and John Brenner from the Natural Resources Conservation Service and Ron Follett from the Agricultural Research Service worked closely with NREL to develop the soil carbon estimates used in this report and to provide additional material on soil carbon stocks in agriculture. Arvin Mosier of the Agricultural Research Service contributed to sections on agricultural sources of methane and nitrous oxide emissions. James Smith, Peter Woodbury, and Linda Heath of the U.S. Forest Service provided Chapter 4, Forest Carbon Sequestration and Products Storage. The U.S. Forest Service provides forest carbon estimates for the official U.S. GHG Inventory. They tailored their analysis for this report to enable a look at regional and land ownership trends in forest carbon. Finally, James Duffield and Hosein Shapouri of the Office of Energy Policy and New Uses prepared Chapter 5, Energy Use in Agriculture. The estimates presented in Chapter 5 are unique to this report and derive from ongoing work in the Office of Energy Policy and New Uses to track fuel consumption in agriculture. Estimates were developed using regional emission factors for electricity consumption provided by Dick Richards from the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration.

The USDA Global Change Task Force provided support and guidance; comments provided by reviewers, many of whom are on the Global Change Task Force, offered a number of helpful suggestions. Raymond Bridge, Office of the Chief Economist, and the USDA Office of Communications provided assistance with publishing.

Glossary of Terms and Units

CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CH ₄	Methane
N ₂ O	Nitrous oxide
NO _x	Nitrogen oxides
C	Carbon
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GWP	Global warming potential
Tg	Teragram (10 ¹² grams)
Tg CO ₂ eq.	Teragrams of carbon dioxide equivalent units
Gg	Gigagram (10 ⁹ grams)
Mg	Megagram (10 ⁶ grams)
t	Metric ton (1,000 kg)
ha	Hectares
ac	Acres
DE	Digestible energy (percent)
Y _m	Fraction of gross energy converted to CH ₄
TDN	Total digestible nutrients
VOCs	Volatile organic compounds
VS	Volatile solids
DM	Dry matter
Btu	British thermal unit
Qbtu	Quadrillion British thermal units
Tbtu	Trillion British thermal units
EF	Emission factor
MCF	Methane conversion factor

Chapter 4: Forest Carbon Sequestration and Products Storage

4.1 Net Sequestration of CO₂ in Forest Ecosystems and Forest Products

Carbon dioxide is continually exchanged between forest ecosystems and the atmosphere as illustrated by the pools and fluxes in Figure 4-1. Photosynthesis leads to the conversion of carbon dioxide into organic carbon in growing plants, and some of the carbon thus sequestered as plant biomass is subsequently lost through respiration. A large net flux of carbon from atmosphere to tree accompanies early tree growth. Over time, the net rate of exchange decreases due to increasing carbon loss through respiration or the loss and subsequent decomposition of plant material as litter and woody debris. A large amount of carbon is released to the atmosphere as trees die and decompose. Other mechanisms of carbon loss from forest systems include physical removal of organic matter or rapid loss through natural disturbance, such as fire. A significant form of removal in the United States is harvest of wood, but carbon can also be removed through runoff or leaching through soil. Subsequent forest regeneration and growth can then reestablish the section of forest as a sink of atmospheric carbon dioxide. The continuous exchange of carbon with the atmosphere is by far the most significant role of forests in the U.S. greenhouse gas inventory; the net flux of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere to forest ecosystems and harvested wood products in 2001 is estimated at 759 Tg CO₂ eq. Thus, forest carbon budgets are the focus of this chapter.

Forest management is an activity involving the regeneration, tending, protection, harvest, and utilization of forest resources to meet goals defined by the forest landowner. Forest management regimes vary by forest ecosystem, landowner objectives, and economic possibilities. Increasing tree volume per area of forest generally increases carbon sequestration. Relatively passive management may include tree harvest and removal, followed by natural regeneration, or riparian area management that consists of consciously retaining a buffer strip of trees along a watercourse. Intensive management may consist of site preparation, improved stocking, species conversion, planting genetically improved stock, application of pesticides or fertilizer, and improvement cuttings such as thinning or precommercial thinning.

Goals of forest management can focus on one or more outcome, output, or benefit. Example benefits include conservation of soil, water, vegetation, wildlife, carbon, and nutrient resources. Forest management can enhance levels of carbon stocks. Although some practices may decrease carbon storage for a given site-age-type dynamic, generally more carbon may be sequestered in forest systems through improved forest management practices, afforestation, increased productivity, reduced conversion to non-forest uses, lengthened rotations in some systems, and increased proportion and retention of carbon in harvested wood products. Sustainable short-rotation woody crops systems offer the opportunity to rapidly deploy new, faster growing genetic material, sequester carbon in the soil, add to the wood products pool, and provide energy feedstocks as fossil fuel offsets. Afforestation offers significant opportunities to capture and store carbon on lands that are not currently forested. This is a particularly useful tool for marginal agricultural lands.

Improvements in the management of wood products in use and in landfills provide a number of


opportunities to reduce emissions and increase sequestration. Continuing development of wood products can increase their durability and recycling potential. This increases opportunities for sequestration in wood products and potentially expands the market for wood products relative to more emission-intensive materials.

Urban trees provide important offset opportunities.

Advances in design and deployment of trees in urban environments can provide significant fossil fuel savings for heating and cooling, through microclimate management. Development of urban tree waste management and recycling processes and systems would reduce emissions and increase sequestration opportunities.

This chapter summarizes carbon stocks and stock changes (net carbon fluxes) for U.S. forestland and wood products. Carbon stock estimates are based on extensive forest inventory data, and are consistent with internationally recognized methods for carbon accounting such as the *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines* (IPCC/UNEP/OECD/IEA 1997). Summaries of information included in this chapter represent an update of previous national forest carbon budgets (Birdsey 1992, Birdsey and Heath 1995) and were provided to the United States Environmental Protection Agency for the Land-Use Change and Forestry section of the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2001* (EPA 2003a). Estimated carbon budgets are for the year 2001. Principal sources of forest inventory data are compilations of national forest resource statistics for 1987 and 1997 (Waddell and others 1989, Smith and others 2001). Estimates for years after 1997 are projections based on simulation modeling of expected land use change and forest growth, harvest, and utilization.

Figure 4-1
Summary diagram of forest carbon stocks and carbon transfer among stocks



Source: Adapted from USEPA (2003a), and Heath and others (2003)

4.2 Method for Estimating Forest Carbon Mass

4.2.1 Carbon in Forest Ecosystems and Forest Products

Forest structure provides a convenient modeling framework for simulation models to estimate carbon stocks. Carbon stocks in forest ecosystems are modeled as five distinct pools, which are as follows:

- **Trees:** live and standing dead trees including coarse roots, stems, branches, and foliage (live trees only).
- **Understory vegetation:** including the roots, stems, branches, and foliage of seedlings (trees less than 2.5 cm diameter), shrubs, and bushes.
- **Forest floor:** including fine woody debris up to 7.5 cm diameter, tree litter, and humus.
- **Down dead wood:** including logging residue and other coarse dead wood on the ground and larger than 7.5 cm diameter, and stumps and coarse roots of stumps.
- **Soil:** including all organic material in soil excluding any carbon specified for above pools.

Such pools can also be grouped as live vegetation, standing-dead vegetation, the accumulation of dead material on the soil surface, and organic carbon in soil. This is convenient for modeling mechanisms that affect movement of carbon among pools, as illustrated in Figure 4-1. Transfer among pools depends on processes such as growth, mortality, decay, natural disturbances, and the anthropogenic activities of harvesting, thinning, clearing, and replanting. Carbon is continuously cycled through and among these storage pools and between forest ecosystems and the atmosphere.

The net change in forest carbon over an interval of time is not necessarily equal to the net flux between forests and the atmosphere because timber harvests may not result in an immediate release of harvested carbon to the atmosphere. Harvested wood carbon removed from the forest is summarized as two pools, wood products in use, and wood discarded in landfills. As wood products combust or decay over time, the carbon is ultimately reemitted to the atmosphere as carbon dioxide and methane.

The path by which carbon returns to the atmosphere can be important to overall carbon accounting of forest systems. Emissions can occur from wood burned for energy or from burning or decay of wood without energy capture (Figure 4-1). We include these two “pools” of emitted carbon dioxide—with and without energy capture—because they help provide a complete picture of forest carbon budgets. The rate of emission varies considerably among different product pools. For example, if timber is harvested for energy use, combustion results in an immediate release of carbon. Conversely, if timber is harvested and subsequently used as lumber in a house, it may be many decades or even centuries before the lumber decays and carbon is released to the atmosphere. If wood products are disposed of in landfills, the carbon contained in the wood may be released gradually over years or decades as carbon dioxide or

methane gas. Wood burned for energy, as a substitute for fossil fuel, is a relatively large pool, and there may be potential for even greater energy recovery from waste wood products.

4.2.2 Background Information in Forest Inventories

The Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (FIA) of the USDA Forest Service has conducted consistent forest surveys based on extensive statistically based sampling of much of the forestland in the United States since 1952. The United States has approximately 300 million hectares of forestland; about 250 million hectares are located in the conterminous 48 States and form the basis for the estimates provided in this chapter (Smith and others 2001). Seventy-nine percent of the 250 million hectares are classified as timberland, meaning they meet minimum levels of productivity and are available for timber harvest. Historically, timberlands in the conterminous 48 States have been more frequently and intensively surveyed than other forestlands. Of the remaining 51 million hectares, 16 million hectares are reserved forestlands (withdrawn by law from management for production of wood products) and 35 million hectares are lower productivity forestlands.


Historically, the main purpose of the FIA program has been to estimate areas, volume of growing stock, and timber products output and utilization factors. Growing stock is simply a classification of timber inventory that includes live trees of commercial species meeting specified standards of quality (Smith and others 2001). Timber products output refers to the production of industrial roundwood products such as logs and other round timber generated from harvesting trees, and the production of bark and other residue at processing mills. Utilization factors relate inventory volume to the volume cut or destroyed when producing roundwood (May 1998). Growth, harvest, land-use change, and other estimates of change are derived from repeated land, aerial, and satellite surveys. Although carbon sequestration is not directly measured in these surveys, the data provide a strong foundation for carbon estimates because the inventories collect data that are highly correlated with carbon stocks. Carbon stocks and fluxes can be estimated using mathematical models and supplemental data from research studies and more intensive monitoring sites.

Forest inventories used in this chapter are based on the State-by-State surveys periodically conducted (every 5-14 years, depending on the State) by regional FIA programs during the 1980s and 1990s. Compilations of these data for 1987 and 1997 are given in Waddell and others (1989) and Smith and others (2001), with trends discussed in the latter citation. FIA has adopted a new annualized design that includes a more extensive and nationally consistent database, which is also conducted State-by-State (Miles and others 2001, <<http://www.ncrs.fs.fed.us/4801/fiadb/index.htm>>). The annualized survey also includes plans for measurements to facilitate direct estimates of carbon in woody debris, forest floor, and mineral soil from systematically sampled data. However, these data are only beginning to become available from a limited number of States. One feature of the periodic survey data used in this chapter is that some forestlands were surveyed less often than others. Estimates of carbon stock changes can be influenced by the frequency of these surveys.

4.2.3 Estimating Forest Carbon Stocks and Stock Changes

Map 4-1
Regions used for carbon stock summaries

Regions in the upper map are: Pacific Northwest – Westside (PNWW); Pacific Northwest – Eastside (PNWE); Pacific Southwest (PSW); Rocky Mountain – North (RMN); Rocky Mountain – South (RMS); North Central (NC); Northeast (NE); South Central (SC); and Southeast (SE).



The inventory data are converted to carbon using conversion factors or using the model forest carbon budget simulation model FORCARB2 (Birdsey and Heath 1995, Heath and others 2003). The seven component carbon pools, or stocks, are listed in Table 4-1, and relationships among the parts are illustrated in Figure 4-1. Separate estimates are made for each of the forest ecosystem carbon pools: trees, understory vegetation, forest floor, down dead wood, and soils. Stock change, or net annual flux, is based on the difference between two successive estimates of stock divided by the number of years in the interval. Negative fluxes (in parentheses in tables) represent gains in carbon stocks, or removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere; this is the convention in all tables and figures. Note that the sign

convention is maintained to indicate direction of carbon flux; in the text, direction of flux is indicated by explicitly identifying sources and sinks. Total forest ecosystem stocks or stock changes can be obtained from summing the five constituent pools; similarly, totals for carbon in harvested wood can be obtained from summing the two pools (Table 4-1). Projected carbon stock changes are derived from areas, volumes, growth, land-use changes, and other forest characteristics projected in a system of models (see Haynes and others 2003) representing the U.S. forest sector, including FORCARB2.

Table 4-1 Summaries of forest area, carbon stocks for 1987, 1997, and 2002; and average net annual stock change for the intervals 1987-1996 and 1997-2001

Year/Interval	Stock	Stock Change	Stock	Stock change	Stock
	Jan. 1, 1987	1987-1996	Jan. 1, 1997	1997-2001	Jan. 1, 2002
	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq./yr</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq./yr</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>
Forests	174,398		182,092		184,822
Trees	55,579	(469)	60,272	(447)	62,508
Understory	1,642	(9)	1,733	(15)	1,806
Forest floor	15,536	(24)	15,778	29	15,631
Down dead wood	7,541	(54)	8,080	(59)	8,373
Forest soils	94,100	(213)	96,229	(55)	96,504
Harvested Wood	7,035		9,080		10,140
Wood products	4,342	(49)	4,833	(58)	5,123
Landfilled wood	2,693	(155)	4,247	(154)	5,016
Energy Capture		176		185	
Emitted		129		136	
	<i>Tg C</i>	<i>Tg C/yr</i>	<i>Tg C</i>	<i>Tg C/yr</i>	<i>Tg C</i>
Forests	47,595		49,695		50,440
Trees	15,168	(128)	16,449	(122)	17,059
Understory	448	(3)	473	(4)	493
Forest floor	4,240	(7)	4,306	8	4,266
Down dead wood	2,058	(15)	2,205	(16)	2,285
Forest soils	25,681	(58)	26,262	(15)	26,337
Harvested Wood	1,920		2,478		2,767
Wood products	1,185	(13)	1,319	(16)	1,398
Landfilled wood	735	(42)	1,159	(42)	1,369
Energy capture		48		51	
Emitted		35		37	
Area of forest	Jan. 1, 1987	Jan. 1, 1997	Jan. 1, 2002		
<i>1,000 ha</i>	245,593	250,027	251,029		

Parentheses indicate net sequestration.

Table 4-2 Forest carbon stocks, area, and net annual stock change by forest type, 2001

Forest type	Stocks			Area	Net Annual Change	
	Biomass	Nonliving Plant Mass	Soil Organic Carbon	Area	Biomass	Nonliving Plant Mass
	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>	<i>1,000 ha</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq./yr</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq./yr</i>
<i>Eastern Forest Types</i>						
White-red-jack pine	1,252	434	3,423	4,758	(5.7)	1.0
Spruce-fir	1,391	1,163	4,941	6,983	(3.5)	4.1
Longleaf-slash pine	818	396	2,805	5,611	(8.6)	(3.7)
Loblolly-shortleaf pine	3,805	1,742	7,368	21,906	(42.7)	(23.8)
Oak-pine	2,735	1,064	4,156	13,770	(17.1)	(3.3)
Oak-hickory	13,831	3,952	16,877	54,157	(163.4)	(27.4)
Oak-gum-cypress	3,509	1,016	7,087	12,697	(30.5)	(5.6)
Elm-ash-cottonwood	1,232	701	2,482	5,729	(18.1)	(3.8)
Maple-beech-birch	5,998	3,224	11,639	22,748	(43.1)	(1.3)
Aspen-birch	1,307	580	6,370	7,329	(7.6)	(1.5)
Other eastern types	74	20	247	677	26.9	7.5
Nonstocked - East	34	23	219	600	30.4	5.5
<i>Western Forest Types</i>						
Douglas-fir	5,744	3,532	5,269	16,025	49.8	44.1
Ponderosa pine	2,549	1,820	3,291	12,736	58.8	35.9
Western white pine	35	22	37	148	7.5	4.0
Fir-spruce	3,978	2,633	5,532	10,967	32.5	38.1
Hemlock-sitka spruce	1,700	951	2,081	3,613	(0.5)	0.3
Larch	172	106	131	546	(2.6)	(1.0)
Lodgepole pine	1,726	1,039	1,712	7,445	(43.9)	(9.8)
Redwood	215	211	117	373	(1.0)	(0.3)
Hardwoods	2,968	1,763	4,029	13,812	(116.7)	(63.1)
Other western types	1,434	955	1,526	4,618	(112.7)	(40.1)
Pinyon-juniper	2,268	1,808	4,325	20,938	(30.2)	(9.3)
Chaparral	65	57	188	870	16.8	16.8
Nonstocked - West	123	141	652	1,972	(14.3)	(14.8)

Parentheses indicate net sequestration.

Empirical simulation or process models within FORCARB2 estimate ecosystem carbon stocks; estimators are generally classified according to region (Map 4-1), forest type (such as those listed in Table 4-2) and ownership (for example, public versus private forestlands). Live tree carbon and standing dead tree carbon are estimated from stand-level volumes from the inventory data. The volume-to-biomass coefficients are published in Smith and others (2003). Understory carbon is estimated from forest inventory data and equations based on estimates in Birdsey (1996). Forest floor carbon is estimated from the forest inventory data using an empirical simulation model (Smith and Heath 2002). Estimates of carbon in down dead wood are described in Annex O of Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2001 (EPA 2003a). Estimates of soil carbon are based on data from the STATSGO database (USDA 1991). Soil organic carbon estimates are made solely according to forest type and do not reflect effects of past land use. Some example conversion coefficients used in the forest carbon modeling system are found in Annex O (EPA 2003a).


The disposition of harvested wood carbon is simulated according to methods described in Skog and Nicholson (1998). Carbon stocks in wood products in use and wood stored in landfills are based on historical data from the USDA Forest Service (Howard 2001), and historical data as implemented in the framework underlying the NAPAP (Ince 1994) and TAMM/ATLAS (Haynes and others 2003, Mills and Kincaid 1992) models. The carbon conversion factors and decay rates for harvested carbon removed from the forest are taken from Skog and Nicholson (1998). The net carbon stock changes presented in this chapter represent the amounts of carbon that continue to be stored. Annual historical estimates and projections of detailed product production were used to divide consumed roundwood into product, wood mill residue, and pulp mill residue. The rates of carbon decay for products and landfills were estimated and applied to the respective pools. The results were aggregated to produce national estimates. The same disposal rates are used to account for carbon in all wood products produced in the United States, including exported products, whereas carbon in imported wood is not counted.

4.3 Forest Carbon Stocks and Stock Changes, 2001

4.3.1 Estimates by Region, State, Carbon Pool, Forest Type, Age, and Stand Size

Forest areas, carbon stocks, and stock changes for the United States are summarized in Table 4-1. Both carbon dioxide equivalent and carbon summary values are shown for five forest ecosystem pools and two pools of harvested wood products. The rate of increase in ecosystem carbon stocks—net stock change—is somewhat lower since 1997 as compared with the interval from 1987 through 1997. Part of the difference between periods may be due to the timing of forest inventories, or may in part be due to the use of projections after 1997. Organic carbon in soils is the largest carbon pool, followed by carbon in live and standing dead trees. Pools of carbon in harvested wood products are estimated as very similar in size for products in use versus products in landfills. However, the net flux of carbon to landfills is greater. The

Figure 4-2
Forest ecosystem carbon stocks and average stock density according to region and carbon pool, 2001



majority of carbon emitted to the atmosphere from harvested wood products is associated with some energy capture from burning.

Total forest ecosystem carbon stocks are greater in the East than in the West (Figure 4-2A). However, regional average values for carbon density, or mass of carbon per unit area (for example, Mg CO₂ eq./ha), do not show such a distinct East-West trend (Figure 4-2B). Thus, the larger pools in the East are principally due to greater forest area (Table 4-2). The most apparent regional trends in ecosystem pool carbon density are: greater carbon in trees in the Pacific Northwest-Westside; greater soil organic carbon pools in northern regions; and smaller pools of down dead wood and forest floor in the South. Net annual stock changes are shown in Figure 4-3, which includes estimated changes in harvested wood product pools. Regional estimates of flux of carbon reemitted to the atmosphere are also included in Figure 4-3. However, the two separate emission fluxes should not be

included when summing total flux for a region because those quantities are already included in the net fluxes for wood products and landfills. The greatest net annual increases in carbon stocks were in the South. Area change strongly affects estimates of change in total stocks: regions with a net decrease in forest area since 1997 are the Pacific Northwest-Eastside, Rocky Mountain-North, North Central, Northeast, and Southeast.

Carbon stocks, forest areas, and stock changes for 2001 are shown in Table 4-2 according to forest type. Pool classifications in this table are carbon in biomass, non-living plant mass, and soil.


Biomass is live trees plus live understory vegetation. Non-living plant mass includes standing dead trees, down dead wood, and the forest floor. Carbon estimates include aboveground and belowground components.

Changes in carbon stock totals as shown in Table 4-2 depend partly on changes in carbon density and partly on changes in total forest area of each forest type. All forest types with a net loss of carbon in biomass during 2001 were accompanied by a net decrease in forest area. Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, and fir-spruce forest types in the West each lost an estimated average of 1 percent of forest area per year since 1997.

Other forest types with loss in total carbon stock represent relatively smaller areas of forest, and a portion of area change may be due to reclassification. White-red-jack pine and spruce-fir forests in the East also lost area, but this was estimated at about 1 percent since 1997. For detailed inventory data corresponding to this summary of carbon stocks, see Smith and others (2001).

Distribution of carbon stocks among forest age classes is shown in Appendix Table C-2 for privately owned and Appendix Table C-3 for publicly owned forests. The tables illustrate that the greater proportion of forest, and thus carbon stocks, in the East are under private ownership while the greater proportion in the West is under public ownership. Distributions according to age are shifted toward older forests on public lands; this is the case for all four regions but is more apparent in the West. Similarly, distribution according to stand size class (Appendix Table C-4) shows a greater proportion in larger size-class stands in the West. Forest land ownership varies by forest type and region. These patterns are illustrated with forest carbon pools (excluding soils) in Appendix Table C-5. Ownership is classified as public or private for timberlands (forests of minimum productivity and available for harvesting). The remaining

Figure 4-3
Net annual forest carbon stock change, summarized according to region and carbon pool, 1997-2001



Note: Negative values correspond to sequestration.

forestland, both public and private, is either reserved from harvesting or is considered less productive (and thus not managed for wood products). Western forests include a greater proportion of public and reserve/other forest carbon. Similarly, the greater changes (Appendix Table C-6) are in public and reserve/other forest carbon. For more information about forest inventory variables such as forest classifications of ownership, productivity, forest type, and stand size class see Smith and others (2001), and Miles and others (2001).

All States in the conterminous United States have forestland. State-by-State totals of forest area, ecosystem carbon stock, stock change, and stock change of harvested wood products for 2001 are shown in Appendix Table C-1. Total stock change per State is the sum of the separate forest ecosystem and products estimates. Estimates of stock change, or flux, for individual States are modeled; a number of States did not have two complete forest inventories as inputs, which can affect the estimates developed by the models. State values for carbon fluxes in wood products, shown in Appendix Table C-1, are based on the amount of wood products produced in the State. Map 4-2 illustrates both the spatial distribution of forest ecosystem carbon and average non-soil carbon density. This map does not include the soil organic carbon and wood products pools, and is therefore not influenced by the relatively large size of this pool. The spatial distributions of net flux of carbon in harvested wood products is influenced by forest management and will not necessarily show the same pattern (these estimates are not yet available in such detail).


4.3.2 Management Activities and Land Use Change

Forest area in the conterminous United States declined by approximately 2.3 million hectares between 1977 and 1987, but area increased by about 4.4 million hectares between 1987 and 1997. Forest area has continued to increase since 1997. These changes in forest area represent average annual fluctuations of less than 0.2 percent. Given the low rate of change in U.S. forestland area, the major influences on the current net carbon flux from forestland are management activities, management intensity, and the ongoing impacts of previous disturbances and past land-use changes. For example, intensified management can increase both the rate of growth and the eventual biomass density of some forest systems, thereby increasing the uptake of carbon. A comparison of carbon density of Southeastern pine stands (10 to 25 years old) found 24 percent greater carbon density in live trees in planted pine stands compared to naturally regenerated stands (156 versus 126 Mg CO₂ eq./ha). Harvesting removes much of the aboveground carbon on forests, but trees may regrow on harvested areas and further sequester carbon. Net ecosystem sequestration associated with harvests depends on factors such as site productivity and decomposition rates. The reversion of cropland to forestland through natural regeneration will cause increased carbon storage in biomass and soils. The net effects of past forest management and land-use change involving forests are captured in the carbon estimates provided in this chapter.

Improved forest management practices, the regeneration of previously cleared forest areas, and timber harvesting and use have resulted in an annual net uptake of carbon during the period

Map 4-2

**Average non-soil forest carbon stock density
(t CO₂ eq./ha) over all forestland**



from 1987 through 2001 (Table 4-1). Due to improvements in U.S. agricultural productivity, the rate of forest clearing for crop cultivation and pasture slowed in the late 19th century, and by 1920 this practice had all but ceased. As farming expanded in the Midwest and West, large areas of previously cultivated land in the East were taken out of crop production, primarily between 1920 and 1950, and were allowed to revert to forests or were actively reforested. The impacts of these land-use changes are still affecting carbon fluxes for forests in the East. In addition to land-use changes in the early part of this century, carbon fluxes from Eastern forests have been affected by a trend toward managed growth on private land. Collectively, these changes have produced a near doubling of the carbon density in Eastern forests since the early 1950s. More recently, the 1970s and 1980s saw a resurgence of federally supported forest management programs (for example, the Forestry Incentive Program) and soil conservation programs (for example, the Conservation Reserve Program), which have focused on tree planting, improving timber management activities, combating soil erosion, and converting marginal cropland to forests. In addition to forest regeneration and management, forest harvests have also affected net carbon fluxes. Because most of the timber that is harvested from U.S. forests is used in wood products and much of the discarded wood products are disposed of in landfills, rather than by incineration, significant quantities of this harvested carbon are transferred to long-term storage pools rather than being released to the atmosphere. The size of these long-term carbon storage pools has increased over the last century.

A large proportion of non-forest trees in the United States are in urban areas. These urban trees constitute approximately 3 percent of total tree cover in the conterminous United States (EPA 2003a). Methods have been developed for estimating carbon sequestration rates for urban trees of the United States (Nowak and Crane 2002). Net flux of carbon into urban trees for 2001 was estimated at 58.7 Tg CO₂ eq. per year (from Table 6-6 in EPA 2003a). This represents significant carbon accumulation (Table 4-1). Urban trees provide additional favorable GHG benefits beyond accumulating carbon stocks; these include direct effects on energy savings [see Dwyer and others (2000) and Akbari (2002) for further discussion].

4.4 Uncertainty of the Estimates

Carbon stocks and stock changes as provided here are the current estimates of the most likely values, and include some level of uncertainty. Better information such as samples, processes, or models could reduce uncertainty of future estimates. However, we believe the estimates are unbiased, so reductions in uncertainty are not expected to change mean values significantly.

Forest inventories, which are the input data to FORCARB2, include sampling, measurement and modeling errors that contribute to uncertainty. Forest Inventory and Analysis surveys are based on a statistical sample designed to represent the wide variety of growth conditions present over large territories. Although the potential for uncertainty is large, the sample design for forest surveys contributes to limiting the error, and relative error is inversely proportional to degree of aggregation of inventory data (Phillips and others 2000). Similarly, the inventory design contributes to limiting uncertainty about net annual carbon stock change. Estimates from sampling at different times on permanent plots are correlated, and this correlation reduces the uncertainty in stock change variables (Smith and Heath 2001).

Additional sources of uncertainty come from the empirical models used by FORCARB2 to estimate carbon storage in specific ecosystem components, such as forest floor, understory vegetation, and mineral soil. Certainty about model predictions is limited by precision in process definitions, coefficients, and relationships among system components. Uncertainty also arises from extrapolation of the results of site-specific ecosystem studies to very large areas of forestland because such studies may not adequately represent regional or national averages. An important source of uncertainty is attributed to the lack of knowledge about the impacts of forest management activities, including harvest, on soil carbon. Soil carbon impact estimates need to be very precise because even small changes in soil carbon may sum to large differences over large areas; thus, limited understanding of soils can significantly affect overall forest carbon budget estimates (Heath and others 2003).

4.5 Summary of Current Net CO₂ Sequestration for U.S. Forests and Forest Products

Forest ecosystems and forest products represent a significant carbon dioxide sink in the United States. Over 90 percent of the sequestration in agriculture and forests occurs in the forest

sector, with an additional 7 percent sequestered in urban trees. Total carbon stocks in forest ecosystems of the conterminous United States are estimated at 184,800 Tg CO₂ eq. (Table 4-1). The net amount of carbon stored in forest ecosystems in the conterminous U.S. increased by an estimated 547 Tg CO₂ eq. This estimate does not include increases in biomass harvested from a portion of U.S. forests, used largely as timber and fuelwood. In the same year, the net increase in carbon sequestered in harvested wood products, which includes long-term storage in landfills, is estimated at 212 Tg CO₂ eq. This net value is the sum of an annual sink in harvested wood of 533 Tg CO₂ eq. and emission of carbon to the atmosphere of 321 Tg CO₂ eq. Fifty eight percent of these emissions included some form of energy recapture associated with the combustion of wood products. Total net sequestration, or gain in carbon storage, by forest ecosystems and harvested wood products for 2001 was 759 Tg CO₂ eq.

Appendix C: Forest Carbon Stocks

Appendix Table C-1	State summaries of forest area, carbon stocks for 2002, estimated net forest stock change 2001, and estimated net harvested wood products stock change for 2001. Total stock change per State is the sum of the forest and products estimates.	C-2
Appendix Table C-2	Carbon stocks on privately-owned forestland in 2001, by region, age-class, and pool	C-3
Appendix Table C-3	Carbon stocks on publicly-owned forestland in 2001, by region, age-class, and pool	C-4
Appendix Table C-4	Carbon stocks on timberlands in 2001 by region, stand size class, and carbon pool	C-5
Appendix Table C-5	Carbon stocks on all forestland for 2001 by forest type and ownership, excluding soils	C-6
Appendix Table C-6	Annual carbon stock change on all forestland for 2001 by forest type and ownership, excluding soils	C-7

Appendix Table C-1 State summaries of forest area, carbon stocks for 2002, estimated net forest stock change 2001, and estimated net harvested wood products stock change for 2001. Total stock change per State is the sum of the forest and products estimates.

State	Area	Forest non-soil stocks	Forest non-soil stock change	Products stock change
	<i>1,000 ha</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq./yr</i>	<i>Tg CO₂ eq./yr</i>
Alabama	9,302	2,540	(24.4)	(19.3)
Alaska	nd ¹	nd	nd	nd
Arizona	7,862	1,801	(2.4)	(0.2)
Arkansas	7,596	2,191	(23.4)	(10.0)
California	16,282	7,527	(21.4)	(8.4)
Colorado	8,756	3,214	(3.5)	(0.3)
Connecticut	752	324	(1.3)	(0.2)
Delaware	155	61	(0.4)	(0.1)
Florida	6,590	1,429	(11.6)	(7.8)
Georgia	9,876	2,625	(26.9)	(20.2)
Hawaii	nd	nd	nd	nd
Idaho	8,760	4,145	(12.1)	(3.4)
Illinois	1,753	674	(2.6)	(1.0)
Indiana	1,821	744	(11.6)	(1.3)
Iowa	830	244	(3.8)	(0.3)
Kansas	625	179	(2.4)	(0.1)
Kentucky	5,133	1,738	(10.8)	(3.3)
Louisiana	5,589	1,707	(8.2)	(10.6)
Maine	7,163	2,582	(3.2)	(5.9)
Maryland	1,038	454	(2.3)	(0.5)
Massachusetts	1,265	563	(3.4)	(0.2)
Michigan	7,803	2,998	(23.6)	(4.7)
Minnesota	6,750	2,016	(8.6)	(4.3)
Mississippi	7,519	2,048	(22.3)	(15.5)
Missouri	5,662	1,390	(12.2)	(2.2)
Montana	9,426	3,938	(21.5)	(2.3)
Nebraska	383	111	(1.8)	(0.1)
Nevada	4,130	856	(9.6)	(0.0)
New Hampshire	1,950	887	(7.1)	(1.9)
New Jersey	863	304	(3.4)	(0.1)
New Mexico	6,751	1,802	1.7	(0.2)
New York	7,459	2,548	(15.5)	(1.9)
North Carolina	7,811	2,558	(15.6)	(13.7)
North Dakota	272	57	(1.3)	(0.0)
Ohio	3,179	1,142	(17.6)	(1.4)
Oklahoma	3,102	625	(9.2)	(1.7)
Oregon	11,999	6,273	(29.4)	(11.5)
Pennsylvania	6,841	2,645	(8.2)	(2.9)
Rhode Island	156	56	(0.2)	(0.0)
South Carolina	5,056	1,390	(8.8)	(10.1)
South Dakota	655	192	0.6	(0.2)
Tennessee	5,826	2,046	(19.2)	(4.9)
Texas	6,940	1,591	(1.3)	(11.3)
Utah	6,344	1,736	1.4	(0.1)
Vermont	1,869	867	(11.7)	(1.0)
Virginia	6,505	2,195	(15.6)	(7.9)
Washington	8,818	5,263	(7.0)	(11.6)
West Virginia	4,900	1,947	(25.4)	(2.2)
Wisconsin	6,460	2,195	(15.0)	(4.8)
Wyoming	4,449	1,897	(7.8)	(0.2)

¹ no data; Parenthesis indicate net sequestration.

**Appendix Table C-2 Carbon stocks on privately-owned forestland in 2001,
by region, age-class, and pool**

	Age class	Soil organic carbon	Non-living plant mass	Biomass	Total
		<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>			
North		26,060	5,997	13,155	45,212
	< 20	2,326	278	398	3,003
	20-40	4,136	626	1,229	5,990
	40-60	5,498	1,209	2,898	9,605
	60-80	5,502	1,453	3,383	10,338
	80-100	3,216	938	2,159	6,314
	100-150	1,802	578	1,174	3,553
	150-200	89	32	50	170
	200+	8	3	4	15
	Uneven	3,484	880	1,860	6,224
South		28,018	5,857	16,245	50,120
	< 20	9,302	1,279	2,768	13,348
	20-40	6,200	1,369	3,610	11,179
	40-60	6,213	1,622	4,800	12,635
	60-80	3,493	980	3,109	7,582
	80-100	942	281	904	2,127
	100-150	362	108	340	809
	150-200	9	2	8	20
	200+	0	0	0	0
	Uneven	1,498	217	705	2,420
Pacific Coast		4,749	3,085	4,001	11,835
	< 20	758	243	195	1,197
	20-40	663	408	554	1,624
	40-60	725	643	940	2,308
	60-80	561	479	693	1,733
	80-100	419	367	501	1,287
	100-150	280	275	352	906
	150-200	52	50	69	171
	200+	74	101	119	295
	Uneven	1,217	520	578	2,315
Rocky Mountain		3,924	1,926	2,181	8,032
	< 20	449	185	111	745
	20-40	218	83	75	376
	40-60	456	197	217	870
	60-80	835	418	511	1,764
	80-100	887	479	609	1,975
	100-150	623	338	403	1,364
	150-200	251	137	164	552
	200+	97	44	51	192
	Uneven	109	45	40	194

Note: Privately owned forests include timberlands, reserves, and other forestland.

**Appendix Table C-3 Carbon stocks on publicly-owned forestland in 2001,
by region, age-class, and pool**

	Age class	Soil organic carbon	Non-living plant mass	Biomass	Total
<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>					
North		9,486	1,831	3,817	15,133
	< 20	1,169	118	190	1,477
	20-40	1,244	156	293	1,693
	40-60	1,802	323	727	2,853
	60-80	1,775	409	953	3,137
	80-100	1,033	282	679	1,994
	100-150	540	160	323	1,022
	150-200	26	8	13	47
	200+	5	2	2	9
	Uneven	1,893	372	637	2,902
South		3,975	618	2,758	7,350
	< 20	617	63	199	879
	20-40	667	99	381	1,147
	40-60	962	169	743	1,874
	60-80	857	153	755	1,765
	80-100	276	52	257	585
	100-150	144	26	134	304
	150-200	9	2	8	19
	200+	1	0	2	3
	Uneven	442	54	278	774
Pacific Coast		7,487	3,905	7,867	19,259
	< 20	708	205	186	1,099
	20-40	337	124	233	695
	40-60	469	216	463	1,148
	60-80	659	325	654	1,639
	80-100	795	435	926	2,155
	100-150	1,573	907	1,828	4,307
	150-200	933	584	1,238	2,755
	200+	964	660	1,469	3,093
	Uneven	1,050	449	870	2,369
Rocky Mountain		12,805	6,136	8,939	27,880
	< 20	1,163	459	318	1,940
	20-40	490	182	159	831
	40-60	878	361	465	1,704
	60-80	1,629	746	1,154	3,529
	80-100	1,967	966	1,575	4,508
	100-150	2,948	1,495	2,299	6,741
	150-200	1,432	761	1,146	3,338
	200+	761	414	579	1,753
	Uneven	1,537	754	1,244	3,535

Note: Publicly owned forests include timberlands, reserves, and other forestland.

Appendix Table C-4 Carbon stocks on timberlands in 2001 by region, stand size class, and carbon pool

	Stand size class	Soil organic carbon	Non-living plant mass	Biomass	Total
		<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>			
North		33,135	7,392	16,250	56,777
	Nonstocked	70	7	6	83
	Seedling/ sapling	7,314	964	1,242	9,520
	Poletimber	10,865	2,418	5,004	18,287
	Sawtimber	14,887	4,003	9,998	28,887
South		30,229	6,288	18,158	54,674
	Nonstocked	255	20	40	315
	Seedling/ sapling	8,861	1,111	2,503	12,475
	Poletimber	7,598	1,626	4,462	13,686
	Sawtimber	13,514	3,530	11,152	28,197
Pacific Coast		8,154	5,168	8,817	22,139
	Nonstocked	240	57	46	343
	Seedling/ sapling	1,448	531	495	2,474
	Poletimber	902	422	641	1,965
	Sawtimber	5,564	4,159	7,635	17,357
Rocky Mountain		9,273	4,801	6,859	20,933
	Nonstocked	376	160	77	613
	Seedling/ sapling	1,049	435	275	1,759
	Poletimber	1,526	782	1,125	3,433
	Sawtimber	6,322	3,423	5,382	15,127

Note: Carbon stocks are for timberlands only.

**Appendix Table C-5 Carbon stocks on all forestland for 2001
by forest type and ownership, excluding soils**

	Private	Public	Reserve/ other
<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>			
<i>Eastern forests</i>			
White-red-jack pine	1,207	392	87
Spruce-fir	1,673	660	221
Longleaf-slash pine	955	209	51
Loblolly-shortleaf pine	4,865	606	76
Oak-pine	3,200	462	138
Oak-hickory	14,717	2,210	855
Oak-gum-cypress	3,921	491	114
Elm-ash-cottonwood	1,541	310	82
Maple-beech-birch	7,361	1,506	356
Aspen-birch	1,145	645	98
Other eastern types	0	0	93
Nonstocked - East	29	6	21
<i>Western forests</i>			
Douglas-fir	2,836	5,365	1,075
Ponderosa pine	1,956	1,736	677
Western white pine	6	25	26
Fir-spruce	787	4,049	1,774
Hemlock-sitka spruce	777	1,226	648
Larch	70	176	32
Lodgepole pine	286	1,530	949
Redwood	342	34	49
Hardwoods	1,418	1,255	2,057
Other Western types	40	1,574	775
Pinyon-juniper	4	30	4,042
Chaparral	0	0	122
Nonstocked - West	35	63	166

Note: Private and public forestland include timberlands only.

Appendix Table C-6 Annual carbon stock change on all forestland for 2001 by forest type and ownership, excluding soils

	Private	Public	Reserve/Other
<i>Tg CO₂ eq.</i>			
<i>Eastern Forests</i>			
White-red-jack pine	3.18	(0.61)	(7.26)
Spruce-fir	(2.40)	(2.58)	5.65
Longleaf-slash pine	(0.76)	(3.46)	(8.10)
Loblolly-shortleaf pine	(56.34)	(4.99)	(5.13)
Oak-pine	(3.76)	(0.94)	(15.66)
Oak-hickory	(102.73)	(29.27)	(58.82)
Oak-gum-cypress	(24.08)	(5.05)	(6.97)
Elm-ash-cottonwood	(17.59)	(3.70)	(0.63)
Maple-beech-birch	(30.06)	(12.58)	(1.75)
Aspen-birch	(7.29)	(3.12)	1.30
Other Eastern types	0.00	(0.02)	34.34
Nonstocked - East	8.92	0.70	26.28
<i>Western forests</i>			
Douglas-fir	4.33	58.58	30.98
Ponderosa pine	(2.74)	120.66	(23.13)
Western white pine	(0.04)	2.03	9.49
Fir-spruce	(4.29)	63.84	11.14
Hemlock-sitka spruce	(1.39)	(4.09)	5.32
Larch	0.04	(1.45)	(2.15)
Lodgepole pine	(1.11)	(17.00)	(35.62)
Redwood	(1.17)	0.29	(0.45)
Hardwoods	(3.63)	(49.37)	(126.86)
Other Western types	2.27	(243.04)	87.94
Pinyon-juniper	(0.68)	3.76	(42.57)
Chaparral	0.00	0.00	33.64
Nonstocked - West	(0.60)	(9.80)	(18.69)

Note: Private and public forestland include timberlands only. Parenthesis indicate net sequestration.

References

- AAPFCO (1995) Commercial Fertilizers 1995. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- AAPFCO (1996) Commercial Fertilizers 1996. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- AAPFCO (1997) Commercial Fertilizers 1997. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- AAPFCO (1998) Commercial Fertilizers 1998. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- AAPFCO (1999) Commercial Fertilizers 1999. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- AAPFCO (2000a) 1999-2000 Commercial Fertilizers Data. ASCII files. Available: David Terry, Secretary, AAPFCO.
- AAPFCO (2000b) Commercial Fertilizers 2000. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- AAPFCO (2002) Commercial Fertilizers 2001. Association of American Plant Food Control Officials and The Fertilizer Institute, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- Allmaras, R.R., H.H. Schomberg, C.L. Douglas, and T.H. Dao (2000) Soil organic carbon sequestration potential of adopting conservation tillage in U.S. croplands. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 55, 365-373.
- Anderson, S. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Steve Anderson, Agricultural Statistician, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Washington, DC. 31 May.
- ASAE (1999) ASAE Standards 1999, 46th Edition, American Society of Agricultural Engineers, St. Joseph, MI.
- ASAE (1999) ASAE Standards 1999. 46th Edition, American Society of Agricultural Engineers, St. Joseph, MI.
- Barnard, G., and Kristoferson, L. (1985) *Agricultural Residues as Fuel in the Third World*. Earthscan Energy Information Programme and the Beijer Institute of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. London, England.
- Bastian, R. (1999) Telephone conversation between Marco Alcaraz of ICF Consulting and Robert Bastian, Office of Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, August.
- Bastian, R. (2001) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Robert Bastian, Office of Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, September-October.
- Bastian, R. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Robert Bastian, Office of Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, 23 August.
- Becket, J.L. and J.W. Oltjen (1993) Estimation of the water requirement for beef production in the United States. *Journal of Animal Science*, 71:818-826.
- Beuselinck, P.R. and Grant, W.F. (1995) "Birdsfoot Trefoil," In: *Forages, Volume I: An Introduction to Grassland Agriculture*, R.F. Barnes, D.A. Miller, and C.J. Nelson, (eds.), pp. 237-248, Iowa State University Press, Ames, IA.
- Birdsey, R.A. (1996) "Carbon Storage for Major Forest Types and Regions in the Conterminous United States," in *Forest and Global Change Volume 2: Forest Management Opportunities for Mitigating Carbon Emissions*, R.N. Sampson and D. Hair, eds., American Forests, Washington DC, pages 1-26 and 261-379.
- Birdsey, R.A. (1992) *Carbon Storage and Accumulation in United States Forest Ecosystems*. General Technical Report WO-59, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC, 51 pages.
- Birdsey, R.A., and L.S. Heath (1995) "Carbon Changes in U.S. Forests," in *Productivity of America's Forests and*

Climate Change, L.A. Joyce, ed., Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station General Technical Report RM-271, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO, pages 56-70.

Bollich, P. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Pat Bollich, Professor with Louisiana State University Agriculture Center, 17 May.

Bossio, Deborah A., William Horwath, Randall G. Mutters, and Chris van Kessel (1999) Methane pool and flux dynamics in a rice field following straw incorporation. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 31:1313-1322.

Brady, N.C. and R.R. Weil (1999) *The Nature and Properties of Soils*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 881 pp.

Brenner, J., K. Paustian, G. Bluhm, J. Cipra, M. Easter, E.T. Elliott, T. Kautza, K. Killian, J. Schuler and S. Williams (2001) Quantifying the change in greenhouse gas emissions due to natural resource conservation practice application in Iowa. Final report to the Iowa Conservation Partnership. Colorado State University Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Fort Collins, CO, USA.

Brenner, J., K. Paustian, G. Bluhm, J. Cipra, M. Easter, R. Foulk, K. Killian, R. Moore, J. Schuler, P. Smith, and S. Williams (2002) Quantifying the change in greenhouse gas emissions due to natural resource conservation practice application in Nebraska. Final report to the Nebraska Conservation Partnership. Colorado State University Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Fort Collins, CO.

Bruce J.P., M. Frome, E. Haites, H. Janzen, R. Lal, K. Paustian (1999) Carbon sequestration in soils. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 54, 382-389.

California Air Resources Board (1999) Progress Report on the Phase Down of Rice Straw Burning in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, Proposed 1999 Report to the Legislature, December.

California Air Resources Board (2001) Progress Report on the Phase Down and the 1998-2000 Pause in the Phase Down of Rice Straw Burning in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, Proposed 2001 Report to the Legislature, June.

Carpenter, G.H. (1992) "Current Litter Practices and Future Needs," in: 1992 National Poultry Waste Management Symposium Proceedings, Blake, J.P., J.O. Donald, and PH Patterson, P.H. (eds.), pp. 268-273, Auburn University Printing Service, Auburn, AL.

Cibrowski, P. (1996) Telephone conversation between Heike Mainhardt of ICF Incorporated and Peter Cibrowski, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 29 July.

Cicerone R.J., C.C. Delwiche, S.C. Tyler, and P.R. Zimmerman, P.R. (1992) "Methane Emissions from California rice paddies with Varied Treatments." *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 6:233-248.

Cole C.V., K. Flach, J. Lee, D. Sauerbeck and B. Stewart (1993) Agricultural sources and sinks of carbon. *Water Air Soil Poll*, 70:111-122

Cropper, J. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Jim Cropper, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Pennsylvania, 24 May, 6 June, and 13 June.

Crutzen, P.J., I. Aselmann, and W. Seiler (1986) Methane production by domestic animals, wild ruminants, other herbivores, fauna, and humans." *Tellus*, 38B:271-284.

CTIC (1998) Crop Residue Management Executive Summary. Conservation Technology Information Center, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Daly, C., G.H. Taylor, W.P. Gibson, T. Parzybok, G.L. Johnson, and P.A. Pasteris (1998) "Development of High Quality Spatial Datasets for the United States." in: Proceedings, 1st International Conference on Geospatial Information in Agriculture and Forestry, LA

Daly, C., R.P. Neilson, and D.L. Phillips (1994) A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain." *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 33:140-158.

-
- Deal, P. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Peter B. Deal, Rangeland Management Specialist, Florida Natural Resources Conservation Service, 21 June.
- Deren, C. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Dr. Chris Deren, Everglades Research and Education Centre at the University of Florida, 15 August.
- Dixon, R.K. (1995) Agroforestry systems: sources or sinks of greenhouse gases? *Agroforestry Systems*, 31: 99-116.
- DOE EIA (2001) U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, Office of Oil and Gas. *Natural Gas Monthly*. November.
- DOE EIA (2002) U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, Form EIA-1605 (2002), Updated State and Regional-level Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for Electricity, March 2002, <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/1605/e-factor.html>.
- Donovan, K. (1999) Personal communication, University of California, Davis.
- Donovan, K. and L. Baldwin (1999) Results of the AAMOLLY model runs for the Enteric Fermentation Model. University of California, Davis.
- EPA (1992a) Global Methane Emissions from Livestock and Poultry Manure. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, February.
- EPA (1992b) Prescribed Burning Background Document and Technical Information Document for Prescribed Burning Best Available Control Measures. EPA-450/2-92-003. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle, NC.
- EPA (1993a) Federal Register. Part II. Standards for the Use and Disposal of Sewage Sludge; Final Rules. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR Parts 257, 403 and 503.
- EPA (1993b) Anthropogenic Methane Emissions in the United States: Estimates for 1990, Report to Congress. Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- EPA (1994) International Anthropogenic Methane Emissions: Estimates for 1990, Report to Congress. EPA 230-R-93-010. Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC.
- EPA (1999) Biosolids Generation, Use and Disposal in the United States. Office of Solid Waste, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Available online at <<http://biosolids.policy.net/relatives/18941.PDF>>.
- EPA (2000a) Draft Enteric Fermentation Model Documentation. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, Washington, DC, June 13, 2000.
- EPA (2000b) AgSTAR Digest, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, Spring.
- EPA (2001a) Cost Methodology Report for Beef and Dairy Animal Feeding Operations. EPA-821-R-01-019,
- EPA (2001b) Development Document for the Proposed Revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulation and the Effluent Guidelines for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. EPA-821-R-01-003, January.
- EPA (2003a) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks - 1990-2001. April 2003, available at <http://Yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/content/resourcecenterpublications.html>.
- EPA (2003b) Data and analysis archives that support development of Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks—1990-2001.
- ERG (2000a) Calculations: Percent Distribution of Manure for Waste Management Systems. August.
- ERG (2000b) Summary of Bo literature review. June.

-
- ERG (2001) Summary of development of MDP Factor for methane conversion factor calculations. September.
- Eve, M. (2001) E-mail from Marlen Eve of the Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory to Barbara Braatz and Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting, containing statistics on U.S. histosol areas cultivated in 1982, 1992, and 1997, which were extracted from the 1997 National Resources Inventory, September.
- Evers, G.W. (2000) Telephone and E-mail conversation between Barbara Braatz of ICF Consulting and Gerald W. Evers, Texas Agricultural Experiment Center, Texas A&M University, 7 July and 10 July.
- Falloon P., P. Smith, J. Szabó, and L. Pásztor (2002) Comparison of approaches for estimating carbon sequestration at the regional scale. *Soil Use and Management*, 18:164-174.
- FAO (2002) FAOSTAT Statistical Database. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. <<http://apps.fao.org>>. Accessed June, 19.
- Feedstuffs (1998) "Nutrient requirements for pregnant replacement heifers." *Feedstuffs*, Reference Issue, p. 50.
- Fife, L. (1999) Telephone conversation between Catherine Leining of ICF Consulting and Les Fife, President and General Manager, Fife Environmental, 9 June.
- Follett R.F. (2001) Soil management concepts and carbon sequestration in cropland soils. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 61:77-92.
- Gerrish, J. (2000) Telephone conversation between Barbara Braatz of ICF Consulting and Dr. Jim Gerrish, Forage Systems Research Center, University of Missouri, 7 July.
- Groffman, P.M., R. Brumme, K. Butterbach-Bahl, K.E. Dobbie, A.R. Mosier, D. Ojima, H. Papen, W.J. Parton, K.A. Smith, C. Wagner-Riddle (2000) Evaluating annual nitrous oxide fluxes at the ecosystem scale. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 14(4): 1061
- Guethle, D. (1999) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and David Guethle, Agronomy Specialist, Missouri Cooperative Extension Service, 6 August.
- Guethle, D. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and David Guethle, Agronomy Specialist, Missouri Cooperative Extension Service, 17 May.
- Guethle, D. (2001) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and David Guethle, Agronomy Specialist at Missouri Cooperative Extension Service, 31 July and 4 September.
- Guethle, D. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and David Guethle, Agronomy Specialist, Missouri Cooperative Extension Service, 19 August.
- Haas H.J., C.E. Evans, and E.F. Miles (1957) Nitrogen and Carbon Changes in Great Plains Soils as Influenced by Cropping and Soil Treatments, Technical Bulletin No. 1164 U.S. Department of Agriculture, State Agricultural Experiment Stations, 111 pp.
- Harper, L.A., O.T. Denmead, J.R. Freney, and F.M. Byers (1999) Direct measurements of methane emission from grazing and feedlot cattle. *J. Anim. Sci*, 77:1392-1401.
- Hashimoto, A.G. (1984) Methane from swine manure: effect of temperature and influent substrate composition on kinetic parameter (k). *Agricultural Wastes*, 9:299-308.
- Hashimoto, A.G., V.H. Varel, and Y.R. Chen (1981) ultimate methane yield from beef cattle manure; effect of temperature, ration constituents, antibiotics and manure age. *Agricultural Wastes*, 3:241-256.
- Heath, L.S., and J.E. Smith (2000) An assessment of uncertainty in forest carbon budget projections, *Environmental Science and Policy*, 3:73-82.

-
- Heath, L.S., J.E. Smith, and R.A. Birdsey (2003) Carbon Trends in U.S. Forestlands: A Context for the Role of Soils in Forest Carbon Sequestration," in: *The Potential of U.S. Forest Soils to Sequester Carbon and Mitigate the Greenhouse Effect*, J.M. Kimble, L.S. Heath, R.A. Birdsey, and R. Lal, (eds.), CRC Press, New York, Chapter 3, pages 35-45.
- Hill, D.T. (1982) Design of digestion systems for maximum methane production. *Transactions of the ASAE*, 25 (1):226-230.
- Hill, D.T. (1984) Methane productivity of the major animal types. *Transactions of the ASAE*, 27(2):530-540.
- Holzappel-Pschorn, A., Conrad, R., and Seiler, W. (1985) Production, oxidation, and emissions of methane in rice paddies. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 31:343-351.
- Hoveland, C.S. (2000) Telephone conversation between Barbara Braatz of ICF Consulting and Carl S. Hoveland, Department of Agronomy, University of Georgia, 7 July.
- Hoveland, C.S. and G.W. Evers (1995) "Arrowleaf, Crimson, and Other Annual Clovers," in: *Forages, Volume I: An Introduction to Grassland Agriculture*, Barnes, R.F., D.A. Miller, and C.J. Nelson, (eds.), pp. 249-260, Iowa State University Press, Ames, IA.
- Howard, J.L. (2001) U.S. Timber Production, Trade, Consumption, and Price Statistics 1965-1999. Forest Products Laboratory Research Paper RP-595, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Madison, WI, 90 pages, 2001.
- ILENR (1993) Illinois Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990. Office of Research and Planning, Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Springfield, IL.
- Ince, P.J. (1994) Recycling and Long-Range Timber Outlook. Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station General Technical Report RM-242, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO, 66 pages.
- IPCC (2000) Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Chapter 4: IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme Technical Support Unit, Kanagawa, Japan. Data also available at <<http://www.ipcc-nggip.ig>
- IPCC/UNEP/OECD/IEA (1997) Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Paris: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, United Nations Environmental Programme, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, International Energy Agency.
- IPCC (1995) Second Assessment Report: Climate Change 1995. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, United Nations Environment Programme. Available at <http://www.ipcc.ch/pub/reports.htm>
- Jenkins, B.M., S.Q. Turn, and Williams, R.B. (1992) Atmospheric emissions from agricultural burning in California: determination of burn fractions, distribution factors, and crop specific contributions. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 38:313-330.
- Johnson, D. (1999) Personal communication, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, 1999.
- Johnson, D. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Dan Johnson, State Water Management Engineer, California Natural Resources Conservation Service, 23 June.
- Johnson, D. (2002) Personal Communication, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, 2002.
- Johnson, K.A. and D.E. Johnson (1995) Methane emissions from cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 73:2483-2492.
- Karkosh, R. (2000) Telephone conversation between Barbara Braatz of ICF Consulting and Roy Karkosh, Crops Branch, National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 17 July.
- Ketzis, J. (1999) Telephone and e-mail conversations between Marco Alcaraz of ICF Consulting and Jen Ketzis

-
- regarding the Animal Science Department Computer Model (Cornell Net Carbohydrate and Protein System), Cornell University, June/July.
- Klosterboer, A. (1997) Telephone conversation between Holly Simpkins of ICF Incorporated and Arlen Klosterboer, Texas A & M University, 1 December.
- Klosterboer, A. (1999a) Telephone conversation between Catherine Leining of ICF Consulting and Arlen Klosterboer, Extension Agronomist, Texas A & M University, 10 June.
- Klosterboer, A. (1999b) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Arlen Klosterboer, Extension Agronomist, Texas A & M University, 12 August.
- Klosterboer, A. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Arlen Klosterboer, Extension Agronomist, Texas A & M University, 18 May.
- Klosterboer, A. (2001a) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Arlen Klosterboer, Extension Agronomist, Texas A & M University, 6 August.
- Klosterboer, A. (2001b) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Arlen Klosterboer, Extension Agronomist, Texas A & M University, 8 October.
- Klosterboer, A. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Arlen Klosterboer, Extension Agronomist, Texas A&M University, 19 August.
- Kort, J. and R.Turlock (1999) Carbon reservoir and biomass in Canadian prairie shelterbelts. *Agroforestry Systems*, 44:175-189.
- Lal R., J.M. Kimble, R.F. Follett, and C.V. Cole (1998) *The Potential of U.S. Cropland to Sequester Carbon and Mitigate the Greenhouse Effect*. Sleeping Bear Press, Chelsea, MI, 128 pp.
- Lange, J. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and John Lange, Agricultural Statistician, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Washington, DC, 8 May.
- Lin, B.H., M. Padgett, L. Bull, H. Delvo, D. Shank, and H. Taylor (1995) *Pesticide and Fertilizer Use and Trends in U.S. Agriculture*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, AER-717.
- Lindau, C.W. and P.K. Bollich (1993) Methane Emissions from Louisiana first and ratoon crop rice. *Soil Science*, 156:42-48.
- Lindau, C.W., P.K. Bollich, and R.D. DeLaune (1995) Effect of rice variety on methane emission from Louisiana rice. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 54:109-114.
- Lindberg, J. (2002) Telephone conversation and email correspondence between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Jeff Lindberg, California Air Resources Board, 12-23 September.
- Linscombe, S. (1999a) Telephone conversation between Catherine Leining of ICF Consulting and Steve Linscombe, Research Agronomist, Rice Research Station in Crowley, LA, 3 June.
- Linscombe, S. (1999b) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Steve Linscombe, Research Agronomist, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center, 9 August.
- Linscombe, S. (2001a) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Steve Linscombe, Research Agronomist, Rice Research Station in Crowley, LA, 30 July–1 August.
- Linscombe, S. (2001b) E-mail correspondence between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Steve Linscombe, Research Agronomist, Rice Research Station in Crowley, LA, 4 October.
- Linscombe, S. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Steve Linscombe, Professor with the Rice Research Station at Louisiana State University Agriculture Center, 21 August.

-
- Martin, J. (2000) "A Comparison of the Performance of Three Swine Waste Stabilization Systems," paper submitted to Eastern Research Group, Inc. October, 2000.
- May, D.M. (1998) The North Central Forest Inventory & Analysis Timber Product Output Database--A Regional Composite Approach. North Central Research Station General Technical Report NC-200, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, St. Paul, MN, 16 pages.
- Mayhew, W. (1997) Telephone conversation between Holly Simpkins of ICF Incorporated and Walter Mayhew, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, 24 November.
- Metcalf and Eddy, Inc. (1991) Wastewater Engineering: Treatment, Disposal, and Reuse, Third Edition, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, NY.
- Miles, P.D., G.J. Brand, C.L. Alerich, L.F. Bednar, S.W. Woudenberg, J.F. Glover, and E.N. Ezell (2001) The Forest Inventory and Analysis Database Description and Users Manual Version 1.0. North Central Research Station General Technical Report NC-218, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, St. Paul, MN, 130 pages.
- Miller, P. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Paul Miller, Iowa Natural Resources Conservation Service, 12 June.
- Mills, J.R., and J.C. Kincaid (1992) The Aggregate Timberland Assessment System-ATLAS: A Comprehensive Timber Projection Model. Pacific Northwest Research Station General Technical Report PNW-GTR-281, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, OR, 16 pages.
- Milton, B. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Bob Milton, Chief of Livestock Branch, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, 1 May.
- Morris, G.R. (1976) Anaerobic Fermentation of Animal Wastes: A Kinetic and Empirical Design Fermentation. M.S. Thesis. Cornell University.
- Mosier, A.R., J.M. Duxbury, J.R. Freney, O. Heinemeyer and K. Minami (1998a) Assessing and mitigating N₂O emissions from agricultural soils. *Climatic Change*, 40:7-38.
- Mosier, A.R., J.M. Duxbury, J.R. Freney, O. Heinemeyer and K. Minami (1998b) Mitigating agricultural emissions of methane. *Climatic Change*, 40:39-80.
- Mutters, C. (2001) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Cass Mutters, Rice Farm Advisor for Butte, Glen, and Tehama Counties, University of California Cooperative Extension Service, 5 September.
- Mutters, C. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Cass Mutters, Rice Farm Advisor for Butte, Glen, and Tehama Counties, University of California Cooperative Extension Service, 27 August.
- Nair, P. K. R. and V.D. Nair. (2003) "Carbon Storage in North American Agroforestry Systems," pp. 333-346, In: J. Kimble, L.S. Heath, R.A. Birdsey, and R. Lal. (eds), *The Potential of U.S. Forest Soils to Sequester Carbon and Mitigate the Greenhouse Effect*, Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press LLC.
- Najita, T. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Theresa Najita, Air Pollution Specialist, California Air Resources Board, 17 August.
- Najita, T. (2001) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Theresa Najita, Air Pollution Specialist, California Air Resources Board, 31 July.
- Nevison, C. (2000) Review of the IPCC methodology for estimating nitrous oxide emissions associated with agricultural leaching and runoff. *Chemosphere-Global Change Science*, 2:493-500.
- NOAA (2001) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Climate Data Center, Downloaded

“0106.tmp” on July 27, 2001 from <ftp://ftp.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cirs/> (for all States except Alaska and Hawaii); downloaded “all-1994.ta

Noller, J. (1996) Telephone conversation between Heike Mainhardt of ICF Incorporated and John Noller, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, 30 July.

NRC (1999) 1996 Beef NRC, Appendix Table 22. National Research Council.

NRC (2000) Nutrient Requirements of Beef Cattle: Seventh Revised Edition: Update 2000, Table 11-1, Appendix Table 1. National Research Council.

Ogle, S.M., M.D. Eve, F.J. Breidt and K. Paustian (2003) Uncertainty in Estimating Land Use and Management Impacts on Soil Organic Carbon Storage for U.S. Agricultural Lands between 1982 and 1997. *Global Change Biology* (in press).

Ogle, Stephen (2002) E-mail from Stephen Ogle of the Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory to Barbara Braatz of ICF Consulting, containing revised statistics on U.S. histosol areas cultivated in 1982, 1992, and 1997, which were extracted from the 1997 Nati

Oregon Department of Energy (1995) Report on Reducing Oregon’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Appendix D: Inventory and Technical Discussion. Oregon Department of Energy, Salem, OR.

Paustian, K., J. Brenner, K. Killian, J. Cipra, S. Williams, E.T. Elliott, M.D. Eve, T. Kautza and G. Bluhm (2002) State Level Analyses of C Sequestration in Agricultural Soils,” in: J.M. Kimble, R. Lal, and R.F. Follett (eds). *Agriculture Practices and Policies for Carbon Sequestration in Soil*. pp. 193-204. Lewis Publishers, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA.

Paustian, K., H.P. Collins, and E.A. Paul (1997b) “Management Controls on Soil Carbon,” in: Paul, E.A., K. Paustian, E.T. Elliott, and C.V. Cole (eds.), *Soil Organic Matter in Temperate Agroecosystems: Long-Term Experiments in North America*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 15-49.

Paustian, K., O. Andren, H.H. Janzen, R. Lal, P. Smith, G. Tian, H. Tiessen, M. Van Noordwijk, and P.L. Woomer (1997a) Agricultural soils as a sink to mitigate CO₂ emissions. *Soil Use and Management*, 13:230-244.

Pederson, G.A. (1995) “White Clover and Other Perennial Clovers,” in: *Forages, Volume I: An Introduction to Grassland Agriculture*, Barnes, R.F., D.A. Miller, and C.J. Nelson, (eds.), pp. 227-236, Iowa State University Press, Ames, IA.

Pederson, G.A. (2000) Telephone conversation between Barbara Braatz of ICF Consulting and Dr. Gary A. Pederson, Department of Agronomy, Mississippi State University, 24 July and 25 July.

Peterson, K., J. King, and D. Johnson (2002) Methodology and Results for Revised Diet Characterization Analysis, deliverable under EPA contract no. 68-W7-0069, task order 505-01. Memorandum to EPA from ICF Consulting, 31 July.

Phillips, D.L., S.L. Brown, P.E. Schroeder, and R.A. Birdsey (2000) Toward error analysis of large-scale forest carbon budgets. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 9:305-313.

Poe, G., N. Bills, B. Bellows, P. Crosscombe, R. Koelsch, M. Kreher, and P. Wright (1999) Staff Paper Documenting the Status of Dairy Manure Management in New York: Current Practices and Willingness to Participate in Voluntary Programs, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, September.

Safley, L.M. Jr. (2000) Telephone conversation between Deb Bartram of ERG and L.M. Safley, President, Agri-Waste Technology, June.

Safley, L.M. Jr., M.E. Casada, J.W. Woodbury, and J.F. Roos (1992) Global Methane Emissions from Livestock and Poultry Manure. EPA/400/1-91/048, Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

February.

Safley, L.M., Jr. and P.W. Westerman (1989) Anaerobic lagoon biogas recovery systems. *Biological Wastes*, 27:43-62.

Safley, L.M., Jr. and P.W. Westerman (1990) "Psychrophilic anaerobic digestion of animal manure: proposed design methodology. *Biological Wastes*, 34:133-148.

Safley, L.M., Jr. and P.W. Westerman (1992) "Performance of a low temperature lagoon digester. *Biological Wastes*, 9060-8524/92/S05.00.

Saichuk, J. (1997) Telephone conversation between Holly Simpkins of ICF Incorporated and John Saichuk, Louisiana State University, 24 November.

Sass, R.L., F.M. Fisher, and Y.B. Wang (1992) Methane emission from rice fields: the effect of floodwater management. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 6:249-262.

Sass, R.L., F.M. Fisher, P.A. Harcombe, and F.T. Turner (1990) Methane production and emissions in a Texas rice field. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 4:47-68.

Sass, R.L., F.M. Fisher, P.A. Harcombe, and F.T. Turner (1991a) Mitigation of methane emissions from rice fields: possible adverse effects of incorporated rice straw. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 5:275-287.

Sass, R.L., F.M. Fisher, F.T. Turner, and M.F. Jund, (1991b) Methane emissions from rice fields as influenced by solar radiation, temperature, and straw incorporation. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 5:335-350.

Schlesinger, W. H. (1986) "Changes in Soil Carbon Storage and Associated Properties with Disturbance and Recovery," pp. 194-220, in: J. R. Trabalka and D. E. Reichle (eds.), *The Changing Carbon Cycle: A Global Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Schroeder, P. (1994) Carbon storage benefits of agroforestry systems. *Agroforestry Systems*, 27: 89-97.

Schueneman, T. (1997) Telephone conversation between Barbara Braatz of ICF Incorporated and Tom Schueneman, County Extension Agent, Florida, 7 November.

Schueneman, T. (1999a) Telephone conversation between Catherine Leining of ICF Consulting and Tom Schueneman, Palm Beach County Agricultural Extension Agent, Florida, 7 June.

Schueneman, T. (1999b) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Tom Schueneman, Palm Beach County Agricultural Extension Agent, Florida, 10 August.

Schueneman, T. (1999c) Telephone conversation between John Venezia of ICF Consulting and Tom Schueneman, Palm Beach County Agricultural Extension Agent, Florida, 27 August.

Schueneman, T. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Tom Schueneman, Palm Beach County Agricultural Extension Agent, Florida, 16 May.

Schueneman, T. (2001a) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Tom Schueneman, Palm Beach County Agricultural Extension Agent, Florida, 30 July.

Schueneman, T. (2001b) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Tom Schueneman, Palm Beach County Agricultural Extension Agent, Florida, 9 October.

Skog, K.E., and G.A. Nicholson (1998) Carbon cycling through wood products: the role of wood and paper products in carbon sequestration. *Forest Products Journal*, 48: 75-83.

Slaton, N. (1999a) Telephone conversation between Catherine Leining of ICF Consulting and Dr. Nathan Slaton, Extension Agronomist - Rice, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 3 June.

-
- Slaton, N. (1999b) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Dr. Nathan Slaton, Extension Agronomist - Rice, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 6 August.
- Slaton, N. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Nathan Slaton, Extension Agronomist - Rice, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 20 May.
- Slaton, N. (2001a) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Nathan Slaton, Extension Agronomist - Rice, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 23 August.
- Slaton, N. (2001b) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Nathan Slaton, Extension Agronomist - Rice, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 3 October.
- Smith W.N., R.L. Desjardins, and E. Pattey (2000) The net flux of carbon from agricultural soils in Canada 1970-2010. *Global Change Biology*, 6:557-568.
- Smith, J.E., and L.S. Heath (2000) "Considerations for Interpreting Probabilistic Estimates of Uncertainty of Forest Carbon," in: *The Impact of Climate Change on America's Forests*, L.A. Joyce and R.A. Birdsey, (eds.). Rocky Mountain Research Station General Technical Report RMRS-59, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO, Chapter 7, pp. 102-111.
- Smith, J.E., and L.S. Heath (2001) Identifying influences on model uncertainty: An application using a forest carbon budget model. *Environmental Management*, 27: 253-267.
- Smith, J.E., and L.S. Heath (2002) A Model of Forest Floor Carbon Mass for United States Forest Types. Northeastern Research Station Research Paper NE-722, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Newtown Square, PA, 37 pages.
- Smith, J.E., L.S. Heath, and J.C. Jenkins (2003) Forest Volume-to-Biomass Models and Estimates of Mass for Live and Standing Dead Trees of U.S. Forests. Northeastern Research Station General Technical Report NE-298, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Newtown Square, PA, 57 pages.
- Smith, P., J. Brenner, K. Paustian, G. Bluhm, J. Cipra, M. Easter, E.T. Elliott, K. Killian, D. Lamm, J. Schuler and S. Williams (2002) Quantifying the change in greenhouse gas emissions due to natural resource conservation practice application in Indiana. Final report to the Indiana Conservation Partnership. Colorado State University Natural Resources Ecology Laboratory and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Fort Collins, CO.
- Smith, T. (1999) Telephone conversation between John Venezia of ICF Incorporated and Terrie Smith, Sem-Chi Rice Company, Florida, 1 September.
- Smith, W.B., J.S. Vissage, D.R. Darr, and R.M. Sheffield (2001) Forest Resources of the United States, 1997. North Central Research Station General Technical Report NC-219, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, St. Paul, MN, 190 pages.
- Sperow M, M.D. Eve, and K. Paustian (2003) Potential soil C sequestration on U.S. agricultural soils. *Climatic Change*. (in press).
- Stettler, D. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Don Stettler, Environmental Engineer, National Climate Center, Oregon Natural Resources Conservation Service, 27 June.
- Stevens, G. (1997) Telephone conversation between Holly Simpkins of ICF Incorporated and Gene Stevens, Extension Specialist, Missouri Commercial Agriculture Program, Delta Research Center, 17 December.
- Street, J. (1997) Telephone conversation between Holly Simpkins of ICF Incorporated and Dr. Joe Street, Mississippi State University, Delta Research and Extension Center and Delta Branch Station, 1 December.
- Street, J. (1999a) Telephone conversation between Catherine Leining of ICF Consulting and Joe Street, Mississippi State University, Delta Research Center, 8 June.

-
- Street, J. (1999b) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Joe Street, Mississippi State University, Delta Research Center, 6 August.
- Street, J. (2000) Telephone conversation between Payton Deeks of ICF Consulting and Joe Street, Mississippi State University, Delta Research Center, 17 May.
- Street, J. (2001) Telephone conversation and e-mail correspondence between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Joe Street, Mississippi State University, Delta Research Center, 1 August and 3 October.
- Street, J. (2002) Telephone conversation and e-mail correspondence between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Joe Street, Mississippi State University, Delta Research Center, 19 August.
- Strehler, A. and W. Stütze (1987) "Biomass Residues" in: Hall, D.O. and R.P. Overend, (eds.) Biomass. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd. Chichester, UK.
- Summers, R. and S. Bousfield (1980) A detailed study of piggery-waste anaerobic digestion. *Agricultural Wastes*, 2:61-78.
- Sweeten, J. (2000) Telephone conversation between Indra Mitra of ERG and John Sweeten, Texas A&M University, June 2000.
- Taylor, N.L. and R. R. Smith (1995) "Red Clover," in: Forages, Volume I: An Introduction to Grassland Agriculture, Barnes, R.F., D.A. Miller, and C.J. Nelson (eds.), pp. 217-226, Iowa State University Press, Ames, IA.
- Turn, S.Q., B.M. Jenkins, J.C. Chow, L.C. Pritchett, D. Campbell, T. Cahill, and S.A. Whalen, (1997) Elemental characterization of particulate matter emitted from biomass burning: Wind tunnel derived source profiles for herbaceous and wood fuels. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 102(D3):3683-3699.
- TVA (1991) Commercial Fertilizers 1991. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.
- TVA (1992a) Commercial Fertilizers 1992. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.
- TVA (1992b) Fertilizer Summary Data 1992. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.
- TVA (1993) Commercial Fertilizers 1993. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.
- TVA (1994) Commercial Fertilizers 1994. Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, AL.
- UEP (1999) Voluntary Survey Results - Estimated Percentage Participation/Activity, Caged Layer Environmental Management Practices, Industry data submissions for EPA profile development, United Egg Producers and National Chicken Council.
- University of California (1977) Emission Factors from Burning of Agricultural Waste Collected in California. University of California, Davis.
- Uri, Noel D. and K. Day (1991) Energy efficiency, technological change and the dieselization of agriculture in the United States. *Transportation Planning and Technology*, 16:221-231.
- USDA APHIS (1996) Swine '95: Grower/Finisher Part II: Reference of 1995 U.S. Grower/Finisher Health & Management Practices, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal Plant Health and Inspection Service, Washington, DC, June.
- USDA APHIS NAHMS (1993) Beef Cow/Calf Health and Productivity Audit. National Animal Health Monitoring System, Fort Collins, CO, August. Data also available from <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.
- USDA APHIS NAHMS (1994) Beef Cow/Calf Health and Productivity Audit. National Animal Health Monitoring System, Fort Collins, CO. Data also available from <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.
- USDA APHIS NAHMS (1996). Beef Cow/Calf Health and Productivity Audit (CHAPA): Forage Analyses from

Cow/Calf Herds in 18 States, National Animal Health Monitoring System, Washington DC, March. Data also available from <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.

USDA APHIS NAHMS (1998) Beef '97, National Animal Health Monitoring System, Fort Collins, CO, 1998. Data also available from <<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ceah/cahm>>.

USDA APHIS NAHMS (2000) Layers '99 – Part II: References of 1999 Table Egg Layer Management in the U.S., U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), National Animal Health Monitoring System (NAHMS), January.

USDA APHIS NAHMS Special Request (1998) Re-aggregated data from the National Animal Health Monitoring System's (NAHMS) Swine '95 study aggregated by Eric Bush of the Centers for Epidemiology and Animal Health, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

USDA APHIS NAHMS Special request (2000) Re-aggregated data from the National Animal Health Monitoring System's (NAHMS) Dairy '96 study provided by Stephen L. Ott of the , Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, June 19.

USDA ERS (2000b) "Agricultural Production Management: Nutrient Management (Chapter 4)," in: Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators. Found at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Emphases/Harmony/issues/arei2000/>.

USDA ERS (1994) Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators. Agricultural Handbook No. 705, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

USDA NASS (1999a) Miscellaneous Livestock and Animal Specialties Inventory and Sales: 1997 and 1992, <http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/census97/volume1/us-51/us2_25.pdf>, Table 25. U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Washington, DC. (Accessed May 2000).

USDA NASS (1999b) Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey, Volume 3, Special Studies, Part 1, 1997 Census of Agriculture. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, DC, October.

USDA NASS (2001a) Published Estimates Database, National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Downloaded from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>, 26 September.

USDA NASS (2001b) Farm Production Expenditures, 2000 Summary National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington DC, July.

USDA NASS (2002) Agricultural Statistics 2002. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

USDA NASS Cattle (1995) Final Estimates 1989-93. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Cattle (1999) Final Estimates 1994-1998. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington DC. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Cattle (1999) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 January.

USDA NASS Cattle (2000) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Cattle (2001) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 26 January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Cattle (2002) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 1 February 1. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Cattle on Feed (2000) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,

Washington, DC, 14 April and February. (Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>).

USDA NASS Cattle on Feed (2001) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 19 January and 16 February. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Cattle on Feed (2002) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 18 January and 15 February. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Census (1999) 1992 and 1997 Census of Agriculture (CD-ROM), National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

USDA NASS Chicken and Eggs (2002) Annual Summary. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 29 January, revised March 22. (Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>).

USDA NASS Chicken and Eggs (1998) Final Estimates, 1994-97. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, December.

USDA NASS Chicken and Eggs (2000) Final Estimates 1988-1993. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, downloaded from <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/datasets/livestock/95908/sb908.txt>. 3 May.

USDA NASS Chicken and Eggs (2001) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, January.

USDA NASS Crop Production (2000) Crop Production 1999 Summary. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available online at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/>. Accessed July 2001.

USDA NASS Crop Production (2001) Crop Production 2000 Summary. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available online at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/>. Accessed July 2001.

USDA NASS Crop Production (2002) Crop Production 2001 Summary. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available online at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/>. Accessed June 2002.

USDA NASS Dairy (1995) Dairy Outlook, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, 27 February. Data also available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/so/view.asp?f=livestock/ldp-dbb/>.

USDA NASS Field Crops (1994) Field Crops Final Estimates, 1987-1992. Statistical Bulletin No. 896, National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/>.

USDA NASS Field Crops (1998) Field Crops Final Estimates, 1992-97. Statistical Bulletin No. 947a. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/>.

USDA NASS Hogs and Pigs (1994) Final Estimates 1988-92. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, December. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Hogs and Pigs (1998) Final Estimates 1993-97. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Hogs and Pigs (1999) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 December. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Hogs and Pigs (2000) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 December. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Hogs and Pigs (2001) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 December. Data also available from <http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>.

USDA NASS Hogs and Pigs (2002) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 June. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Livestock Slaughter (1999) Livestock Slaughter, January 22 – December 23, 1999. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Livestock Slaughter (2000) Livestock Slaughter, January 21 – December 22, 2000. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Livestock Slaughter (2001) Livestock Slaughter, January 19 – December 21, 2001. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Livestock Slaughter (2002) Livestock Slaughter, January 25 – June 21, 2002. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Milk Cows and Production (1999) Final Estimates 1993-1997. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Milk Production (2000) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 16 February. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Milk Production (2001) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 16 February. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Milk Production (2002) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 15 February. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Poultry Production and Value (1995) Final Estimates, 1989-1993. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, January.

USDA NASS Poultry Production and Value (1999) Final Estimates, 1994-97. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, March.

USDA NASS Poultry Production and Value (2001) 1999 Summary. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, April.

USDA NASS Poultry Production and Value (2002) Annual Summary. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 29 April, revised May 3. (Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>).

USDA NASS Sheep and Goats (1994) Final Estimates 1988-93. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 31 January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Sheep and Goats (1999) Final Estimates, 1994-1998. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, January.

USDA NASS Sheep and Goats (1999) Final Estimates, 1994-98. National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 1999. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Sheep and Goats (2000) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 28 January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Sheep and Goats (2001) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 26 January. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NASS Sheep and Goats (2002) National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC, 1 February. Data also available from <<http://www.nass.usda.gov:81/ipedb/>>.

USDA NRCS (1981) Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States. Agriculture Handbook No. 296, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln, NE, 156 pp.

USDA NRCS (1991) State Soil Geographic (STATSGO) Data Base Data Use Information. Miscellaneous Publication No. 1492, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fort Worth, TX.

USDA NRCS (1996) Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook, National Engineering Handbook, Part 651, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, July.

USDA NRCS (1997) National soil survey laboratory characterization data, digital data, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Lincoln, NE.

USDA NRCS (1998) Nutrients Available from Livestock Manure Relative to Crop Growth Requirements. Resource Assessment and Strategic Planning Working Paper 98-1, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, February.

USDA NRCS (2000) 1997 National Resources Inventory. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

Waddell, K.L., D.D. Oswald, and D.S. Powell (1989) Forest Statistics of the United States, 1987. Pacific Northwest Research Station Resource Bulletin PNW-RB-168, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Portland, OR, 106 pages.

Western Dairyman (1998) "How Big Should Heifers Be at Calving?" The Western Dairyman, September, p. 12.

Wilson, C. (2001) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Dr. Chuck Wilson, Rice Specialist, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 1 August.

Wilson, C. (2002) Telephone conversation between Caren Mintz of ICF Consulting and Dr. Chuck Wilson, Rice Specialist, University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, 23 August.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (1993) Wisconsin Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Estimates for 1990. Bureau of Air Management, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison, WI.

Wright, P. (2000) Telephone conversation between Lee-Ann Tracy of ERG and Peter Wright, Cornell University, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 23 June.