Our “contribution” to the forest includes growing two times more wood than is harvested annually, ensuring our forestland is growing, not shrinking, and pulling carbon out of the atmosphere.

It is a well known fact that younger trees absorb carbon dioxide at a much more significant rate than older trees. So a sustainably managed forest with trees in multiple different stages of growth is actually absorbing more carbon than an unmanaged forest that is susceptible to fire, insect infestation and disease.

Good news! Our forests are already protected. In fact, there are 20% more trees in the U.S. today than there were in 1970. U.S. Southern forests are thriving. They have grown 24% between 1997 and 2017 - all while the Southeast provides wood to produce paper and wood products needed to house families and provide useful paper, packaging and tissue essential for today’s busy consumers. Fortunately, the U.S. forest products industry has a strong and meaningful commitment to sustainability where companies certify their supply chains to external standards or adopt sustainable forestry plans.

The forest industry is a major economic lifeline in many rural Southern areas where it can often be one of the largest employers in a region.

These are serious issues that have NOTHING to do with responsible forest management. And it is deeply irresponsible and misleading to suggest some link. First of all, over 100 forest scientists representing more than 80 top research universities have twice written the EPA supporting the carbon neutrality of biomass, saying that using forest bioenergy is a positive for addressing climate change.

In addition to fuel, wood is often promoted as a "carbon-negative" material for building and housing applications, a source of "renewable" fuel for the aviation industry, as a "sustainable" building material and a "green" material for a sustainable world. And despite the many environmental benefits and conservation organizations, failing to take action is the worst thing people can do. But by doing nothing, we will exacerbate climate change. "Reducing even 0.5% of CO2 emissions will dramatically reduce the rate of climate change.

Secondly, comparing carbon dioxide absorption rates between a rainforest and a temperate carbon cycle of trees and forest products is not a fair comparison. The carbon cycle of the rainforest is different from that of a temperate forest because trees in the equatorial rainforest are much different and their carbon cycle simply is not comparable. Moreover, any carbon sequestered in the ground would not be counted in this comparison. Furthermore, trees and plant matter emit carbon through decay and absorb it through growth. A real scientific assessment would not view half of the carbon cycle completely out of context.

In the same way, consumption of wood and paper products is not something consumers should feel guilty about. These products come from a renewable resource and paper has the highest rate of recovery for recycling of any type of material, according to the EPA.

The author provides no evidence that carbon sequestered “in the ground” is any better than carbon sequestered in responsibly manufactured forest products. The important thing is supposed to be keeping it out of the atmosphere right? Making products that store carbon from a renewable resource (trees) that provide the livelihoods for many families is good. We think so.

Growing trees capture carbon more efficiently than mature trees. That’s why it is important to have trees of many ages in a healthy, sustainably managed forest.