Canadian Journal of Forest Research
Revue canadienne de recherche forestière

Spatial and temporal quantification of forest residue volumes and delivered costs

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Forest Research</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfr-2015-0451.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Mar-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Wells, Lucas; Oregon State University, Forest Engineering, Resources and Management Chung, Woodam; Oregon State University, Forest Engineering, Resources and Management Anderson, Nathaniel; USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station Hogland, John; USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station
Keyword:	forest biomass, stand characteristics, treatment residue, bioenergy, stand delineation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Spatial and temporal quantification of forest residue volumes and delivered costs

Lucas A. Wells^{a,1}, Woodam Chung^{b,*}, Nathaniel M. Anderson^c, John S. Hogland^d

^a Department of Forest Management, 32 Campus Way, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59801, USA, Email: lucas.wells@oregonstate.edu

^b Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management, 276 Peavy Hall, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA, Email: woodam.chung@oregonstate.edu

^c Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, 200 East Broadway, Missoula, MT 59807, USA, Email: nathanielmanderson@fs.fed.us

^d Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service, 200 Easy Broadway, Missoula, MT 59807, USA, Email: jshogland@fs.fed.us

* Corresponding author: Tel: 541-737-8248

¹ Present address: Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management, 068 Peavy Hall, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA

Spatial and temporal quantification of forest residue volumes and delivered costs

Abstract

Growing demand for bioenergy, biofuels and bioproducts has increased interests in the utilization of biomass residues from forest treatments as feedstock. In areas with limited history of industrial biomass utilization, uncertainties in the quantity, distribution, and cost of biomass production and logistics can hinder the development of new bio-based industries. This paper introduces a new methodology to quantify and spatially describe delivered feedstock volumes and costs across landscapes of arbitrary size in ways that characterize operational and annual management decision-making. Using National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery, the forest is segmented into operational-level treatment units. A remote sensing model based on NAIP imagery and Forest Inventory and Analysis plot data is used to attribute treatment units with stand-level estimates of basal area, tree density, above ground biomass, and quadratic mean diameter. These methods are applied to a study site in southwestern Colorado to assess the quantity and distribution of treatment residue for use in bioenergy production. Results from the case study demonstrate how this generalized approach can be used in the analysis and decision-making process when establishing new bioenergy industries that use forest residue as feedstock.

Keywords: forest biomass, stand characteristics, treatment residue, bioenergy, stand delineation

53 **1 Introduction**

54 The interior west of the United States has experienced growing interests in using forest biomass as a
55 renewable source of energy. Historically the use of forest biomass has been dominated by the forest
56 products industry for generating heat, steam, and electricity (Guo et al., 2007). However, emerging
57 markets for forest biomass as a fuel and feedstock for bioenergy applications can be found throughout
58 the U.S. In the western U.S., interests in these potential and emerging markets are closely linked to the
59 increasing risk of significant forest disturbances, such as fire, insects and disease, and by the broad
60 agreement that silviculture using active treatments, including thinning and prescribed fire, is urgently
61 needed to restore historic stand dynamics and improve forest health (Brown et al., 2004). The large
62 potential treatment area throughout the western U.S. presents opportunities to increase the use of
63 renewable energy sources and stimulate local economic development with new bioenergy and bio-
64 based products enterprises that will use the woody biomass byproducts produced by these treatments.

65 In the 15 Western States there are at least 11 million hectares (ha) that could benefit from some
66 type of treatment to restore ecosystems, protect water and soil quality, and improve forest and
67 rangeland resilience (Rummer et al., 2003). Assuming such management occurs only on forests with
68 annual timber production of at least 21 m³ ha⁻¹ per year, an estimated biomass availability of 245
69 million dry tonnes (t) could result from forest treatments on 4.3 million ha in the west (Western
70 Governors' Association, 2005). The U.S. Department of Energy and USDA Forest Service estimated
71 that an annual supply of 907 million t of biomass would displace 30% or more of domestic petroleum
72 consumption. Of this amount, the continental U.S. could potentially produce 429 million t at \$54.43 t⁻¹
73 from forest residue and agricultural waste in 2012 (US DOE, 2011).

74 Recent studies have evaluated the benefits associated with the use of treatment residues for
75 bioenergy production. Gan and Smith (2007) found that removing logging residues would save \$495-
76 620 per ha in site preparation costs during forest regeneration in East Texas. Results from Jones et al.

(2010) show that bioenergy, as an alternative to on-site burning, generates fewer carbon dioxide, methane, and particulate matter emissions. Loeffler and Anderson (2014) examined emissions from co-firing forest biomass with coal and found at 20% substitution, or 120,717 t of forest biomass per year, total system emissions decreased 15% for CO₂, 95% for CH₄, 18% for NO_x, 82% for PM₁₀, and 27% for SO_x. Furthermore, there could be economic benefits in using revenues from biomass to offset restorative treatment costs (Brown et al., 2004).

The availability of biomass at tactical and operational scales relies on many factors such as current biomass stocks, harvesting systems, terrain, road network, species, forest characteristics, silviculture, ownership, public policy and regulation, local markets and management objectives, yet these factors are often ignored in large-scale forest biomass supply models that focus on biomass stocks. This is largely attributable to the complexity of forest landscapes and the difficulty in modeling spatial and temporal details of forest management activities. There is a need for an integrated framework to provide realistic forest biomass supply and costs of feedstock across a large landscape at a tactical resolution that takes into account forest inventory, existing infrastructure, and current forest management objectives applied across multiple scales and time frames. A standardized approach for carrying out such an assessment does not exist and likely is not possible given the variability in forests, management practices, and policies across the western U.S. Nonetheless a workflow to guide these types of assessments and tools to help decision makers quantify and spatially describe treatment residue supply volumes are needed to accompany a growing bioenergy enterprise. Broadly, providing high-resolution estimates of biomass stocks and potential flows from restoration treatments at spatial and temporal scales that are relevant to industry is critical for facility capitalization, construction and planning. Operationally, in the context of meeting non-market forest restoration objectives, managers can identify and prioritize treatments with costs that are well matched with both overall demand and the market price of biomass. The overall effect of offsetting the costs of restoration treatments with

101 revenues from both timber and biomass would be to allow forest managers to treat more acres at lower
102 cost.

103 The objectives of this study are to 1) develop a generalized workflow to evaluate forest biomass
104 utilization and bioenergy supply at tactical and operational scales through space and time and 2)
105 demonstrate the utility of the proposed methodology via application to a study area in southwestern
106 Colorado.

107

108 **2 Methods**

109 The central components of the presented methodology and their role in the workflow are highlighted in
110 Figure 1. The workflow consists of three process modules: *stand characterization, treatment*
111 *simulation, and feedstock cost estimation*. In the first module we use modern remote sensing and image
112 processing techniques to produce forest stand boundaries and stand descriptive statistics. These
113 outputs are then coupled with site specific silvicultural prescriptions in the second module to estimate
114 retention, merchantable yield and resulting recoverable biomass residue volumes. The third module
115 routes the recoverable biomass volumes to a conversion facility by least-cost route, and estimates
116 delivered costs of feedstock. Since it is difficult to describe some of the methods in the absence of a
117 site specific example, we present the generalized, non-site specific methods (i.e., stand characterization
118 module) in the following section, then present the subsequent modules in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 after
119 introducing the case study area and site specific data.

120

121 **2.1 Stand characterization module**

122 **2.1.1 Imagery**

123 Imagery of the National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) was used to estimate forest
124 characteristics and define potential treatment units. NAIP acquires aerial digital orthophotos during the

agricultural growing seasons and the imagery is publicly available within a year of acquisition. The imagery has a 1 m ground sample distance (1 m spatial resolution) with a horizontal accuracy of within 6 m at a 95% confidence level (USDA-FSA-APFO, 2011) and a temporal resolution of 2 to 5 years. The default spectral resolution is natural color (RGB) with an option to include the near infrared band. The configuration used in this study was a 3 band composite including near infrared, green and blue bands (Color-infrared).

2.1.2 Stand delineation

An automated forest segmentation algorithm (Wells, 2013), hereinafter referred to as the stand delineation algorithm (SDA), was developed in this study to delineate forest landscapes into operational-level treatment units. The SDA employs a series of image filtering techniques and the mean-shift algorithm (Fukunaga and Hostetler, 1975) to decompose NAIP imagery into individual forest stands defined as “a contiguous group of trees sufficiently uniform in age-class distribution, composition and structure, and grown on a site of sufficiently uniform quality to be a distinguishable unit” (Helms, 1998). These processes are embedded in a subspace, multi-scale framework to circumvent computational limitations associated with large scenes of very high resolution imagery. The algorithm uses 12 digit hydrological unit (USGS, 2006) boundaries, also called sub-watersheds, as initial subspace geometries. New geometries created by the segmentation process within each sub-watershed are stored in a vector database and used to further subset the image in the next iteration. As objects become smaller, finer resolutions are used for segmentation to locate features that may not be visible at coarser scales. The algorithm can also be parameterized to comply with minimum and maximum treatment unit area constraints. Minimum and maximum treatment unit area constraints were 2 and 40 ha respectively.

The algorithm begins by querying geometry i from database j (figure 2). If geometry i is less than

the maximum specified treatment unit size and greater than the minimum specified treatment unit size then the geometry is not segmented further. It is appended to vector database $j + 1$ and the algorithm moves to the next geometry $i + 1$. If the geometry is less than the minimum specified treatment unit size, then adjacent geometries are located and geometry i is merged with the candidate adjacent geometry most alike in terms of the average spectral value. If geometry i is greater than the maximum specified treatment unit size then the imagery within the geometry is extracted for segmentation.

The next step tests if the extracted image results in memory saturation. If the image is too large, it is resampled by iteratively decreasing the resolution (i.e. 1 m, 2 m, 4 m, 8 m, 16 m, etc.) until the image can be stored in memory. Once the image is sufficiently resampled it is convolved with a 3x3 Gaussian filter ($\sigma = 0.5$) and 50 iterations of the anisotropic diffusion filter (time step = 0.125). Next the mean shift algorithm segments the image grouping cells to their associated local maxima and labelling groups sequentially. The resulting labeled raster is vectorized and appended to database $j + 1$.

In some cases the new geometry i in database $j + n$ could match geometry i in database $j + (n - 1)$ if the chosen resolution for segmentation is the same resolution at which geometry i in database $j + (n - 1)$ was processed. If this occurs the spectral radius parameter of the mean shift algorithm is iteratively reduced by one until new geometries are created. Reducing this parameter allows the mean shift segmentation to produce more geometries with similar spectral values as opposed to merging these modes as one cluster. When new geometries are created, they are appended to vector database $j + 1$.

Once all geometries in database j have been processed the algorithm iterates through the geometries in database $j + 1$. When all the geometries in database $j + n$ meet the minimum and maximum unit size criteria the final vector database is rasterized to a 1 meter resolution and the dataset is smoothed. Next the smoothed raster is vectorized and the process is terminated. The hierarchy of spatial vector data is used in figure 2 where “layer” describes the database where geometries or “features” are stored.

The resulting stand boundaries were assessed qualitatively by visual evaluation and quantitatively by minimum, maximum and average area and shape compactness value. Compactness is a proportional metric between the area of a feature and the area of a circle having the same perimeter of said feature. Compactness was determined an important measure from a forest operations perspective due to inefficiencies in elongated (non-compact) areas where the area to perimeter ratio is low. The compactness value was calculated by $A_i / \pi (\frac{P_i}{2})^2$ where A_i is equal to the area of the stand and P_i is the perimeter of the stand. Thus, a stand with a compactness value of 1 would be a circle.

2.1.3 Stand characteristics

Stand characteristics including basal area, tree density, and above ground biomass are estimated for each treatment unit using the Forest Characteristics Model (FCM) (Hogland et al., 2014). The FCM is a two-tiered remote sensing model where the first stage performs a probabilistic classification of identifiable patterns (e.g. tree canopy, shadow, grass, or water) within NAIP imagery. The classification is the result of a polytomous logistic regression scheme (Hogland et al., 2013) employing a collection of texture derivatives as explanatory variables. The classification output and texture derivatives of each class are summarized for the spatial footprint bounding the four subplots of a FIA field plot and related to average plot estimates of basal area, tree density, and above ground biomass using multivariate linear regression. The result is a multiband raster dataset where each pixel (1 m²) represents mean plot estimates of forest characteristics for each species group. Above ground biomass estimates are derived from equations found in Jenkins et al. (2003) and thus can be used to calculate stump, bole, top, and foliage biomass components. Quadratic mean diameter (cm) is added to the dataset post hoc by $(BA / [k \times t_d])^{1/2}$ where BA is basal area (m² ha⁻¹), t_d is tree density (stems ha⁻¹), and $k = 0.00007854$ (foresters constant). For model validation methods and results see Wells (2013).

197

198 **2.2 Treatment simulation module**

199

200 The treatment simulation and feedstock cost estimation modules in this study require site specific data.
201 To facilitate effective presentation of the two modules, we introduce our case study area and follow
202 with a description of the modules.

203

204 **2.2.1 Case study area**

205 The study area includes the extent of the Uncompahgre Plateau National Forest (UPNF). The UPNF
206 covers approximately 235,000 ha on the west slope of the Colorado Rocky Mountains. Stretching
207 northwest to southeast for 200 kilometers (km), the plateau ranges in elevation from 1,700-1,800 m in
208 canyon bottoms to upland elevations around 2,500-3,000 m. Three primary vegetation strata occupy
209 the plateau. Pinyon-juniper (*Pinus edulis*, *Juniperus osteosperma*, *Juniperus scopulorum*) cover occurs
210 at the lower elevations ranging from 1,800 to 2,100 m, Gambel oak and Ponderosa pine (*Quercus*
211 *gambelii*, *Pinus ponderosa*) forests inhabit elevations from 2,200 to 2,700 m and occur in both mixed
212 and pure stands. The upland zone is dominated by aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), mixed-conifer and
213 spruce-fir (*Picea engelmannii*, *Abies lasiocarpa*) forests.

214 Approximately 70% of the UPNF is in fire regime condition class 2 or 3 (Hardy et al., 2001;
215 Schmidt et al., 2002), suggesting that these areas exhibit fuel conditions that are conducive to
216 uncharacteristic, high intensity fires. The potential for these disturbance events have initiated active
217 restoration management across the plateau to reduce fuel loading in mixed-conifer and Ponderosa pine,
218 increase diversity in age, size and seral conditions in spruce-fir, regenerate damaged aspen stands from
219 sudden aspen decline, and mitigate pinyon-juniper encroachment into native grasslands and sagebrush
220 ecosystems.

The renewable energy portfolio standard recently implemented in Colorado has stimulated the need to incorporate a higher level of renewable resources into energy production systems, including wind, solar, and biomass. Co-firing biomass with coal has been explored as an option to meet this standard (Loeffler and Anderson, 2014). Though not currently a source of biomass demand, in this study a 100 megawatt coal fired electric power plant located approximately 16 km west of the eastern border of the study area served as the hypothetical bioenergy facility. Although this particular power plant is fueled completely by bituminous coal, it could be retrofitted to co-fire forest biomass.

2.2.2 Modeling silvicultural prescriptions and prioritizing stands for treatments

GIS coverage of forest roads on the UPNF was used to query accessible treatment units. These units were defined as having a centroid that fell within maximum skidding distance for whole tree harvesting from an existing road edge, assumed to be 610 m (2,000 feet) in this study. Three quantifiable silvicultural prescriptions were developed to model removal and retention of biomass on candidate treatment units. These prescriptions are generalized and adapted from the current forest plan for the Uncompahgre National Forest (UPNF Current Forest Plan, 2012) and from a management plan assembled by the Uncompahgre Plateau Collaborative Restoration Project (UPCRP). Management planning documents provided detailed information regarding current conditions, including problems with forest health, reference conditions, and desired future conditions. Stands assigned to a silvicultural prescription are a subset of the accessible treatment units and classified as candidate treatment units. Such stands are included in the selection pool as potential treatment units, but may or may not receive treatment under a given scenario.

Stands were categorized into species groups based on a basal area weighted species composition. Pure stands were considered to have a composition of at least 80% in a single species. Species groups describing two species were stands with an additive composition of 80% in two species. Mixed-conifer

species group distinguishes stands with a composition of at least 80% of any combination of spruce-fir, pine, and aspen. Current treatment prescriptions and associated logging systems (e.g. mechanized thinning with whole tree skidding) in spruce-fir, mixed-conifer, aspen and pine stands present opportunities for residue extraction due to the centralization of residues during whole tree harvesting (above the stump) operations. In contrast, treatments in other species groups - such as pinyon-juniper and gamble oak - where mastication, lop-and-scatter and decentralized pile burning are deployed have logistics limitations that reduce potential for biomass residue extraction. Specifically, harvest and collection of biomass residues left behind after these types of treatments can be extremely expensive because the materials are spread over large areas rather than centralized. Therefore only species groups commonly treated with whole-tree skidding are included in this study. These species groups are used to apply a silvicultural prescription to candidate treatment units for the purpose of estimating how much residue will be produced from the activity. These prescriptions include stocking-based, regeneration, and restoration.

Stocking-based management – This study uses stocking-based management prescriptions, which reduce stand density for fuels reduction. This approach is commonly applied to spruce-fir and mixed-conifer forest types in the study area. Stand density index, introduced by Reineke (1933), was used to develop silvicultural guidelines specific to the selected stands. The maximum stand density index (SDI) was located by plotting tree density against quadratic mean diameter (D_q) for all stands selected for stocking-based management on log-log axes. A line with a slope of -1.605, suggested by Reineke (1933) as the cross-species slope of the 100% stocking line, was hand fitted on the right edge of the data. Trees ha^{-1} was then indexed where the 100% stocking line and $D_q = 25$ cm intersected, resulting in a maximum SDI of 717 trees ha^{-1} . For the purpose of the this analysis the hand fitting method was considered sufficient at removing enough subjectivity in locating maximum SDI since the slope of the line was constrained to -1.605. See Zhang et al. (2005) for a comparison of more objective methods for

fitting the self-thinning line.

Relative density (RD) was calculated for each stand by dividing SDI by the maximum SDI (717). Stands with a $RD \geq 60\%$ were considered candidate stands for a treatment during the simulation time frame. The target management zone was bounded by a lower zone at 35% of maximum SDI and an upper zone at 60% of maximum SDI. When a given stand was selected for treatment, it was assumed that the treatment would reduce the stand's SDI to 47.5% (half of the distance between the lower and upper management zones) of the maximum SDI. Stands were prioritized by iteratively selecting the highest RD then removing the stand from the selection pool. This approach facilitates efficient treatment application by prioritizing the densest stands for treatment.

Regeneration management – Regeneration management was applied to pure aspen stands and aspen stands with a conifer component no greater than 40%. Two important aspects of aspen management across the study area are sudden aspen decline (SAD) and conifer encroachment. The management goal in both situations is to establish a vigorous regenerative age class of aspen. Branch dieback in aspen stands was first noted in southwestern Colorado in 2004 (Worrall et al., 2008) and soon after dubbed “sudden aspen decline”, characterizing the sudden, rapid progression of the disease. To this end, the etiology of SAD has been widely studied and recent assessments suggest that SAD appears to have a strong correlation with climate and SAD-like events commonly occur earlier in regions with higher temperatures and drier climates (Hogg, 1997; Shields Jr. and Bockheim, 1981).

Results from Worrall et al. (2010) conclude that the areas experiencing the greatest mean moisture deficit during the drought of 2002 showed the highest degree of decline in 2008. This was statistically tested by relating climate moisture index (CMI) values to inventoried aspen stands. Since outputs from the FCM do not provide information regarding mortality, aspen management was prioritized by calculating CMI for the study area and allocating treatments to stands with the highest susceptibility to decline in the event of extreme heat and moisture deficiency.

CMI is an index of moisture surplus or deficit, simply precipitation minus potential evapotranspiration. CMI was calculated using an approach outlined by Hogg (1997). Monthly PRISM climate data (Daly et al., 2009) for 2002 (year of drought) on a 4-km grid and a digital elevation model with 10 m spatial resolution were obtained covering the extent of the study area. The 2002 annual CMI was determined by summing the monthly CMI values. These values were used to locate susceptible areas during extreme conditions similar to the drought of that year.

Since multiple stands fell within each CMI grid cell, auxiliary information was needed to further prioritize treatments. To augment CMI, the topographic wetness index (TWI) was calculated for the study area using the elevation dataset. Topography affects the spatial distribution of soil moisture and sub-surface flow often follows surface topography (Rodhe and Seibert, 1999; Seibert et al., 1997; Zinko et al., 2005). Therefore this index has been used to depict spatial soil moisture patterns (Burt and Butcher, 1986; Moore et al., 1991). TWI provided local information regarding potential stress in aspen stands due to moisture deficit within each 4-km cell of the CMI. TWI was computed by $\ln(a / \tan\beta)$ where a is the local upslope area draining through a certain point per unit contour length and $\tan\beta$ is the local slope (Beven and Kirkby, 1979).

Treatments were prioritized first by locating stands with the lowest CMI value, then locating stands with the lowest average TWI value. When a given stand encountered a treatment event, a regeneration cut was simulated removing 100% of the estimated growing stock and subtracting merchantable yield to estimate the amount of treatment residue.

Restoration in ponderosa pine – Restoration treatments were applied to pure ponderosa pine stands as well as aspen-pine and juniper-pine stands with a pine component of at least 60%. The majority of ponderosa pine stands across the plateau no longer exhibit the structure that was common in the 19th century (Binkley et al., 2008). Historically these stands had a clumped distribution, interspersed with small (0.04 to 0.2 ha) meadows and basal area ranging from 5 to 20 m² ha⁻¹. Many of the stands on the

plateau exceed $20 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ and few well over $35 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$. Restoration treatments for ponderosa pine in this study reduced basal area to $5\text{--}11 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ following recommendations from Binkley et al. (2008). The basal area of each treated stand was reduced to $8 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$. Treatments were prioritized by iteratively selecting the stand with the highest basal area value and thinning to the target basal area. Treatment residues were calculated by subtracting retention and merchantable yield from above ground biomass for each treated stand.

2.2.3 Treatment residue volumes

Residue was estimated for each candidate treatment unit by first subtracting the removed biomass from the total above ground biomass then subtracting gross merchantable yield. The amount of removed biomass was determined by the silvicultural prescription while the gross merchantable yield was calculated by using a component ratio estimator for stem wood and stem bark based on qmd and tree length from a 30 cm stump height to a 10 cm top diameter (Jenkins et al., 2003). Total treatment residues were reduced by 30% to account for the leakage during transport from stump to landing and the recovery rate of the residue at the landing (Baral and Guha, 2004; Fight et al., 2006). These operational constraints also effectively leave a significant amount of woody biomass on the unit to meet guidelines for retention associated with soil and biodiversity objectives (Abbas et al., 2011). Equation 1 was used to calculate treatment residue (TR) where B_{ag} is above ground biomass, B_{sr} is silviculturally retained biomass (biomass units in dry tonnes per hectare). β_0 and β_1 are the species-specific component ratio coefficients for stem wood and stem bark, D_q is the quadratic mean diameter for the stand and r is the reduction factor of leakage and recovery rates (0.7). Residue extraction was assumed to take place after the removal of the commercial component and residue was allowed time to dry to a moisture content of 30% (Han et al., 2010).

[1]
$$TR = r([B_{ag} - B_{sr}][1 - e^{\beta_0 + \frac{\beta_1}{Dq}}])$$

2.3 Feedstock cost estimation module

The harvesting system for each treatment was assumed to be mechanical felling with a feller-buncher followed by whole-tree skidding where the tops and limbs of the removed trees were transported with the bole to a road side landing designated for each unit. The extraction operation was assumed to be road-side processing and biomass grinding since all candidate treatment stands were selected to be within the maximum skidding distance of 610 m to unit centroid from the existing road network. A marginal cost approach was used to calculate forest operations costs (Puttock, 1995). This approach considers biomass to be a byproduct of the production of higher value components like sawlogs, and fully allocates harvest costs of felling, extraction, processing, road construction, and stumpage to these products. Therefore costs begin to accrue with the collection of residues at the roadside. Handling, processing and loading costs for residues were calculated following methods from Anderson (2011) by averaging the results from 40 scientific studies examining biomass removal from timber harvest, fuel treatments, and other residue related operations resulting in \$31.14 t⁻¹.

Transportation costs (T [\$ t⁻¹]) were calculated for each candidate treatment unit. Optimized round trip delivery times, denoted by variable h (hours [hr]) in Equation 2, from each unit to the potential bioenergy facility were calculated using a GIS coverage of all UPNF roads. A transportation network optimization program was used to determine the least cost route for each unit based on engineered road speed (Chung and Sessions, 2003). Other variables used to calculate transportation costs were load time (l) and unload time (u) each assumed to be 0.5 hr, non-fuel trucking (operator) cost (c) set at \$48.03 hr⁻¹ (ATRI, 2013), a specialized trucking premium (p) of \$12.00 hr⁻¹, \$1.04 L⁻¹ for diesel fuel price (d) (US EIA, 2013), average fuel economy (s) of 1.98 km L⁻¹, average truck speed (v

[km hr⁻¹]) which depends on the engineered road speed of the shortest path distance for each unit, lubrication price (a) set at 10% of the diesel fuel price assumed to correlate perfectly with diesel fuel price, van capacity (m) of 27.22 t, and biomass moisture content (w) of 0.3 (Anderson, 2011).

$$T = \frac{(h+l+u) \{c+p+(d[1+\frac{a}{100}]s^{-1}v)\}}{m(1-w)}$$

2.4 Management scenarios for the case study area

A 10 year management simulation was conducted to estimate delivered feedstock volume and costs under current site-specific management objectives. The annual treatment area constraint was set according to management planning documents developed by the US Forest Service and UPCR. Stocking-based prescriptions were constrained to 850 ha yr⁻¹, aspen regeneration prescriptions constrained to 587 ha yr⁻¹, and pine restoration constrained to 445 ha yr⁻¹ totaling to 1882 ha yr⁻¹. The year that a given stand gets treated depends on the order in which the stands are selected for treatment (defined in the silvicultural prescription) and the annual treatment area constraint for that prescription. Once a unit is selected for treatment it is no longer considered a candidate treatment unit for the duration of the simulation. The annual delivered volumes and costs are calculated for each species group (silvicultural prescription).

A second scenario was carried out to evaluate how treatment area (total area treated during the next 10 years) affects the quantity of treatment residue volume and the spatial distribution of treatments. The purpose of this analysis is to identify the capacity of the landscape in terms of feedstock supply and characterize how delivered costs change as allowable treatment area increases. Starting with proportion of the area treated in the first scenario, which is approximately 50% of the total candidate area, the treated area was increased iteratively by 10% until 100% of the candidate treatment area was selected for treatment. The area allocations to the prescriptions described in the

389 current management scenario were proportionally consistent for each 10% augmentation. Total
390 available residues were calculated for each 10% increase in allowable treatment area.

391 An additional analysis was performed to locate residues available at or below a specified
392 delivered cost using a cost-dependent classification scheme. Delivered costs were calculated for each
393 candidate treatment unit and categorized into \$5 increments. The available residues were summed for
394 each delivered cost category. From a market perspective, the assumption in this analysis is that residues
395 generated from treatment would be supplied to end-users at a market price at or above the specified
396 delivered cost, but that residues with higher costs would probably be burned in place for disposal
397 because utilization would represent higher net costs than disposal.

398

399 **3 Results and discussion**

400

401 ***3.1 Stand delineation and characteristics***

402 Stand boundaries were assessed by visual evaluation, compliance with the size restrictions, and the
403 overall shape compactness value. The visual assessment consisted of scanning all stand boundaries
404 superimposed on the NAIP imagery and checking for delineations that were incongruent with
405 vegetation patterns observed in the imagery. Manual alterations of the stand boundaries were not
406 necessary. Some of the boundaries separated apparently homogeneous and contiguous areas of forest
407 cover. This is a result of the maximum stand area restriction and the algorithms' ability to numerically
408 discriminate areas that might not be easily distinguishable by the human eye. This visual assessment
409 was carried out only to identify any unexpected errors in the algorithm and to help fine tune algorithm
410 parameters during the testing phase. The authors feel that visual assessment of all stand boundaries
411 will not be necessary if the SDA is implemented on similar landscapes. However, if the SDA is used in
412 a forest that is dissimilar in composition and structure than that of the present study site, then visual

assessment is recommended.

The average size of the delineated stands was 9.2 ha ($SD = 10.3$). All stands met the minimum and maximum size restrictions with a minimum size of 2.95 ha and a maximum of 39.97 ha. The average shape compactness value was 0.49 ($SD = 0.14$) with a maximum value of 0.89 and a minimum of 0.11. In many cases compactness values less than 0.2 were a result of the segmentation algorithm following roads and streams yielding elongated shapes with poor compactness values. Buffering roads and streams prior to carrying out segmentation would likely resolve this issue and increase the average compactness value.

Figure 3 shows the distribution of cover types across the UPNF. Cover types including scrub-oak, mountain mahogany, and other species cover 25.5% of the plateau. Mixed-conifer had the second highest coverage of 22.4%. Pinyon-Juniper occupies 12.8% of the plateau, covering mostly the lower elevations on the east and west extents. Pure aspen stands occur on the higher elevations covering approximately 8.5% of the plateau. Ponderosa pine, spruce-fir, and other mixed-species (pine-juniper, aspen-pine) stands cover the remaining of the forested area and non-forested areas account for approximately 8% of the landscape. The values in table 1 represent stand statistics for forest types across the study area. Forest types not assigned to a silvicultural prescription in treatment simulations are included to demonstrate the utility of the SDA and the FCM, which were conducted for the entire study area.

3.2 *Silvicultural prescriptions*

The selection of accessible forest stands resulted in 13,887 stands of the total 25,538 or 54% of the total area. A total of 5,297 stands within the accessible area were considered candidate treatment units. The remaining accessible stands were given a “no treatment” prescription because they 1) currently meet desired future conditions, 2) are in early seral stage, or 3) are composed of a species group that is

437 either not targeted or has high biomass logistics costs. Figure 4 shows the location of candidate
438 treatment units by silvicultural prescription. These stands totaled to 46,840 ha with 20,228 ha, 8,102 ha
439 and 18,510 ha in stocking-based, regeneration and restoration respectively.

440

441 **3.3 Feedstock volume and delivered costs**

442 Operations costs were calculated for all accessible stands across the study area. These costs represent
443 handling, processing and loading cost plus round trip transportation cost to the bioenergy facility.
444 Operations costs were close to normally distributed and ranged from $\$34.77 \text{ t}^{-1}$ to $\$51.13 \text{ t}^{-1}$ with a
445 mean of $\$42.57 \text{ t}^{-1}$ ($SD = 3.28$). These costs correlate perfectly with travel distance to the bioenergy
446 facility since in-woods operations costs were fixed.

447

448 **3.3.1 Current management**

449 The 10 year management simulation resulted in 18,564 treated ha and 463,726 t of available treatment
450 residue. The area treated is less than the constraint (18,820 ha) as when a stand is selected for
451 treatment the entire stand must be treated, not a portion of the stand. Figure 5 illustrates the
452 distribution of selected treatment stands for each simulated year. The distribution of delivered costs for
453 each year is shown in figure 6. Year 6 had the largest range of delivered costs of $\$34.18$ to $\$50.91 \text{ t}^{-1}$.
454 The lowest average delivered costs was $\$42.02 \text{ t}^{-1}$ during year 2 and the highest during year 10 at
455 $\$42.98 \text{ t}^{-1}$. The average delivered cost for the 10 year simulation was $\$42.54 \text{ t}^{-1}$ ($SD = 3.24$).

456 Although the area constraints were held constant throughout the simulation, the available residue
457 decreased each year (table 2). This was a result of treatment prioritization targeting higher stocked
458 stands in the beginning of the simulation. It is worth noting that this decreasing trend is likely to
459 persist if the simulation is continued for a longer planning horizon. This is in part due to the absence of
460 forest growth in the presented methodology as under stocked stands may grow into overstocked stands

during the 10 year planning horizon, but it is primarily attributable to the treatment prioritization schemes that were based on ecological goals: restorative management regimes targeted at overstocked stands tend to produce large amounts of treatment residue including non-merchantable small-diameter trees. The long-term management goal of restoration means that more hectares of forest will be changed from current overstocked conditions to a state that more closely represents historic reference conditions, especially if periodic low-intensity natural and prescribed fires are used as a management tool to maintain understory conditions where appropriate. It is expected that available residue volumes will continue to decrease as the forests approach the desired future conditions. Note that the stands selected for treatments account for only 8% of the total area while the above ground biomass in these stands account for 15% of the total (table 3). In theory, available residue will stabilize assuming that management intensity (treatment area constraints) remain constant and restoration efforts involve natural mechanisms, such as fire, to maintain historic stand densities and structure.

From a biomass supply perspective, it is important to recognize that restoration treatments differ from even-aged silviculture for timber management, which includes periodic over story removal to harvest mature timber and regenerate the stand, and is capable of supplying a sustained yield of biomass residues associated with timber harvest. We would not expect such a decline in available residues in an even-aged timber management context.

3.3.2 Augmented allowable treatment area

The augmented treatment area simulation resulted in a linear increase in treatment residue from 499,735 t to 960,905 t at 50% and 100% of candidate treatment area respectively. The 50% allowable treatment area was considered the base case condition since the area treated was similar to that of the current management scenario. Each 10% increase in allowable treatment area added approximately 9,000 t of available treatment residue. Conceivably, the proportion of residue in each silvicultural

485 designation remains roughly consistent during each 10% increase in allowable treatment area (figure
486 7). The average annual available treatment residue was 49,974 t per year ($SD = 3,854$) at 50%
487 treatment area and culminated at 100% yielding 96,091 t per year ($SD = 5,415$) of residue. The spatial
488 distribution of residues in this scenario was similar to that of the current management scenario, thus the
489 delivered cost per t, which hinges on transportation cost, remains relatively consistent during each 10%
490 increase in treatment area. The average delivered cost for all treatment area augmentations was \$41.89
491 t^{-1} ($SD = 3.43$). Figure 8 shows the location of stands selected at 50% (black) and 100% (gray)
492 allowable treatment area.

493 Stocking-based management was assigned to the mixed-conifer and spruce-fir species groups and
494 accounted for the largest percentage (43%) of the total candidate treatment area. Therefore the
495 stocking-based prescriptions produce the largest percentage of available residue at all treatment levels.
496 Conversely, stands selected for regeneration management, only 20% of the candidate treatment area
497 produced the second largest percentage of total available residue. This was due to the removal of all
498 growing stock in these stands. Although restoration treatments in ponderosa pine covered 40% of the
499 candidate treatment area, these stands produced the lowest residue volumes at all treatment levels due
500 to low pretreatment basal area values relative to mixed-conifer, spruce-fir and aspen stands.

501 It is likely that the establishment of a bioenergy supply chain will provide incentives to increase
502 the allowable treatment area. According to these results it is estimated that each 10% increase (from
503 50% to 100%) in allowable treatment area will yield 9,000 t of feedstock without significantly
504 increasing or decreasing delivered costs. This relationship might not be consistent if this analysis is
505 repeated on a managed forest operating at an annual allowable treatment level that is large in
506 proportion to the candidate treatment area. Furthermore, in certain situations increasing the allowable
507 treatment area can have negative impacts on average delivered costs if more treatments are scheduled
508 further away from the bioenergy facility.

509

510 *3.3.3 Economic classification of candidate treatment area*

511 Figure 9 reveals the spatial structure of delivered costs for residues across the candidate treatment area.

512 Nearly 55% (524,154 t) of the residues within the candidate treatment area are available at \$40-45 t⁻¹513 and roughly 33% (321,812 t) of residues are available at \$45-50 t⁻¹ (table 4). These results can be used

514 to prioritize treatments early in the development of a bioenergy supply chain to initiate markets by

515 allocating efforts to residues available at relatively low costs. As markets develop, managers can begin

516 to incorporate the acreage allocation constraints to meet forest-wide desired future conditions.

517 Potential end users can use this information to evaluate feedstock prices that would result in different

518 levels of feedstock supply and production.

519 In certain forests, the primary management focus is to improve forest health using restoration

520 treatments. Commonly, these treatments produce a large amount of low-grade materials with high

521 logistics costs and low market value. Existing markets are typically dominated by fuel markets for

522 electricity production and co-generation of heat and power by forest industry facilities, sometimes with

523 emerging demand by pellet mills and smaller bioenergy and bioproducts facilities. For the UPNF,

524 where 70% of the forest is in fire regime condition class 2 or 3 and markets are very limited, a strategic

525 approach to biomass analysis can support emerging biomass markets in several ways.

526 In other situations, such as commercial forests where broad-scale restoration is not a primary

527 concern, different strategies may be more appropriate. Nonetheless, this methodology was designed

528 with adaptability in mind to accommodate a range of management objectives across a diversity of

529 landscapes and resources. The NAIP and FIA datasets used in this study have broad national coverage,

530 facilitating similar analysis throughout the United States, but any similar remote sensing and inventory

531 data can be used.

532

533 **4 Conclusion**

534 The integration of the stand delineation algorithm and the forest characteristics model coupled with site
535 specific silvicultural prescriptions and operational planning presents the opportunity to carry out
536 detailed spatial analysis for a diversity of resources on very large landscapes. As demonstrated in this
537 study, the methodology can be employed to assess the feasibility of biomass utilization, assist
538 silvicultural decisions, and facilitate operational planning at tactical, and operational scales. The
539 capacity to not only estimate residue quantities, but also map the spatial distribution of stand-level
540 residues following alternative management regimes is vital in areas with limited history of industrial
541 biomass utilization and uncertainties in biomass markets. This information is useful to stakeholders
542 across the biomass supply chain, including land managers, contractors, and end users.

543 Research is still needed to fill the knowledge gap regarding residue leakage from stump to
544 landing and recovery rates at the landing, as well as site-specific forest operations costs. Small changes
545 in leakage and recovery rates can drastically influence estimated biomass availability. Although this
546 study assumed a 70% reduction rate to account for stump to landing leakage and recovery at the
547 landing, this can vary significantly depending on species, time since harvest, level of stand mortality,
548 and other variables. An improved model would incorporate forest growth in temporal simulation,
549 allowing more accurate estimates well beyond the 10-year time frame used in this study. This
550 improvement would broaden the planning horizon to better understand the sustainability of biomass
551 flows, as well as the long-term viability of supplying bioenergy and biofuels facilities with biomass
552 from forest restoration treatments. The assumption that the road network will remain static over the
553 next 10 years may result in significant underestimation of potential supply volume. It is recommended
554 that proposed road additions are included, or proposed road decommissions excluded in the presented
555 workflow to deal with changes in accessibility. Future studies could use this methodology to optimally
556 locate bioenergy facilities in the region in ways to reduce feedstock procurement costs, and determine

the scale at which they could operate sustainably, and in balance with forest management regimes that meet a broad range of social, economic and ecological objectives.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative, Biomass Research and Development Initiative, Competitive Grant no. 2010-05325 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture and a USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station Grant no. 10-JV-11221636-282 with significant cost match and in-kind support from the University of Montana and Oregon State University.

References

- Abbas, D., Current, D., Phillips, M., Rossman, R., Hoganson, H., and Brooks, K.N. 2011. Guidelines for harvesting forest biomass for energy: A synthesis of environmental considerations. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 35, 4538–4546. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.06.029
- Anderson, N.M. 2011. Estimating the delivered costs of biomass from the Uncompahgre Plateau using Monte Carlo simulation. A mid-project Summ. Prep. stakeholders, partners Coop. Rocky Mt. Res. Stn. Compet. Res. Initiat. – Uncompahgre Plateau Proj. 1–18.
- ATRI, 2013. American Transportation Research Institute. Am. Truck. Assoc. Fed. URL <http://atri-online.org/> [accessed 11 October 2013].
- Baral, A., Guha, and G.S. 2004. Trees for carbon sequestration or fossil fuel substitution: The issue of cost vs. carbon benefit. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 27, 41–55. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2003.11.004
- Beven, K.J. and Kirkby, M.J. 1979. A physically based, variable contributing area model of basin hydrology. *Hydrol. Sci. Bull.* 24, 43–69. doi:10.1080/02626667909491834
- Binkley, D., Romme, B., and Cheng, T. 2008. Historical Forest Structure on the Uncompahgre Plateau : Informing restoration prescriptions for mountainside stewardship. Prepared by the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute ,. *Color. For. Restor. Inst.* 1–27.

- 584 Brown, R.T., Agee, J.K., and Franklin, J.F. 2004. Forest Restoration and Fire: Principles in the Context
585 of Place. *Conserv. Biol.* 18, 903–912. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.521_1.x
- 586 Buchholz, T., Canham, C.D., and Hamburg, S.P. 2011. Forest Biomass and Bioenergy : Opportunities
587 and Constraints in the Northeastern United States. *Cary Inst. Ecosyst. Stud.* 1–75.
- 588 Burt, T. and Butcher, D. 1986. Stimulation from simulation? a teaching model of hillslope hydrology
589 for use on microcomputers. *J. Geogr. High. Educ.* 10, 23–39.
- 590 Chung, W. and Sessions, J. 2003. Network 2000: a program for optimizing large fixed and variable
591 cost transportation systems, in: *Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium on System Analysis in*
592 *Forest Resources*, Snowmass Village, Colorado, USA. pp. 109–120. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-
593 0307-9_12
- 594 Daly, C., Gibson, W., Doggett, M., Smith, J., and Taylor, G. 2009. Near-real-time monthly high-
595 resolution climate data set for the conterminous united states. *Spat. Clim. Anal. Serv. Oregon*
596 *State Univ. Corvallis, OR, USA.*
- 597 Fight, R.D., Hartsough, B.R., and Noordijk, P. 2006. Users Guide for FRCS : Fuel Reduction Cost
598 Simulator Software. USDA For. Serv. Pacific Northwest Res. Station. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-
599 GTR-668 1–30.
- 600 Fukunaga, K. and Hostetler, L. 1975. The estimation of the gradient of a density function, with
601 applications in pattern recognition. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 21, 32–40.
602 doi:10.1109/TIT.1975.1055330
- 603 Gan, J. and Smith, C.T. 2007. Co-benefits of utilizing logging residues for bioenergy production: The
604 case for East Texas, USA. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 31, 623–630.
605 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2007.06.027
- 606 Guo, Z., Sun, C., and Grebner, D.L. 2007. Utilization of forest derived biomass for energy production
607 in the U.S.A.: status, challenges, and public policies. *Int. For. Rev.* 9, 748–758.
608 doi:10.1505/ifor.9.3.748
- 609 Han, H.S., Halbrook, J., Pan, F. and Salazar, L. 2010. Economic evaluation of a roll-off trucking
610 system removing forest biomass resulting from shaded fuelbreak treatments. *Biomass and*
611 *Bioenergy* 34, 1006–1016. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.02.009
- 612 Hardy, C.C., Schmidt, K.M., Menakis, J.P., and Neil, S.R. 2001. Spatial data for national fire planning
613 and fuel management. *Int. J. Wildl. Fire* 10, 353–372.
- 614 Helms, J.A., 1998. *The dictionary of forestry.* Soc. Am. For. Bethesda, MD. 210 p.
- 615 Hogg, E.H. 1997. Temporal scaling of moisture and the forest-grassland boundary in western Canada.
616 *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 84, 115–122. doi:10.1016/S0168-1923(96)02380-5

- 617 Hogland, J., Billor, N., and Anderson, N.M. 2013. Comparison of standard maximum likelihood
618 classification and polytomous logistic regression used in remote sensing. *Eur. J. Remote Sens.* 46,
619 623–640. doi:10.5721/EuJRS20134637
- 620 Hogland, J.S., Anderson, N.M., Chung, W., and Wells, L. 2014. Estimating forest characteristics using
621 NAIP imagery and ArcObjects, in: *Proceedings of the 2014 ESRI Users Conference*; July 14-18,
622 2014, San Diego, CA. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research Institute. Online:
623 http://proceedings.esri.com/library/userconf/proc14/papers/155_181.pdf. pp. 1–22.
- 624 Jenkins, J.C., Chojnacky, D.C., Heath, L.S., and Birdsey, R.A. 2003. National-scale biomass estimators
625 for United States tree species. *For. Sci.* 49, 12–35.
- 626 Jones, G., Loeffler, D., Calkin, D., and Chung, W. 2010. Forest treatment residues for thermal energy
627 compared with disposal by onsite burning: Emissions and energy return. *Biomass and Bioenergy*
628 34, 737–746. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.01.016
- 629 Loeffler, D. and Anderson, N.M. 2014. Emissions tradeoffs associated with cofiring forest biomass
630 with coal: A case study in Colorado, USA. *Appl. Energy* 113, 67–77.
631 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.07.011
- 632 Moore, I.D., Grayson, R.B., and Ladson, A.R. 1991. Digital Terrain Modeling : A Review of
633 Hydrological Geomorphological and Biological Applications. *Hydrol. Process.* 5, 3–30. doi:DOI:
634 10.1002/hyp.3360050103
- 635 Puttock, G.D. 1995. Estimating cost for integrated harvesting and related forest management activities.
636 *Biomass Bioenergy* 8, 73–79. doi:10.1016/0961-9534(95)00001-N
- 637 Reineke, L.H. 1933. Perfecting a stand-density index for even-aged forests. *J. Agric. Res.* 46, 627–638.
- 638 Rodhe, A., and Seibert, J. 1999. Wetland occurrence in relation to topography: A test of topographic
639 indices as moisture indicators. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 98-99, 325–340. doi:10.1016/S0168-
640 1923(99)00104-5
- 641 Rummer, B., Prestemon, J., May, D., Miles, P., Vissage, J., McRoberts, R., Liknes, G., Shepperd,
642 W.D., Ferguson, D., Elliot, W., Miller, S., Reutebuch, S., Barbour, J., Fried, J., Stokes, B., Bilek,
643 E., and Skog, K. 2003. A Strategic Assessment of Forest Biomass and Fuel Reduction Treatments
644 in Western States. USDA For. Serv. Res. Dev. Online <http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/23846>
645 18 p.
- 646 Schmidt, K.M., Menakis, J.P., Hardy, C.C., Hann, W.J., and Bunnell, D.L. 2002. Development of
647 coarse-scale spatial data for wildland fire and fuel management. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech.
648 Rep. RMRS-GTR-62.
- 649 Seibert, J., Bishop, K.H., and Nyberg, L. 1997. A test of TOPMODEL's ability to predict spatially
650 distributed groundwater levels. *Hydrol. Process.* 11, 1131–1144. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-
651 1085(199707)11:9<1131::AID-HYP549>3.0.CO;2-#

- 652 Shields Jr., W.J., and Bockheim, J.G. 1981. Deterioration of trembling aspen clones in the Great Lakes
653 region. *Can. J. For. Res.* doi:10.1139/x81-073
- 654 UPNF Current Forest Plan, 2012. Grand Mesa Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests.
655 http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/gmug/landmanagement/planning/?cid=fsbdev7_003229 [accessed
656 20 September 2013].
- 657 US DOE 2011. US billion-ton update: biomass supply for a bioenergy and bioproducts industry. Oak
658 Ridge Natl. Lab. 228 p.
- 659 US EIA 2013. US Energy Information Administration. US Dep. Energy. URL <http://www.eia.gov/>
660 (accessed 2 October 2013).
- 661 USDA-FSA-APFO 2011. National agricultural imagery program. USDA, Farm Serv. Agency, Aer.
662 Photogr. F. Off. Salt Lake City, Utah.
- 663 USGS 2006. Watershed boundary data - 12 digit hydrological units.
664 <http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/watershed/>.
- 665 Wells, L.A. 2013. Spatial Distribution and Quantification of Forest Treatment Residues for Bioenergy
666 Production. Thesis, Univ. Mont. Coll. For. Conserv. Dep. For. Manag.
667 <http://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/4177> 118 p.
- 668 Western Governors' Association 2005. Western Regional Biomass Energy Program.
669 www.westgov.org/wga/initiatives/biomass/.
- 670 Worrall, J.J., Egeland, L., Eager, T., Mask, R.A., Johnson, E.W., Kemp, P.A., and Shepperd, W.D.
671 2008. Rapid mortality of *Populus tremuloides* in southwestern Colorado, USA. *For. Ecol.*
672 *Manage.* 255, 686–696. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2007.09.071
- 673 Worrall, J.J., Marchetti, S.B., Egeland, L., Mask, R.A., Eager, T., and Howell, B. 2010. Effects and
674 etiology of sudden aspen decline in southwestern Colorado, USA. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 260, 638–
675 648. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2010.05.020
- 676 Zhang, L., Bi, H., Gove, J.H., Heath, L.S. 2005. A comparison of alternative methods for estimating
677 the self-thinning boundary line. *Can. J. For. Res.* 35: 1507-1514. doi:10.1139/X05-070
- 678 Zinko, U., Seibert, J., Dynesius, M., and Nilsson, C. 2005. Plant species numbers predicted by a
679 topography-based groundwater flow index. *Ecosystems* 8, 430–441. doi:10.1007/s10021-003-
680 0125-0
- 681
- 682
- 683
- 684

685

686

Draft

Tables

Table 1: Summary of forest characteristics by forest type. Values for basal area, density, and above ground biomass represent the mean within the forest type (standard deviation in parentheses).

forest type	# of stands	area (ha)	baa (m ² ha ⁻¹)	tpa (stems ha ⁻¹)	qmd (cm)	agb (t ha ⁻¹)
aspen	2,123	19,866	22.96 (9.83)	444.79 (192.67)	25.40 (0.74)	48.99 (21.17)
aspen-pine	3,015	26,852	16.76 (6.45)	276.76 (124.96)	27.94 (1.75)	35.38 (14.16)
pinyon-jun	3,266	30,121	14.69 (6.26)	143.32 (68.5)	35.56 (3.46)	15.42 (6.25)
juniper-pine	950	8,768	10.56 (3.79)	111.20 (49.15)	35.56 (3.81)	15.42 (5.59)
mixed conifer	5,385	52,717	25.48 (10.69)	509.04 (210.12)	25.40 (0.89)	53.52 (22.63)
pine	1,033	8,340	9.41 (2.84)	108.73 (45.79)	33.02 (3.94)	19.05 (6.72)
spruce-fir	1,060	9,069	26.86 (12.28)	536.22 (234.78)	25.40 (1.27)	53.52 (25.79)
other	6,764	59,964	18.14 (8.76)	318.77 (176.81)	27.94 (2.39)	30.84 (18.87)
non-forested	1,943	19,142	-	-	-	-

Table 2: Area treated, pretreatment above ground biomass, removed biomass, merchantable yield, treatment residue, and available feedstock per year.

Year	area (ha)	agb (t)	removed (t)	merchantable (t)	residue (t)	feedstock (t)
1	1,861	392,094	193,936	111,920	73,851	51,696
2	1,827	354,698	191,892	118,271	73,060	51,142
3	1,870	337,680	184,988	114,928	70,060	49,042
4	1,832	317,217	178,740	111,020	67,721	47,405
5	1,874	311,540	181,018	112,418	68,600	48,019
6	1,867	294,931	174,710	108,690	66,021	46,215
7	1,874	277,972	166,400	103,139	62,355	43,648
8	1,867	265,062	160,152	99,956	60,195	42,137
9	1,836	257,877	160,792	100,170	60,622	42,434
10	1,856	239,137	158,033	98,050	59,983	41,988

Table 3: Proportion of area and above ground biomass in accessible, candidate and treated units to the total study area.

selection area	area (ha)	agb (t)	% of total area	% of total agb	agb (t ha ⁻¹)
landscape	234,842	20,126,839	100	100	86
accessible	126,495	10,735,459	54	53	85
candidate	46,839	5,936,051	20	30	128
treated	18,564	3,048,209	8	15	166

Draft

Table 4: Area treated and treatment residue at each delivered costs category.

delivered cost (\$ t ⁻¹)	area (ha)	residue (t)	cumulative residue (t)
< 40	3,153	56,924	56,924
40-45	25,627	524,154	581,078
45-50	14,915	321,812	902,890
> 50	3,144	58,015	960,906

760 **Figures**

761

762

763 Figure 1: Overview of the workflow components for estimating treatment residue quantity, spatial
764 distribution and delivered costs.

765

Figure 2: Flowchart of the stand delineation algorithm.

Figure 3: Mapped forest types across the study area. Zoomed areas show stand boundaries superimposed on NAIP-CIR imagery and their respective forest type.

Figure 4: Candidate treatment units by silvicultural prescription. (a) Stocking-based management; (b) regeneration management; (c) restoration in ponderosa pine.

Figure 5: Stands selected for treatment (black) by simulation year. Grey areas show stands treated in previous years.

Figure 6: Distribution of operations costs per year. Black lines represent the median costs and points represent average costs.

839

840

841 Figure 7: Available residue volume by silvicultural prescription at each simulated treatment level.

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

Figure 8: Change in distribution of treatments as allowable treatment area restriction increases. The black area shows stands selected at 50% allowable treatment area and gray represents stands selected at 100% allowable treatment area.

Figure 9: Spatial distribution of delivered costs for the candidate treatment area. Delivered costs are categorized in \$5 increments.