



**BUREAU  
VERITAS**

**Bureau Veritas Certification  
North America, Inc.  
SFI Audit Report**

390 Benmar Drive, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77060

Phone (281) 986-1300: Toll Free (800) 937-9311

Company Name	Domtar
Contact Person	Mike Furniss
Address	1 Station Rd , Espanola, ON
Phone / Fax	705-869-2020 ext. 101
PQC Code	E01E-Forestry, logging related

Contract Number:	<b>CA 1732893</b>	Certification Audit:	x	Re-Certification Audit:		Surveillance: (Indicate visit # or Pre-Assessment)	
------------------	-------------------	----------------------	---	-------------------------	--	---	--

**Audit Summary**

**Introduction**

This report documents the Stage 1 assessment of the status of Domtar Inc.'s forest management program on its 11,836 acres (4792 hectares) private lands against the requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 Forest Management Standard. All parcels are within 80 km (50 miles) of Domtar's pulp and Paper Mill in Espanola, ON. The audit evaluated performance against the requirements of Objectives 1-7, 14-17 and 19 and 20. The forest lands are also certified to the FSC Forest Management standard and a Private Land Management Plan, which has been approved under Ontario's Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program.

**Audit Scope, Objectives and Process**

The scope of the audit is "Forest Management". No harvest has occurred on the lands past 30 years. The parcels were acquired by the company as a source of fiber for the mill, as such, the main focus of land management has been timber production. The land has also been used by the public or organizations (i.e. cottage associations or snowmobile clubs) for a variety of recreational programs.

Standard Bureau Veritas Certification protocols and forms were applied throughout the audit as provided by the most recent version of the Bureau Veritas Certification SFI Auditor Handbook. The objective of the audit was to confirm the company's continuing conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Forest Management Standard Objectives 1-7, 14-17 and 19 and 20, and the associated ISO Guide 65 requirements. The audit also included certification to the FSC and PEFC chain of custody standards.

The audit included a review of forest management documents detailing adherence to the SFI standard as well as site inspections of 9 distinct parcels. As noted above, no harvest or other operations have occurred on any of the private ownership in over 30 years. The site inspections focused mainly on wood quality, recreational use, and access.

**Audit Plan**

A copy of the audit plan was submitted to Domtar in advance of the audit and has been retained on file at BV offices in Houston. A copy of the audit plan has also been appended to this report.

## Company Information

Domtar is a multinational forest products company that manufactures pulp, paper, and personal care products from virgin wood and recycled fibre. The company is publically traded on both the New York and Toronto Stock exchanges. The majority of its pulp production is consumed internally to manufacture paper and consumer products. Domtar is the largest integrated marketer of uncoated freesheet paper in North America with recognized brands such as Cougar®, Lynx® Opaque Ultra, Husky® Opaque Offset, First Choice®, and EarthChoice® Office Paper. Domtar is also a leading marketer and producer of a broad line of incontinence care products marketed primarily under the Attends®, IncoPack, and Indasec® brand names as well as baby diapers. In 2013, Domtar had sales of US\$5.4 billion from some 50 countries. The Company employs approximately 10,000 people.

This audit is focused on the private land held in conjunction with the company's Espanola pulp and paper mill.

## Audit Results

The company was well prepared for the audit. Documentation was in order and the small staff was very familiar with the requirements of the SFI standard. One minor nonconformance was issued pertaining to background information in support of eventual herbicide use. Given that no herbicides had been used in over 30 years and no use was anticipated in the next three years, the non-conformity addressed a documentation requirement of the standard as opposed to strategic of field based performance.

A summary of company performance for each of the objectives evaluated follows:

**Objective 1 – Forest Management Planning:** The company has a complete forest management plan that addresses the requirements of the SFI standard. It has been formatted to meet the requirements of the Ontario Managed Forest Tax Incentive program, with unique SFI program additions, such as internal audits and management reviews, added as supplements.

There are two additional documents that provide direction to management on the forest. The first is the approved Forest Management Plan (FMP) for the North Shore Forest. The North Shore Forest is a 1,080,477 ha (2.5 million acres) public forest owned by the Province of Ontario and managed under the auspices of a Sustainable Forest Licence by North Shore Forest Inc. The FMP for the North Shore Forest features public review and government approval, and includes long term (i.e. 120 years) strategic plans for timber and non-timber values as well as operational procedures for forest harvest, renewal and protection of non-timber forest products.

The second operations guidance document is the Guide to Best Management Practices for Forest Operations in Northern Ontario and Manitoba, produced by the SFI implementation Committee for Central Canada. The document includes operational procedures for road construction and maintenance, use of qualified logging professionals, stream crossings, environmental protection of non-timber values, aggregates, harvest (including environmental protection, harvest prescriptions, wood utilization and wasteful practices, and adverse weather), post-harvest operations and forest renewal, management of hazardous materials health and safety and emerging measures and spill response.

The timber inventory on the forest is approximately 30 years old. New digital photography is currently available (flown in 2009) and a newly interpreted inventory is expected in 2017.

Domtar has two staff working in their procurement group that is responsible for management and harvest on their private lands. They are supported on an as needed basis by private consultants or by staff from North Shore Forest Inc.

In summary, the management of the forest is well documented and, in the opinion of the auditor, meets the requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 standard Objective 1.

**Objective 2 – Forest productivity:** Domtar staff maintain responsibility to create renewal prescriptions on a site by site basis. This is done at the time of harvest planning and verified post-harvest to ensure prescription are still valid for site conditions and have a high probability of meeting company objectives in term of future wood supply as well as non-timber objectives (e.g. provision of wildlife or occasionally recreational opportunities. Soil conservation is maintained through implementation of Operating Procedures for Domtar Freehold lands (April 2014). These procedures rely on technical standards listed in the Central Canada SFI Implementation Committee (Guide to best Management Practices for Forest Operations in Northern Ontario and Manitoba 2012) as well as Area of Concern Prescriptions (AOC) that are a formal part of the government approved 2009-2019 Forest management plans for the North Shore Forest. Carbon storage has been addressed briefly in Appendix 6 of the MIFTIP Plan (Non timber values). The basic premise is that the land will be maintained as forested by careful monitor and timely renewal.

There have been no herbicides or other chemicals used on the land base in over 30 years and none are expected for two or three years post-harvest. However, the company did not have as specific commitment to meet the requirements of indicator 2.2.2 (use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives) and a nonconformance was issue.

Soil protection measures are in place and procedures guiding road construction and water quality protection are well defined. The company monitors insect pest populations and has treated with the biological insecticide bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) to limit damage cause by the jack pine budworm in the recent past.

There were no other deficiencies noted with respect to Objective 2.

**Objective 3 - Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources:** The forest management plan has specific Area of Concern (AOC) prescriptions for working around or near water bodies. The Best Management Practices (BMP) guide has 3 sections that address working around water. Water crossings and riparian habitat protection have been effectively managed. These meet local, provincial, and federal requirements with respect to water quality protection. No harvest contracts have been issued recently, but procedures note that harvest operations must conform to the AOC prescriptions defined in the Forest Management Plan for the North Shore Forest. This document, which was constructed and reviewed by a multi-disciplinary planning team, vetted by a local citizens committee is available for public review on the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) web site (<http://www.efmp.lrc.gov.on.ca/eFMP/home.do?currentFmu=&language=en>) includes a complete list of detailed prescriptions for operations near all identifiable non timber values, including all operations near aquatic values (e.g. riparian areas, bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of ecological significance, crossings over streams of rivers).

In summary, management perceptions near aquatic values are well defined. In the opinion of the auditor, meets the requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 standard Objective 3.

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value: The impact of the relatively small parcels of private lands on wildlife habitat is relatively small. All stands have been evaluated for presence of Rare, threatened or endangered (RTE) species. With the exception of specific sites, on one block, which have been mapped and are specifically managed to maintain white oak growing at the northern edge of its range, all non-timber species identified are also occupants of the much larger adjacent Crown land base. As has been noted in the NSF 2009 FMP, no special management activities, other than protection of nests during breeding season, are required for work in these areas.

Surveys have not been completed for aquatic species but potential impacts on these have been mitigated by buffer zones and operating prescriptions during road construction near streams.

Some of the stands were originally planted (circa 1990) for volume production of pulp fibre, and these stands have less inherent biodiversity than would be found in a more natural forest. The impact of these more homogenous stands has been mitigated as natural mortality of planted stock and emergence of natural species understory has developed, and by the small area included in the private Domtar forests contained entirely within the boundaries of the 1.8 million ha North Shore Crown forest.

In the opinion of the auditor, management of the forest meets the requirements of the SFI 2010-2014 standard Objective 4.

Objective 5 - Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits: The program level evidence addressing the requirements of Objective 5 is not currently consolidated. However, there are several items that, if considered collectively, meet the standard of the visual quality management requirements. The NSF 2009 FMP includes viewscape analysis from tourism lakes and includes direction for operations are around public waterways and highways. Direction in the Central Canada SFI Implementation Committee BMP's (pre harvest planning) direct a non-harvest buffer be left "for your neighbors aesthetics". The company has internal direction to leave a 30 m buffer unless the exact the location of the property boundary is known, which contributes to the sense of visual quality protection. Finally, the company has stated intentions to promptly renew all harvest sites, thereby replacing the view of recent harvest with that of a new and growing forest. Overall the auditor would conclude that the components of a visual quality program are in place. **There is some interpretation required to support this conclusion, and an Opportunity for improvement (OFI) has been issued suggesting conformance to the requirements of this indicator could be more clearly be presented if the evidence were issued in a collated procedure (Indicator 5.1.1).**

Objective 6 - Protection of special sites: Special sites have been identified as High Conservation Values (HCV) as part of the company's FSC forest management certification of the land base. In one case (White oak site) there is a site specific management prescription. Parcel 1502 has been set aside as a trail for public use. No other special sites have been identified. In the opinion of the auditor, the company has met the requirements of this objective.

Objective 7 - Efficient use of forest resources: No harvest has occurred so empirical evidence of conformance does not exist. The company has procedures on product utilization defined in the CCSIC BMP's and their own forest management plan. In the opinion of the auditor, the company has met the requirements of this objective, but notes that a fuller evaluation will be completed once harvest operations have occurred.

Objectives 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are not applicable to the certification of this forest.

Objective 14 - Legal and Regulatory Compliance: The company subscribes to an annual subscription service that tracks all legal, regulatory, and policy requirements. The list does not include the Pesticides Control Act. This is not a significant omission as the company is not currently using pesticides. However, an NCR has been issued requiring the company to conform to requirements of indicator 2.2.2. An OFI is issued suggesting the company ensure the Ontario Pesticides Act is included in the list for indicator 14.1.1.

Objective 15 - Forestry Research, Science, and Technology: Company is an active member of the CCSIC, FP Innovation, and the Forest Ecosystem Science Cooperative and the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI). Research and technology transfer efforts are visible. NCASI has a list of projects vs SFI indicator. Company participates in climate change research and the staff is aware of research by NCASI with respect to climate change. Short rotation on the private lands should allow for reaction in a timely manner as process for reacting to climate change matures. In the opinion of the auditor, the company has met the requirements of this objective.

Objective 16 – Training and Education: The Company maintains an extensive training list of suppliers that includes a summary of the individuals that have received training on each of the ten CCSIC training modules and the year that training was received. The representative from North Shore Forest Management listed on the training roster is currently directly employed by Domtar. Other supply staff have been trained through the CCSIC training modules. In the opinion of the auditor, the training program for both staff and contractors is effectively implemented and monitored. The requirements of this objective have been met.

Objective 17 - Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry: Domtar is an active member of the CCSIC. The Company maintains an interpretive trail for the public on part of their land base immediately adjacent to the Town of Espanola. This was established in conjunction with the local Boy Scouts and School groups.

Objective 18 - Public Land Management Responsibilities: this objective is not applicable to this certification as there are no public lands involved.

Objective 19: Communications and Public Reporting: The requirements of this objective will be evaluated on the first surveillance audit.

Objective 20 – Management review and Continual Improvement: Domtar is ISO 14000 and 9000 and an internal audit and management review process has been part of mill and woodlands operations for over a decade. A specific internal audit and management review of the FM program has been completed in advance of the certification audit. The requirements of this objective have been met.

## Findings

### Previous non-conformances:

Not applicable. As this is an initial audit report, no previous findings existed.

### Non-conformances: Indicator 2.2.1

The company has not used any herbicides in the past ten years, as there has been no harvest or renewal activity. The Freehold land operating procedures specifies that the company will consider possible alternatives prior to using herbicides, that the minimum amount possible shall be used to meet silvicultural objectives. The company has not included a statement confirming they will use only the least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives. **Minor NCR 2014-2.2.2 was issued.** The auditor notes that the company only has choice of three herbicides for its renewal program and that planned use will likely be based on use of the least toxic product.

### Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicator 5.1 – **Opportunity for Improvement** - The program level evidence that demonstrates visual quality considerations is not currently consolidated. However, there are several items that, if considered collectively, meet the implied standard of a visual quality management program. The NSF 2009 FMP includes viewscape analysis from tourism lakes and includes direction for operations are around public waterways and highways. Direction in the CCSIC BMP's (pre harvest planning) direct a non-harvest buffer be left "for your neighbors aesthetics". The company has internal direction to leave a 30 m buffer unless the exact the location of the property boundary is known, which contributes to the sense of visual quality protection. Finally, the company has stated intentions to promptly renew all harvest sites, thereby replacing the view of recent harvest with that of a new and growing forest. Overall the auditor would conclude that the components of a visual quality program are in place. **There is some interpretation required to support this conclusion, and an OFI is issued suggesting conformance to the requirements of this indicator could be more clearly be presented if the pieces were issued in a collated procedure.**

Indicator 14.1 **Opportunity for Improvement** - The company subscribes to an annual subscription service that tracks all legal, regulatory, and policy requirements. The list does not include the Pesticides Control Act. This is not a significant omission as the company is not currently using pesticides. However, an NCR has been issued requiring the company to conform to requirements of indicator 2.2.2 assuming herbicide use will occur as harvest and renewal activities proceed. An OFI is issued suggesting the company ensure the Ontario Pesticides Act is included in the list for indicator 14.1.1 prior to use of any pesticides on the forest.

**Notable Practices:** No notable practices were issued.

**Logo/label use:** The company does not have intentions to use the SFI logo.

**SFI reporting:** This will be evaluated at the first surveillance audit.

## Conclusions

The company has done an effective job of preparing and implementing the SFI program. One minor non-conformance and two opportunities for improvement were identified. In the opinion of the auditor, the company has presented sufficient evidence to support a recommendation that



Corrective Action Plan (s) Accepted	Yes	x	No		Date:	19 June 2014
Proceed to/Continue Certification	Yes	x	No		Date:	20 June 2014
All NCR's Cleared	Yes	x	No		Date:	19 June 2014
<b>Standard audit conducted against:</b>						
1)	SFI 2010-2014 – Objectives 1-7, 14-17, 19,20	3)				
2)		4)				
<b>Team Leader (1):</b>		<b>Team Members (2,3,4...)</b>				
Craig Howard		2)				
		3)				
		4)				
		5)				
<b>Scope of Supply: (scope statement must be verified and appear in the space below)</b>						
Forest Management						
Accreditation's	ANAB					
Number of Certificates	1					
<b>Proposed Date for Next Audit Event</b>						
Date	June 2015					
<b>Audit Report Distribution</b>						
Mike Furniss – (mike.furniss@domtar.com )						
Melani Potts (melani.potts@us.bureauveritas.com)						

Clause	Audit Report
Opening Meeting	<p>Participants: Phil Bunce (Consultant) , Paul Kallonen (Procurement Manager), Jim Hawkins (Environmental Technician) , Craig Howard (Auditor)</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Introductions</li> <li>➤ Scope of the audit</li> <li>➤ Audit schedule/plan</li> <li>➤ Nonconformance types – Major / Minor</li> <li>➤ Review of previous nonconformances - 0.</li> <li>➤ Process approach to auditing and audit sampling</li> <li>➤ Confidentiality agreement</li> <li>➤ Termination of the audit</li> <li>➤ Appeals process</li> <li>➤ Closing meeting timing</li> </ul>
Closing Meeting	<p>Participants: Phil Bunce (Consultant) , Paul Kallonen (Procurement Manager), Jim Hawkins (Environmental Technician) , Craig Howard (Auditor)</p> <p>Discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Introductions and appreciation for selecting Bureau Veritas Certification.</li> <li>➤ Review of audit process - process approach and sampling.</li> <li>➤ Review of OFIs and System Strengths</li> <li>➤ Nonconformances - 1</li> <li>➤ Date for next audit.</li> <li>➤ Reporting protocol and timing</li> </ul>





## SF02/NA NONCONFORMITY REPORT

<b>Company Name and Site:</b>		<b>SF02#:</b>	
Domtar, 1 Station Road, Espanola, ON		2014- 2.2.2	
Contract #:	Type of audit (e.g., initial, surveillance):	Team Leader:	
CA 1732981	SFI FM Initial audit	Craig Howard	
Date:	Standard and Clause #:	Team Member:	
17 June 2014	SFI 2010-2014 Ind 2.2.1		
Major	Minor	Other Documents (if applicable):	Company Representative:
	x		Mike Furniss
<b>REQUIREMENT OF AUDITED STANDARD:</b>			
Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives.			
<b>OBSERVED NONCONFORMITY:</b>			
<p>The company has not used any herbicides in the past ten years, as there has been no harvest or renewal activity. The Freehold land operating procedures specifies that the company will consider possible alternatives prior to using herbicides, that the minimum amount possible shall be used to meet silvicultural objectives. The company has not included a statement confirming they will use only the least toxic and narrowest –spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives. <b>Minor NCR 2014-2.2.2 was issued.</b> The auditor notes that the company only has choice of three herbicides for its renewal program and that planned use will likely be based on use of the least toxic product.</p>			
<b>ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN</b> (To be completed by the Company. Plan to be submitted in 30 days)			
Corrective Action Plan Date:	June 19, 2014	Company Representative:	Phil Bunce
<b>Root Cause Analysis and Corrective Action</b>			
<p><b>Root Cause:</b> Herbicides have not been used on the freehold in the past 10 years and with no current plantations requiring release they are not expected to be used in the near future. There are however Company operating procedures for herbicide use in place should they be required. Although implied, they do not actually state that only “least toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives” will be used.</p> <p><b>Corrective Action Plan:</b> The operating procedures will be updated to be sure that a statement to that effect will be included and the update will be completed by June 30, 2014 and incorporated into the Procedures document.</p>			
<b>ROOT CAUSE AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN ACCEPTANCE REPORT</b> (To be completed by Bureau Veritas Certification – Verify effective identification of Root Cause and acceptance of Corrective Action Plan)			
<p><b>Root Cause:</b> As no herbicides have been used and the procedures passed the requirements of the FSC standard , it was assumed that it would meet the SFI requirements. However, the specific wording of the SFI standard are not in the procedures.</p> <p><b>Corrective Action Plan:</b> The company will review the herbicide use procedures and ensure that it is specifically stated that only the least toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives. A review of alternatives will be conducted. It is highly likely that the only herbicide that will meet silvicultural objectives will be glyphosate, based on the competing vegetation challenges on the forest and the alternatives available.</p>			
Plan Accepted:	Yes	c	No
Auditor:		Craig Howard	Date: 18 June 2014
<b>CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION</b>			
To be completed by Company – Provide objective evidence. Not to exceed: 90 Days SFI, PEFC <input type="checkbox"/> ; 1 year FSC <input type="checkbox"/> ; other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Days			
Corrective Action Completion Date:		Company Representative:	

Corrective Action Implementation: Method used to verify effectiveness of action taken:											
<b>CORRECTIVE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION ACCEPTANCE REPORT</b> (To be completed by Bureau Veritas Certification – Acceptance of Corrective Action taken)											
Accepted:		Yes		No		Nonconformance Closed:		Yes		No	
Follow Up Comments:											
Auditor:						Date:					



**BUREAU  
VERITAS**

<b>Company</b>	Domtar		
<b>Contract Number</b>	CA.1732981		
<b>Audit Type</b>	Phase 2	<b>Audit Dates</b>	17 June 2014
<b>Standards</b>	SFI - 2010-2014		
<b>Audit Team:</b>	Craig Howard		
<b>SFI/EMS Representative:</b>	Mike Furniss		
<b>Opening Meeting:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	17 June 2014	
	<b>Time:</b>	0900	
	<b>Place:</b>	1 Station Rd., Espanola, Ontario P5E1R6	
<b>Closing Meeting:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	17 June 2014	
	<b>Time:</b>	1700	
	<b>Place:</b>	1 Station Rd., Espanola, Ontario P5E1R6	
<b>Audit Scope:</b>	Forest Management		
<b>Verification Indicators</b>	See table below		

**Audit Objectives – SFI Certification shall establish:**

Determine conformance of the organization’s SFI program against the SFIS, and determine whether the organization’s SFI Program Management System and on-the-ground activities conform to the SFIS.

**Procedures and Protocols Used:**

The certification audit will be conducted under environmental auditing methodologies identified in the 2010-2014 audit procedures section of the SFI standard requirements document. Standard protocols and forms as found in the Bureau Veritas Certification SFI Auditor Handbook will be applied throughout the verification.

**Audit Schedule**

**Date: 17 June 2014**

Time	Activity	BVC Repr.	Company Repr.
08:00	Opening Meeting	Howard	Furniss
0930	Document review	Howard	Furniss
10:00	Field inspections	Howard	Furniss
16:00	Auditor review	Howard	
16:30	Closing meeting	Howard	Furniss
17:00	Depart site	Howard	Furniss

**Notes:** This Phase 2 audit will complete a review of documents and field observations supporting Domtar’s SFI forest management program.

An “X” indicates the objectives, performance measures and indicators that will be audited. Yellow highlighted cells indicate mandatory objectives on all audits. Objectives 1-7 apply to forest land management. Objectives 8-13 apply to fiber sourcing, with Objectives 8-10 applicable to fiber sourcing within the United States and Canada, and Objectives 11-13 applicable to fiber sourcing outside the U.S. and Canada. Objectives 14-20 apply to both forest land management and fiber sourcing companies, with Objective 18 applicable to management of public lands.

All applicable objectives, performance measures, and indicators must be covered during the certification or renewal audit. All requirements must be audited between the two surveillances combined.

Audit event	Certification	Surveillance # 1	Surveillance # 2
<b>List sites audited; Meritt Township – parcel 8078, Stand 314, Meritt Township - parcel 4883, stand 258, Merritt Township – parcel 5143, stand 666,668, Curtin Township parcel 37, Stand 474, Curtin Township – Parcel 38, stand 514, Curtin Township -Parcel 38 stand 522, Curtin Township – Parcel 38 stand 647, Curtin Township- Parcel 38 Stand523, Curtin Township Parcel 37 stand 475</b>			
<b>OBJECTIVE 1</b>	X		
Performance Measure 1.1	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 2</b>	X		
Performance Measure 2.1	X		
Performance Measure 2.1	X		
Performance Measure 2.3	X		
Performance Measure 2.4	X		
Performance Measure 2.5	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 3</b>	X		
Performance Measure 3.1	X		
Performance Measure 3.2	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 4</b>	X		
Performance Measure 4.1	X		
Performance Measure 4.2	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 5</b>	X		
Performance Measure 5.1	X		
Performance Measure 5.2	X		
Performance Measure 5.3	X		
Performance Measure 5.4	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 6</b>	X		
Performance Measure 6.1	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 7</b>	X		
Performance Measure 7.1	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 8</b>	X		

Performance Measure 8.1	NOT APPLICABLE		
<b>OBJECTIVE 9</b>	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 9.1	NOT APPLICABLE		
<b>OBJECTIVE 10</b>	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 10.1	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 10.2	NOT APPLICABLE		
<b>OBJECTIVE 11</b>	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 11.1	NOT APPLICABLE		

<b>OBJECTIVE 12</b>	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 12.1	NOT APPLICABLE		
<b>OBJECTIVE 13</b>	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 13.1	NOT APPLICABLE		
<b>OBJECTIVE 14</b>	X		
Performance Measure 14.1	X		
Performance Measure 14.2	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 15</b>	X		
Performance Measure 15.1	X		
Performance Measure 15.2	X		
Performance Measure 15.3	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 16</b>	X		
Performance Measure 16.1	X		
Performance Measure 16.2	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 17</b>	X		
Performance Measure 17.1	X		
Performance Measure 17.2	X		
Performance Measure 17.3	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 18</b>	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 18.1	NOT APPLICABLE		
Performance Measure 18.2	NOT APPLICABLE		
<b>OBJECTIVE 19</b>	X		
Performance Measure 19.1	X		
Performance Measure 19.2	X		
<b>OBJECTIVE 20</b>	X		
Performance Measure 20.1	X		