

SFI CERTIFICATION AUDIT FINAL REPORT

**Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard
2002-2004 Edition**



**for the
Wisconsin County Forest System**

**By
Mike Ferrucci**

December 6, 2004



NSF International Strategic Registrations, Ltd.

A subsidiary of NSF International

December 6, 2004

Jeff Barkley, County Forest Program Specialist
Bureau of Forest Management
WI Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921

Re: SFIS Standard Draft SFI Certification Audit Report
Wisconsin County Forest System 1Y943

Dear Mr. Barkley:

Congratulations, the Wisconsin County Forest System has successfully achieved a recommendation for independent certification to the SFI Standard, according to the auditing procedures of NSF-ISR!

Overview and Wisconsin County Forest System Description

Twenty-nine counties participate under the Wisconsin County Forest Program, comprising more than 2.3 million acres of forestland. These county forests represent the largest public forest ownership in Wisconsin. Individual county forests range from 880 to over 269,000 acres and are generally located in the northern half of Wisconsin. These lands include a diverse mix of forests ranging from the boreal conifer forests adjacent to Lake Superior to the central hardwood forests of southern Wisconsin.

Under the framework provided by Section 28.11, Wisconsin Statutes, the Department of Natural Resources has oversight authority for the County Forest Program. The DNR provides technical assistance and supervision, approves entry and withdrawal of land in the program, approves comprehensive long-range plans, provides financial assistance and works cooperatively with the county forests in developing policy and legislation that promotes sustainable forestry. The Department also conducts program reviews and audits to assure that the individual counties operate their programs within the statutory sideboards. (Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources – Division of Forestry)

The SFI Certification Audit was performed on the land management operations of the Wisconsin County Forest System and 25 cooperating county forest systems. The assessment was conducted to confirm whether the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources' SFI Program conforms to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2002-2004 Edition. An audit team assembled by NSF-ISR made a determination of conformance according to the SFI® Verification/Certification Principles and Procedures (SFI-V/CP).

The scope of the proposed SFIS Certification Audit encompasses sustainable forestry activities of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System and land management operations in selected Wisconsin County Forests including 25 counties encompassing approximately 2,179,483 acres of publicly owned forests, including the following counties:

Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire , Florence , Forest , Iron, Jackson , Juneau , Langlade, Lincoln , Marathon , Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, Wood

This scope was confirmed during the Certification Audit.

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on September 27 to October 5, 2004. The NSF-ISR lead auditor was Mike Ferrucci. The other members of the audit team were Gary Zimmer, Wildlife Biologist, Dan Pubanz, Wisconsin Forester, and Dave Wager, Forest Ecologist. The audit team is fully qualified to conduct the SFI Certification Audit, with members of the audit team having worked in the forest and paper products industry and having extensive knowledge of the SFI Standard and practices of the forest products industry within your region.

NSF-ISR SFI Audit Reporting

The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Process began in the fall of 2003 with a preliminary Gap Analysis and Readiness Review. This work served to identify the scope of your operations and which SFI Performance Measures apply and whether your SFI Program was sufficiently documented to proceed with the audit. In September of 2004 another review of your SFI Program documentation was conducted, leading to the preparation of a readiness review report and an audit plan. The findings of the Readiness Review were reported to you on September 25, 2004.

We determined that several of the SFI Performance Measures were outside of the scope of your SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit. The SFIS Performance Measures that are included in and excluded from the scope of the SFIS Certification Audit were outlined in the Document Review Summary Sheet within the Readiness Review Report.

The actual NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit was governed by a detailed Audit Plan that was prepared specifically for your SFI Audit (Section A). The objective of the audit was to assess conformance of your SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2002-2004 Edition. The scope of the SFIS Audit included your forest management on county forestland and related sustainable forestry activities. The Audit Plan was focused on helping the audit team determine whether there were any deficiencies and inconsistencies between your SFI Program and the SFIS Performance Measures that apply to your organization.

The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS. The detailed spreadsheets addressing the above findings are contained in the SFI Certification Audit Matrix (Section B). Any non-conformances were fully documented and reported using the NSF-ISR Corrective Action Request (CAR) form (Section C).

NSF-ISR conducted an audit of the written documentation that your organization assembled to provide objective evidence of SFIS Conformance. NSF-ISR also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the

NSF-ISR SFI-SOP. NSF-ISR also selected contract loggers, landowners and employees within your organization to interview to confirm that the SFI Standard was understood and actively implemented.

NSF requires all auditors to adhere to strict agreements regarding confidentiality and prohibiting consulting during audits (Section D). Attendance Sheets for the Opening and Closing Meetings of the Certification Audit are attached in Section E. The names of those internal and external personnel interviewed during the SFI Certification Audit are contained in the SFI Certification Audit Matrix.

Forest practices that were inspected included those that have been under active management over the planning period of the past two years.

Audit Findings

No major non-conformances were identified as part of the NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Process. As such, your SFI Program has achieved conformance with the SFI Standard, 2002-2004 Edition.

Four minor non-conformances were identified during the audit. These minor non-conformances are documented in the SFI Certification Audit Matrix and the Corrective Action Request forms (Section C). You submitted Corrective Action Plans within the agreed upon time period after the closing meeting to complete corrective action plans for these minor non-conformances. The lead auditor approved those Corrective Action Plans and will assess progress in addressing the identified non-conformances as part of the first surveillance audit/reaudit tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2005.

NSF-ISR also identified fourteen Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) for your SFI Program. These findings are keyed to the relevant portion of the SFI Standard via the Performance Measure and Core Indicator (CI) in parenthesis (refer to the Section B: SFI Certification Audit Matrix) following each OFI in the list below:

1. There is an opportunity to improve information systems for forest fiber resources including: improved growth monitoring to better understand long-term implications of silvicultural systems, calculate growth and update volumes; updating reconnaissance data in a timely manner; taking appropriate advantage of detailed information on tree quality collected during recon; and conducting trend analysis using growth and drain data for specific forests or forest cover types. (4.1.1.1.1 CI 2; 4.1.1.1.4 CI 3 & 4)
2. There is an opportunity to improve the clarity of regeneration targets for all types. (4.1.2.1.1 CI 3)
3. There is an opportunity to improve chemical training for responsible persons, not just when restricted use pesticides are applied and not just for the contracted applicator. (4.1.2.1.3 CI 8 Designated state-trained or certified applicators supervise forest chemical applications.)
4. There is an opportunity to improve documentation of chemical trials, using existing database developed by Colleen Matula or other mechanisms that would ensure that this information is available to other interested forest managers. (4.1.2.1.3 CI 10)
5. There is an opportunity to improve the consistent definition of excessive rutting and to better understand the long-term effects of compaction and rutting. (4.1.2.1.4 CI 5.)
6. There is an opportunity to clarify the policy for use of genetically improved trees. (4.1.2.1.6 CI 1)

7. There is an opportunity to improve monitoring of BMPs for all phases of operations, for example road building, chemical applications, site preparation. (4.1.3.1.1 CI 7).
8. There is an opportunity to improve riparian and other protections (4.1.3.1.2 CI 3) and BMP implementation to protect water quality (4.1.3.1.4 CI 1) by having individual counties encourage and support logger training (4.2.1.1.2 CI 1) in order to improve the understanding of forest protection measures in timber sales (currently DNR Madison staff are primarily responsible for meeting these SFI requirements).
9. There is an opportunity to improve protections for vernal pools & other small wetlands. (4.1.3.1.1 CI 4.)
10. There is an opportunity to improve training or education for field foresters in endangered species identification and protection and in identifying and conserving rare and unique biological communities (4.1.4.1.1 CI 4 & 4.1.4.1.3 CI 2) & identification of culturally or historically significant sites (4.1.6.1.1 CI 3) and to use the best available information sources (state archaeologist).
11. There is an opportunity to improve quantitative guidelines for stand level retention (e.g. coarse woody debris, den trees, snags) to ensure more consistent implementation. (4.1.4.1.1 CI 5)
12. There is an opportunity to improve the process for calculating the average clearcut size. (4.1.5.1.2 CI 3)
13. There is an opportunity to clarify the policy of not placing clearcuts adjacent unless already “green” meaning 3 years old or 5 feet high. (4.1.5.1.3 CI 1)
14. There is an opportunity to improve management review specific to SFI.

These OFIs do not indicate a current deficiency, but serve to alert your organization to potential future deficiencies if not addressed. The Opportunities for Improvement not only alert you to areas that need future attention, but also can be a focus of continual improvement efforts. These Opportunities for Improvement will also be reviewed during the surveillance audits over the three/five-year SFI implementation and improvement period.

NSF-ISR also identified a number of forest practices and operations that exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard as follows:

4.1.1.1.3 Providing recreation opportunities for the public: the participating counties provide an exceptional diversity and extent of recreational activities on these lands.

4.1.5.1.1 Developing policies to manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality: the on-the-ground results observed at all sites visited were exceptional, with many careful provisions taken to improve the appearance of harvest sites.

4.2.1.1.1 and 4.2.1.1.6 Encouraging landowners to reforest following harvest and to use Best Management Practices; and to educate and assist forest landowners: the WI DNR, working in concert with the counties, has developed a strong program supporting private forest management.

4.3.2.1.1 Supporting and promoting public outreach, education & involvement related to forest management: employees of the counties and the DNR are involved in a wide range of public outreach activities.

These practices are further documented in the SFI Certification Audit Matrix. Your organization is to be commended for performance above and beyond the basic requirements of the SFIS in the areas specified.

This report is intended for use by your organization in understanding your conformance with the SFI Standard and for purposes of improving your SFI Program over time.

The attached SFI Audit Summary (Section F) is intended for public disclosure. Be advised that the SFI Verification Process Principles and Procedures require you to provide the Audit Summary to the AF&PA and Sustainable Forestry Board two weeks prior to making any public claims regarding successful independent certification of conformance with the SFI Standard.

NSF-ISR is issuing a formal Certificate of Conformance to the SFI Standard to your organization. The Certificate includes the NSF-ISR Logo, the client's name, the standard certified to, the date of the certification, and signatures of responsible authorities.

NSF-ISR would like to express its sincere appreciation for the active support and participation of your staff in the independent SFI Certification Audit Process. We look forward to working with you during the scheduled surveillance audits and the three-year re-audit process as you continue to improve your SFI Program.

It has been a pleasure providing you with Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard certification services. If we may be of further assistance, or answer any of your questions regarding any aspect of the NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Process, please feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR SFI Lead Auditor

Cc: Audit Team Members

Certification Report Sections:

Section A Audit Plan
Section B SFI Certification Audit Matrix
Section C NSF-ISR Corrective Action Request (CAR) form(s)
Section D Agreement(s) to Not Disclose and to Not Consult
Section E Attendance Sheets for the Opening and Closing Meetings
Section F SFI Audit Summary for Public Disclosure

Section A

Audit Plan

Section B

SFI Certification Audit Matrix

Section C

NSF-ISR Corrective Action Request (CAR) form(s)

Corrective And Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin DNR County Forest Program</u>	Date: <u>October 5, 2004</u> FRS # <u>1Y943</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR</u>	Finding Number: <u>CA-2004-1</u>
Location of Finding: _____	CAR Number: <u>CA-2004-1</u>
Discussed with: <u>Jeff Barkley, County Forestry Specialist</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: _____

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2002-2004 SFIS: 4.1.1.1.1 (written policy to implement & achieve SFIS); 4.2.1.1.5 CI 1 (Written policy statement of commitment to the SFIS that is communicated throughout their organization.)

(NSF-ISR Policy or Company procedure, if applicable) Although they have indicated a strong willingness to participate, most counties have not yet committed to the SFI Program. The general SFI principles are being followed in all county programs, but have not been identified or communicated as a specific commitment to the SFI Standard.

Major Nonconformity

Minor Nonconformity

Company Representative's Signature: _____

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

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

The member counties in the Wisconsin County Forests Program have not as yet committed to SFI certification. As a result, there has been no policy or official communication of commitment to the program. The WDNR, as the group certificate holder, also has yet to formalize its acceptance to SFI certification of the County Forest program through the Natural Resources Board (NRB previously advocated for SFI certification of the State Forests).

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.

By March 1, 2005 each member County that is committing to the SFI program will submit written commitment to the program through a County Board resolution and/or Forestry Committee meeting minutes. In addition, member Counties will include a statement of commitment into their County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan. These plans are currently being revised with the new plans to be in effect Jan. 1, 2006.

WDNR will communicate and reaffirm NRB approval of SFI certification by March 1, 2005.

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.

Communication of SFIS principles will be included as a topic for regular County Forest audits (scheduled every 3 years) as well as at County Forest / DNR partnership meetings held annually.

Company Representative's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:

Comments: The proposed actions meet the identified non-conformance. During the recertification review (annual surveillance audit) the lead auditor will review these actions, and how the policy statement is "communicated throughout the organization"

STATUS: Approved

AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci. 12/03/04

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:

Comments: _____

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

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

While we do not contest the auditor’s findings or their significance, we feel the findings are isolated with respect to the County Forest program. This non-conformance was not an issue in any of the other field visits conducted during the audit. In this particular County, deviations from the accepted northern hardwood silvicultural guidelines have long been a source of conflict between one particular County Forester and DNR Foresters working on the Forest.

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.

a) Effective immediately, the County Forest Administrator will convene with the Forester in question to provide solid direction to mark within the silvicultural guidelines. Northern hardwood marking needs to improve the stand quality, create canopy gaps to develop/release regeneration and remove poor quality, at risk trees. There will be an increased focus on marking overstocked hardwood pole stands as well.

b) Effective immediately, County / DNR staff will collect field data on sales already closed-out to gain a better understanding of the ramifications of different marking schemes. The data will be fed into LS-TWIGS FVS model

c) WDNR, in its oversight role, will not approve timber sales falling outside the parameters of the Silvicultural Hbk. unless an experimental silvicultural trial has been agreed to.

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.

Effective immediately, internal monitoring of timber sales will occur whereby a County Forester (typically the Forest Administrator) and a DNR Forester will jointly field review all timber sales for compliance with the silvicultural guidelines as well as other aspects of timber sale setup and design.

By June 30, 2005 there will be consultation and a field evaluation by the DNR’s Forest Silviculturist to provide insight into the sideboards of the Northern Hardwood chapter in the Silvicultural handbook.

Within the next 2 years, opportunities for ongoing training in Northern Hardwood management will be made available to DNR and County staff.

Company Representative’s Signature: _____ *Date:* _____

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S PLAN:

Comments: The proposed actions appear to represent a good plan to close the specific non-conformance, as well as a blueprint for significant progress on the larger and very complex issue of managing tolerant hardwood stands at a time when practices in this area are changing based on new information from research and experience.

STATUS: Approved

AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci. 12/03/04

AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY’S COMPLETED ACTION:

Comments: _____

STATUS: _____ AUDITOR/DATE: _____

LEGEND FOR STATUS: OPEN = CA Plan Accepted
REJECTED = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

CLOSED = CA implemented, verified & accepted

Corrective And Preventive Action Request (CAR)

Company/Location: <u>Wisconsin DNR County Forest Program</u>	Date: <u>October 5, 2004</u> FRS # 1Y943
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR</u>	Finding Number: <u>CA-2004-3</u>
Location of Finding: _____	CAR Number: <u>CA-2204-3</u>
Discussed with: <u>Jeff Barkley, County Forestry Specialist</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: _____

AUDITOR FINDING: Standard Number and Clause: 2002-2004 SFIS: 4.1.3.1.1 Program Participants shall meet or exceed Best Management Practices...; CI 2 Field Staff and contractors trained in water quality laws and state BMPs; CI 5 Contract provisions specify BMP compliance **CI 2:** Not all road building / road maintenance personnel have received BMP training. Training records for county staff are not complete in some cases, making it difficult for managers to be certain that all field staff are trained. New foresters may not have received adequate formal BMP training in school, and some delay may occur before they receive BMP training while employed. **CI 5:** Confirmed in contracts in 6 of 7 county forests visited. Where not specified in contract the programs clearly do include BMPs in design of projects, and have provisions for some BMP issues.

Major Nonconformity

Minor Nonconformity**Company Representative's Signature:** _____**IF NECESSARY, PLEASE ATTACH A SEPARATE REPORT ADDRESSING THE FOLLOWING THREE ITEMS:**

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

To this point in time BMP's have been voluntary guidelines in Wisconsin. County Forests have routinely made them a part of forest management projects and referenced them in the long range County Forest plans. Many have formalized their acceptance by including them in their timber sale contracts. Application of BMPs on projects has been evaluated and reviewed but WDNR, in its oversight role, has no statutory authority to require BMP training of County Forest staff. Similarly, WDNR has not required training records be kept at the County Forest level. A variety of training opportunities have been made available for both WDNR and County Forest staff. Participation of some counties has been limited by costs incurred and perceived lack of value from the local County Forest committee and /or Forest administrator.

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.

a) The WDNR Division of Forestry has made contact with the Forest Industry Safety Training Alliance (FISTA) to contract BMP training for DNR and County Forest staff. This training will be made available by Dec. 31, 2005. The importance of training all staff, including those involved in road / trail construction, will be communicated to the counties.

b) By July 2005, a section in the County Forest Plan template will be added that addresses the importance of training and the maintenance of training records for County Forest staff. The format of the training records will be left to the individual counties discretion.

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.

WDNR will include an assessment of the training and training records for County Forest staff as part of the internal SFI monitoring that will be built into the regular County Forest audits (3 yr. intervals) as well as at the annual County Forest / DNR partnership meeting. This will be completed by July of 2006.

Company Representative's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Section D

Agreement(s) to Not Disclose and to Not Consult

Section E

Attendance Sheets for the Opening and Closing Meetings

Section F

SFI Audit Summary for Public Disclosure

The SFI Program of the Wisconsin County Forest System has achieved conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2002-2004 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

The scope of the proposed SFIS Certification Audit encompasses sustainable forestry activities of participating counties within the Wisconsin County Forest System and land management operations in selected Wisconsin County Forests including 25 counties encompassing approximately 2,179,483 acres of publicly owned forests, including the following counties:

Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Eau Claire , Florence , Forest , Iron, Jackson , Juneau , Langlade, Lincoln , Marathon , Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, Wood

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on September 27 to October 5, 2004. The NSF-ISR lead auditor was Mike Ferrucci. The other members of the audit team were Gary Zimmer, Wildlife Biologist, Dan Pubanz, Wisconsin Forester, and Dave Wager, Forest Ecologist. The audit team is fully qualified to conduct the SFI Certification Audit, with members of the audit team having worked in forest management and having extensive knowledge of the SFI Standard and practices of sustainable forestry practices in the Lakes States region.

SFIS Audit Process

NSF-ISR initiated the SFIS audit process with a Gap Analysis Review to identify the scope of the SFI Program and which SFI Performance Measures were relevant. We then conducted a Readiness Review to confirm the scope of the audit, prepare a detailed audit plan, review the SFI Indicators and evidence to be used to assess conformance, and to verify that the Wisconsin County Forest System was prepared to proceed to the SFIS Certification Audit. We then conducted the SFIS Certification Audit of conformance to the SFI Standard. Annual follow-up Surveillance Audits will be scheduled, commencing October of 2005.

Summary of Audit Findings

The Wisconsin County Forest System's SFI Program was found to be in full conformance with the SFIS Standard 2002-2004 Edition. The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Process determined that there were four minor non-conformances involving the commitment to the SFI program, partial harvesting practices, and training and record-keeping for staff and contractors. The Wisconsin County Forest System has developed plans to address these issues.

Fifteen opportunities for improvement were also identified, involving improved information systems and related analysis, refinements to targets for regeneration and stand-level retention; improved training involving chemical use and RTE identification and protections; improved understanding of effects of compaction and rutting; clarifications to selected policies; more attention to BMP monitoring; increased protections for small wetlands; and SFI-specific management review. These findings do not indicate a current deficiency, but served to alert the Wisconsin County Forest System to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention. The Wisconsin County Forest System has already improved its SFI Program in response to the identified opportunities for improvement.

NSF-ISR also identified the following areas where forestry practices on the Wisconsin County Forest System's lands exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard:

- Providing recreation and education opportunities for the public;
- Managing the visual impact of harvesting and other forest operations;
- Encouraging landowners to reforest following harvest and to use Best Management Practices; and
- Educating and assisting forest landowners.

Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry:

- “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 the reforestation, 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 in forests, and promote among other forest landowners, sustainable forestry practices that are economically, environmentally and socially responsible.
- 3) Forest Health and Productivity: To protect forests from wildfire, pests, diseases and other damaging agents to maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.
- 4) Protecting Special Sites: To manage forests and lands of special significance (e.g., biologically, geologically, culturally or historically significant) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.
- 5) Legal Compliance: To comply with applicable federal, state or local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.
- 6) 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 - 2002-2004 SFI Standard®)