

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Large CO2 removal potential of woody debris preservation in managed forests

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6ss5n3rn>

Journal

Nature Geoscience, 18(7)

ISSN

1752-0894

Authors

Luo, Yiqi
Wei, Ning
Lu, Xingjie
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2025-07-01

DOI

10.1038/s41561-025-01731-2

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

22 ¹¹Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, 23 St
23 Macher Drive, Aberdeen, AB24 3UU, UK

24 ¹²Systems Engineering, College of Engineering, Cornell University, New York, USA

25 ¹³Horticulture Section, School of Integrative Plant Science, Cornell AgriTech, Cornell
26 University, New York, USA

27 ¹⁴Horticulture Section, School of Integrative Plant Science, Cornell University, New
28 York, USA

29

30 * Equal contributions to this study.

31 For correspondence, yiqi.luo@cornell.edu

Abstract:

Limiting climate warming to 1.5 °C requires reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and carbon dioxide (CO₂) removal. While various CO₂ removal strategies have been explored to achieve global net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and account for legacy emissions, additional exploration is warranted to examine more durable, scalable, and sustainable approaches to achieve climate targets. Here we show that preserving woody debris in managed forests can remove gigatons of CO₂ from the atmosphere sustainably based on a carbon cycle analysis using three earth system models. Woody debris is produced from logging, sawmill, and abandoned woody products, and can be preserved in deep soil to lengthen its residence time (a measure of durability) by thousands of years. Preserving the yearly produced woody debris in managed forests has the capacity to remove 769-937 Gt CO₂ from the atmosphere cumulatively (10.1-12.3 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹ on average) from 2025 to 2100 if its residence time is lengthened for 100-2,000 years and after 5% CO₂ removal is discounted to account for CO₂ emission due to machine operation for wood debris preservation. This translates to a reduction in global temperatures between 0.35 - 0.42°C. Given the large potential, relatively low cost and long durability, future efforts should be focused on establishing large-scale demonstration projects for this technology in a variety of contexts, with rigorous monitoring of carbon dioxide removal, its co-benefits and side-effects.

Main text:

The Paris Climate Agreement has spurred research and development of climate solutions to help hold global mean temperature rise to 2.0 °C or preferably 1.5 °C¹⁻³. Among such solutions, carbon dioxide removal (CDR) strategies can accelerate the pace of decarbonization, compensate for emissions from hard-to-abate sectors (e.g., agriculture and heavy industry), and enable net-negative global emissions (e.g., to enable a return to the agreed warming limits after overshoot, remove legacy emissions, and address intergenerational justice)^{4,5}. Modeled pathways of global emissions to limit global warming to 1.5 or 2 °C entail the removal of 3-18 gigatons (Gt) of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year from the atmosphere². As carbon budgets consistent with <1.5 °C of global warming dwindle, it is thus urgent to identify and implement large-scale CDR methods using our known principles of carbon cycle science.

From the perspective of carbon cycle science, CDR approaches effectively transfer carbon from the atmosphere to storage in land, ocean, and geological reservoirs⁶. The amount of land carbon storage is determined together by two processes: the carbon influx from the atmosphere and the residence time of the stored carbon⁷. To remove CO₂ from the atmosphere at the Gt scale, we can either increase the carbon influx into pools with long residence times (i.e., durability or permanence), lengthen the residence times of high-influx pools, or both. For example, bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) aims to store CO₂ in long residence time pools (geologic reservoirs) after using the biomass to generate energy⁸ whereas enhanced rock weathering approaches seek to increase influxes of CO₂ into long-term carbon pools in oceans and deep soil⁹.

Here we present a case study in which we used scientific knowledge gained from basic carbon cycle research to guide development and evaluation of CDR technology. Specifically, we analyzed whether lengthening the residence time of woody debris via

preservation in deep soils could result in a scalable and traceable CDR technology. Our analysis is built upon past studies with detailed methods of implementation, cost estimates, and life-cycle analysis¹⁰⁻¹³. This paper describes how woody debris preservation in deep soil leads to negative carbon emission by depressing carbon emission from wood debris decomposition or burning and how this technology is scaled up to sustainably remove Gt CO₂ from the atmosphere.

Carbon dioxide removal via elongating residence time

Preserving woody debris in deep soil removes CO₂ from the atmosphere by depressing carbon emission from its decomposition or burning, leading to negative carbon emissions in reference to that with its default uses. Woody debris generated from logging, sawmill wastes, and abandoned wood products is usually decomposed or burned to release CO₂ back to the atmosphere at a similar rate with wood production (Fig. 1). When it is preserved in deep soil to lengthen its residence time, the CO₂ emission is delayed for a period determined by the lengthened residence time¹³.

This mechanism underlying CDR though preserving woody debris resembles those underlying afforestation and reforestation, which mainly lengthen biomass carbon residence time in comparison with their reference ecosystems. For example, afforestation removes CO₂ from the atmosphere by converting a grassland or cropland into a forested area. While a newly established forest may have similar carbon input as the previous grassland or cropland¹⁴, input carbon is partially allocated to woody biomass, which has a longer residence time by decades or centuries than biomass in either a grassland or a cropland, which turn over annually (Fig. 2). Similarly, restoration of a peatland results in CDR mainly by allocating carbon to soil carbon pools with long residence time (Fig. 2). By comparison, preservation of woody debris in deep soil diverts carbon from being released via microbial respiration or burning and, thus, effectively transfers carbon from the fast live biospheric

cycle into a slow storage pool. Whereas some forms of the ecosystem restoration, e.g., reforestation, may no longer be effective once the past disturbed ecosystems have mostly been restored to saturation in carbon sink, preserving woody debris can keep removing CO₂ from the atmosphere as woody debris can be sustainably delivered year after year.

Preserving woody debris takes advantage of large annual production rates. Woody biomass is produced at a rate of approximately 14.1 ± 3.2 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹ in managed forests (Fig. 1, Methods, Extended Data Fig. 1). Woody biomass eventually becomes debris in various forms, such as logging debris during harvest, sawmill wastes, abandoned furniture and other wood products. Logging debris is commonly piled up in the field for natural decomposition or burned on site, leading to rapid CO₂ release to the atmosphere. Sawmill wastes are mostly used in ways, such as woodchips and pellets, that be rapidly decomposed. Wood products, such as furniture and lumber, may lengthen the residence time of woody carbon but are eventually abandoned before being burned or landfilled for decomposition. These kinds of woody debris can all be preserved to remove CO₂ from the atmosphere.

In addition, preserving woody debris is much less energy intensive and can be implemented with lower cost than some of the current CDR techniques, such as direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS)^{12,13}. While woody debris is readily available for CDR, DACCS requires engineering of the carbon influxes into storage pools of long residence time through chemical adsorption, absorption or mineralization^{9,16} (Fig 2).

Preserving woody debris sustainably at the gigaton scale

Woody debris can be preserved with many methods to lengthen its residence time, mostly involving extremely dry, cold, and/or anoxic conditions¹⁸. For example, deep soil provides anoxic conditions to preserve woody debris for hundreds or thousands of years¹⁰⁻¹³ primarily because soil is a very effective medium to deplete O₂ concentration to slow

decomposition. O₂ concentration decreases from 21% in air to about 1% at soil depth of one meter and <0.1% at soil depth of two meters¹⁹. Even though decomposition of buried woody debris in deep soil may still occur, its rate is expected to decrease by orders of magnitude in comparison with debris left aboveground²⁰. Additional treatments (e.g., with smoke and salt) could further lengthen the residence time of deeply buried debris. Inhibiting microbial respiration via microbial biotechnology may be another way to further lengthen residence time²¹.

Woody debris can be collected and buried nearby in areas where it is produced with minimal transportation. Logging debris can be collected and buried in the forests where tree harvests take place whereas sawmill wastes and abandoned wood products can be entombed in nearby land. If an average of 4 tons of CO₂-equivalent woody debris is available per hectare for preservation, 0.1 megatons (Mt) CO₂ will be removed from the atmosphere via collecting woody debris from 2,500 km² to be buried in a soil vault of 100 meters long, 100 meters wide, and 10 meters deep, assuming an average of 571 kg dry woody biomass per m³ and 1.75 kg CO₂ per kg dry woody biomass (Methods)¹². In this case, the land area used for the soil vault accounts for 1 in 2.5M of the area of woody debris collection. The volume of the excavation of one soil vault of this size is equivalent to that for constructing a mid-sized commercial building. Preserving 1 Gt CO₂-equivalent woody mass requires 10,000 soil vaults of this size, with the total soil excavation being comparable to that for constructing one building *Burj Khalifa* in Dubai²². Woody debris can be also preserved in existing quarries or abandoned mines to reduce soil excavation. The excavated underground vaults are capped with soil layers so that their land surface can be reused for growing trees, grasses, or crops. Soil respiration may be slightly stimulated by excavation of soil vaults²³. Yet capping the vaults likely results in more carbon storage as the carbon-rich topsoil is mixed in deep soil layers²⁴. Life cycle analyses (LCA) indicated that CO₂ emissions due to energy use for the

whole process of preserving woody debris is equivalent to 2-5% of buried woody debris carbon (Methods)^{12,13}.

Many countries generate woody debris in managed forests that can offset a substantial fraction of carbon emissions. US and China are among the top countries with the largest managed forest lands of nearly 300 million hectares and generate woody debris of 1.33 ± 1.07 and 1.24 ± 0.35 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹, respectively (Fig. 3). If the rate of woody debris production in managed forests holds, it requires 66% of the produced woody debris to be preserved to generate 0.88 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹ for net zero emission for US in 2050. In comparison, China could offset 22% of the required 5.6 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹ in 2050 by preserving woody debris produced from its managed forests. On the other hand, Colombia produces woody debris of 0.51 ± 0.14 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹, more than the required offset. These envelope estimates of the preservation potentials need to be verified with ground measurements in the future.

Accuracy of measurement and reporting

CDR via woody debris preservation can be accurately measured, monitored, reported, and verified (MMRV) to facilitate trading on the voluntary carbon market. The amount of carbon in the to-be-preserved woody debris can be reliably quantified by weighing woody biomass and measuring carbon concentration. How well the woody debris is preserved can be monitored by measuring changes in gaseous CO₂ and CH₄ concentrations in the wood vaults and their release rates at the soil surface above the wood vaults reliably with instruments, such as a gas chromatograph or infrared gas analyzer. As a consequence, reporting and verification can be reliably done with high creditability without sophisticated modeling. In comparison, some of the nature-based solutions to climate change, such as soil carbon sequestration²⁷, suffer from uncertainties in MMRV despite evidence for large-scale CDR

capacity. Due to its high accuracy in MMRV, trading of preserving woody debris has started on voluntary carbon markets²⁸.

Climate benefits of preserving woody debris

To predict CDR and resultant climate benefits through annual preservation of woody debris in managed forests, we conducted 24 experiments each with three models, CLM5, CoLM and CABLE (Methods). The three models are all added one pool for preserved woody debris (Extended Data Fig. 2 for CABLE) and then used to simulate woody debris production in managed forests at $16.0 \pm 3.4 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ on average from 2025 to 2100 under the SSP1-2.6 climate change scenario. Woody debris is preserved at four fractions, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%, each with six levels of lengthened residence time, 0, 20, 50, 100, 200, and 2000 years (Fig. 4 and Methods). If all the produced woody debris in managed forests is fully preserved to lengthen residence time for 100, 200, and 2,000 years, 10.6 ± 4.6 , 11.7 ± 4.2 , and $13.0 \pm 3.5 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, respectively, are removed from the atmosphere. CDR steeply increases with lengthening residence time in the low range from 0 to 50 years but slightly in the high range from 100 to 2000 years. After the 5% CO₂ cost is reduced for the energy use of the implementation, the net CDR is 10.1, 11.1, and 12.4 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹, respectively, for lengthened residence time by 100, 200, and 2,000 years.

An extra 3.0 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹ of woody debris is required for preservation to compensate largely for reduced soil carbon storage with a lengthened residence time of 2000 years. When woody debris is preserved to depress decomposition and reduce CO₂ release, carbon input to various soil pools decreases. Thus, the modeled soil carbon storage under the scenario of woody debris preservation is less than that under the control, assuming that wood debris in default uses is all returned to soil (See Extended Data Fig. 3 for CABLE results). The amount of extra woody debris for the compensation becomes larger due to faster backflow from the increased stocks in the preservation pool if the residence time of the preserved woody debris

is lengthened less. Preserving the total sum of woody debris produced from 2025 to 2100 with a net increase of residence time by 2,000 years and the 5% CO₂ cost subtracted for the operation has a capacity to remove 936.2 Gt CO₂ from the atmosphere, leading to a reduction of temperature rise by 0.42°C according to the transient climate sensitivity value of 0.45 °C per 1000 Gt CO₂ to cumulative CO₂ emissions (median from earth system models)²⁹. Lengthening the mean residence time by 100 years removes 768.7 Gt CO₂ and reduces temperature rise by 0.35°C.

It is unlikely that all the woody biomass produced in managed forests can become debris to be preserved. Difficult to collect for preservation are, for example, woody biomass belowground in forest ecosystems, paper pulp wastes, and abandoned wood products. On the other hand, urban and orchard woody wastes can be preserved for CDR. Besides woody debris, other biomass and materials, such as crop residues and landfill organic wastes of more than 100 Gt^{30,31}, can be preserved in deep soil to decrease their decomposition, contributing to CDR from the atmosphere. In addition to preservation, woody debris can be used in other alternative ways, such as biochar as soil supplement and wood fuel for energy, for climate mitigation³². While relative benefits of different wood usages for climate mitigation are yet to be evaluated³³, woody debris preservation likely offers one of the most effective climate solutions because its lengthened residence time can be up to thousands of years.

Co-benefits and side-effects to be evaluated in the future

A major co-benefit of burying dead wood salvaged from forestry is the potential reduction of wildfire risks in fire-prone regions. Globally, wildfire burning releases 7.7 ± 0.7 Gt CO₂ yr⁻¹ and other greenhouse gases, e.g., methane (18 Mt CH₄ yr⁻¹), and unhealthy particles (44 Mt PM_{2.5} yr⁻¹)³⁴⁻³⁷, to the atmosphere. As one of the most fire-prone regions on earth, the United States has invested about \$25.7 billion for fire suppression since 2010³⁸ but

still released more than 180 Tg CO₂ yr⁻¹ due to fires³⁴ and induced annual property damage by \$10.8 billion³⁹. Removing woody debris reduces surface fuel availability and decreases the combustion-induced carbon emissions. Forest thinning in fire-prone regions for woody debris preservation to prevent wildfire will result in additional CDR from the atmosphere.

Another co-benefit is to offer new options to manage woody wastes from various sources, such as fruit tree pruning and urban management, while achieving negative carbon emissions. Urban woody waste is produced every year from pruned branches, stumps, and whole trees from street and public areas. But its production rate has not been well quantified, varying from 58 Mt CO₂ yr⁻¹ in USA⁴⁰ to 66.5 Mt CO₂ yr⁻¹ in California⁴¹. The amount of woody material from fruit tree pruning can be substantial⁴² to significantly contribute to carbon neutrality in orchards if buried. Moreover, this strategy can be implemented together with afforestation, reforestation, and agroforestry to enhance their effectiveness for climate mitigation.

One major concern of preserving woody debris under anaerobic conditions is to produce methane, a highly potent greenhouse gas. Previous studies suggest that methanotrophic microorganisms ubiquitously exist in various environments^{43,44} and likely oxidize most of the methane along soil profiles before it reaches the atmosphere and therefore we assumed that these methane emissions are negligible in this study whereas wood debris on ground surface emits methane⁴⁵. Nevertheless, it is still essential to measure methane production from buried woody debris, its transport and oxidization along the soil profiles, and methane fluxes at the soil surface. Other possible side-effects to be quantified include carbon release from soil excavation and impacts of woody debris removal from the forest floor on soil health; diversity of microorganisms, animals, and plants; and tree regeneration⁴⁶.

While residence time of buried woody debris in deep soil is likely to be substantially lengthened, new research is needed to quantify very slow processes of decomposition under

anaerobic conditions. Although methods to bury woody debris underground are readily available, techniques to deprive O₂ more effectively from buried woody debris for CDR at the Gt scale need to be explored and further developed. Moreover, relative impacts on nutrient availability are yet to be evaluated for woody debris preservation versus other uses although woody debris has low nutrient concentrations⁴⁷.

Many aspects of this CDR strategy need to be evaluated before it can avoid unintended ecosystem degradation and achieve true climate benefits. It is critical to identify situations under which this approach could provide benefits and/or where it could have negative impacts. Although wood wastes from urban management and forest thinning in fire-prone regions were not accounted in the estimates of CDR and subsequent reduction in temperature rise in this analysis, future research may be focused on these sectors as they likely offer high societal benefits in addition to climate mitigation. To be avoided for this CDR strategy are harvesting woods from intact forests, especially the primary tropical forests, and prohibiting other long-lived uses of the material for the sake of burying the woods. Careful research is needed to elucidate opportunities for possible misapplications of this CDR strategy.

Future research toward implementation

This paper presented a novel analysis based on the principles of carbon cycle science to suggest that woody debris preservation offers a scalable, durable, and sustainable technology of CO₂ removal from the atmosphere. Preserving woody debris in managed forests has the potential to remove 769-936 Gt CO₂ from the atmosphere by 2100 and reduce temperature rise by 0.35 - 0.42°C if woody residence time is lengthened by 100-2000 years and 5% of buried carbon is discounted for CO₂ emissions due to preservation operation. Because the amount of carbon preserved can be measured, monitored, reported, and verified

with high accuracy, this technology can facilitate trading on and potentially be promoted by voluntary carbon markets. Biomass preservation in deep soil reduces wildfire risks whereas its impacts on soil health, methane emission, nutrient dynamics, and biodiversity are yet to be investigated. While preserving woody debris has a large potential for climate mitigation due to relatively easy implementation and long durability, urgent is to establish large-scale demonstration projects for this technology in a variety of contexts, with rigorous monitoring of CDR, co-benefits and side-effects. Through such demonstrations, strengths and weaknesses of preserving wood debris relative to other CDR options can be assessed while implementation can be optimized and operational costs and CO₂ emissions minimized.

References:

- 1 Meinshausen, M. *et al.* Realization of Paris Agreement pledges may limit warming just below 2 °C. *Nature* **604**, 304-309 (2022).
- 2 in *Climate Change 2022 - Mitigation of Climate Change: Working Group III Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (ed Change Intergovernmental Panel on Climate) 149-150 (Cambridge University Press, 2023).
- 3 in *Global Warming of 1.5°C: IPCC Special Report on Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C above Pre-industrial Levels in Context of Strengthening Response to Climate Change, Sustainable Development, and Efforts to Eradicate Poverty* (ed Change Intergovernmental Panel on Climate) 93-174 (Cambridge University Press, 2022).
- 4 National Academies of Sciences, E. & Medicine. *Negative Emissions Technologies and Reliable Sequestration: A Research Agenda*. (The National Academies Press, 2019).
- 5 Roe, S. *et al.* Land-based measures to mitigate climate change: Potential and feasibility by country. *Global Change Biology* **27**, 6025-6058 (2021).
- 6 Smith, P. *et al.* Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO₂ emissions. *Nature Climate Change* **6**, 42-50 (2016).

301 7 Luo, Y. & Weng, E. Dynamic disequilibrium of the terrestrial carbon cycle under global
302 change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **26**, 96-104 (2011).

303 8 Hanssen, S. V. *et al.* The climate change mitigation potential of bioenergy with carbon
304 capture and storage. *Nature Climate Change* **10**, 1023-1029 (2020).

305 9 Canadell, J. G. *et al.* in *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis* (Cambridge
306 University Press, 2021).

307 10 Zeng, N. Carbon sequestration via wood burial. *Carbon Balance and Management* **3**, 1-
308 12 (2008).

309 11 Zeng, N. *et al.* Carbon sequestration via wood harvest and storage: an assessment of its
310 harvest potential. *Climatic Change* **118**, 245-257 (2013).

311 12 Zeng, N. & Hausmann, H. Wood Vault: remove atmospheric CO₂ with trees, store wood
312 for carbon sequestration for now and as biomass, bioenergy and carbon reserve for the
313 future. *Carbon Balance and Management* **17**, 2 (2022).

314 13 Zeng, N. *et al.* 3775-year-old wood burial supports “wood vaulting” as a durable carbon
315 removal method. *Science* **385**, 1454-1459 (2024).

316 14 Krause, A. *et al.* Quantifying the impacts of land cover change on gross primary
317 productivity globally. *Scientific Reports* **12**, 18398 (2022).

318 15 Seibold, S. *et al.* The contribution of insects to global forest deadwood decomposition.
319 *Nature* **597**, 77-81 (2021).

320 16 Consoli, C. Bioenergy and carbon capture and storage. *Global CCS Institute* (2019).

321 17 Smith, S. *et al.* The State of Carbon Dioxide Removal – 2nd Edition. (2024). Available
322 at: <https://www.stateofcdr.org>

323 18 Yablonovitch, E. & Deckman, H. Scalable, economical, and stable sequestration of
324 agricultural fixed carbon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**,
325 e2217695120 (2023).

326 19 Cook, F., Knight, J. & Kelliher, F. Modelling oxygen transport in soil with plant root
327 and microbial oxygen consumption: depth of oxygen penetration. *Soil Research* **51**, 539-
328 553 (2013).

329 20 Luo, Y. & Zhou, X. Soil respiration and the environment. (Elsevier Academic Press,
330 2006).

- 331 21 Yi, L., Zhao, H., Yuan, Z., Zhou, D. & Liang, Y. Depression of soil microbial
332 respiration, ammonification and cellulose degradation under the stress of antibiotic
333 residuals. *Environmental engineering and management journal* **15**, 2189-2194, (2016).
- 334 22 Poulos, H. G. & Bunce, G. Foundation design for the Burj Dubai—the world’s tallest
335 building. *The 6th international conference on case histories in geotechnical engineering*,
336 *Arlington, AV, August* (2008).
- 337 23 Kainiemi, V., Kirchmann, H. & Kätterer, T. Structural disruption of arable soils under
338 laboratory conditions causes minor respiration increases. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and*
339 *Soil Science* **179**, 88-93 (2016).
- 340 24 Alcántara, V., Don, A., Vesterdal, L., Well, R. & Nieder, R. Stability of buried carbon in
341 deep-ploughed forest and cropland soils - implications for carbon stocks. *Scientific*
342 *Reports* **7**, 5511 (2017).
- 343 25 Lesiv, M. *et al.* Global forest management data for 2015 at a 100 m resolution. *Scientific*
344 *data* **9**, 199 (2022).
- 345 26 FAO. Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020: Main report. (Rome, Italy, 2020).
- 346 27 Luo, Y. *et al.* Toward more realistic projections of soil carbon dynamics by Earth
347 system models. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **30**, 40-56 (2016).
- 348 28 Ma, M. *Bill Gates-Backed Startup to Use Old Wood to Remove Carbon From the Air.*
349 *Bloomberg*. [https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-11-13/bill-gates-backed-](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-11-13/bill-gates-backed-startup-uses-old-wood-to-remove-carbon-from-air)
350 [startup-uses-old-wood-to-remove-carbon-from-air](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-11-13/bill-gates-backed-startup-uses-old-wood-to-remove-carbon-from-air). (accessed 24 May 2024).
- 351 29 Meehl, G. A. *et al.* Context for interpreting equilibrium climate sensitivity and transient
352 climate response from the CMIP6 Earth system models. *Science Advances* **6**, eaba1981
353 (2020).
- 354 30 United Nations Environment Programme. *Converting Waste Agricultural Biomass into a*
355 *Resource-Compendium of Technologies*. (2009). Available at: [https://stg-](https://stg-wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/7614)
356 [wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/7614](https://stg-wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/7614).
- 357 31 Tripathi, N., Hills, C. D., Singh, R. S. & Atkinson, C. J. Biomass waste utilisation in
358 low-carbon products: harnessing a major potential resource. *npj Climate and*
359 *Atmospheric Science* **2**, 35 (2019).

360 32 Peng, L., Searchinger, T. D., Zionts, J. & Waite, R. The carbon costs of global wood
361 harvests. *Nature* **620**, 110-115 (2023).

362 33 Hanssen, S. V. & Huijbregts, M. A. J. Assessing the environmental benefits of utilising
363 residual flows. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* **150**, 104433 (2019).

364 34 Liu, T. *et al.* Diagnosing spatial biases and uncertainties in global fire emissions
365 inventories: Indonesia as regional case study. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **237**,
366 111557 (2020).

367 35 Kaiser, J. *et al.* Biomass burning emissions estimated with a global fire assimilation
368 system based on observed fire radiative power. *Biogeosciences* **9**, 527-554 (2012).

369 36 Van Der Werf, G. R. *et al.* Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016. *Earth*
370 *System Science Data* **9**, 697-720 (2017).

371 37 van Wees, D. *et al.* Global biomass burning fuel consumption and emissions at 500 m
372 spatial resolution based on the Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED). *Geoscientific*
373 *Model Development* **15**, 8411-8437 (2022).

374 38 National Interagency Fire Center. Suppression costs. [https://www.nifc.gov/fire-](https://www.nifc.gov/fire-information/statistics/suppression-costs/)
375 [information/statistics/suppression-costs/](https://www.nifc.gov/fire-information/statistics/suppression-costs/) (accessed 24 May 2024).

376 39 NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) U.S. Billion-Dollar
377 Weather and Climate Disasters. <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/billions/> (accessed 24
378 May 2024).

379 40 Nowak, D. J., Greenfield, E. J. & Ash, R. M. Annual biomass loss and potential value of
380 urban tree waste in the United States. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* **46**, 126469
381 (2019).

382 41 CalRecycle. *Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling*. [https://calrecycle.ca.gov/](https://calrecycle.ca.gov/condemo/)
383 [condemo/](https://calrecycle.ca.gov/condemo/) (accessed 24 May 2024).

384 42 Moreno-García, M., Repullo-Ruibérriz de Torres, M. A., Carbonell-Bojollo, R. M. &
385 Ordóñez-Fernández, R. Management of pruning residues for soil protection in olive
386 orchards. *Land Degradation & Development* **29**, 2975-2984 (2018).

387 43 Hanson, R. S. & Hanson, T. E. Methanotrophic bacteria. *Microbiological reviews* **60**,
388 439-471 (1996).

- 44 Guerrero-Cruz, S. *et al.* Methanotrophs: discoveries, environmental relevance, and a perspective on current and future applications. *Frontiers in microbiology* **12**, 678057 (2021).
- 45 Gorgolewski, A. S. *Methane Fluxes from Living and Dead Trees in a Temperate Forest*. University of Toronto (Canada) ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 29390839. (2022).
- 46 Gurnell, A. M., Gregory, K. J. & Petts, G. E. The role of coarse woody debris in forest aquatic habitats: Implications for management. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **5**, 143-166 (1995).
- 47 Wojciech, P., Ewa, B. & Jarosław, L. Soil biochemical properties and stabilisation of soil organic matter in relation to deadwood of different species. *FEMS microbiology ecology* **95**, fiz011 (2019).

Methods:

Definition of Managed Forests

We derived a mask of managed forests from a global wall-to-wall map of forest management at a 100 m resolution for the year 2015²⁵. This global map was generated by a machine learning algorithm based on PROBA-V satellite imagery and a reference dataset of 226,322 unique locations through a series of expert and crowdsourcing campaigns using Geo-Wiki (<https://www.geo-wiki.org/>). We included five categories from the global map as managed forests, which are naturally regenerating forest with signs of management (e.g., logging and clear cuts), planted forests, plantation forests (rotation time up to 15 years), oil palm plantations, and agroforestry, covering a total area of 3.1×10^7 km². The areas of mapped forest management classes under the definition by Lesiv et al. (2022)²⁵ were cross-checked and generally consistent with United Nation (UN) Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015²⁶.

Woody biomass and debris expressed in unit of CO₂ equivalent

Woody biomass is expressed in this paper by unit of CO₂ equivalent to be consistent with the unit commonly used for CDR research and practice. The unit is defined by biomass times carbon (C) concentration times CO₂/C ratio of 3.67 (i.e., 44/12). Wood carbon concentrations range widely from 28 to 65%, with a global average of 47.6 ± 4.0 (s.d., 95% confidence limits = 45.7, 49.4%)⁴⁸. One unit of dry matter of wood equals 1.75 units of CO₂ ($=3.67 \times 0.476$). This unit measures the amount of CO₂ released from mineralization of one unit of woody biomass.

We assume that woody debris contains the same amount of carbon as woody biomass in the managed forests. One cubic meter of space to store approximate one metric ton of CO₂-equivalent woody debris if we assume specific weight of wood is 0.571 tons biomass per cubic meters¹¹. The specific weight of wood ranges from 0.2 to 0.9 tons⁴⁹⁻⁵¹.

Model description and experimental design

Three models, the Australian Community Atmosphere Biosphere Land Exchange (CABLE) model version 2, the Community Land Model version 5 (CLM5) model, and the Common Land Model (CoLM) were used in this study to estimate the woody debris production over global managed forests and predict potential carbon sequestration by preserving woody debris annually. The CABLE model is a comprehensive land surface model that incorporates fully coupled carbon (C), nitrogen (N), and phosphorus (P) cycles⁵². In this model, the representation of plant, litter, and soil C stocks includes nine distinct pools, namely leaf, root, wood, metabolic litter, structural litter, coarse woody debris (CWD), fast soil organic matter (SOM), slow SOM, and passive SOM.

The CLM5 is the default land component for the Community Earth System Model version 2 (CESM2)⁵³. CLM5 describes the energy, water and mass balance of the land surface and the interaction with the atmosphere. CLM5 biogeochemical module describes the C and N mass balance of terrestrial ecosystem processes. Carbon stocks in CLM5 are

represented by 18 vegetation pools, and 140 soil organic pools (7 pools $\times$ 20 layers). Vegetation pools include six nutritive organ tissue pools: leaf, fine root, live stem, dead stem, live coarse root, and dead coarse root. Every tissue pool is accompanied by a storage and a transfer pool. Seven soil organic pools include metabolic litter, cellulose litter, lignin litter, CWD, fast SOM, slow SOM, and passive SOM.

The Common Land model (CoLM) adopts all the C stocks representation from CLM5 but with 10 soil layers. Major differences between CoLM and CLM5 are from biophysical processes, which influence the biogeochemical processes. The CoLM employs a three-dimensional (3D) canopy representation⁵⁴, reflecting a more realistic energy redistribution within canopy and radiation competition among plant functional types. CoLM developed a variably saturated flow scheme to numerically solved the soil wetting front and water table. The variably saturated flow scheme has significantly improved the soil moisture simulation⁵⁵, which has been identified as the largest uncertainty source to the permafrost soil carbon dynamics in land models⁵⁶.

Meteorological data, including temperature, precipitation, downward shortwave radiation, downward longwave radiation, specific humidity, pressure, and wind speed, to drive models were obtained from CRUNCEP^{57,58} (for CABLE) and GSWP⁵⁹ (for CLM5 and CoLM). These data, along with observed atmospheric CO₂ concentration data, were used for spin-up of the CABLE, CLM5 and CoLM models in 1901, followed by transient simulations from 1902 to 2013. The spatial resolutions for these models were 0.5° $\times$ 0.5° (CABLE), 1.875° $\times$ 2.5° (CLM5) and 1.875° $\times$ 2.5° (CoLM). Note that the two forcing datasets, CRUNCEP and GSWP, use different algorithms for spatial upscaling from similar observational data sets, resulting in similar spatial patterns of temperature, precipitation, downward shortwave and longwave radiation, specific humidity, pressure, and wind speed (Extended Data Figs. 4 and 5). The CRUNCEP dataset in this study mainly results from

interpolation of the NCEP reanalysis, with $2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$ 6-hourly data from 1948 to 2013⁶⁰ with the CRU TS3.2, providing $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ monthly data from 1901 to 2002, used to apply monthly adjustments for improved accuracy⁶¹. Similarly, GSWPv3 builds upon the 20th Century Reanalysis (20CR) dataset, a global 2° resolution⁶². Using a spectral nudging technique within a Global Spectral Model (GSM), it is dynamically downscaled to a finer $\sim 0.5^\circ$ grid. The CRU TS data was also used in correcting biases in the downscaled 20CR data⁶², making the GSWPv3 and CRUNCEP similar (Extended Data Figs. 6 and 7). Using these simulations from the models and a managed forest mask²⁵, we estimated a woody debris production rate of $14.1 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in the global managed forests on average from 2004 to 2013 (Extended Data Fig. 1).

To examine additional carbon storage created for CDR through the preservation of woody debris we established a new pool for preserved woody debris in each of the CABLE, CLM5, and CoLM models. The new pool receives carbon from woody biomass pool(s) with different fractions for preservation and different lengthened residence times (Extended Data Fig. 2). The latter determines the rate of decomposition of preserved woody debris, which partially releases CO_2 to the atmospheric and partially transfers to soil carbon pools.

Then, we extended the historical simulation from 2013 to the year 2100 under the Sustainability Pathway 1 with a radiative forcing at 2.6 W/m^2 level (SSP1-2.6) climate change scenario⁶³. From 2025 onward, woody debris was annually redirected to the preserved pool as described below (Extended Data Fig. 2). To investigate the impacts of the amount of annually preserved woody debris and varying degrees of lengthening residence time on ecosystem C storage, we conducted 24 experiments with four levels of burying woody debris (i.e., transferring 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% of the annual woody production to the preserved pool) and six levels of lengthened residence time of preserved woody debris (i.e., 0, 20, 50, 100, 200, and 2000 years). By comparing the ecosystem C storages under different

levels of woody debris burial and varied residence time, we evaluated the potential of CDR from the atmosphere in managed forests (Extended Data Figs. 8-10).

We estimated carbon dioxide removal for each of the countries in Fig. 3 consistently using averaged woody debris production from the three models. One caveat is that neither of the three global models has specific plant functional types (PFTs) for managed forests and all the three models use forests with existing PFTs to estimate woody production of managed forests.

Life-cycle analysis for discounting carbon dioxide removal

This paper used an estimate of 5% to discount carbon dioxide removal from wood debris preservation according to the life-cycle analysis of two wood vault projects presented in Zeng et al. (2024)¹³. The estimated emission ratio of machine operation, including wood harvest and transportation, soil vault excavation, and recapping, to the carbon entombed in the wood vault is 2% for the Montreal project in 2013 but 5% for the Potomac Project. The higher emission ratio in the Potomac Project than the Montreal Project is due to much longer transportation distance, which accounts for 83% of the total emissions with the rest 17% of the total emissions from wood vault construction. In this study, we used 5% as the emission ratio to reduce the total amount of carbon dioxide removal by burying wood debris.

References:

- 48 Martin, A. R., Doraisami, M. & Thomas, S. C. Global patterns in wood carbon concentration across the world's trees and forests. *Nature Geoscience* **11**, 915-920 (2018).
- 49 Cown, D. J. in *Encyclopedia of Materials: Science and Technology* (eds K. H. Jürgen Buschow et al.) 9620-9622 (Elsevier, 2001).

- 50 MTCOPELAND. in Wood Density Explained, Plus Wood Density Chart.
<https://mtcopeland.com/blog/wood-density-explained-plus-wood-density-chart/>
(accessed 24 May 2024).
- 51 Doraisami, M. *et al.* A global database of woody tissue carbon concentrations. *Scientific Data* **9**, 284 (2022).
- 52 Wang, Y., Law, R. & Pak, B. A global model of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus cycles for the terrestrial biosphere. *Biogeosciences* **7**, 2261-2282 (2010).
- 53 Lawrence, D. M. *et al.* The Community Land Model version 5: Description of new features, benchmarking, and impact of forcing uncertainty. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* **11**, 4245-4287 (2019).
- 54 Dai, Y. *et al.* Different representations of canopy structure—A large source of uncertainty in global land surface modeling. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **269**, 119-135 (2019).
- 55 Dai, Y., Zhang, S., Yuan, H. & Wei, N. Modeling variably saturated flow in stratified soils with explicit tracking of wetting front and water table locations. *Water Resources Research* **55**, 7939-7963 (2019).
- 56 Lu, X. *et al.* Full Implementation of Matrix Approach to Biogeochemistry Module of CLM5. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* **12**, e2020MS002105 (2020).
- 57 New, M., Hulme, M. & Jones, P. Representing twentieth-century space–time climate variability. Part I: Development of a 1961–90 mean monthly terrestrial climatology. *Journal of climate* **12**, 829-856 (1999).
- 58 New, M., Hulme, M. & Jones, P. Representing twentieth-century space–time climate variability. Part II: Development of 1901–96 monthly grids of terrestrial surface climate. *Journal of climate* **13**, 2217-2238 (2000).
- 59 Dirmeyer, P. A. *et al.* GSWP-2: Multimodel analysis and implications for our perception of the land surface. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **87**, 1381-1398 (2006).
- 60 Viovy, N. CRUNCEP Version 7 - Atmospheric Forcing Data for the Community Land Model. Research Data Archive at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, Computational and Information Systems Laboratory. <https://doi.org/10.5065/PZ8F-F017>. Accessed 01 November 2024. (2018)

- 61 Lin, S. *et al.* Estimates of net primary productivity and actual evapotranspiration over
the Tibetan Plateau from the Community Land Model version 4.5 with four atmospheric
forcing datasets. *Journal of Plant Ecology* **17**, rtae052 (2024).
- 62 Kim, H. Global Soil Wetness Project Phase 3 Atmospheric Boundary Conditions
(Experiment 1). Tokyo/Japan: Data Integration and Analysis System (DIAS). (2017).
- 63 O'Neill, B. C. *et al.* The Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP) for
CMIP6. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **9**, 3461-3482 (2016).

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Meredith Holgerson for her comments on an early version of this manuscript. This work was supported by US National Science Foundation (NSF) Grants (DEB 2242034, DEB 2406935, and DEB 2425290), US Department of Energy, Terrestrial Ecosystem Sciences Grant DE-SC0023514, the subcontract CW55561 from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory to Cornell University, and the project NYS Connects: Climate Smart Farms & Forestry funded by US Department of Agriculture (USDA), New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets. This research is also part of AI-CLIMATE: “AI Institute for Climate-Land Interactions, Mitigation, Adaptation, Tradeoffs and Economy” supported by USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and NSF National AI Research Institutes Competitive Award no. 2023-67021-39829.

Contributions

Y.L. conceived the study . N.W and X.L. did the modeling analysis. Y.Z., F.T., Q.Q., and C.L. collected relevant information from the literature. Y.L. wrote the first draft. All authors contributed to major revisions of the paper and approved the final version.

Competing interests

570 The authors declare no competing interests

571 **Data availability**

572 All data and code used to produce the main and extended figures are available at:

573 [https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data_figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in_Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846)
574 [figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data_figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in_Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846)
575 [Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data_figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in_Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846)

576 **Code availability**

577 The data and code used to produce the main and extended figures are available at:

578 [https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data_figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in_Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846)
579 [figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data_figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in_Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846)
580 [Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_and_code_used_for_the_main_and_extended_data_figures_in_i_Large_Carbon_Sequestration_Potential_of_Woody_Debris_Preservation_in_Managed_Forests_i_/28824182?file=53783846)

581 Code for the three woody debris preservation models is available at:

582 [https://ecolab.cals.cornell.edu/download/Luo_et_al_Preserving_wood_debris_for_CDR_data](https://ecolab.cals.cornell.edu/download/Luo_et_al_Preserving_wood_debris_for_CDR_data_code.php)
583 [_code.php](https://ecolab.cals.cornell.edu/download/Luo_et_al_Preserving_wood_debris_for_CDR_data_code.php)

584 These materials are freely accessible to researchers for the purpose of reproducing or
585 extending the analysis presented in the study.

Figures

Fig. 1 | A schematic illustration of CDR via preserving woody debris in managed forests.

The managed forests take up approximately $173.0 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ from the atmosphere by via photosynthesis. Autotrophic respiration releases $90.4 \pm 16.7 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ back to the atmosphere while the remaining carbon uptake is used to grow plant biomass, mostly for fine roots and foliage. Approximately $14.1 \pm 3.2 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ is used to grow woody biomass in managed forests. The woody biomass is harvested to produce woody products for construction, furniture, and others while woody debris is generated from logging and sawmill. Wood products, once abandoned after they are used for a period, are usually landfilled. Averaged over time, the managed forests generate woody debris approximately by $14.1 \pm 3.2 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, ignoring minor disequilibrium (i.e., carbon sink) during the period, while the global forests produce approximately $40.4 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ woody debris^{11,15}. The woody debris is decomposed or burned to release CO_2 back to the atmosphere at a similar rate with wood production. If the woody debris is preserved in deep soil to depress heterotrophic respiration (R_h) and prevent burning by, for example, $6 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, R_h from both woody debris and nonwoody litter would decrease from $82.6 \pm 27.7 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ as marked in dark color to $76.6 \pm 27.7 \text{ Gt CO}_2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ as marked in red color. The gross primary production (GPP), net primary production (NPP), autotrophic respiration (R_a), nonwoody biomass production, and woody biomass production in managed forests are derived from the model ensemble mean of CLM5, CoLM, and CABLE over the 2004-2013 period.

Fig. 2 | Carbon influxes and residence times of newly created pools under various CDR strategies at the global scale. The axes only indicate carbon influxes and residence time

induced by each CDR method in the order of magnitude in reference to IPCC AR6² and Smith et al. 2023¹⁷ as neither of them is well quantified.

Fig. 3 | Top ten countries with the highest wood production in managed forests. The ranking of wood production is indicated by numerical values. The wood production rate is estimated as a decadal mean over the period of 2025-2050 predicted by CLM5, CoLM, and CABLE models under the SSP1-2.6 scenario. The managed forest map used in the analysis is from Lesiv et al. (2022)²⁵ and cross validated with UN FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015²⁶ (see Methods) despite their differences in areas of managed forests for individual countries. The bar plot presents country-level estimates of wood production rate (mean $\pm$ standard deviation, $n = 3$), projected carbon emissions to be offset in 2050, and managed forest area. Emission estimates are from Meinshausen et al. (2022)¹, except for Russia, Brazil, and Congo (no data, see Methods).

Fig. 4 | The potential for CO₂ removal and climate benefits from preserving woody debris in the global managed forests over the period of 2025-2100 under the SSP1-2.6 scenario. The amount of carbon removal (left vertical axis) and its resultant climate benefit (right vertical axis) depend on residence time lengthened and the fraction of coarse woody debris (CWD) to be preserved. The response surface is the average of outputs from three models, CLM5, CoLM, and CABLE with 5% discount for the cost of operation estimated from life-cycle analysis¹³ (Extended Data Fig. 4-6 for outputs of individual models in two-dimension figures). The climate benefit (i.e., the temperature reduction) is calculated approximately according to the transient climate sensitivity value²⁹.







