

Reconciliation of reviewer comments

Title: Timber Products Output and Timber Harvests in Alaska: Projections for 2005-25

Authors: Brackley, Allen M.; Rojas, Thomas D.; Haynes, Richard W.

Reviewer: Guy Robertson (USDA, Forest Service, Washington office)

Comment 1 (Introduction): Projections for SE Alaska or Alaska as a whole? Explicitly identify what volumes come from where

Response: Rewrote Introduction and moved footnote 1 to help explain where Alaska timber volumes have come from

Comment 2 (Assumptions): Restate assumptions up front linking projections to domestic markets

Response: Rewrote Assumptions and rearranged their order

Comment 3 (Alternative Projections): Specify greater in scenario descriptions what is assumed about utility logs

Response: When rewrote assumptions, expanded description about utility logs

Comment 4 (Methods): Describe how the model works with diagrams or tables explaining materials accounting process

Response: Created new Methods section which describes the model and added figures 1 and 2

Comment 5 (Conclusions): Identify risks and recognize likelihood of scenarios

Response: Added section on Most Probable Outcome

Comment 6 (Entire Manuscript): Line-by-line review to improve writing

Response: Rewrote most of the paper

Reviewer: Lloyd Irland (Yale University)

Comment 1 (Summary): Improve historical context of the report, clearer on demand in general vs. demand for N.F. timber

Response: Rewrote Introduction and added Literature Review of previous projection reports

Comment 2 (Conclusions): Help readers judge likelihood of scenarios, how this demand analysis can be applied to decision-making

Response: Added section on Most Probable Outcome

Comment 3 (Stumpage Price Projections): Acknowledge pricing issue, clarify in table 7 exactly what those prices represent

Response: Footnote describes expected stumpage price and equation for calculation

Comment 4 (Entire Manuscript): Inconsistent view with investment risk

Response: The manuscript has been revised to correct this issue. Increased levels of uncertainty (associated with things like timber supply) results in lower level of investor willingness to invest

Comment 5 (): Clarify specific product mix of wood going to Lower 48 States

Response: See page 12 and 13 for update and Assumptions

Comment 6 (): Clarify Lower 48 or North American market, Seattle or some local areas?

Response: See page 12 and 13 and Assumptions

Comment 7 (Entire Manuscript): Questions about word choice and clarity in some sections

Response: Rewrote most of the paper and resolved issues

Comment 8 (): Are AK mills running any dry, surfaced lumber now?

Response: See page 12 and 13

Comment 9 (Stumpage Price Projections): Offer more views on rising U.S. softwood real stumpage prices for next few decades

Response: The presented view is the only one that is publicly available and a broader discussion is outside the scope of this paper.

Reviewer: Darius Adams (Oregon State University)

Comment 1 (): Thought you used assumptions about AK's share of U.S. market to figure shipments to the United States

Response: Yes, we did. Clarified this in rewrite.

Comment 2 (Methods): Add diagram to show sequence of computations and example how projections are actually made

Response: Created new Methods section which describes the model and added figures 1 and 2

Comment 3 (Conclusions): Need to convince readers at least that scenarios somehow encompass the range of likely variation

Response: Added a section on Most Probable Outcome

Comment 4 (Introduction): Report needs to stand on its own, assume readers didn't read past reports or don't remember them

Response: Rewrote Introduction and added Literature Review of previous projection reports

Comment 5 (Results): Not clear from where Pacific Rim imports projections come

Response: Added section on Origins of Future Demand and figure 3

Comment 6 (Entire Manuscript): Questions about word choice, clarity, and relevance in some sections

Response: Rewrote most of paper and resolved issues

Comment 7 (): Did you look at prices for major European competitors in Japanese market?

Response: No, but this is a good suggestion for a future research topic

Comment 8 (Methods): Why is this development (SE AK mills no longer completely dependent on N.F. for significant volumes of raw material) highly unlikely?
Response: Up to 6.8 mmbf supplied from state lands

Comment 9 (Methods): Don't you mean AK share of the Japanese market and not North American?
Response: No, corrected in rewrite

Comment 10 (Review of Scenarios): Make it clear that you will assume construction of MDF plant in scenarios
Response: Rewrote Methods section and improved description of scenarios

Comment 11 (Sensitivity Analysis): Not sure why sensitivity analysis is needed
Response: We included it so that it is available as a reference in future reports

Comment 12 (Table 4): Harvest by product numbers do not add up
Response: Noted this problem and corrected the table values. Also, there is a footnote in table 4 that states that totals may not equal column entries due to rounding errors and the balancing methods

Comment 13 (Table 5B): Change title to "Shares of AK lumber output going to export and domestic markets" instead of "Ratio of exports to domestic market shares for all scenarios"
Response: Made change as suggested

Comment 14 (Tables): You refer to AK's share of the NA market, but you really mean AK's share of the Pacific Rim market...For example, in Table 6 you have "AK share of NA shipments to Pac Rim" where it should read just "AK shipments to Pac Rim"
Response: Clarified some table titles, added "Pacific Rim" in table 6

Comment 15 (Entire manuscript): Needs a thorough editing for usage, grammar, and spelling
Response: Rewrote most of the paper and made corrections