# NSF-ISR, LTD
# SURVEILLANCE AUDIT REPORT
**January 11, 2007**

**A. Program Participant's Name: Minnesota DNR FRS #: 6Y921**

**B. Scope:**

Forest management on Minnesota DNR's forestry lands, wildlife lands except for the Prairie Province, Lake County fisheries lands, and Land Utilization Project (LUP) lands, and related sustainable forestry activities covered by the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard®.

☒ No Change
☐ Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS)

**C. NSF Audit Team:**

Mike Ferrucci, Lead; Dave Wager, JoAnn Hanowski, Dennis Becker

**D. Audit Date(s): October 16-19, 2006**

**E. Reference Documentation:**

2005-2009 SFI Standard®; documents provide by Minnesota DNR

**F. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded**

☐ Acceptable with no nonconformances; or

☒ Acceptable with minor nonconformances that should be corrected before the next regularly scheduled surveillance visit;

☐ Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;

☐ Several major nonconformances - the certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

**G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:**

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide brief description of the changes:

- A reorganization to take effect Jan. 2007 will reduce forestry regions from 4 to 3
- New field foresters hired: September 2006 8; January 2007 8
- Legislation passed for logger training and horse trail fee and funding
- Ecological Services has four new regional manager positions
- Wildlife Division involved in acquisition; funding for $7 million easement purchases
- Purchased and preparing to change to Woodstock/Stanley growth model (from custom approach based on FIA data); working to decide on growth curve sourcing

**H. Other Issues Reviewed:**

☒Yes ☐No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.

☒Yes ☐No ☐N.A. SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly. If no, document on CAR forms.

**I. Corrective Action Requests: (see also Appendix IV)**

**Corrective Action Requests issued this visit:**

MF-2006-1 Goals assigned among administrative areas

☐ Corrective Action Plan is not required.

☒ Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances). CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.

☐ Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances).

Corrective Action Plans should be mailed to:

Mike Ferrucci
26 Commerce Drive
North Branford, CT 06471

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit the remaining open CARs are: MAJOR(S): 0 MINOR(S): 1

In addition, eight Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) were identified.

**Appendices:**

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule
Appendix II: Corrective Action Requests
Appendix III: Public Surveillance Audit Report
Appendix IV: Audit Matrix

**APPENDIX I**

# Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

**NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd.**

September 11, 2006

Andrew Arends, Forest Certification Coordinator
Minnesota DNR Division of Forestry
500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4044

Re: Confirmation of SFI Standard Surveillance Audit

Dear Mr. Arends,

We are scheduled to conduct the Surveillance Audit of Minnesota DNR on October 16 through 19, 2006. This is a partial review of your SFI Program to confirm that it continues to be in conformance with the SFI Standard and that continual improvement is being made. The SFI review will be in conjunction with the FSC Annual Audit. The audit team will consist of: Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR Lead Auditor, JoAnn Hanowski, Dennis Becker, and Dave Wager. Mr Wager will also lead the simultaneous FSC Annual Audit.

During the audit we will:

1. Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
2. Review selected components of your SFI program;
3. Verify effective implementation of corrective action plans;
4. Review SFI logo and/or label use;
5. Confirm public availability of public reports; and
6. Evaluate the effectiveness of planned activities aimed at continual improvement of your SFI Program.

The enclosed tentative schedule outlines the topics I expect to review during this visit. The schedule can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. I've also attached the preliminary site selections (with instructions provided separately).

Sincerely yours,

Mike Ferrucci, SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
Enclosure: Agenda for Surveillance Audit

# Agenda for Surveillance Audit
# Minnesota DNR
Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard (2005-2009)
October 16-19 2006

**Monday October 16, 2006, 6th Floor Conference Room, St. Paul Central Office**

11 am -1 pm SFI Opening Meeting/Agenda Review
Review NSF SFI Audit Procedures, Scope, Certificate, Facility Record Sheet
Discuss changes/improvements to the SFI Program, changes in operations, or changes in scope since the certification audit
Review AF&PA Survey forms and confirm public report is available to public
Review Logo or Label use issues

Noon -1 pm Mike Ferrucci SFI Program Review (working lunch)

| | |
|---|---|
| Objective 12 | Public & Landowner Involvement |
| 12.1 | Cooperative Efforts for Sustainable Forestry |
| 12.2 | Outreach, Education, Involvement |
| 12.5 | Inconsistent Practices or Concerns |
| 12.6 | Annual Reporting |
| Objective 13 | Management Review and Continual Improvement |
| 13.1 | Management Review System |

Review minutes of Management meetings

1– 3:30 pm FSC CARs
(Note schedule and order determined by MDNR)

3:30-3:45 pm Break

3:45–4:30 pm SFI Minor Non-conformances
(Note: where these align with FSC CARs the discussions will be joint.)

4:30- 4:45 Closing Meeting
Review field site visit provisions and other logistical issues

4:45 Leave for Duluth

Evening: Lodging at South Pier Inn in Duluth (for reservations call 800-430-7437)

**Tuesday October 17, 2006**

8-9:15 am Two Harbors Area Office Meeting
Introductions, Lead Auditors Briefly Describe Process
Area Forester Provides Overview (5-10 minutes)
Fisheries Overview (5-10 minutes)
Wildlife Division Overview (5-10 minutes)
Discussions

9:15 – 9:30 Organize for Field Tours

9:30- 4:30 Field Tours
Lunches to be arranged by Minnesota DNR
12:30pm – Arends and Wager split off from team to review OHV planning at the Cloquet Area Forestry Office (meet DNR staff at the Cloquet Area Forestry office at 1pm)

4:30 – 5:00 Daily Debriefing at Area Office

Evening: Drive to Orr (Merchant will drive Ferrucci and Hanowski to Orr and Arends will drive Wager to Orr), Lodging at AmericInn (for reservations call 218-757-3613)

**Wednesday October 18, 2006**

8-9 am Orr Area Office Meeting
Introductions, Lead Auditors Briefly Describe Process
Area Forester Overview / Wildlife Division Overview (5-10 minutes each)
Discussions

9– 9:15 am Organize for Field Tours

9:15- 4:30 Field Tours
Lunches to be arranged by Minnesota DNR

4:30 – 5:00 Daily Debriefing at Area Office

Evening: Drive to International Falls, Lodging at Holliday Inn (for reservations call 218-283-8000)

**Thursday October 19, 2006**

8-9 am Littlefork Area Office Meeting
Introductions, Lead Auditors Briefly Describe Process
Area Forester Overview / Wildlife Division Overview (5-10 minutes each)
Discussions

9– 9:15 am Organize for Field Tours

9:15- 2:00 Field Tours
Lunches to be arranged by Minnesota DNR

2 - 3:00 Daily Debriefing at Area Office

3:30 Lead auditors arrive I-Falls airport

## Two Harbors

**From original spreadsheet**

| Location | Acres | Start Date | Status | Action | Description | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 568W105 | | | | | Fisheries lands - was 2005 audit selection | |
| 5907w116 | 383 | | ? | | **Permit B1709: Selection harvest was 2005 audit selection, was not visited** | |
| 5708w1340954 | 50.2 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv | |
| 5806w1020006 | 67.4 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest | |
| 5807w1270329 | 107.1 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest | |
| 5906w1270171 | 25.3 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest | |
| The following | are | lower | priority | | | |
| 5907w1090173 | 30 | 7/1/2004 | Completed | PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | Planting | |
| 5907w1170272 | 4.5 | 7/1/2005 | Completed | PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | Planting | |
| 5707w1250223 | 47.7 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest | along hiking/rec. trail near Hwy.61 |

**From Actuals for Two Harbors (253) Selected Townships (Status for all: "Completed"**

| Location | Ac. | Start Date | Description | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| T05707w1160301-RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | 5.9 | 1/19/2006 | Clearcut-w/Rsrv | Easy access near Finland |
| T05707w1160301-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 5.9 | 4/13/2006 | Sale Closed | |
| T05807w1360425-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 8.5 | 2/3/2005 | Sale Closed | Cramer Road, County Route 7 |
| T05807w1360430-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 11.2 | 2/3/2005 | Sale Closed | |
| T05808w1150366-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 14.3 | 4/5/2006 | Sale Closed | Murphy city, Route 1 |
| t05808w1150778-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 13.6 | 4/5/2006 | Sale Closed | |
| t05907w1090175-PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | 30.0 | 5/21/2005 | Planting | May skip in favor of easier planting site |
| t05907w1090175-SPREP-SPREP-BRSHRAK | 30.0 | 10/11/2004 | Raking | |
| t05907w1140033-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 25.9 | 3/30/2005 | Sale Closed | Near Permit B1709 also to be visited |
| t05907w1150301-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 68.2 | 12/16/2004 | Sale Closed | Near Permit B1709 also to be visited |
| t05907w1310302-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 32.8 | 12/16/2004 | Sale Closed | |
| t05708w1100177-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 4.0 | 6/16/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| **The following are QUESTIONS, not selections:** | | | | |
| t05708w1100210-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 11.6 | 6/16/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1100211-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 11.3 | 6/16/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1100244-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 20.0 | 6/16/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1100249-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 5.5 | 6/16/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1110203-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 101 | 6/16/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1140431-RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | 115 | 10/1/2004 | CCut-w/Rsrv | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1140431-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 115 | 1/11/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1150329-PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | 9.0 | 5/6/2006 | Planting | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1150329-SPREP-SCARF-STRP | 8.8 | 8/15/2005 | Strip | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1151008-RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | 30.3 | 10/1/2004 | CCut-w/Rsrv | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1151008-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 30.3 | 1/11/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2087 visited 2005 audit? |
| t05708w1311011-TMBRSALE-TMBRSALE-SALECLOSE | 19.8 | 2/8/2006 | Sale Closed | Permit B2228 visited 2005 audit? |

# ORR

**Notes:**

1. Data provided did not include any completed timber harvests. Thus, starting with any completed sales from the lists below, please select at least one completed harvest from each of the listed towns: 6520w 65-21w 64-21w 68-21w 68-20w
   If there are no completed sales in these towns then please provide **a total of two** from nearby areas

2. We also need to see an ongoing harvest. Thus, add **a total of** two ongoing harvests in the listed towns, starting in the vicinity of the selections below.

3. Finally select from these lists about 10-12 other sites to review, including a range of activities, with some planned and most completed where possible. Priority should be given to the sites where planning for the action started more recently, although we realize that generally recently planned actions likely are not yet complete.

**From original spreadsheet**

| Location | Acres | Start_date | Status | Action | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6520w1030219 | 16.5 | 5/1/2005 | Completed | PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | Planting |
| 6520w1030550 | 5.4 | 12/6/2005 | Contracted | RHAR-REGN-EA-CCSw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv-Sprouting |
| 6520w1040173 | 22.3 | 12/6/2005 | Contracted | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCARw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv - Art Regen |
| 6520w1040202 | 8.1 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1040222 | 5 | 7/15/2006 | Not Started | SPREP-CHEM-BGRB | Broadcast-Ground |
| 6520w1040557 | 7.1 | 12/6/2005 | Contracted | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1050234 | 2 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1050246 | 7 | 9/1/2005 | Completed | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| 6520w1050265 | 9 | 9/1/2006 | Not Started | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| 6520w1060034 | 2.8 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1060047 | 8.8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-SHLT | Shelterwood |
| 6520w1060191 | 11.1 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1060269 | 21.3 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1070048 | 6 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-SHLT | Shelterwood |
| 6520w1070060 | 6.4 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1070471 | 33 | 9/1/2005 | Completed | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| 6520w1160319 | 20 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6520w1160326 | 13 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1160232 | 33.8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1160507 | 37.1 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1160515 | 19 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1160542 | 4.2 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1160568 | 7.1 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1170236 | 7.3 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1170246 | 9.2 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1170259 | 6.9 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1170549 | 42.8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1180833 | 50 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6820w1190256 | 26 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1130294 | 4.3 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1130301 | 47.3 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1130303 | 7 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1130583 | 29 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | TSI-RLS-MEC/BRSAW | Mech-Brush Saw |
| 6821w1130599 | 8 | 9/1/2006 | Not Started | PROT-MECH-BUDCAP | Bud Caps |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6821w1130616 | 6.5 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1140234 | 5.2 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1140270 | 3 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1170302 | 6.8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1170608 | 37.9 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-ST | Seed Tree |
| 6821w1180230 | 16 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1180238 | 20 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1180258 | 8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1180613 | 10.7 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1190337 | 3.7 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-ST | Seed Tree |
| 6821w1200342 | 6.8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1200352 | 24.4 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6821w1240341 | 9 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |

**Orr Area (241) Actuals Selected Townships**

| Location | Acres | Start Date | Action | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| t06520w1030219-PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | 16.5 | 5/11/2005 | PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | Planting |
| t06520w1030219-SPREP-HRB-BAER | 17 | 7/19/2004 | SPREP-CHEM-BAER | Broadcast-Aerial |
| t06520w1050246-005-PROT-ANML-REPELL | 7 | 10/14/2005 | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| t06520w1050265-005-PROT-ANML-REPELL | 9 | 10/14/2005 | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| t06520w1070471-005-PROT-ANML-REPELL | 33 | 10/14/2005 | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| t06820w1090186-SPREP-MECH-FELL | 16 | 4/10/2006 | SPREP-MECH-FELL | Felling |
| t06820w1180833-PLANT-PLANT-UNDER | 3.1 | 5/16/2006 | PLANT-PLANT-UNDER | Underplant |
| t06820w1190256-PLANT-PLANT-UNDER | 7.6 | 5/16/2006 | PLANT-PLANT-UNDER | Underplant |

## Littlefork

**Notes:**

1. Data provided did not include any completed timber harvests. Thus, starting with any completed sales from the lists below, please select at least one completed harvest from each of the listed towns: 154-25W, 155-25W, 156-25W, 67-26W.

2. If there are no completed sales in these towns then please provide **a total of two** from nearby areas

3. We also need to see an ongoing harvest. Thus, add **a total of** two ongoing (active) harvests in the selected towns, starting in the vicinity of the selections below.

4. Add to those sites, the one site below that is highlighted in yellow (15525w1331065 53 7/1/2004 Not Started RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV)

5. Select from the below lists about 6-8 other sites to review, including a range of activities, with some planned and most completed where possible. Priority should be given to the sites where planning for the action started more recently, although we realize that generally recently planned actions likely are not yet complete.

6. Finally, one or more team members would like to see some management actions that occurred within the Evergreen Pond WMA (however, nothing was listed in the data provided). Please provide a list 4 or 5 management activities that we could view within this WMA.

| **Location** | Acres | Start date | Status | Action | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **15425**w1**07**0053 | 10 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1190142 | 23.8 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1200448 | 10.4 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest |
| 15425w1260514 | 7.7 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest |
| 15425w1290188 | 45.2 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1290217 | 15.7 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1310273 | 5.9 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1310595 | 15.2 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1320245 | 11.8 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15425w1350530 | 78.1 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest |
| 15425w1350621 | 1 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| t15525w1171096-PLANT-PLANT-INTER | 4 | 5/12/2005 | Completed | PLANT-PLANT-INTER | Interplant |
| t15525w1210664-PLANT-PLANT-INTER | 7 | 5/20/2005 | Completed | PLANT-PLANT-INTER | Interplant |
| t15525w1221145-SPREP-SPREP-BRSHRAK | 34 | 4/13/2005 | Completed | SPREP-MECH-RAK | Raking |
| 15525w1331065 | 53 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| t15525w1311158-PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | 5.5 | 5/20/2005 | Completed | PLANT-PLANT-PLANT | Planting |
| t15525w1311158-SPREP-HRB-BAER | 5 | 7/17/2004 | Completed | SPREP-CHEM-BAER | Broadcast-Aerial |
| t15525w1350917-1-PROT-ANML-REPELL | 6 | 9/29/2005 | Completed | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| 15525w1340713 | 7 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | TSI-RLS-MEC/BRSAW | Mech-Brush Saw |
| 15525w1340907 | 21 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-UA-REGN-UA | Uneven Age Regen Harvest |
| 15525w1350917 | 6 | 11/3/2004 | Completed | PROT-CHEM-CHEM | Chemical |
| 15525w1360624 | 5 | 8/15/2004 | Completed | PROT-MECH-PRUNE | Pruning |
| 15625w1150687 | 6.7 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15625w1150699 | 8.1 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15625w1150702 | 15 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 15625w1340441 | 38 | 7/1/2004 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15625w1350785 | 21.5 | 4/1/2006 | Not Started | SEED-AERIAL-BRDCST | Broadcast |
| 6726w1020069 | 7 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | TSI-RLS-MEC/BRSAW | Mech-Brush Saw |
| 6726w1050028 | 16.3 | 12/2/2004 | Not Started | RHAR-REGN-EA-CCSw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv- Sprouting |
| 6726w1080147 | 5.2 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6726w1090179 | 4.2 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6726w1090186 | 9 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6726w1090187 | 8.8 | 7/1/2006 | Not Started | RHARV-REGN-EA-CCw/RSRV | Clearcut-w/Rsrv |
| 6726w1120092 | 20 | 7/1/2005 | Not Started | SPREP-MECH-SHLOW | Shearing-Lowland |
| 6726w1130057 | 5 | 7/18/2004 | Completed | SPREP-CHEM-BAER | Broadcast-Aerial |

**APPENDIX II**


# Corrective Action Requests

| | |
|---|---|
| Company/Location: Minnesota DNR Forest Service | Date: Oct 21, 2005 FRS # 6Y921 |
| Auditor: Mike Ferrucci | CAR Number: SFI-2006-01 (NEW) |
| Location of Finding: General | Previous CAR Number/Date: NA |
| Discussed with: Andrew Arends, others | Nonconformance Type: Major **Minor** |

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clause:

2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® Indicator 1.1.1: "A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation)."

Description: Subsection Forest Resource Plan (SFRMP) goals for desired future conditions of vegetation, particularly goals for proportions of various cover types over space and time, are not clearly assigned among administrative areas. This results in confusing or incomplete direction to field foresters. This is exacerbated by delays in finalizing plans and in providing training in plan implementation. Absent these goals the plans are not in conformance with the standard.

**If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:**

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

DNR SFRMPs establish numerous desired future conditions, some of which are quantifiable at the subsection level, some that are purely directional (i.e., more or less of some condition compared to current conditions) and intended to be broadly applied across the subsection, and some that can be roughly allocated to various administrative areas the boundaries of which cross into a subsection. It is difficult and frequently undesirable to assign many of the stated desired future conditions by administrative area because not enough site-level information is available during planning to do so (e.g., since cover type conversion decisions are necessarily based on on-site evaluations and conditions, it is difficult to allocate cover type conversion goals by administrative area as in a meaningful way), the future conditions are intended to be applied/achieved broadly across the entire subsection, and allocating landscape level goals back to administrative areas is considered as being counter to the original purpose and decision to plan by landscape. The decision to plan by landscape required a major conceptual shift from the administrative area-based approach used by the DNR prior to SFRMP. As such, the DNR is hesitant to incorporate efforts that might cause confusion or interfere with staff embracing a landscape approach. In addition, DNR believes that periodic implementation monitoring will be an effect tool in holding staff accountable to plan goals and direction and has directed additional staff time towards getting the monitoring process and reports operational. Communication of SFRMP desire future condition goals and strategies has been primarily through participation in the planning process and training sessions for all field staff. However, this SFRMP training has not occurred for all subsections where SFRMP direction is being implemented. Some of this is due to a desire to hold off on training until each plan is officially completed, which has taken longer than anticipated for most SFRMPs.

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Completing SFRMPs – The Mille Lacs Uplands, Agassiz Lowlands and North Shore SFRMPs will be completed by July 1, 2007.

SFRMP training - SFRMP training has been completed for Border Lakes and North Shore SFRMPs. By July 1, 2007, training will be held for Mille Lacs Uplands and Agassiz Lowlands SFRMPs.

SFRMP Implementation monitoring – by July 1, 2007, initial SFRMP implementation monitoring reports will be developed for each of subsections for which SFRMP direction has been implemented. This implementation monitoring information will help determine progress towards desired future conditions and implementing key strategies by subsection. Contributions by administrative areas towards some subsection goals/strategies will also be monitored, recognizing that resources (i.e., opportunities) are not necessarily equally distributed among administrative areas. DNR intends to use mo

Allocation of SFRMP Goals by Administrative Area – By May 1, 2007 DNR will identify the SFRMP desire future condition goals that will be allocated in some manner by Division of Forestry administrative area versus those where staff will be held accountable primarily via SFRMP implementation monitoring (e.g., to gauge relative contributions by administrative area). In most cases where "goals" are allocated by administrative areas, they will be provided as rough proportionate estimates for gauging relative progress during implementation monitoring. Allocation of subsection goals by administrative area, as determined above, will be done as part of or upon completion of the each SFRMP plan. For SFRMPs already completed, this will be done to the extent possible.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Completing SFRMPs – Additional process revisions were identified this past summer. These will be put into place with start of the next SFRMPs (e.g., final four NE subsections). An external (i.e., conducted by an outside consultant) SFRMP process review and recommendations will be completed by the end of May 2007. Additional planning and administrative support will be in place by March 1, 2007 for the Chippewa Plains –Pine Moraines SFRMP, completing the Mille Lacs Uplands and North Shore SFRMPs, and preparing for and starting the final four NE subsections process (likely to begin in May 2007).

SFRMP Training: Training will be provided to field staff once the decision is made to begin implementing the strategic direction (i.e., desired future condition, strategies) from an SFRMP. Beginning in 2007, area annual stand exam list review meetings (involving Forestry, Fish & Wildlife and Eco-Services staff) will include a review of direction from applicable SFRMPs, with emphasis on any areas of concern arising from the initial monitoring reports. Brief SFRMP field guides will be provided to field staff as a day-to-day reference for important SFRMP desired conditions, strategies and associated site-level considerations.

SFRMP Implementation Monitoring – SFRMP implementation reports will be generated periodically following completion of the plan. SFRMP teams will reconvene as necessary to address areas of concern identified by the monitoring process. Corrective measures (e.g., additional training, resources, guidance) will be applied as needed to address identified concerns with implementation progress.

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

The lead auditor generally accepts the explanation of the nature and intent of subsection planning and its relationship to administrative areas outlined in the root cause analysis. Further, the corrective and preventive actions outlined in parts 2 and three are responsive to the CAR, particularly in light of the more nuanced understanding of the role of subsection goals in planning. The implementation of these actions will be reviewed during the 2007 surveillance audit, with a strong focus on understanding how this collection of actions has and will be expected to address the overall concern about the effective implementation of landscape-derived goals.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci January 8, 2007

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____

**STATUS LEGEND: OPEN**=CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED**=CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Company/Location: Minnesota DNR Forest Service | Date: July 15, 2005 FRS # 6Y921 |
| Auditor: Mike Ferrucci | CAR Number: MF-2005-01 |
| Location of Finding: St. Paul, MN (office) | Previous CAR Number/Date: 2005-01 |
| Discussed with: Andrew Arends, Forest Cert. Team | Nonconformance Type: Major **Minor** |

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number & Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® Indicator 10.1.4: Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.

Description: MN DNR does not require any particular level of training for harvesting contractors.

**IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:**

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

In the past, MNDNR has considered implementing a training requirement as part of the requirement for bidding on State of Minnesota timber sales, but Minnesota's Attorney General determined that the DNR could not place any such restrictions on the purchase of state timber. However, Minnesota's Logger Education Program (MLEP), has determined that currently some 90 percent of DNR timber is harvested by MLEP members. This situation has changed somewhat with the introduction in 2005 of "Responsible Bidder" requirements that limit bidding on state timber to persons deemed to be fiscally responsible for the purposes of operating on State of Minnesota land.

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Prior to the October 2005 field assessment, Minnesota DNR submitted a 2006 Preliminary Legislative Proposal intended to amend Minn. Statute Chapter 90 to, "proactively address weaknesses identified by third party auditors during the current forest management certification process [the pre-assessment meetings] by a) designating training, insurance, and liability qualifications for timber sale purchasers . . . ." This Legislative Proposal has broad support and is expected to pass during the 2006 Legislative session.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

In addition to the preventive and corrective actions stated under (2) above, Minnesota DNR personnel have agreed to develop language for inclusion in the proposed legislation that defines Field Operators, Resource Operators, and Timber Sale Operators, and makes a distinctions among them for the purposes of bidding on, and operating on, forest lands administered by the State of Minnesota. Field Operators include Resource Operators and Timber Sale Operators. The proposed definition of Resource Operator is, "Any person(s) or company who, in pursuit of independent business: purchases the right to extract a resource from State of Minnesota lands; and/or conducts the field operations necessary to extract the resource purchased." In this sense the definition of Resource Operators will include Timber Sale Operators. Timber Sale Operators are separately defined as, "any person(s) or company who in pursuit of independent business, conducts logging and supports field operations on land administered by the State of Minnesota in order to extract timber resources purchased under a State Permit to Cut Timber." These clearer role and responsibility definitions will enable the development of specific and appropriate fiscal, performance, and training requirements for each separate role related to operation on state-administered forest land. We anticipate the development of agreed-upon language regarding specific fiscal, performance, and training requirements for these roles during 2006, after engaging in the appropriate inter-division discussion and review of the proposed language.

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

Approved – this is a comprehensive and responsive plan.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci January 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

The plan has been implemented fully, except for some minor provisions for contracts signed before the law was changed.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci 10-19-06

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Company/Location: Minnesota DNR Forest Service | Date: Oct 19, 2005 FRS # 6Y921 |
| Auditor: Mike Ferrucci | CAR Number: MF-2005-02 |
| Location of Finding: General | Previous CAR Number/Date: NA |
| Discussed with: Andrew Arends, Forest Certification team | Nonconformance Type (underline): Major **Minor** |

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® Performance Measure 2.1: Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regen. methods within five years. Indicator 2.1.2: Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration.

Description: There is a need to improve the understanding and consistent implementation of regeneration survey policies and to ensure that the requirements of Performance Measure 2.1 are met. Regeneration survey protocols that call for surveys at 1 and 10 years may not ensure that regeneration at desired levels is achieved within five years. Furthermore, the five year regeneration target is not always met in Jack Pine regeneration treatments, and composition targets are not always met in Birch stands. The exception for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations should be noted in the Corrective Action Plan.

**If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:**

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

Regeneration surveys are generally done at 1-, 3-, 5-, and 10-year time periods. The 1- and 10-year regeneration standards surveys are used to measure regeneration against a statewide standard. The 3- and 5-year surveys, and in some areas a 7-year survey, are used to monitor the progress of the regeneration effort and to take action if it appears the 10 year standard will not be attained. Policy for survey timing is addressed both in the Regeneration Standards and the Development Manual. The SFI standard to assure regeneration "at desired levels" within 5 years is being addressed. However, because there are regeneration surveys prescribed by the Regeneration Standards and the Development Manual, there is confusion in the field as to what is required. The struggles with regenerating jack pine in the Bemidji Area are well known. High deer populations, the regular occurrence of jack pine budworm, and frequently recurring drought cycles have all contributed to the difficulty in regenerating jack pine. For the birch composition concern, more details will need to be known so that a determination of where this is occurring, under what circumstances, and the magnitude of this issue can be determined.

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Action 1: By July 1, 2006, review and revise the Regeneration Standards that will ensure that the division can determine after the 5th growing season whether or not regeneration is on target to meet the 10-year Regeneration Standards.

Action 2: By July 1, 2006, update/revise the Forest Development manual. Meld together the Regeneration Standards and the regeneration survey timing and purpose in the Development Manual to reduce the appearance of two approaches to regeneration surveys. And, by December 31, 2006 post the manual on the DNR Intranet so that all have easy access to the information.

Action 3: By December 31, 2006, communicated policies and procedures to the field through annual regional field tours, periodic Area Program Leader meetings, and an annual statewide silviculture meeting.

Action 4: By July 1, 2006, form a regeneration "SWAT" team to analyze the regeneration program and results in the Bemidji Area where jack pine regeneration efforts have not met the 5-year regeneration goals. The swat team would consist of region and area silviculturists who have experience in jack pine regeneration, forest ecologist, forest health specialist, and a wildlife manger experienced in managing deer in forested areas in northern Minnesota. By March 31, 2007, produce a report as to cause and recommended actions based on SWAT team's analyses.

Action 5: By December 31, 2006, define the scope of the issue of not meeting composition goals in birch stands so that strategies can be developed to address the situation.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

See above.

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

Approved – this is a comprehensive and responsive plan; some elements go beyond 1 year, but key provisions that are to be completed by 2006 Surveillance Audit are sufficient to close if implemented.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci January 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

The plan has been implemented fully, except for some minor provisions for contracts signed before the law was changed.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci 10-19-06

**STATUS LEGEND: OPEN** = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Company/Location: Minnesota DNR Forest Service | Date: Oct 19, 2005 FRS # 6Y921 |
| Auditor: Peter Bundy, Mike Ferrucci | CAR Number: PB-2005-03 |
| Location of Finding: General | Previous CAR Number/Date: NA |
| Discussed with: Andrew Arends, Mike Altman, and others | Nonconformance Type (underline): Major **Minor** |

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number & Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® Indicator 3.2.3: Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Description: At Deer River harvest X3499 riparian management zones were lacking at two locations near open-water wetlands. BMPs (FRC Site Level Guidelines) recommend a fifty-foot riparian management zone. At three locations the Basal Area was reduced to less than 10 square feet of basal area per acre. Blue painted sale boundary was at the edge of water. At one site (Tower B2020) unauthorized road use contributed to the failure of waterbars, allowing sheet erosion to occur on a spur logging road. At another site (Hanson's Creek Snowmobile Bridge and trail at Red Lake WMA) illegal ORV use has caused rutting in the trail and the wet meadow that is part of the riparian area, which is also a known location of a Minnesota-threatened rare plant, the "Least White Water Lily". In some cases failure to quickly close logging roads after the completion of harvests contributes to ORV-related damage to streams and wetland areas. A review of Timber Sales Inspection Results – FY04 revealed that Riparian Zones were accurately and clearly marked in 83% of the cases, and that 9% of harvests had harvesting within the RMZ that did not meet the Site-level guidelines.

**If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:**

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

Part of this issue relates to some confusion about the different situations where filter strips are required and when RMZs are required. There is also some confusion about what constitutes an open-water wetlands needing an RMZ (type 3,4,and 5 wetlands). In Minnesota, much of our timber is appraised in frozen ground conditions, and when there can be many inches of snow on the ground. That can make it difficult to recognize where filter strips or RMZ are required. The issue of OHV damage in streams in wetlands and streams after logging is due primarily to the rapid proliferation of these machines, and the need to take quick action in closing, and blocking logging roads at the completion of the harvest.

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Monitoring the appropriate use of RMZs and filter strips was an area of focus in our timber sales inspection effort, and according to FY05 timber sales inspection results, 96% of the riparian management zones were accurately identified and located. To help improve the appropriate location of RMZs, the Department will investigate and implement on a pilot basis (in Aitkin County) an effort to integrate the National Wetlands Inventory as a theme within our ArcGIS system, to help appraisers know if a mapped Type 3,4, or 5 wetland is within or adjacent to a proposed timber sale. In addition, we will continue to stress the appropriate use of filter strips and RMZs, in our annual timber sales design training, and monitor use in our timber sales inspection system. Ongoing training and development will begin in December, and extend throughout calendar 2006.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY –** Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Same as above

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

Approved – provisions should be sufficient to address issues if implemented.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci January 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

The plan has been effectively implemented, given inspection results and observations during 2006 Surveillance Audit. Increased enforcement of OHV rules should help protect wetlands.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci 10-19-06

**STATUS LEGEND: OPEN** = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Company/Location: Minnesota DNR Forest Service | Date: Oct 19, 2005 FRS # 6Y921 |
| Auditor: JoAnn Hanowski, Mike Ferrucci | CAR Number: JH-2005-04 |
| Location of Finding: General | Previous CAR Number/Date: NA |
| Discussed with: Andrew Arends, Forest Cert. team | Nonconformance Type: Major **Minor** |

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number & Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ® Indicator 4.1.4: Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (snags, down woody debris, mast den & nest trees).

Description: Inconsistent application of the retention (green tree) guidelines is apparent, with some projects meeting the guidelines well. In many cases the individually retained trees did not meet the guidelines for the size of retained trees, the type of retained trees (selection for wind firmness). Clumped retention does not meet the intent of the guidelines in cases where pockets of smaller, generally unmerchantable trees were the main or sole component of the retained clump, island, or cluster. The internal audit report "Timber Sales Inspection Results FY04" confirms these observations regarding inconsistent application of Site-level guidelines for leave trees and reserves. Further, unique stand-level legacy features (for example very large, old trees, some of which contained potentially useful structural features) may not be afforded sufficient protection.

**If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:**

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

The certification audit and our own internal monitoring indicate that while we, in most cases, meet the letter of guideline, we may be falling short of the intent. We believe this may be an effort toward efficiency among field staff to reserve certain species, or clumps that are more easily identified by the forester (i.e reserve all red maple, reserve lowland ash swale).

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

In our on-going training of field staff in guideline application, and in our reports of timber sales monitoring we will highlight the need to establish reserves first, focusing on clumps that can meet multiple management objectives (wildlife habitat, biodiversity, visual quality, etc). Minnesota's "Site Level Guidelines" suggest that retaining leave trees in clumps is the preferred method to meeting the retention requirement. If that option is not possible to the extent required, that individual green tree retention will be used, with the intent of reserving those trees and species that have the highest wildlife habitat values, offering a range of ages, and sizes. Our annual timber sales monitoring will help us track compliance and improvement in this area.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY – Same as above, #2**

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

Approved – provisions should be sufficient to address issues if implemented.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci January 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

The plan has been implemented. Field staff interviewed in the 2006 Surveillance Audit and planned/implemented projects reviewed provided ample evidence that understanding of the spirit and intent of green tree retention provisions of the MFRC Guidelines are significantly improved.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, JoAnn Hanowski 10-19-06

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Company/Location: Minnesota DNR Forest Service | Date: Oct 20, 2005 FRS # 6Y921 |
| Auditor: Mike Ferrucci, Peter Bundy | CAR Number: MF-2005-05 |
| Location of Finding: General (internal monitoring, field sites) | Previous CAR Number/Date: NA |
| Discussed with: Andrew Arends, Others | Nonconformance Type (underline): Major **Minor** |

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®
Indicator 2.3.3 Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.

Description: Erosion control techniques designed to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity are not consistently applied correctly, as evidenced by observations during the certification audit and by internal monitoring reports. Field observations at completed or active harvest sites confirmed that the FRC site-level guidelines (the DNR's standard) for soil control techniques to minimize soil disturbance are generally, but not always, followed or effective. At one field site (see CAR PB-2005-01 under 3.2.3) a filter strip was not present as specified in the BMPs. At another site (Tower X2020) unauthorized road use contributed to the failure of waterbars, allowing sheet erosion to occur on a spur logging road. A review of "Timber Sales Inspection Results – FY04" which provided internal Minnesota DNR monitoring results revealed that needed water diversion structures were appropriately placed in only 35% of the cases.

**IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:**

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**–Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

Though provided as part of standardized BMP training this issue was identified through our internal monitoring in FY04. There appears to be several root causes: 1 Some erosion and soil loss occurred after the sale was completed. Our foresters, in some cases did not anticipate the erosion potential, and did not direct loggers to take appropriate mitigations steps before they left the sale. 2. Unauthorized OHV use damaged access roads that were to be used only for forest management purposes after the sale was completed.

**CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

When the results of the FY04 monitoring was summarized, and this systematic issue became apparent, a series of presentations and communications with timber sales administrators, region and area staff focused on this issue, and requested more attention be paid to this area for improvement. Practices such a redistributing slash on potential erosion areas, and making a more concerted effort to block access to temporary logging roads were stressed, along with other mitigation practices. The results of the FY05 monitoring showed that water diversion structures were appropriately placed in 65%, up from 40% in FY04, of the situations where they were required. This is a substantial improvement, but not yet to the level that we believe is possible or satisfactory. Future training and communications will continue to highlight this issue.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Same as above, #2

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

Approved – provisions should held to address issues if implemented.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci January 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

The plan has been implemented. Observations and discussions confirm that the elements of the plan are being attempted. The issue regarding recreational use of logging roads is difficult and not conclusively solved – future audits will revisit the issue. General BMP compliance rates are improving; an OFI was issued and progress in improving these rates will be part of future Surveillance Audits.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci 10-20-06

**STATUS LEGEND: OPEN** = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

## APPENDIX III

# Minnesota DNR SFI Surveillance Audit Report 2006

The Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Program of the Minnesota DNR has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2005-2009 Edition, according to the NSF-International Strategic Registration SFIS Certification Audit Process.

NSF-ISR initially certified Minnesota DNR to the SFIS on December 2, 2005. This report describes the first annual follow-up Surveillance Audit designed to focus on changes in the standard, changes in operations, the management review system, and efforts at continuous improvement. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review.

Minnesota DNR manages 4.9 million acres of state lands throughout Minnesota, following an interdisciplinary approach designed to integrate the harvesting of forest products, the provision of wildlife habitat, the protection of special sites, and the provision of extensive recreational opportunities. These lands encompass a variety of forest types, including aspen, white, red, and jack pine, mixed lowland conifers, oak-hickory, and northern hardwoods. A variety of forest products are produced, including timber, pulpwood, firewood, cabin logs, poles, and other specialty products.

The surveillance audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 16 to 19, 2006 by an audit team including Dave Wager, JoAnn Hanowski and Dr. Dennis Becker, and headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor. Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits contained in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ). The objective of the audit was to assess continuing conformance of the department's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009 Edition.

The scope of the SFIS Audit included "Forest management on Minnesota DNR's lands throughout Minnesota, including forestry lands, wildlife lands except for the Prairie Province, Lake County fisheries lands, and Land Utilization Project (LUP) Lands, and related sustainable forestry activities covered under the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard". Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since the previous field audit conducted in October of 2005. A sample of operations since that time was reviewed to ensure that SFI requirements were met. In addition, a subset of SFI obligations to promote sustainable forestry practices, to seek legal compliance, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were reexamined during the audit. Use of the SFI logo and the requirement to provide a public of audit reports were also reviewed.

The published indicators of the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard were the basis for the certification review. All of the SFI Performance Measures within Objective 8

involving procurement of wood were outside of the scope of the Minnesota DNR's SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit. Indicator 3.2.5 was also not applicable because Minnesota has published Best Management Practices (BMPs). No indicators were modified.

## SFIS Surveillance Audit Process

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol designed to enable the audit team determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities were provided to the auditor in advance, and a sample of the available audit evidence was designated by the auditor for review.

The possible findings for specific SFI requirements included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS. Surveillance Audits generally focus on conformance issues and do not generally address exceptional practices.

## Overview of Audit Findings

Minnesota DNR's SFI Program was found to be in full conformance with the SFIS Standard. The NSF-ISR Audit team reviewed all previous minor non-conformances and corrective action plans implemented by Minnesota DNR and closed them, as follows:

1: Indicator 10.1.4 *"Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities."* Minnesota DNR has established training requirements for harvesting contractors.

2: Indicator 2.1.2 *"Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration."* The regeneration survey methods and stocking requirements have been synchronized, additional information and training has bee provided, and field staff demonstrated understanding and consistent implementation of regeneration survey policies to ensure that the five year regeneration target is met, where appropriate.

3: Indicator 3.2.3 *"Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies."* Riparian protection BMPs implementation rates have improved, based on field sites visited during the audit and monitoring reports.

4: Indicator 4.1.4 *"Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat."* Training and emphasis on the Minnesota Forest Resource Council's Site-Level Guidelines for green tree retention have significantly improved results for individually retained trees and trees retained in clumps.

5: Indicator 2.3.3 *"Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity."* Internal monitoring reports and observations during the certification audit showed that rates of correct application of erosion control techniques are increasing.

The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Process determined that there was one new minor non-conformance under 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® Indicator 1.1.1 for long-term analysis and planning:

- Subsection Forest Resource Plan (SFRMP) goals for desired future conditions of vegetation, particularly goals for proportions of various cover types over space and time, are not clearly assigned among administrative areas. This results in confusing or incomplete direction to field foresters. This is exacerbated by delays in finalizing plans and in providing training in plan implementation.

Minnesota DNR has developed plans to address these new issues. Progress in implementing the sole remaining open corrective action plan will be reviewed in subsequent surveillance audits.

Eight opportunities for improvement were also identified. These findings do not indicate a current deficiency, but served to alert the Minnesota DNR to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention.

- Indicator 2.3.3 requires the use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity. There is an opportunity to improve BMP implementation rates on logging roads that have been stabilized following completion of harvests. Failure to quickly close logging roads after the completion of harvests contributes to OHV-related damage by recreational users.

- Indicator 3.1.1 requires a program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities. There is an opportunity to improve rates of BMP compliance.

- Indicator 4.1.6 requires support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership. There is an opportunity to improve the mapping of designated old-growth on state forest lands.

- Indicator 4.1.7 requires participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities. There is an opportunity to improve in the area of prevention for invasive plants potentially spread by motor vehicles of all types.

- Indicator 4.1.8 requires the incorporation of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate. There is an opportunity to improve in the use of prescribed fire on special forested sites.

- Indicator 4.2.2 requires a methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions. There is an opportunity to improve by completing updates to the forest/wildlife guidelines.

- Indicator 10.1.3 requires staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. There is an opportunity to improve in the training of foresters in the intent and implementation of management plans.

- Indicator 13.1.2 requires a system for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures. There is an opportunity to improve by developing protocols and a charge for the recently assembled internal audit team.

The Minnesota DNR has also improved its program for the management of certified lands as follows:

- Implementing an "Internal Audit" program;
- Reorganizing to reduce the number of forestry regions to 3;
- Hiring additional field foresters and regional manager positions in Ecological Services;
- Implementing legislation for logger training and horse trail fee and funding;
- Leadership by the Wildlife Division in land acquisition; and
- Purchasing and preparing to change to Woodstock/Stanley growth model.

NSF-ISR also confirmed that forestry practices on Minnesota DNR's lands continue to exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard in the following areas:

- Minnesota DNR's programs in forest health and protection are exemplary examples of Integrated Pest Management.
- A significant array of measures to protect rare, threatened, or endangered species was demonstrated.
- Clearcut size is far lower than the 120-acre maximum average.
- The management and protection of special sites is a program strength relative to the SFI Standard.
- The Minnesota DNR has made significant investments in science and technology, particularly for tools related to site classification and landscape scale analysis to support management decisions.

This program is being audited under the standard surveillance audit option provided in the SFI program. The next surveillance audit is scheduled for September 2007.

## Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

**1. Sustainable Forestry**
To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitat, recreation, and aesthetics.

**2. Responsible Practices**
To use and to promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally, and socially responsible.

**3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity**
To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

**4. Forest Health and Productivity**
To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

**5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity**
To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

**6. Protection of Water Resources**
To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

**7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity**
To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, and ecological or natural community types.

**8. Legal Compliance**
To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

**9. Continual Improvement**
To continually improve the practice of forest management and also to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

*Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition*

### For Additional Information Contact:

Mike Ferrucci
SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
26 Commerce Drive
North Branford, CT 06471
203-887-9248 mferrucci@iforest.com

Andrew Arends
Forest Certification Program Leader
Minnesota DNR Division of Forestry
500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4044
651-259-5261 andrew.arends@dnr.state.mn.us

**APPENDIX IV**


# Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR auditors use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Indicator. If a non-conformance is found the auditor shall fully document the reasons on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. N/A in the Auditor column indicates that the associated Performance Measure or Indicator does not apply. Findings are indicated by a date or date code: Audit Date October 2006 Date Code 6

**Objective 1: To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term harvest levels based on the use of the best scientific information available.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | *- - - Indicate Only One - - -* | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***1.1*** | ***Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.*** | | | | | | |
| 1.1.1 | A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including:<br>a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory;<br>b. a land classification system;<br>c. soils inventory and maps, where available;<br>d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities;<br>e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS);<br>f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and<br>g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation). | MF | | | | 6 | |
| 1.1.2 | Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan. | | | | | | |
| 1.1.3 | A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 1.1.4 | Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 1.1.5 | Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans. | MF | 6 | | | | |

**Objective 2: To ensure long-term forest productivity and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | *- - - Indicate Only One - - -* | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***2.1*** | ***Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.1.1 | Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.1.2 | Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.1.3 | Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.1.4 | Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.1.5 | Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***2.2*** | ***Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.*** | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 | Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.2.2 | Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.2.3 | Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.2.4 | Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible. | MF | | 6 | | | |
| 2.2.5 | Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.2.6 | Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example: adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; public road access controlled during and after applications; streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper … | MF | 6 | | | | |

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 2.2.6 | …equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other waterbodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species | | | | | | |
| ***2.3*** | ***Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.3.1 | Use of soils maps where available. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.3.2 | Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.3.3 | Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity. | MF | | | | | 6 |
| 2.3.4 | Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails). | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.3.5 | Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.3.6 | Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.3.7 | Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***2.4*** | ***Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.4.1 | Program to protect forests from damaging agents. | MF | | 6 | | | |
| 2.4.2 | Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 2.4.3 | Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***2.5*** | ***Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.*** | | | | | | |
| 2.5.1 | Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology. | | | | | | |

**Objective 3: To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***3.1*** | ***Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.1.1 | Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities. | MF | 6 | | | | 6 |
| 3.1.2 | Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.1.3 | Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.). | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.1.4 | Monitoring of overall BMP implementation. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***3.2*** | ***Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.2.1 | Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.2.2 | Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.2.3 | Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.2.4 | Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 3.2.5 | Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures. | N.A. | | | | | |

**Objective 4: Manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape- level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals including aquatic fauna.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - *Indicate Only One* - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***4.1*** | ***Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.*** | | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 | Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels. | JH | 6 | | | | |
| 4.1.2 | Program to protect threatened and endangered species. | MF | | 6 | | | |
| 4.1.3 | Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies | | | | | | |
| 4.1.4 | Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees). | JH | 6 | | | | |
| 4.1.5 | Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives. | | | | | | |
| 4.1.6 | Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership. | JH | 6 | | | | 6 |
| 4.1.7 | Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities. | JH | 6 | | | | 6 |
| 4.1.8 | Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate. | MF | 6 | | | | 6 |
| ***4.2*** | ***Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.*** | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| 4.2.1 | Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support. | | | | | | |
| 4.2.2 | A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions. | JH | 6 | | | | 6 |

**Objective 5: To manage the visual impact of harvesting and other forest operations.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***5.1*** | ***Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.*** | | | | | | |
| 5.1.1 | Program to address visual quality management. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 5.1.2 | Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***5.2*** | ***Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.*** | | | | | | |
| 5.2.1 | Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes. | MF | | 6 | | | |
| 5.2.2 | Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size. | | | | | | |
| ***5.3*** | ***Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.*** | | | | | | |
| 5.3.1 | Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods. | | | | | | |
| 5.3.2 | Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods. | | | | | | |
| 5.3.3 | Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant. | | | | | | |

**Objective 6: To manage Program Participant lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***6.1.*** | ***Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.*** | MF | | 6 | | | |
| 6.1.1 | Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities. | MF | | 6 | | | |
| 6.1.2 | Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites. | MF | | 6 | | | |

**Objective 7: To promote the efficient use of forest resources.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***7.1*** | ***Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and "in-woods" manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.*** | | | | | | |
| 7.1.1 | Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure<br>a. landings left clean with little waste;<br>b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests;<br>c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization;<br>d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material;<br>e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose;<br>f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood;<br>g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or<br>h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets). | MF | 6 | | | | |

**N.A. Objective 8: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs.**

**Objective 9: To improve forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sound forest management decisions are based.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | *- - - Indicate Only One - - -* | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***9.1*** | ***Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.*** | | | | | | |
| 9.1.1 | Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include some or all of the following issues:<br>a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions;<br>b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management;<br>c. water quality;<br>d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels;<br>e. conservation of biological diversity; and<br>f. effectiveness of BMPs. | MF | | 6 | | | |
| ***9.2*** | ***Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.*** | | | | | | |
| 9.2.1 | Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of<br>a. regeneration assessments;<br>b. growth-and-drain assessments;<br>c. BMP implementation and compliance; and<br>d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners. | MF | | 6 | | | |

**Objective 10: To improve the practice of sustainable forest management by resource professionals, logging professionals, and contractors through appropriate training and education programs.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - *Indicate Only One* - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***10.1*** | ***Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 10.1.1 | Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 10.1.2 | Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 10.1.3 | Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. | MF | | | | | 6 |
| 10.1.4 | Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***10.2*** | ***Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 10.2.1 | Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address<br>a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program;<br>b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement;<br>c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics;<br>d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat;<br>e. logging safety;<br>f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws;<br>g. transportation issues;<br>h. business management; and<br>i. public policy and outreach. | MF | 6 | | | | |

**Objective 11: Commitment to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***11.1*** | ***Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.*** | | | | | | |
| 11.1.1 | Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 11.1.2 | System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 11.1.3 | Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information. | | | | | | |
| 11.1.4 | Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology. | | | | | | |
| ***11.2*** | ***Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 11.2.1 | Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures,<br>workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know,<br>prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety. | MF | 6 | | | | |

**Objective 12: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry and publicly report progress.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - *Indicate Only One* - - - FC | EXR | Maj | Min | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***12.1*** | ***Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.1.1 | Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.1.2 | Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.1.3 | Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.1.4 | Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements). | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.1.5 | Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***12.2*** | ***Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.*** | | | | | | |
| 12.2.1 | Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs). | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.2.2 | Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as<br>a. field tours, seminars, or workshops;<br>b. educational trips;<br>c. self-guided forest management trails; or<br>d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters; or<br>e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts. | | | | | | |
| 12.2.3 | Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives. | MF | 6 | | | | |

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - Indicate Only One - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***12.3*** | ***Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.3.1 | Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.3.2 | Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***12.4*** | ***Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.4.1 | Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to<br>a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge;<br>b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and<br>c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***12.5*** | ***Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.5.1 | Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.5.2 | Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| ***12.6*** | ***Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.*** | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.6.1* | Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.<br>(*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.) | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.6.2 | Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 12.6.3 | Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard | MF | 6 | | | | |

**Objective 13: To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.**

| Performance Measure/ Indicator | | Audit-or | - - - *Indicate Only One* - - - | | | | OFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FC | EXR | Maj | Min | |
| ***13.1**** | ***Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.*** (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.) | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 13.1.1 | System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. | MF | 6 | | | | |
| 13.1.2 | System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures. | MF | | | | | 6 |
| 13.1.3 | Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance. | MF | 6 | | | | |

| Require-ment | Audit Notes |
|---|---|
| ***1.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans."*** |
| 1.1.1 | "A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS);<br>f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation)."<br>• **Minor Non-conformance SFI-2006-01:** Subsection Forest Resource Plan (SFRMP) goals for desired future conditions of vegetation, particularly goals for proportions of various cover types over space and time, are not clearly assigned among administrative areas. This results in confusing or incomplete direction to field foresters. This is exacerbated by delays in finalizing plans and in providing training in plan implementation<br>• Minnesota DNR is beginning to transition to Woodstock-Stanley for spatially-explicit harvest planning; challenges exist in determining appropriate growth curves, with industry favoring more harvests based on different yield curves |
| 1.1.2 | "Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan."<br>• |
| 1.1.3 | "A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth."<br>• The Minnesota DNR has set targets for acres to be re-inventoried annually. Confirmed recent increased efforts to keep stand inventory current, updates to CSA inventory on an ongoing basis when stands are regenerated or when they are expected to reach conditions suited to silvicultural treatment. Harvest levels are then determined annually based on the acres appraised (set up for sale), which is a subset of the stands selected for review during either SFRMP or Interim Planning.<br>• Confirmed that each area visited participated in inventory updates. |
| 1.1.4 | "Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests."<br>• A total of 63,095 acres were updated in FY03<br>• 102,504 acres were updated in FY04.<br>• FY05 completed 128,000 acres of re-inventory<br>• FY06 completed 116,000 acres of re-inventory (111% of target)<br>• The MDNR annual statewide goal is 104,000 per year. |
| 1.1.5 | "Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans. "<br>• Goals in the North Shore and Border Lakes SFRMPs include restoration of conifer stands. Confirmed by field observations at regeneration sites visited that significant and effective investments are being made to ensure regeneration of white spruce and of pines (white, jack, Norway) including site preparation, planting, release, and protection from deer browse damage.<br>• Confirmed effective system for tracking and implementing stand-level projects and prescriptions by review of documentation and cross-checking with field visits. |
| ***2.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.*** |
| 2.1.1 | "Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration. "<br>• All field sites involving regeneration treatments had clear goals documented |
| 2.1.2 | "Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration."<br>• Closed Minor Non-conformance MF-2005-2; refer to the CAR form for details.<br>• Confirmed use of "Inventory of Regeneration Site" form which includes data on % of plots stocked, number of trees per acre, heights, and composition of crop tree species and competition species, as well as significant damage.<br>• Review of regeneration treatments confirmed that sites are being regularly monitored, that most |

| | |
|---|---|
| | sites are regenerating according to original plans, and that actions are taken when needed to supplement natural regeneration or less successful plantings. |
| 2.1.3 | "Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk."<br>• Field observations confirmed that exotics are not planted. |
| 2.1.4 | "Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest. "<br>• Field observations confirmed. |
| 2.1.5 | "Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested."<br>• SFRMP (overall plans), stand selection, and harvest approval processes include input from ecologists and biologists. Conversions (see 1.1.5 above) are driven by ecological restoration goals that link to landscape goals (from Minnesota Forest Resource Council planning and SFRMP process). Ecological impacts are the key issue in these analyses. |
| ***2.2*** | ***"Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.*** |
| 2.2.1 | "Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives."<br>• Foresters are careful to take full advantage of harvesting approaches that minimize the need for chemical site preparation, such as requiring loggers to pile (and burn) slash or more commonly distribute slash and incorporate it back into the soil by requiring the use of multiple skid corridors spread throughout the site (Example: Two Harbors Stop 2). |
| 2.2.2<br>2.2.3 | "Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective."<br>"Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements."<br>• Choice of site preparation and release chemicals (Accord, Garlon) and deer repellent (Plantskyd) indicate conformance with these two indicators. |
| 2.2.4 | "Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible."<br>• Exceeds the Requirement: Minnesota DNR's programs in forest health and protection are exemplary examples of Integrated Pest Management.<br>• Stands are managed to maintain healthy conditions, which is particularly effective in conifer stands. Examples include treating most jack pine stands before they are unhealthy, attention to and strong knowledge of IPM for mistletoe in black spruce.<br>• Forest health specialists on staff; they are readily available to field foresters; field foresters exhibited good working knowledge of potential pest problems and preventative measures. |
| 2.2.5 | "Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators."<br>• Confirmed that Licensed applicators are on staff for the Orr Area and Littlefork Area<br>• Two Harbors: Certified pesticide applicators in the Two Harbors area are Paul Moran, Brad Berg, Rob Fasteland and John Bachar. |
| 2.2.6 | "Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example …"<br>• Review of documentation for sites visited which had recent chemical applications confirmed numerous practices including careful planning, review of sites, notifications of neighbors. |
| ***2.3*** | ***Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.*** |
| 2.3.1<br>2.3.2 | "Use of soils maps where available."<br>"Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance."<br>• Confirmed by field observations, review of documentation, and interviews with foresters that planning includes review of maps and site conditions, increasing use of ECS as a site classification tool, and multidisciplinary reviews. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.3.3 | "Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity."<br>• Closed Minor Non-conformance MF-2005-; refer to the CAR form for details.<br>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited that erosion control measures are used (planning, avoidance, waterbars, slash distribution). However on one site post harvest use of the access road by recreational users (likely primarily hunters) has worn down the water bar such that it no longer functions effectively. This issue will be revisited during future Surveillance Audits.<br>• FY05 internal monitoring showed 65% Compliance and FY06 showed 78% compliance; Appears to be an item of attention and an interest in improving compliance<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve BMP implementation rates on logging roads that have been stabilized following completion of harvests. Failure to quickly close logging roads after the completion of harvests contributes to OHV-related damage by recreational users. |
| 2.3.4 | "Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails)."<br>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited. |
| 2.3.5 | "Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area."<br>• Confirmed by field observations at all partial harvesting sites visited. Exceptions involved leaving non-vigorous trees for biodiversity and habitat reasons. |
| 2.3.6 | Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.<br>• Reviewed new document on rutting criteria (DNR Forest land Rutting Guidelines), which starts with "The following rutting standards have been developed to provide staff foresters, and timber sales administrators with measurable metrics for applying the rutting guidelines to forest management activities on DNR administered state lands." The guidelines include provisions defining depth, length or percentage of road length impacted, and location on the landscape.<br>• Contracts, forester judgment, and MFRC Site Level Guidelines also provide criteria.<br>• To review again in 2007, with focus on new rutting criteria. |
| 2.3.7 | Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.<br>• Few new roads are constructed, beyond re-use of winter roads.<br>• Review of road budget information indicates that funding for road maintenance has been variable, ranging from 33% of requested amounts up to 85%. FY 2006 funding at Two Harbors was increased significantly from FY2005, which was low compared to prior years. For Orr funding in 2006 was slightly reduced from 2005, and is about one-third of request. At Littlefork FY 2006 funding was 25% of requested.<br>• I have the road budget Info you wanted for the Littlefork Area:<br>• FY04: requested $24,500; received $24,519<br>• FY05: requested $29,500; received $14,750<br>• FY06: requested $158,750 (includes money for gravel crushing); received $38,247<br>• Roads will be a focus in the 2007 Surveillance Audit<br>• The audit team also reviewed the ATV issue, including interviews with Minnesota DNR staff and stakeholders and review of documents such as "All-terrain Vehicles in Minnesota: Economic impact and consumer profile" and concluded that the department is meeting the requirement when the objectives are considered.<br>• |
| ***2.4*** | ***Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.*** |
| 2.4.1 | Program to protect forests from damaging agents.<br>• Exceeds the Requirement: Minnesota DNR's programs in forest health and protection are exemplary examples of Integrated Pest Management.<br>• Forest health specialists on staff; they are readily available to field foresters; field foresters exhibited good working knowledge of potential pest problems and preventative measures. |
| 2.4.2 | Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.<br>• Forests observed during the certification audit were healthy.<br>• Close examination of mistletoe in black spruce stands confirmed appropriate management of this difficult pathogen, including careful observations during inventory, consultation with experts, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | design of harvest blocks to limit spread or reintroduction, and sanitation harvests. |
| 2.4.3 | Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.<br>• Confirmed extensive involvement by area staff in fire programs.<br>• See mistletoe above; expertise is available as needed |
| ***2.5*** | ***Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.*** |
| 2.5.1 | Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology. |
| ***3.1*** | ***Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.*** |
| 3.1.1 | Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities. ”<br>• FY05 internal monitoring showed 65% Compliance and FY06 showed 78% compliance; Appears to be an item of attention and an interest in improving compliance<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve rates of BMP compliance. |
| 3.1.2 | Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance. ”<br>• Confirmed in sample of contracts reviewed. |
| 3.1.3 | Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc). ”<br>• Confirmed that several sites visited had been harvested during dry or frozen conditions<br>• Confirmed that foresters are trained in and use ECS to help set “time of year for harvest” |
| 3.1.4 | Monitoring of overall BMP implementation. ”<br>• Confirmed that MFRC and the MDNR both monitor BMPs by review of reports and by interviews and field time with MFRC staff. FY05 internal monitoring showed 65% Compliance and FY06 showed 78% compliance |
| ***3.2*** | ***Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.*** |
| 3.2.1 | “Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”<br>• Field observations confirmed that same program continues in the 3 areas visited. |
| 3.2.2 | “Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.”<br>• Confirmed that riparian zones, streams, water bodies and lakes are mapped; confirmed that they were marked on the ground where needed |
| 3.2.3 | “Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.”<br>• Closed Minor Non-conformance PB-2005-03 – refer to the CAR form for details.<br>• Riparian management zones and filter strips were correctly implemented where these were investigated during the 2006 Surveillance Audit<br>• Internal audit indicated that RMZs were marked and 83% were in compliance<br>• In FY05 RMZ compliance was 96%<br>• In Aitkin Co. the use of NWI as a theme improved RMZ compliance around wetlands |
| 3.2.4 | “Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.”<br>• Confirmed that nonforested wetlands were protection by sale design and layout, by contract clauses, and by logging practices. Several sites in the ORR Area had many scattered small wetlands that were not entered by logging equipment. Larger wetlands at all sites visited had appropriate buffers. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3.2.5 | "Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures. " |
| ***4.1*** | ***"Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-scales.*** |
| 4.1.1 | "Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels. "<br>• Extensive measures and programs exist to promote diversity. The most important of these are the involvement of biologists and ecologists from Wildlife and Endangered Resources in planning at multiple spatial scales.<br>• Endangered Resources staff are limited in numbers and hence in influence on decision-making.<br>• There is an issue of excessive Deer Browse; efforts are being made to assess statewide populations and consider vegetation effects:<br>o DNR with citizen involvement met to determine deer zone population goals (seemed to be a positive exercise)<br>o Determined that it would take work and time to meet goal of 20/square mile<br>o Will monitor population reduction effectiveness with experimental studies in Itasca State Park |
| 4.1.2 | "Program to protect threatened and endangered species."<br>• Exceeds the Requirement: The Natural Heritage and Nongame Research Program administers Minnesota's endangered species laws, rules, and permits pertaining to species designated by rule as endangered or threatened. Confirmed by interviews and review of documents provided that the Minnesota DNR Division of Forestry, Division of Fish and Wildlife, and Division of Ecological Services all collaborate to protect threatened and endangered species.<br>• Endangered Resources staff are limited in numbers and hence in influence on decision-making. |
| 4.1.3 | "Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies. "<br>• |
| 4.1.4 | "Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees). "<br>• Closed Minor Non-conformance JH-2005-04 – refer to the CAR form for details.<br>• New forest planning modules are being used as checklists to determine which and how individual guidelines should be applied to a site<br>• A new planning module is due to be up and running by January 2007<br>• Recent internal audits note improvement in green tree retention<br>• Site level visits indicate that staff are more aware of green tree retention and how to apply the guideline in the field<br>• herbicide skips in Jack Pine that had Aspen regen, provides diversity (MF A-8031) |
| 4.1.5 | "Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives. "<br>• |
| 4.1.6 | "Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership. "<br>• OFI There is an opportunity to improve the mapping of designated old-growth on state forest lands. |
| 4.1.7 | "Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities. "<br>• DNR has long had a state level interagency task force focused on aquatic invasives<br>• DNR team for terrestrial invasive plants has been established led by Jones/Skinner to develop a "department-wide" response to invasives; BMPs being developed |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • A pilot project first does mapping, with implementation to start with state parks<br>• 2 workshops have been completed "Invasive Plants of Minn's Forests"<br>• Species specific control measures are in place; power-washing is sometimes req.<br>• Forests classified as limited and closed (a portion) will have reduced number of trail miles, making it easier to control issues associated with OHVs as vectors for invasive plants<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve in the area of prevention for invasive plants potentially spread by motor vehicles of all types. |
| 4.1.8 | "Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate."<br>• Interviews confirmed that the prescribed fire program continues to operate, mostly on timber-production sites<br>• Use of prescribed fire for management of special forested sites is almost completely absent from DNR lands<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve in the use of prescribed fire on special forested sites. |
| ***4.2*** | ***"Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.*** |
| 4.2.1 | "Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support. "<br>• |
| 4.2.2 | "A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions."<br>• Involvement of Wildlife Division biologists and ecologists from Ecological Services<br>• Training programs<br>• updates to the forest/wildlife guidelines have not been completed.<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve by completing updates to the forest/wildlife guidelines. |
| ***5.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.*** |
| 5.1.1 | "Program to address visual quality management."<br>• The use of trained foresters (who have training in visual management) and the department review process (which considers visual issues) constitute a program. |
| 5.1.2 | "Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern. "<br>• Confirmed by field observations at many sites visited that an array of measures are taken, including layout of cut blocks, retention elements located to reduce apparent opening size, and care taken to clean most loading sites upon completion. |
| ***5.2*** | ***"Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.*** |
| 5.2.1 | "Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes."<br>• Exceeds the Requirement: Few very large clearcuts were observed; the average cut unit is under 40 acres. |
| 5.2.2 | "Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size."<br>• |
| ***5.3*** | ***"Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.*** |
| 5.3.1 | "Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods. "<br>• |

| | |
|---|---|
| | |
| 5.3.2 | "Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods."<br>• |
| 5.3.3 | "Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant. "<br>• |
| ***6.1.*** | ***"Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.***<br>Exceeds the Requirement: The management and protection of special sites is a clear program strength relative to the SFI Standard. |
| 6.1.1 | "Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities."<br>• Confirmed use of heritage data by field foresters, who consult data base<br>• Confirmed that ecologists in the Division of Ecological Services review and comment on draft management prescriptions for stands or other management activities (e.g. OHV trail designation) that contain rare species records.<br>• Confirmed by interviews and review of documents, the Minnesota DNR Division of Forestry, Division of Fish & Wildlife, and Ecological Services Division all collaborate to protect threatened and endangered species. |
| 6.1.2 | "Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites."<br>• Confirmed that new locations of T&E species continue to be recorded by MCBS. MCBS survey work continues, and this represents a comprehensive effort to substantially strengthen the States natural heritage inventory database;<br>• There continues to be no mandate for DNR forestry staff to report data to the NHNRP for inclusion in the NHIS. A form exists; however, reporting is variable.<br>• Observed errors in old growth inventory |
| ***7.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and "in-woods" manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.*** |
| 7.1.1 | "Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include... "<br>• Confirmed good utilization at most sites visited; trade-offs with value of coarse woody debris are being considered. |
| ***9.1*** | ***Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.*** |
| 9.1.1 | Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include …"<br>• Exceeds the Requirement: The Minnesota DNR has made significant investments in science and technology, particularly for tools related to site classification and landscape scale analysis to support management decisions. |
| ***9.2*** | ***Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.*** |
| 9.2.1 | "Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners. " |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Exceeds the Requirement: The Minnesota DNR has made significant investments in science and technology, particularly for tools related to site classification and landscape scale analysis to support management decisions. |
| ***10.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.*** |
| 10.1.1 | "Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters."<br>• Confirmed that field personnel are knowledgeable about the SFI Standard. |
| 10.1.2 | "Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives."<br>• Responsibility for addressing CARs arising from the 2005 SFI Certification Audit was clearly assigned<br>• Minnesota DNR employs a Forest Certification Coordinator |
| 10.1.3 | "Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities. "<br>• Evidence of continuing training included interviews with staff<br>• DNR has made ECS training mandatory<br>• By 1 Jan 08, ECS must be completed on all sites prior to forest mgmt.<br>• Orr and Two Harbors observations: field personnel showed improvement over 2005 audit in knowledge of ECS, guidelines and SFRMP<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve in the training of foresters in the intent and implementation of management plans |
| 10.1.4 | "Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities."<br>• Closed Minor Non-conformance MF-2005-01: Corrective action plan implemented to require presence of trained personnel and procedures to ensure conformance. A site supervisor who is "effectively supervising the site operations" must be present. This was part of a new law that "designated training, insurance, and liability qualifications for timber sale purchasers."<br>• The requirements from this law are phasing in over time, and will be fully enforced by 1-1-2007 |
| ***10.2*** | ***"Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.*** |
| 10.2.1 | "Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses…"<br>• Confirmed MDNR participation in SFI Implementation Committee by Tom Baumann, Assistant to Director, Forest Management, DNR and Andrew Arends, Forest Certification Specialist<br>• Confirmed MDNR support and participation in training sessions for loggers<br>• The DNR is also an active participant and board member of the Minnesota Loggers Education Program (MLEP). |
| ***11.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.*** |
| 11.1.1 | "Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations."<br>• Confirmed printed materials at one field office; these are available to all staff on the intranet |
| 11.1.2 | "System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations."<br>• Minnesota DNR employs an array of approaches to ensure that federal, state, and local laws and regulations are followed, including access to legal advice, training, and review of all projects by specialists, generally at multiple levels (area, region, , and St. Paul as appropriate). Confirmed that these policies are still in place and operating in the three FM Areas visited. |
| 11.1.3 | "Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information."<br>• |

| | |
|---|---|
| | |
| 11.1.4 | "Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology. "<br>• |
| ***11.2*** | ***" Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.*** |
| 11.2.1 | "Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety. "<br>• These policies remain in force. |
| ***12.1*** | ***"Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.*** |
| 12.1.1<br>12.1.2 | "Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees. "<br>"Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners."<br>• 2006: attended meetings; Kurt Rusterholz, DNR Ecological Services helped with the publication "The Special Ones" which provides information for private landowners on RTE species and communities. DNR provided photos and written material. |
| 12.1.3 | "Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species. "<br>• 2006: attended meetings; Kurt Rusterholz, DNR Ecological Services helped with the publication "The Special Ones" which provides information for private landowners on RTE species and communities. DNR provided photos and written material. These documents were available at the Minnesota State Fair. |
| 12.1.4 | "Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest "Legacy, or conservation easements). "<br>• $7 million from state budget has been allocated for the purchase of conservation easements, in a program administered by Wildlife. These monies will be spent in projects that are collaborations with private landowners and with ENGOs. |
| 12.1.5 | "Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives. "<br>• Confirmed continuing involvement and linkages to the large-scale biodiversity goals of the Minnesota Forest Resources Council. |
| ***12.2*** | ***"Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.*** |
| 12.2.1 | "Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs). "<br>• Confirmed (see 12.1 above for notes) |
| 12.2.2 | "Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as …"<br>• In 2007 will request Division-basis information. |
| 12.2.3 | "Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives."<br>• Confirmed extensive recreation programs and facilities. |

| | |
|---|---|
| ***12.3*** | ***"Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.*** |
| 12.3.1 | "Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public."<br>• The two major DNR planning initiatives, SFRMP and OHV Forest Classification/Trail designation, each have substantial public input opportunities.<br>• Changes were made to the public involvement process for OHV planning that allow for public input earlier in the process<br>• With respect to SFRM Planning- "Public involvement will, at a minimum, occur through:<br>o distribution of the initial assessment information; a public comment period to help identify key forest management issues and solicit public opinion of preferred management direction;<br>o public meetings and a comment period to review and comment on desired future forest composition (DFFC) and forest management strategies proposed by the DNR to address identified issues and the criteria that will be used to select stands to be treated;<br>o public meetings and a comment period to review and comment on the DNR's 10-year list of stands proposed for treatment and associated new access needs;<br>o public review and comment on proposed plan revisions."<br>See http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/forestry/subsection/summary.html#public_involvement; http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/forestry/subsection/process.html; for more detail. |
| 12.3.2 | "Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration."<br>• Confirmed this is occurring, see response and links under 12.3.1 |
| ***12.4*** | ***"Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.*** |
| 12.4.1 | "Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to<br>a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge;<br>b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and<br>c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands. "<br>• Appears that there has been good progress in including tribes in DNR activities/decisions<br>• Question regarding Nett Lake tribe participation in ORR- appears that they are sensitive to tribal communication, in this case tribe appears not to be interested in participating in local planning efforts/activities |
| *12.5* | ***"Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.*** |
| 12.5.1 | "Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices. "<br>• 2006: Minn. Forest Resource Council 1-800- number reported two contacts, none of which involved state lands. |
| 12.5.2 | "Process to receive and respond to public inquiries."<br>• 2006: The Department of Natural Resources posts the stand exam list on web site, and members of the public are encouraged to comment to web site or to local area office; Minn. Forest Resource Council 1-800- number; some comments received at St. Paul are passed on to the field.<br>• For state-level issues most comments would come through the information center, or may be passed through from areas to Tom Baumann. Example of the Gunflint Trail. Comments are often brought directly to the governor, especially when levels of harvest are discussed. |
| ***12.6*** | ***"Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.*** |
| 12.6.1* | "Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report."<br>(*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • 2006: Confirmed with SFI, Inc. that the 2005 report was provided on time and complete. |
| 12.6.2 | "Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports."<br>• Confirmed local recordkeeping by review of documentation in comparison with field observations, and by interviews with area staff. This information is reported to the St. Paul office. |
| 12.6.3 | "Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard."<br>• Andrew Arends was able to provide a copy of the most recent (2005) report. |
| ***13.1**** | ***"Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.*** |
| 13.1.1 | "System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. "<br>• Confirmed the following elements of systematic review (source 2005 audit matrix):<br>o Planned continuation of a Forest Certification Implementation Team (FCIT) or similar body to review commitments and respond to audits<br>o Division of Forestry Management Team monthly meetings, including program, policy and procedure reviews<br>o DNR Conservation Agenda and Governor's Department Results Performance Indicators<br>o Annual or periodic program workshops (Timber Sales, Forest Development, Timber Appraisal, CFM, Wildlife Training Session and Meeting, etc.)<br>• Area-level silviculture program review<br>• The department has established an internal audit team to proactively identify and address possible CARS. Confirmed that a consultant was retained to provide training to the internal auditors (RFP for Internal Auditors) and that the training occurred. The team has not yet received its full instructions (will review in 2007). |
| 13.1.2 | "System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures."<br>• Currently Internal Audits are conducted on an "ad hoc" basis (e.g. silviculture program review); coverage of SFI requirements not clearly documented<br>• DNR has established a 13-person "Internal Audit Team" with a core mission of helping to "review DNR's resource management".<br>• Division of Forestry annual work planning and accomplishment reporting process and quarterly progress reports comprise an important part of the system.<br>• OFI: There is an opportunity to improve by developing protocols and a charge for the recently assembled internal audit team. |
| 13.1.3 | "Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance."<br>• The work of the Forest Certification Implementation Team (FCIT) continues, as confirmed by interviews. The FCIT was described by MDNR: "The Forest Certification Implementation Team (FCIT) continues to review the DNR's resource management to the SFI standard. FCIT is well suited to serve as a review body because its team members (a mix of Forestry, Fisheries & Wildlife, Trails & Waterways, and Ecological Services staff) have a deep understanding of the SFI standard, a broad knowledge of the DNR's forest management, and has inroads to implement policies or procedures within the divisions they represent."<br>• The DNR's Forest Resources Issues Team (FRIT) reviews progress towards achieving certification requirements as part of its overall mandate. The FCIT was described by MDNR: "FRIT's mission is to:<br>1) Provide process guidance and direction to major inter-disciplinary efforts (current examples include subsection forest resource management planning, and the DNR Interdisciplinary Forest Management Coordination Policy), 2) Provide a forum for internal communication, framing discussions and developing effective external communications, 3) Ensure appropriate involvement and understanding at the field, region and central office levels of decisions and issues related to forest management, 4) Monitor progress toward effectively addressing issues and topics of concern, and 5) Work to insure resolution of statewide, multi-region, or interdisciplinary forest resource issues." |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Confirmed that "The DNR's Conservation Agenda" was updated in 2006 to cover 2005. The document "provides to staff and stakeholders a listing of the goals and objectives the DNR wishes to accomplish. Many of the Agenda's items intersect the SFI Objectives and Indicators." The update included an overview of certification and progress made towards or the achievement of goals and objectives that most of the SFI Principles for Sustainable Forestry. |

## Attendees

(Note: * denotes attendees at all sessions)

**St. Paul DNR Headquarters – Monday October 16, 2006**

Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor*
Dave Wager, SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor*
Dr. Dennis Becker, Auditor
Gene Merriam, Commissioner DNR
Mark Holsten, Deputy Commissioner DNR
Laurie Martinson, Acting Assistant, DNR Commissioner DNR
Dave Epperly, Director of Forestry Division, DNR
Dave Schad, Director of Fish and Wildlife Division, DNR
Lee Pfannmuller, Director of Ecological Services, DNR
Tom Baumann, Assistant to Director, Forest Management, DNR
Andrew Arends, Forest Certification Program Leader, Minnesota DNR*
Michael Lee, Plant Ecologist, Internal Audit Team, Minnesota DNR *
Steve Merchant, Forest Wildlife Program Consultant*
Keith Jacobson, Forest Products Utilization Program Leader
Jean Mouelle, Forestry, Silviculture & Roads, Central Region
Hannah Texler, Regional Plant Ecologist, Internal Audit Team
Carmen Converse, Supervisor, Minnesota County Biological Survey
Alan Jones, Forestry, Forest Development, Health, and Use Supervisor
Jim Manolis, OMBS/ Forest Ecologist
Les Ollila, Trails/Waterways NE Region Manager
Steven Lane, DNR Forestry Aitkin Area
Keith Simar, Forest Recreation Coordinator
Kurt Rusterholz, DNR Ecological Services
Brian McCann, Planner, Trails and Waterways
Paul Swenson, Tribal Liaison
Keith Wendt, OMBS/ Science Policy Manager

**Two Harbors Area – Tuesday October 17,2006**

JoAnn M. Hanowski, Auditor
John Grossbach, Regional Forester, N.E. Region
Doug Tillma, N.E. Region Timber Program Forester
Jim Rupert, Assistant, Regional Forester, DNR
Rick Horton, N.E. Region Forest Wildlife Coordinator
Wade Miller, OHV Technician, T&W Brainerd
Bruce Carlson, Plant Ecologist, MN County Biological Survey, Duluth
Wes Seele, Field Forester, Finland, MN
Fran Casey, Entry Level Forester
Jeff Wilder, Forester, Onamia, MN
Steve Piepgras, Mille Lacs WMA, Onamia, MN
Lonnie Lilly, Forester, Nimrod
Brad Berg, Forestry Tech
Rob Fasteland, Forestry Tech
Kurt Rusterholz, DNR Ecological Services
Hannah Texler, Regional Plant Ecologist, Internal Audit Team
Jim Manolis, OMBS/ Forest Ecologist
Les Ollila, Trails/Waterways NE Region Manager
Keith Simar, Forest Recreation Coordinator

Dave Olefert, Wildlife Division, Grand Rapids
Tom Peterson, Trails and Waterways Division, Two Harbors

**Orr Area – Wednesday October 18, 2006**
Mark Holsten, Deputy Commissioner DNR
Frank Swendsen, Area Supervisor, Wildlife Division DNR
John Stegmeir, Forestry Area Manager, DNR
John Grossbach, Regional Forester, N.E. Region
Les Ollila, Trails/Waterways NE Region Manager
Michael Phillips, Minnesota Forest Resources Council, St. Paul
Jeff Lightfoot, Wildlife Division, Grand Rapids
Doug Tillma, N.E. Region Timber Program Forester
Rick Horton, N.E. Region Forest Wildlife Coordinator
Dave Sopoci, Forestry Orr DNR
Josh Muchow, Forestry Orr DNR
Curt Westerman, Forestry Orr DNR
Sara Stack, Forestry Orr DNR
Rochelle Gorham, Wildlife Division, Bemidji
Nick Severson, Forestry, Bagley
Steve Wilson, Ecological Services, Tower
Craig Schmid, Area Forester, Deer River
Dana Frame, Forestry Orr DNR
Mike Wurst, Forestry Orr DNR
Cal Tuper, Forestry IAT
Wade Miller, Trails and Waterways, Brainerd Technician

**Littlefork Area – Thursday October 19, 2006**
Cal Tuper, Forestry IAT
Brian Leitinger, Littlefork AFS
Joel Johnson, Littlefork Program Forester
Lawson Gerdes, Ecological Services, MCBS
Mike Albers, Forest Health Specialist
Jeremy Fauskee, Littlefork Timber Program Forester
Mike Phillips, Minnesota Forest Resources Council – Site Level Coordinator
Frank Swendsen, Area Supervisor, Wildlife Division DNR
Larry Petersen, Assistant Frank Area Supervisor, Wildlife Division DNR
Tony Mastrian, Forestry Technician, Littlefork
Doug Tillma, N.E. Region Timber Program Forester
Tim Quincer, Region Forest Wildlife Coordinator, DNR-Brainerd
Chris Scofield, Forest Technician, International Falls
Michael Eilers, Forest Technician, Littlefork
Alan Jones, Forestry, St. Paul
Peter Lindemanis, Forestry, Big Falls
Eric Buchanan, Forestry, Big Falls
John Lumppio, Forestry, Big Falls
Jean Mouelle, Forestry, Silviculture & Roads, Central Region
Jim Rupert, Assistant Regional Forest Supervisor, NE Region, Grand Rapids
Michael Lee, Ecological Services, Plant Ecologist

# Audit Field Sites

**Two Harbors Area – Tuesday October 17,2006**

Audit Team: Dave Wager (DW), Mike Ferrucci (MF), JoAnn Hanowski (JH).

1. MF B1709 Blocks 2 and 3 Planned partial harvest in mixed conifer-hardwoods; vernal protections
2. MF B1709 Block 4: Completed clearcut with varied reserves; good site prep; will plant
3. MF Forest Development Proposal 253-5: variable intensity harvest/gaps; planted May 04, regen survey July 06 – 76% survival of white spruce which are very vigorous, also natural yellow birch seedlings
4. MF B1286 (59-07-09) CC winter 2003, parts w. birch and balsam fir rock-raked then planted with 1/8 white pine and 7/8 white spruce at 7*8'spacing, regen survey not meeting specs., will survey again, but the spruce look better to the field forester than they did during first survey (green, larger)
5. MF East General Grade Road and Manitour River: 2-culvert crossing – well installed and maintained.
6. MF B 1023 Harvest completed 2004: confirmed excellent stand-level retention including 5+ scattered birch per acre plus protected pockets of young conifers
7. MF East General Grade Road and Baptism River crossing: : 2-culverts installed properly and maintained.
8. MF Finland field office garage
9. DW B2226 Planned harvest on fisheries lands; buffers; planning
10. JH Finland Nh thin: Eco and forestry have come up with forest mgmt plan for bt blue warbler, sought outside info from NRRI on min ba retention
11. JH Finland NH patch: Eco and forestry at odds about whether to harvest in thin outstanding CBS site, controversy on whether the stand should be on list
12. JH Norway pine thin: standard pine strip thin, 30 years

**Orr Area – Wednesday October 18, 2006**

Audit Team: Dave Wager (DW), Mike Ferrucci (MF), JoAnn Hanowski (JH).

1. MF, JH, & DW Forest Development Project (FDP) 1510 logged March 2005, slash piles burned; ground sprayed July 2006; will hand plant Norway Pine @ 800 tpa; ECS evaluation; observed minimum maintenance road (logging access road) with proper water bars having been worn down by recreation; DNR had blocked with rocks but someone removed them
2. MF & DW Sale 3780 15 acre aspen clearcut with reserves; part of deer management
3. MF Forest Development Project (FDP) 1423 Deer Repellant applied to Norway planting; example of plan to regenerate long-lived conifers
4. MF & DW Forest Development Project (FDP) 1522 Trenching project then will plant
5. MF & DW X3604 65-21-27 Aspen clearcut some birch, maple; reserved white and red pine, cedar, basswood and Ash; sale area three-lobed, so lots of older trees nearby, but retention barely 5%; good aspen sprouting most of site, no compaction, little rutting
6. MF Forest Development Project (FDP) 1308 pine plantation with 8 year history of various planting and tending work
7. MF Sale 4104 56 acre aspen clearcut with excellent retention patches and Aspen sprouting
8. MF Forest Development Project (FDP) 1420 thinning of aspen with under planting of white pine, regeneration survey 80 to 100% stocked, 15% deer damage; applied deer repellant to pine and natural spruce, will do again this year
9. JH Orr 1 Salvage jack pine JACK pine salvage after wind event, hand seeding, good regen and little deer browse

10. JH Orr 2 Large aspen harvest >80 acre harvest of aspen ERF, minimal retention except in cedar areas where they have under planted spruce
11. JH Orr 3 Arrowhead Trail Visited snowmobile trail and discussed ATV issues in region, not a huge problem yet, but not a large density of user either
12. JH Orr 4 Spruce plant/release young plantation with planned release of aspen, discussed pros and cons of multi-species mgmt (spruce and aspen)
13. JH Orr 5 White pine bud cap and prune 6year old plantation with example of bud cap and prune, discuss success rates of deer browse control with different methods

**Littlefork Area – Thursday October 19, 2006**

Audit Team: Dave Wager (DW), Mike Ferrucci (MF), JoAnn Hanowski (JH).

1. MF B-1104 261-04-002 clearcut harvest mixed pine completed fall 2004; April 2005 raked logging slash and applied Accord/Garlon/Oust; spring 2006 planted 900 Norway pine 7 foot spacing; observed technician applying Plantskyd deer repellant
2. MF A-8031 T155 R25W S21 30 acre site cut Jack Pine with Aspen pockets, but goal is Jack Pine; herbicide used to kill aspen, mostly natural except 5 acres planted and treated with Plantskyd; now considered established; limited Armillaria kill; saw herbicide skips that had Aspen regen, which provides good diversity
3. MF 261-03-063 T 155 R25W S35 Clearcut with reserves; cut winter 2004; spring slash raked, then planted, bare-root and/or poor planting stock didn't reach goals; replant May 2005 white spruce hand plant containerized at 7 foot spacing; next step hand release when leaves off
4. MF & DW B 1407 164 acre black spruce clearcut. Large block design with no retention to minimize mistletoe. Black spruce clearcut very thorough (nothing standing consistent with mistletoe guidelines to promote health; used mechanized harvester with hot saw and mechanical arms to ensure total removal of trees); wet, organic soil site varies from poor to good; helicopter seeded, might burn slash; site impacts consistent with Minnesota site level guidelines. One small area of rutting addressed by moving operator.
5. MF & DW Highway 71 Black spruce mistletoe damage pocket; discussed ecology, silvics of black spruce given ecology of mistletoe; habitat considerations Discussion of spread rates, design of silviculture to reduce spread, and important habitat for spruce grouse and palm wren
6. DW & JH Stop 1 Winter Miller Road: Traveled 2 miles of a winter road viewing road conditions, ATV/OHV use of road, and user created trails. Extensive rutting.
7. DW & JH Stop 1 B 2262 51 acre Aspen regeneration cut adjacent to oak old growth. Scattered and clumped oak retention. Old growth protected through minimizing area of disturbance and retaining more trees in the transition. Old growth stand was incorrectly mapped in inventory.