2009 Progress Report Forms For

Public Agency, Conservation Group, and Other Non-Industrial Forest Landowners

Please complete and return by March 15, 2010 to:

Rachel Dierolf, Manager of Statistics and Labeling, SFI
900 17th Street, NW Suite 700 Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (613) 274-0124 Fax: (613) 792-1470 Email : rachel.dierolf@sfiprogram.org
E-mail submissions are preferred

WA State Department of Natural Resources	**Bureau Veritas Certification North America, Inc**
Program Participant	**Certification Body (if 3rd party certified)**
Lislie Sayers	
Contact (for more information)	
Forest Certification Program Implementation Lead	**360-902-2896**	**360-902-1789**
Title of Contact	**Phone for Contact**	**Fax for Contact**
lislie.sayers@dnr.wa.gov	
E-mail for Contact	

2009 Progress Report for Public Agency, Conservation Group, and Other non-Industrial Forest Landowners

I. General Information

- Forestland[i] Information for Program Participant
  list in acres; to convert from hectares multiply number of hectares by 2.471

TABLE 1.

Country	Total Acres Managed[1]	Acres Certified to the SFI 2005-2010 Standard[2]
United States	2, 010, 748	2,010,748
Canada-Crown License		
Canada-Private Land		

[1]Include acreage in Canada and or the United States that is enrolled in the SFI program.
[2]Include only forest management certifications on the acres managed.

- Recreation
  list in acres only; to convert from hectares to acres, multiply by 2.471
  - For lands owned or controlled by your organization, how many acres are open to the public for recreation (this includes private leases and public permits)? __**2, 010, 748**_____ **(U.S. acres)** _____**(Canadian acres)**

II. Harvesting and Reforestation—Participant Land (list in acres only; to convert from hectares to acres, multiply by 2.471)

- How many acres of harvest units[ii] were completed in 2009[iii] by?

TABLE 2.

Harvest Method	U.S. Acres	Canadian Acres
1. Clearcutting[iv]	*392	
1a. Average size of clearcut harvest areas	*43.6	
2. Seed Tree and Shelterwood	3,121	
3. Selection Methods	1,900	
4. Commercial Thinning or Sanitation Salvage	5,065	

*DNR uses the term clearcut for units that meet the definition in WAC 222-16-10 which states: "Clearcut means a harvest method in which the entire stand of trees is removed in one timber harvesting operation." A literal interpretation is used so that only units that have had all trees removed are classified as clearcut. Due to legacy tree requirements, riparian management zones, other retention areas etc., clearcuts only occur when there are no standing trees available to meet these requirements such as after a fire or severe blow down event. The term variable retention harvest (VRH) is used for units that are regeneration harvests yet retain trees to meet legacy tree or habitat objectives. The table below contains data for clearcuts and variable retention harvests.

	Clearcut	VRH	Combined
Acres	392	11,572	11,964
Average unit size	43.6	36.7	36.9

Note: SFI 2005-209 Performance Measure 5.2 states: *Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests. Indicators: 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. 2. Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.*

TABLE 3.

Please provide explanation if the average size of your clearcut harvest areas exceeds 120 acres
Disease or insect outbreak? _____
Fire salvage? _____
Windthrow? _____
Hurricane? _____
Government regulations requiring larger harvest areas (please specify government policy name and requirement)? _____
Other, please explain:_____

- 2009 Reforestation[v] Activities and Five Year Assessment[v] (Section 1 is for U.S., Section 2 is for Canada)
  - Reforestation Data for the United States (list in acres only; to convert from hectares, multiply by 2.471)

TABLE4.1

Regeneration Type	Within 1 year of Final Harvest (acres)	Within 2 years of Final Harvest (acres)	More than 2 years after Final Harvest (acres)	Total for 2009 (sum of all three-acres)	Percent of Harvest Units Regenerated After 5 Growing Seasons
1. Artificial					
a. Planting	9,277	+ 4,924	+ 1,161	= 15,362	
b. Direct Seeding		+	+	= 0	
2. Natural	Acres In 2009				
a. All types	1,176				
3. Artificial and Natural					
a. All types					100 %

*DNR requires, at a minimum, every reforestation project shall receive an early survey (a stocking survey the first year after planting, or a natural regeneration survey within two years following harvest) and at least one survey to certify that desired species are present in prescribed distribution and numbers and are beyond lethal vegetative competition ("free to grow"). Additional surveys shall be added as needed to ensure timely re-planting or vegetation management. To assess progress toward meeting the free to grow condition, the department tracks the certification of units as free to grow and, for harvested units not certified, the activities that are planned for achieving a free to grow condition.

This approach, while assuring the department meets its objectives, does not provide information specifically after five growing seasons. However, based on harvest methods and assessments done on these units during this five year period it can be reasonably presumed that 100% of them are regenerated to the standard established by forest practices rules and 95% of the stands are certified "free to grow" by this time period.

Using the department's free to grow approach; a silvicultural prescription is required for each unit. This prescription details the distribution and numbers of desired species to be regenerated on the unit. The prescribed regeneration must always meet, but normally exceeds, forest practices rule requirements. Of units harvested in FY 2004 25% have been certified as free to grow. An additional 68% of these harvested units have appropriate follow-up activities and assessments scheduled to assure the free to grow condition is achieved.

- Reforestation Data for Canada (list in acres only; to convert from hectares, multiply by 2.471)

TABLE 4.2

Regeneration Type	Within 1 year of Final Harvest (acres)	Within 2 years of Final Harvest (acres)	More than 2 years after Final Harvest (acres)	Total for 2009 (sum of all three-acres)	Percent of Harvest Units Regenerated After 5 Growing Seasons
1. Artificial					
a. Planting	n/a	+	+	=	
b. Direct Seeding	n/a	+	+	=	
2. Natural	Acres In 2009				
a. All types	n/a				
3. Artificial and Natural					
a. All types					%

III. Research Funding – Internal & External[vi] —($US and $Canadian)

TABLE 5.

	Funding–United States		Funding–Canada	
Category	Internal ($US)	External ($US)	Internal ($Canadian)	External ($Canadian)
A. Forest Health & Productivity		$272,286		
B. Water Quality				
C. Wildlife and Fish	$1, 069, 721			
D. Landscape/Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity				
E. All Other				

IV. SFI Implementation Committee Support

- Funding provided in 2009 for SFI program implementation activities at the state or provincial level (include all funding your organization provided in 2009 to SFI Implementation Committees and others for logger training and education and all other SFI program implementation activities at the state or provincial level):
  - Support for U.S. SFI Implementation Committees (USD) **$500.00**
  - Support for Canadian SFI Implementation Committees (CAD) _____

V. Conservation Partnerships

Since 1995, SFI-certified organizations have contributed more than $1 billion (US) for research activities to improve the health, productivity and responsible management of forest resources. These conservation partnerships are key to responsible forest management, and SFI Inc. acknowledges them in a number of ways, including through conservation awards. Is your organization currently involved in any conservation partnerships/projects?

- ● Yes No

- If yes, please describe below and/or with attachments. The description should include: name of project; partners involved; conservation objective; start date; (estimated) completion date; total project cost; your organization's contribution; other. Note: Please only list projects that were active or concluded in 2009/2010. If you are reporting more than one project, please copy and paste the below table as often as needed.

TABLE 7.a

Project Name	**Stevens County Pre-Commercial Thinning (Northeast Region)**
Short Project Description	Project will thin overstocked young (non-merchantable) forests to reduce wild fire risk and improve forest health.
Partners	US Forest Service – through ARRA Stimulus Funds
Conservation Objective	Improve forest health through thinning to reduce forest susceptibility to insects, disease and fire. In the process help protect homes in the rural forest interface.
Start Date (estimated)	November 2009
Completion date (estimated)	December 31, 2012
Total Project Cost	$65,000 grant
Contribution	None required, but DNR is providing unit layout, contracting and compliance of the thinning as part of current budget.
Other	

TABLE 7. b

Project Name	**Northeast Washington Tree Improvement FIT (Northeast Region)**
Short Project Description	Many of DNR managed forests are overcrowded and have trees that are infested with or susceptible to insects, diseases, wind, ice storms, and fire. The desired outcome of this project is to complete the layout of Forest Improvement Treatment (FIT) projects that will treat up to 2342 acres of DNR managed stands located in Northeast Washington's 5th congressional district, Ferry and Okanogan counties which have been identified to be at-risk of catastrophic loss caused by forest health related issues. Treatment will result in healthier forests in the future and provide funding for non-funded DNR and private forestry consulting jobs today.
Partners	US Forest Service – through ARRA Stimulus Funds
Conservation Objective	Reduce Risk of catastrophic loss due to fire, insects and disease.
Start Date (estimated)	February 1, 2010
Completion date (estimated)	December 31, 2012
Total Project Cost	$280,900
Contribution	N/A
Other	

TABLE 7. c

Project Name	**Highlands Cooperative Fuel Break (Northeast Region)**
Short Project Description	Project is designed to create fuel breaks in strategic locations that will modify wildland fire size, intensity, and behavior; therefore reducing risk to lives, homes, cropland, and natural resources. The created fuel break will assist firefighters in fire suppression, reduce suppression costs, and increase firefighter safety. Havillah community members will build relationships through collaboration with state and federal cooperators. The Havillah CWPP identified mitigation and action items that needed to be implemented in order to achieve the goals identified. Creation of this project will help to accomplish those goals. The CWPP process has increased community awareness and landowners will continue to accomplish fuels reduction and defensible space projects throughout the CWPP area.
Partners	Highlands Fire Defense Team L.C.G.; Sinlahekin Wildlife Area, Wa. Dept. of Fish &Wildlife; WA DNR Highlands District; Wenatchee/Okanogan National Forest; Okanogan CO Planning Department; OK CO Emergency Services; Mount Toleman, BIA; Spokane BLM Wenatchee FieldUnit; OK FPD #12 Tonasket Fire; OK FPD #11 Chesaw/Molson Fire; Okanogan Fire Chief's Association
Conservation Objective	Reduce fuel loadings, protect forest communities and in the process improve forest health and make forest more resilient.
Start Date (estimated)	September 2009
Completion date (estimated)	September 2010
Total Project Cost	$74,800
Contribution	
Other	$38,800 in labor, and equipment. The agency also thinned a much larger adjacent area as part of a Forest Improvement Treatment (FIT) Sale.

TABLE 7. d

Project Name	**Silvis Project** – Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative **(Northeast Region)**
Short Project Description	In cooperation with the Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative at the University of Idaho, Moscow, this research study is designed to investigate young western larch stand density, fertilization and thinning management activities that accelerate young forest stand productivity and develop non-lynx/hare habitat into desired lynx/hare habitat in a shorter period. The Cooperative established a 36 acre western larch seedling spacing, fertilization and thinning study trial at the site location known as "Silvis" in northeast Washington. Six thousand seven hundred and twenty western larch seedlings were planted. There are 4 blocks and 32 plots in the research area. Treatments include three planting densities, two fertilizer blends, and two thinning regimes.
Partners	University of Idaho and the Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative
Conservation Objective	• To determine which stocking and nutrition combinations will improve quality and longevity of snowshoe hare habitat, and • To determine which stocking and nutrition combinations maximize western larch seedling productivity.
Start Date (estimated)	Summer 2007
Completion date (estimated)	Fall 2012 - 5 year report – study will be long term
Total Project Cost	$109,000 DNR funding
Contribution	DNR has also supported this project by supplying 6700 larch seedlings, some labor for planting and vegetation management. DNR also provides cash contribution to the project. Support levels are adjusted periodically to reflect available budget.
Other	

TABLE 7. e

Project Name	**Slice Above Research Installation-** Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative - Nutrition Effects on Future Forest Productivity Study **(Northeast Region)**
Short Project Description	This phase of the nutrient management project involves a core experiment of long-term plots established on newly harvested sites using bole-only and whole tree harvesting in both thinnings and final harvests. In addition, a wide array of post-harvest silvicultural treatment options will be considered including site preparation variations (slash treatment and prescribed burning), "weed and/or feed" operations, and various levels of biomass utilization (retention or removal). Each of these treatments can affect a site's nutrient status and therefore its productivity. In the core experiment, a series of permanent plots, each classified by level of site disturbance and slash retention, will be located within each of the general bole-only and whole tree harvest treatment units
Partners	University of Idaho and the Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative
Conservation Objective	To develop forest management guidelines for various site types that land managers can use to assess probable impact of management operations on nutrient retention and future growth.
Start Date (estimated)	Fall 2010
Completion date (estimated)	Trees will be planted spring 2011 – this will be a long term nutrition study and will go on for decades.
Total Project Cost	$75,500 by the Intermountain Forest Tree Nutrition Cooperative.
Contribution	Adjustments to harvest contract, seedlings, financial support of the cooperative. DNR pays annual dues of $31,120 to the coop that helps pay for this work.
Other	

TABLE 7. f

Project Name	**Species Diversity on Trust Lands (Northwest Region)**
Short Project Description	The NW Region of the Washington DNR submitted a successful proposal for the 2010 planting season that will benefit from Arbor Day Foundation reforestation support. The Arbor Day Foundation will provide the funding for 103,780 western red cedar seedlings. By covering the cost of western redcedar seedlings in NW Region, the Arbor Day Foundation will help the DNR to ensure future trust beneficiaries the highest level of value and ecological function from state forests now and into the future.
Partners	The Arbor Day Foundation
Conservation Objective	The DNR strives to maintain forests where species diversity is present. Traditional forestry in Washington State has created very large areas of Douglas fir plantations. While Douglas fir is a very important and valuable tree, the DNR has also been planting other species to help maintain diversity across the landscape. One of the most important species planted is western redcedar. This species has maintained high value over time and provides a wealth of ecological benefits, including the creation of long lasting snags and down woody debris on which many animal species depend. This is also a tree of significant cultural value to Northwest Native American tribes.
Start Date (estimated)	January 11, 2010
Completion date (estimated)	April 30, 2010
Total Project Cost	$35,285.20

Contribution	Same as above
Other	none

TABLE 7. g

Project Name	**Land Use License #60-WS0480 (South Puget Sound Region)**
Short Project Description	Monitor stream temperatures in the Nisqually Basin
Partners	Nisqually Indian Tribe
Conservation Objective	The Washington State Department of Ecology (WDOE) criteria for the highest 7-DADMax for streams in the Nisqually Basin forest lands (the area of interest) is 17.5 degrees Celsius from June 15 to September 15 (WAC 173-201A-200). The goal of this proposal is to determine, on an annual basis, if there is any proportion of the stream miles in Nisqually forest lands with temperatures for the 7-DADMax equal to or less than 17.5 degrees Celsius from June 15 to September 15. Additional Objectives: • Construct summer temperature regimes for sites • Detect temperature regime changes over the long term (20 years)
Start Date (estimated)	7/15/09
Completion date (estimated)	7/14/14
Total Project Cost	Unknown
Contribution	Staff time to prepare and execute the license.
Other	

TABLE 7. h

Project Name	**Land Use License #60-WS0481 (South Puget Sound Region)**
Short Project Description	Monitor stream conditions on Beaver Creek, Sahara Creek, and an unnamed creek on land recently acquired from Fruit Growers.
Partners	Department of Ecology
Conservation Objective	To measure stream conditions as part of the Washington State Status & Trends Program's Puget regional assessment. To collect biological and habitat data from randomly selected rivers and streams to describe regional and statewide conditions and to inform public policy. More information about the project can be found at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/stsmf/index.html
Start Date (estimated)	7/13/09
Completion date (estimated)	10/31/09
Total Project Cost	Unknown
Contribution	Staff time to prepare and execute the license.
Other	

TABLE 7. i

Project Name	**Land Use License #60-WS0487 (South Puget Sound Region)**
Short Project Description	Measure tree diameters and volume of coarse woody debris for carbon stock assessment in S11 T23N R07E.
Partners	University of Washington Urban Ecology Research Lab
Conservation Objective	A research project for carbon stock assessment of the Central Puget Sound Region.
Start Date (estimated)	9/16/09
Completion date (estimated)	9/18/09

Total Project Cost	Unknown
Contribution	Staff time to prepare and execute the license.
Other	

TABLE 7. j

Project Name	**Land Use License #60-WS0497 (South Puget Sound Region)**
Short Project Description	Create forest edge openings & remove downed trees to enhance wildlife mobility and foraging on DNR property east of North Bend.
Partners	Upper Snoqualmie Elk Management Group
Conservation Objective	Improve elk habitat
Start Date (estimated)	1/15/10
Completion date (estimated)	1/15/15
Total Project Cost	Unknown
Contribution	Staff time to prepare and execute the license.
Other	

TABLE 7. k

Project Name	**Land Use License #60-WS0499 (South Puget Sound Region)**
Short Project Description	Conduct research on black-tailed does and fawns in the Green Mountain and Tahuya State Forests.
Partners	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Conservation Objective	To estimate black-tailed deer populations, and the effects of forest management on black-tailed deer ecology and populations.
Start Date (estimated)	3/1/10
Completion date (estimated)	12/31/12
Total Project Cost	Unknown
Contribution	Staff time to prepare and execute the license.
Other	

TABLE 7.l

Project Name	**Experimental Forest & Range Network (Olympic Region)**
Short Project Description	Designates DNR-managed trust lands in the Olympic Experimental State Forest (OESF) as a participating forest in the Forest Service's Experimental State Forest & Range Network.
Partners	US Forest Service
Conservation Objective	• To accomplish many HCP objectives for the OESF in fulfilling the long-term vision for an experimental forest; • To further the mission of providing scientific and technical assistance; and • To expand the Experimental Forest & Range Network into the temperate rain forest of the Olympic Peninsula.
Start Date (estimated)	8.25.09
Completion date (estimated)	8.25.14
Total Project Cost	Projects are dependent on available resources

Contribution	Projects are dependent on available resources
Other	

VI. SFI Label Use

SFI Inc. often features companies that use SFI on-product labels, and shows samples of these products, in publications and other market outreach materials that raise awareness of the value of certification. If we can feature your organization/products, please forward SFI-labeled samples to Amy Doty, 900 17th Street, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20006.

From: Metnick, Jason [mailto:Jason.Metnick@sfiprogram.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2010 5:57 AM
To: SAYERS, LISLIE (DNR)
Cc: Cantrell, Rick
Subject: RE: 2009 Progress Report

Thanks Lislie.
Jason

From: SAYERS, LISLIE (DNR)
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 12:53 PM
To: 'Amy.Doty@sfiprogram.org'
Cc: ESTEP, ALLEN (DNR)
Subject: 2009 Progress Report

Amy,

Section VI of the 2009 SFI® Progress Report indicates:

> SFI Inc. often features companies that use SFI on-product labels, and shows samples of these products, in publications and other market outreach materials that raise awareness of the value of certification. If we can feature your organization/products, please forward SFI-labeled samples to Amy Doty, 900 17th Street, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20006.

Attached is a pdf of WDNR's certification fact sheet displaying the SFI logo. I'm not sure if it's something that you are interested in since we have both the SFI and FSC logo. But, I thought I'd send it your way. If you'd prefer hard copy, I can send to you that way too.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

VII. Government Relations (optional)

As part of our SFI 2010 strategy, SFI Inc will work with governments at the local, state/provincial and federal levels to enhance recognition of the value of the SFI program across public and private lands and certified and uncertified lands through our fiber sourcing program, our forest management standard and key outreach activities such as conservation projects, Habitat for Humanity and research. Information regarding your organization's involvement in government programs, partnerships and projects would be helpful for SFI to support your work and develop further opportunities to build strong relationships with governments to increase understanding and support of the SFI program. SFI Inc. is also interested in any challenges or unexplored opportunities to build those relationships and ensure strong support of the SFI program and acceptance of SFI certified forest products.

TABLE 8.

Current projects involving government	Optional
Opportunities to involve government moving forward	Optional
Current challenges related to SFI and government acceptance	Optional

VIII. Profile

SFI Inc. is often asked for short profiles on SFI Program Participants. If possible, please provide a brief profile of your organization including product information in the space below or with attachments.

Currently, all 2.1 million acres of Department of Natural Resources (DNR) managed forested state trust lands in Washington State are certified under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Standard. About 166,000 acres of lands within the South Puget Habitat Conservation Plan Planning Unit (located within King, Peirce, Thurston, Lewis, Kitsap, and Mason counties) also are certified under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Pacific Coast Regional Standard.

Since 1970, DNR has generated almost $7.1 billion on state trust lands from sustainably harvesting timber, and from leasing activities such as agriculture, windpower and communication site leases. Trust revenue supports the state's public schools, other institutions, and county services. DNR must treat this and future generations of trust beneficiaries equally. Every 10 years, or as environmental or other regulations change, DNR re-calculates the sustainable timber harvest level so that we do not harvest more than is sustainable into the future. With some of the highest environmental standards in the world, DNR-managed forests offer local markets a continuous flow of high-quality wood that feeds Northwest mills and woodworkers.

Having some of the most commercially productive forests in the United States, DNR is working hard to ensure that products for business, home construction or weekend projects are grown and harvested to protect core environmental values. From lumber to paper, buyers can do their part by asking for FSC- and SFI-certified products. Products grown, harvested, made and milled in the Pacific Northwest support our local communities and help retain working forests that contribute to our quality of life in Washington.

For additional information, attached are two documents:

- Sustainable Working Forests – Washington's "green certified" State Trust Forests; and
- Certification Opportunities for DNR Purchasers.

IX. Off-Shore Fiber

Currently, data collection for the SFI program report includes only U.S. and Canadian information. However, SFI is interested in how much fiber Program Participants procure from offshore and use in manufacturing facilities in the U.S. or Canada that are enrolled in the SFI program. The SFI definition of procurement is: Acquisition of roundwood (sawlogs or pulpwood) and field-manufactured or primary-mill residual chips, pulp, and veneer to support a forest products manufacturing facility.

- Does your company procure off-shore fiber (outside U.S./Canada? Yes ●No
- If yes, how much fiber used by your manufacturing facilities in the US or Canada enrolled in the SFI program is procured from off-shore (please specify units-green tons, MCF, etc.)? _____

X. Biotechnology & Genetic Engineering

Forest tree biotechnology includes the study of genes and genomes and the asexual insertion of genes into trees, or, genetic engineering (GE). Genetically engineered plants are regulated in the US by the USDA Animal and Plant Health

Inspection Service (APHIS). To date APHIS has approved the use of 70 products including two trees (papaya and plum), but no forest trees have been submitted for approval at this time.

Are you:

- Currently doing research with GE trees? Yes ● No
- Planning any research with GE trees? Yes ●No
- Planning commercial plantings of GE trees? Yes ●No
  - if yes, year of anticipated deployment _____
- What % of your current US and Canadian supply is from GE trees? ___0____%
  - What do you project your % will be in 5 years? ___0____%
- What % of your current off shore supply is from GE trees? ___0____%
  - What do you project your % will be in 5 years? ___0____%

XI. Please use the space below to address any other issues or ideas you may have for the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Program.

_____
_____
_____
_____

ENDNOTES

[i] A forested area is classified as "forestland" if it is at least one acre in size and contains 10 percent tree cover.

[ii] These questions are directed solely at harvest and regeneration activities on participant-owned lands, lands under long-term lease to the participant, or lands for which the participant has forest management responsibilities. A long-term lease is one that extends beyond a single rotation – lands would not be included if the number of years specified in or remaining on a lease is less than one rotation.

[iii] Only refer to units where harvesting was completed in 2009. This includes harvesting activities that were started in 2008 and completed in 2009, but not those that were still underway by the end of 2009 calendar/fiscal year.

[iv] There are a variety of definitions for the term "clearcut." In order of preference, the following definitions should be used:

- First, use the legal definition within the state or province in which harvesting activities took place.
- Second, if no legal definition exists within the state or province, use the Society of American Foresters (SAF 1998) definition: "Clearcutting is a regeneration or harvest method that removes essentially all trees in a stand."
- Third, if the SAF definition is deemed inappropriate, you can use a company-specific definition that is consistent with the spirit and intent of the SFI program. Please include the definition with your report.

[v] The replanting "clock" starts after the entire unit is harvested or the sale has been completed (see end note iii). Do not include areas that were replanted due to poor seedling survival. The last column (five-year regeneration success) is designed to provide information on regeneration successes across all regeneration categories: planting, seeding and natural regeneration. As an example, for the time frame ending 12-31-09, list the percentage of harvest units that have adequate regeneration after five complete growing seasons post-harvest.

[vi] List the amount of funding in $US or $Canadian your organization provided in the calendar/fiscal year for forest-related research within your organization (internal) and outside your organization (external) through grants, in-kind assistance, cooperatives, etc. Internal research funding includes salaries for forest-related research staff. While it is difficult in many instances to identify to which category research funding should be allocated, Use your best judgment to identify the primary intent of the project so you can include it in the appropriate research category. If this is not possible, use the "other" category.