2.Low carbon

Timber and carbon sequestration

Will Hawkins discusses carbon sequestration and end-of-life processes in timber structures, and the implications for sustainable decision-making in structural design.

Introduction

The first step towards reducing the embodied carbon of construction is calculating it reliably and repeatably, and it is therefore timely that a strong consensus has formed around a lifecycle assessment (LCA) methodology based on BS EN 15978[1].

This standard underpins the recent guidance from the IStructE[2], and breaks a product's lifecycle down into production (Module A), use (B), end of life (C) and potential recovery/reuse (D).

As more of these stages are included within an LCA's scope, a more complete picture of impacts is provided. However, often only Module A is included due to the considerable uncertainty surrounding end-of-life processes.

For steel and concrete, which both feature high-energy production processes, Module A dominates lifecycle emissions. The production emissions for timber products, from harvesting, drying and sawing, are also significant; however, the mass of carbon absorbed by the tree and stored within the material itself can be even greater.

Although this carbon is typically re-released at the end of life due to combustion and/or decomposition, there are climate benefits of sequestering atmospheric carbon within long-lived timber products which act as a carbon sink[3].

For example, delaying carbon emissions reduces cumulative climatic energy input, buys time for adaptation of both natural and man-made systems, reduces the possibility of reaching dangerous climate 'tipping points', and increases the potential for permanent storage through future technologies such as carbon capture and storage.

However, accounting for sequestered carbon is often a source of debate, confusion and inconsistency. When sequestration is reported within Module A, or alongside it as a negative emission, it can create the counterintuitive impression that using timber excessively can have environmental benefits.

The IStructE guide therefore advises that sequestration should only be aggregated with emissions when end-of-life values are also included, where the stored carbon is typically cancelled out by re-emission at the end of life.

This article provides a rational approach to the incorporation of sequestration in embodied carbon calculations, and provides recommendations for effective climate-focused timber design: sustainable sourcing, long lifespans and efficient use of materials.

Rationalising timber sequestration

Growing trees and locking away carbon in timber buildings has been proposed as a potentially significant carbon sink[3]. But would it be better, from a carbon perspective, to leave forests to grow naturally?

Figure 1 shows the changes in carbon storage within a typical commercially managed Sitka spruce forest with a harvesting cycle of 50 years, using data from a Forestry Commission report[4], and compares this with an equivalent unmanaged forest. This reveals several important points.

Carbon uptake in newly planted saplings is initially slow, but then accelerates as these become established. In an unmanaged forest, sequestration continues until the total carbon eventually tends towards a steady state.

A managed forest also achieves a constant carbon storage, albeit cyclic between each harvesting period and lower than that of an unmanaged forest. However, it also stores carbon in the products produced from it. If these are amassed sufficiently over time, then the total carbon sequestered accumulates and could eventually be greater than that of an unmanaged forest.

Considering these observations, the approach to sequestration taken in this article is based on the following principles:

FIGURE 1: Carbon stored in trees, debris/litter and soil for typical Sitka spruce plantation with 50-year rotation period, compared with forest left unmanaged (with data from Forestry Commission[4])





↑FIGURE 2: Cumulative embodied carbon emissions for concrete, steel and timber options of example building structure[8], including three scenarios for timber components

- Although an understanding of the variation in carbon stored within a forest is informative, this carbon is not typically included in a building's LCA scope. Instead, only the carbon in the timber product itself should be included, in line with typical product LCA methodologies[5].
- Harvesting, processing and constructing a timber building releases a 'spike' of carbon into the atmosphere, whereas sequestration occurs gradually.
- Carbon accounting should always start at zero – credit should not be taken for a tree planted 50 years ago, even if this eventually ends up being used to build the structure under investigation.
- Where trees are harvested and not replaced (deforestation), no sequestration should be accounted for, in line with current European standards[5].

This article recommends using sequestration values corresponding to the timber structure itself, such as those given in the ICE database[6] and IStructE guidance[2], rather than the entire forest from which it came. However, the assumed timing of sequestration is that of the trees which replace those harvested, starting from zero and increasing until the next harvesting cycle, assumed here to be 50 years. This 'forward-looking' approach is characterised and recommended by Helin *et al*.[7], and its implications are explored hereafter.

Comparing concrete, steel and timber building options

This section compares the embodied carbon of concrete (flat slab), steel (composite) and timber (cross-laminated timber (CLT) with glulam frame) options for a six-storey building structure. The designs are those featured in a recent Buro Happold study[8], with all options featuring a concrete core and foundations. The calculation methodology follows IStructE guidance[2] and is detailed in a separate publication[9].

The analysis is cradle-to-grave; Module D benefits (beyond the system boundary), which are reported separately in current standards[1], are not included. This has the same effect as assuming that all material production is effectively decarbonised by the end of the building's 60-year lifespan, in line with UK law, since offset materials would also be zero carbon.

> **"IT IS STILL BETTER (FOR THE CLIMATE) TO BUILD NOTHING AT ALL THAN A TIMBER BUILDING**

Three carbon life cycles are considered for timber:

1) Typical sustainably sourced UK timber with replanting (sequestration) and a large carbon emission at the end of life from recycling (55% by mass), incineration with energy recovery (44%) and landfill (1%)[10], as given in the IStructE guidance[2].
2) As above, but without replanting or sequestration, representing a worst-case scenario (non-sustainably sourced timber, uncommon in the EU).
3) An optimistic scenario which combines sustainable forest management (sequestration) with minimal emissions at the end of life. It has been suggested that up to 90% of combustion emissions could potentially be captured using bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS)[11]. This has been represented here by a 90% reduction in Module C3–4 emissions. Carbon capture is not permitted in a standard LCA[5], but is considered here as a hypothetical scenario.

The cumulative carbon emissions over a 120-year period for each structure are shown in **Figure 2**. The concrete structure has the highest initial (Module A) emissions, followed by steel and then timber, for this structural arrangement. For concrete and steel, the use and end-of-life stages see only small changes in embodied carbon. For timber, however, subsequent changes are significant.

In timber scenario 1, sequestration causes a small, temporary period of negative carbon emissions. This lasts only while the building is in use, ending abruptly upon demolition. If the structure is in use for 100 years, it would be carbon-negative for half its lifetime, whereas the same structure demolished after 40 years would never reach negative carbon.

The dynamic climate impacts of this temporary carbon storage are considered, for a similar case study, in a separate publication[9]. Despite the large Module C emissions, the total cradle-to-grave carbon is still lower than for the concrete and steel options in this scenario.

In scenario 2, without sequestration, the significant release of carbon at the end of life causes the timber option to have the largest total embodied carbon. This highlights the essential importance of sourcing sustainable timber which includes replanting, as is typical in the EU.

Scenario 3 shows the potential for a zero-carbon timber building if end-of-life emissions can be avoided. This is an optimistic scenario, relying on technology which does not currently exist at a meaningful scale. It would therefore be misleading to consider this in a typical embodied carbon calculation, and not permissible using today's standards[1,5]. Even in this



↑FIGURE 3: Wasteful use of timber could have greater impact, in both short and long term, than efficiently designed concrete and steel alternative

event, the large initial emission from construction is not avoided, and still contributes to global warming for several decades[9].

It can therefore be concluded that, even under best-case conditions, it is still better (for the climate) to build nothing at all than a timber building.

Although this study shows concrete as the highest-carbon option, and timber as the lowest, these results are specific to the designs in question and do not represent a fixed hierarchy. This timber design is very light, featuring 100mm thick CLT floors, and the concrete flat slabs are relatively inefficient at 9m spans compared with ribbed or post-tensioned alternatives.

Figure 3 illustrates the point that wasteful or inappropriate use of timber could readily have a greater impact than a more efficient concrete or steel alternative: it is always better to use less of any material. We cannot quickly increase total timber supply, and must therefore use this valuable resource sparingly to enable maximum potential uptake across the sector.

Conclusions

This article has demonstrated an approach to accounting for timber carbon sequestration in line with established guidance. Through a simple case study, several conclusions can be drawn:

- Timber must be sustainably sourced, with replanting, for any potential embodied carbon benefits over concrete and steel to be realised. Thankfully, sustainability certification schemes (such as those run by the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification and the Forest Stewardship Council) are well established and often a legal requirement for import.
- End-of-life carbon fluxes are significant for timber structures. The climate benefits of timber can therefore be maximised by prolonging the life of structures, reusing timber components or recycling into new materials, all of which keep sequestered carbon out of the atmosphere.
- It is hypothetically possible for timber to have a negative cumulative embodied carbon, in the long term, when it is both sustainably sourced and end-of-life emissions are also avoided, e.g. through new technologies such as BECCS. This cannot be relied upon in a typical embodied carbon analysis, however, and several decades of net positive emissions still occur.
- It is better to build nothing at all than a timber building. Similarly, wasteful use of timber can be more damaging than an efficient design in concrete and steel.

Acknowledgements

With thanks to Aurimas Bukauskas, Sam Cooper, Steve Allen, Jonathan Roynon and Tim Ibell for their thoughts, contributions and expertise.

Will Hawkins
MEng, PhD

Will Hawkins is a Lecturer in Structural Engineering Design at the University of Bath. His research and teaching focuses on pathways to zero-carbon building structures, through design optimisation, novel structural systems and low-carbon materials.

REFERENCES

1) British Standards Institution (2011) *BS EN 15978:2011 Sustainability of construction works. Assessment of environmental performance of buildings. Calculation method*, London: BSI

2) Gibbons O. and Orr J.J. (2020) *How to calculate embodied carbon*, London: IStructE Ltd

3) Churkina G., Organschi A., Reyer C.P.O. *et al.* (2020) 'Buildings as a global carbon sink', *Nat. Sustain.*, 3, pp. 269–276, doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0462-4

4) Morison J., Matthews R., Miller G. *et al.* (2012) *Forestry Commission Research Report: Understanding the carbon and greenhouse gas balance of forests in Britain* [Online] Available at: www.forestresearch.gov.uk/research/understanding-the-carbon-and-greenhouse-gas-balance-of-forests-in-britain/ (Accessed: November 2020)

5) British Standards Institution (2012) *BS EN 15804:2012+A2:2019 Sustainability of construction works. Environmental product declarations. Core rules for the product category of construction products*, London: BSI

6) Jones C. and Hammond G. (2019) *Inventory of Carbon and Energy* (Version 3.0) [Online] Available at: https://circularecology.com/embodied-carbon-footprint-database.html (Accessed: November 2020)

7) Helin T., Sokka L., Soimakallio S., Pingoud K. and Pajula T. (2013) 'Approaches for inclusion of forest carbon cycle in life cycle assessment – a review', *GCB Bioenergy*, 5 (5), pp. 475–486, doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12016

8) Roynon J. (2020) *Embodied carbon: structural sensitivity study* [Online] Available at: www.istructe.org/resources/case-study/embodied-carbon-structural-sensitivity-study/ (Accessed: November 2020)

9) Hawkins W., Cooper S., Bukauskas A. *et al.* (In press) 'Rational whole-life carbon assessment using a dynamic climate model: Comparison of a concrete, steel and timber building structure', *Structures*

10) Wood for Good (2017) *Environmental Product Declaration: $1m^3$ of kiln dried planed or machined sawn timber used as structural timber* [Online] Available at: https://woodforgood.com/assets/Downloads/EPD/BREGENEPD000124.pdf (Accessed: November 2020)

11) Committee on Climate Change (2019) *Net Zero: The UK's contribution to stopping global warming* [Online] Available at: www.theccc.org.uk/publication/net-zero-the-uks-contribution-to-stopping-global-warming/ (Accessed: November 2020)