Errata Sheet

For the

Draft Financial Analysis of Alternatives for Establishment of a Sustainable Harvest Level for Forested State Trust Lands in Western Washington

July 2017

Charts

The following tables replace Table C-9 on page C-5, Table C-25 on page C-13, Table C-31 on page C-16, and Table C-53 on page C-27 of the draft financial analysis. The original tables incorrectly show the decadal rates based on fiscal years 2011 through 2015 harvest volume:

- Table C-9 shows 66 million board feet (MMBF); the correct value is 12 MMBF.
- Table C-25 shows 126 MMBF; the correct value is 275 MMBF.
- Table C-31 shows 10 MMBF; the correct value is 11 MMBF.
- Table C-53 shows 45 MMBF; the correct value is 73 MMBF.

All other values are unchanged from the original tables.

Marbled	702 MMBF		462 MMBF		No specific level		Decadal rate
murrelet strategy		based on FY 2011-2015					
alternative	10%	1%	10%	1%	10%	1%	performance
Alt. A	3	5	3	5	3	3	12
Alt. B	3	5	3	5	3	3	
Alt. C	3	5	3	5	3	3	
Alt. D	3	5	3	5	3	3	
Alt. E	3	5	3	5	3	3	
Alt. F	3	5	3	5	3	3	

Table C-9. Planning Decade Volume, Community College Forest Reserve (MMBF/decade)

Marbled	702 N	1MBF	462 MMBF		No specific level		Decadal rate
murrelet strategy		based on FY 2011-2015					
alternative	10%	1%	10%	1%	10%	1%	performance
Alt. A	306	314	327	312	293	314	275
Alt. B	369	370	368	367	350	353	
Alt. C	349	338	357	348	335	335	
Alt. D	355	362	369	363	339	338	
Alt. E	353	344	353	345	335	333	
Alt. F	340	339	335	336	347	341	

Table C-25. Planning Decade Volume, Clallam County (MMBF/decade)

Table C-31. Planning Decade Volume, Grays Harbor County (MMBF/decade)

Marbled	702 MMBF		462 MMBF		No specific level		Decadal rate
murrelet strategy	Riparian thinning						based on FY 2011-2015
alternative	10%	1%	10%	1%	10%	1%	performance
Alt. A	14	14	14	14	14	14	11
Alt. B	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Alt. C	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Alt. D	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Alt. E	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Alt. F	14	14	14	14	14	14	

Marbled	702 N	MMBF	462 MMBF		No specific level		Decadal rate
murrelet strategy					based on FY 2011-2015		
alternative	10%	1%	10%	1%	10%	1%	performance
Alt. A	97	96	97	96	98	97	73
Alt. B	101	101	101	101	101	101	
Alt. C	102	102	102	101	101	101	
Alt. D	101	101	101	102	101	101	
Alt. E	101	100	101	100	101	101	
Alt. F	102	100	102	100	101	101	

Table C-53. Planning Decade Volume, Thurston County (MMBF/decade)

Effects of Riparian Thinning Options on Harvest Volume

On page 23, the third and fourth sentences of the second paragraph in the section called "Effects of Riparian Thinning Options on Harvest Volume" read:

The additional volume under the 1 percent riparian thinning option does not come from riparian areas. Instead, additional non-riparian harvests occur.

DNR would like to correct this statement. Further analysis of model results indicated that, for scenarios including the 1 percent thinning option, *arrearage* harvest in riparian areas was not constrained to 1 percent of the acres thinned or harvested in non-riparian areas. For that reason, more volume is projected to come from riparian areas under the 1 percent riparian thinning option than under the 10 percent riparian thinning option, when those options are paired with either 702 MMBF or 462 MMBF of arrearage volume.