



Surveillance Audit Report

Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

October 30, 2009

A. Program Participant's Name: Indiana Division of Forestry **FRS #: 6L841**

B. Scope: The Sustainable Forestry Initiative program of the Indiana Division of Forestry including land management operations on approximately 154,000 acres of Indiana State Forests and related sustainable forestry activities.

No Change

Changed (see Section H, revised scope statement noted on FRS)

C. NSF Audit Team:

Lead Auditor: Norman Boatwright FSC Auditor: Dave Capen

D. Audit Dates: October 26-28, 2009

E. Reference Documentation:

2005-2009 SFI Standard®; 2008-2012 Strategic Plan, Wildlife Strategy

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

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

Yes No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.
2006-2008 Audit Reports on website.

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)

Correct Action Requests issued this visit:

- 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).

The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented. All major nonconformance(s) must be closed by the auditor prior to the next scheduled surveillance audit by a special verification visit or by desk review, if possible.

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit, no CARs remain open:

MAJOR(S): 0 MINOR(S): 0

In addition, an Opportunity for Improvement (OFI) was 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



September 30, 2009

John Seifert, State Forester
Indiana DNR
402 W. Washington St. Room W296
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Re: Confirmation of SFI and FSC 2009 Surveillance Audits, Indiana DNR

Dear Mr. Seifert:

We are scheduled to conduct the Annual Surveillance Audits of the Indiana DNR on Monday October 26 to Wednesday October 28. The audit will commence with a formal opening meeting at the Harrison-Crawford State Forest Headquarters near Corydon. It will conclude with a closing meeting tentatively scheduled for October 28 (late morning) at the Clark State Forest Headquarters. Additional information regarding the itinerary is provided in the attached "Tentative Audit Schedule".

This is a partial review of your SFI and FSC Programs to confirm that they continue to be in conformance with the requirements and that progress is being made in closing your CARs. The audit team will consist of Dave Capen, FCS Lead auditor and Norman Boatwright, SFI Lead Auditor. During the audit we will focus on the following:

SFI Program:

- Review of any changes within DNR (e.g., staffing, land acquisitions, planning documents) that are pertinent to the certification.
- Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
- Review selected components of your SFI program, including components of Objectives 1 through 7 as encountered at the field sites; and, potentially Objectives 9-13; and other issues as determined by the Lead Auditor.
- Verify effective implementation of the corrective action plans from the previous NSF audit; and
- Evaluate the effectiveness of planned activities aimed at continual improvement of your SFI Program.

FSC Program:

- Review of any changes within DNR (e.g., staffing, land acquisitions, planning documents) that are pertinent to the certification.
- An assessment of the status of outstanding corrective action requests.
- An assessment of selected forests against a portion of the FSC Lake States Standard. Operations will be assessed against Criteria and Indicators of the standard where non-conformances were

observed in the original assessment, as well as other Criteria and Indicators, as determined by the SCS auditor.

Logistics

- As during prior audits, we should plan to have lunch on site whenever possible.
- We will travel in your vehicle(s) each day during the audit, but have our own transportation to each field location at the start and end each audit day.
- We ask that you provide hardhats and other required safety gear for the team if we visit active logging jobs.

Documentation Requested

When we arrive each day please provide documentation for the selected sites similar to that provided for the last certification audit (maps, project descriptions, and contracts). We would also need copies of the applicable management plans and any other information that would help us determine conformance to the certification requirements.

If possible please provide by email one week prior to the audit evidence for corrective actions for each of the open non-conformances. This evidence may be supplemented, of course, by additional information provided during the audit. (Some documents may not be easily emailed, so a combination of advance information that is emailed and printed material handed to us during the opening meeting would be acceptable.

Finally, please remind all involved staff that the auditors do not intend for them to spend large amounts of time making copies. A more efficient approach is to copy a few key documents (2 copies please) while having the files available for review as needed.

The enclosed tentative schedule should be reviewed by all participants. This schedule can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact either of us.

Sincerely yours,



Norman Boatwright

Norman Boatwright
SFI Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR
213 N. Grampian Hills Road
Columbia, SC 29223
North Branford, CT 06471
boatwright@millikenforestry.com
Office 843.788.0590 Cell 843.229.1851

David E. Capen
FSC Lead Auditor
12 Adams Landing Road
Grand Isle VT 05458
david.capen@uvm.edu
Phone: 802-372-4993
Cell: 802-735-6899 (When traveling)

Enclosure: Tentative Audit Schedule for Indiana DNR 2007 Surveillance Audit

Tentative Audit Schedule

For the state forest audits the auditors will fly into Louisville, KY on Sunday the 25th and will leave from Louisville on Wednesday the 28th of October.

Field Audit Summary:

We will conduct field visits in these forests:

- Harrison-Crawford (Monday and Tuesday morning)
- Clark (Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning)

Sunday October 25: travel day

- Hotel: Holiday Inn Express Corydon (reservations secured by Norman)

Monday October 26:

- 8 am to 10 am: Headquarters, Harrison-Crawford – review DNR Central Office material - status of CARs, stakeholder interviews, program updates.
- 10 am 11 am: Review Harrison-Crawford operations.
- 1 pm to 5 pm: Field Audit Harrison-Crawford.
- Lodging: to be arranged by Indiana DNR.

Tuesday October 27:

- 8 am to 10 am: Field Audit Harrison-Crawford.
- 10 am to 12 pm: Travel to Clark and lunch.
- 12 pm to 1 pm: Review Clark operations.
- 1 pm to 5 pm: Field Audit Clark.
- Lodging: to be arranged by Indiana DNR

Wednesday October 28:

- 7:30-10:00 am: Field Audit Clark.
- 10:00 am to 11:00 am: Audit team deliberations at Headquarters, Clark State Forest.
- 11:00 am to 12:00 pm: exit briefing; Headquarters, Clark State Forest
- 12:00 pm on: Auditors travel home
- Indianapolis - 3:20 pm flight Dave Capen; 4:30 pm flight Norman Boatwright;

Key Participants

- Indiana DNR Team:
 - John Seifert, State Forester (iseifert@dnr.in.gov) cell: 812-592-1221
 - Carl Hauser, Property Program Specialist (chauser@dnr.IN.gov) cell: 812-639-2289
- NSF/SCS Team: Norman Boatwright (boatwright@millikenforestry.com) cell – 843.229.1851
Dave Capen (david.capen@uvm.edu) office 802-372-4993;
Cell (when traveling) 802-735-6899

Appendix II



Corrective Action Requests

NONE

Appendix III



Public SFI Surveillance Audit Report

The SFI Program of the Indiana Division of Forestry has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2005-2009 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process. NSF-ISR initially certified Indiana Division of Forestry to the SFIS on November 3, 2006. This report describes the third 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. The program is being audited under the standard audit approach. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for October 2010.

The Indiana Division of Forestry is responsible for management of the state forest system.

“The Indiana state forest system consists of about 156,000 acres in 10 administrative units, located in 23 different counties within the state. The administrative units range in size from 300 acres to 50,000 acres and are primarily located in the southern one half of Indiana. Indiana’s Division of Forestry Properties contain about 3% of the total forestland in Indiana; most of the remainder is in private ownership. Each Indiana Division of Forestry Property is managed as a multiple-use facility, providing numerous benefits including timber production, forest management demonstration areas, outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat and watershed protection through an integrated management program. The Indiana State Forest system was established in 1903 and has been actively managed to provide the above benefits continuously since that time.”

Source: The Indiana Division of Forestry and the Indiana Bat 2005 Status (White Paper draft 11-21-05)

SFIS Audit Process

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 26-28, 2009 by an audit team headed by Norman Boatwright, SFI Lead Auditor and Dave Capen, FSC 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) 2005–2009 Edition. The objective of the audit was to assess continuing conformance of the firm’s SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009 Edition. The scope of the SFIS Audit included the entire state forest system, but this review included field sites at two state forests: Harrison-Crawford and Clark. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been under active management over the past three years, in order to include planned, ongoing, and completed operations. Practices conducted earlier were also reviewed as appropriate (regeneration and BMP issues, for example).

Several of the SFI Performance Measures were outside of the scope of the Indiana Division of Forestry's SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit as follows:

- Indicator 2.1.5: Planting is not done to change forest composition but to maintain it.
- Objective 8: Indiana Division of Forestry is not involved in forest procurement

No indicators were modified; the default indicators in the SFI Standard were utilized.

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol designed to enable the audit team to 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 of the audit include Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that Exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS.

Overview of Audit Findings

Indiana Division of Forestry's SFI Program was found to be in full conformance with the SFIS Standard. No non-conformances were identified.

An opportunity for improvement was also identified:

- 2.1.2: There is an opportunity to improve the development of clear requirements to judge adequate regeneration, including species composition and stocking levels for open or clearcut areas.

Opportunities for improvement do not indicate a current deficiency, but served to alert Indiana Division of Forestry to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention.

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
203-887-9248
mferrucci@iforest.com

John Seifert
Indiana State Forester
(317) 232-4116
jseifert@dnr.in.gov

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 2006 Date Code **6 November 2007 Code 7, November 2008 Code 8, October 2009 Code 9.**

IDOF = Indiana Division of Forestry MF= Mike Ferrucci DW = Dave Wager NB = Norman Boatwright

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	<i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i>	MF	6, 7				
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. 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).	MF	6, 7				
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.	MF	6, 7				
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.	MF	6, 7				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.	MF	6, 7				
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	6, 7				

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	<i>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.</i>	MF	6, 7				
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.	MF	6, 7				
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, NB	6, 7				9
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	MF	6, 7				
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	6, 7				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	N.A.					
2.2	<i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i>	MF NB	6, 8				
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF NB	6, 8				
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.	MF	6, 7				
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.	MF NB	6, 8				
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.	MF NB	6, 8				
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.	MF	6, 7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
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 NB	6, 8			7	
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	<i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i>	MF	6, 7				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF		6, 7			
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	6, 7				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF	6, 7				
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	MF	7			6	
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.	MF		6, 7			
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	7			6	
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.			6, 7			
2.4	<i>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.</i>	MF NB	6, 8				
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF NB	6, 8				
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	6, 7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF NB	6, 8				
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.	MF, NB	6, 9				
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.	MF, NB	6, 9				

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.		6, 8				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.	MF DW NB	6, 8			7	
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.	MF	6, 7				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).	MF NB	8			6	
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.	MF		6, 7			
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, DW NB	8				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF NB	6, 8				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	6, 7				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.	MF, DW	6, 7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.	MF NB	6, 8				
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	Not applicable					

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	<i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i>	MF, DW	6, 7				
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.	MF, DW	6, 7				
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	MF, DW	6, 7				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	MF, DW	6, 7				
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).	MF, DW NB	8			6, 7	
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.	DW, MF	6, 7				
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	DW, MF	6, 7				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
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.	DW, MF	6, 7				
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	DW, MF	6, 7				6
4.2	<i>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.</i>	MF NB	6, 8				
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.	MF NB	6, 8				
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	DW, MF	7			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	<i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i>	MF	6, 7				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	6, 7				
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, 7				
5.2	<i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i>		6				
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, 7				
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF	6				

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
5.3	<i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i>		6				
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.		6				
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.		6				
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.		6				

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.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>	DW, MF	6, 7				
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, 7				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.	DW, MF	6, 7				

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	<i>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.</i>	MF	6, 7				
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure a. landings left clean with little waste; b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose; f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood; g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets).	MF	6, 7				

Not applicable Objective 8: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through procurement programs. Procurement from sources within the United States and Canada (8.1–8.4 apply)

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	<i>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.</i>	MF NB	6	8			
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: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management; c. water quality; d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; and f. effectiveness of BMPs.	MF NB	6	8			
9.2	<i>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.</i>	NB	6, 9				
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.	NB	6, 9				

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	<i>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.</i>		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.	NB	6, 9				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.	MF	6, 7				
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	7				6
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	7			6	
10.2	<i>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.</i>	MF	6, 7				
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 a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach.	MF	6, 7				

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	<i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i>	MF NB	6,8				
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF NB	6,8				
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.	MF NB	6,8				
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	MF NB	6,8				
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.	NA					
11.2	<i>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.</i>	MF, DW	6, 7				
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.	MF, DW	6, 7				

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 ---				OFI	
		FC	EXR	Maj	Min		
12.1	<i>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.</i>	NB		6			
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	NB	9				6
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.	NB	6, 9				
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.	NB	6, 9				
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).	NB	6, 9				
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.	NB	9				6
,12.2	<i>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.</i>		6				
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	7				6
12.2.2	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; or d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.			6			
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.			6			

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.3	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i>	MF, DW	6, 7				
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	MF, DW	6, 7				
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.	MF, DW	6, 7				
12.4	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i>	NA	6, 7				
12.4.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and 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.	NA	6, 7				6
12.5	<i>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.</i>	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	7				6
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.	MF, DW	6, 7				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>	MF NB	6, 8				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)	MF NB	7, 8, 9				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF NB	6, 7				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard	MF NB	8				

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*	<i>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.)</i>	MF NB	6, 7,8,9				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.	MF NB	6, 7,8,9				6
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF NB	6, 7,8,9				
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.	MF NB	9				6, 7,8

2007 Surveillance Audit Notes

Requirement	Finding	Notes
1.1	C	<i>“Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.”</i>
1.1.1	C	<p>“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).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reviewed and discussed with staff “Draft Strategic Plan, 2008 – 2013, State Forest Properties Section” ▪ The draft HCP for Indiana bats has not yet been circulated publicly, but will be as soon as the US FWS completes their review. ▪ Strategy for Indiana Bat Habitat has been in the procedures manual since 2001; these “interim guidelines” are somewhat more restrictive than the draft HCP ▪ The Indiana Division of Forestry procedures manual remains in force, and is largely unchanged since 2006 Certification Audit. ▪ Harvest levels are determined for each forest, and field staff continue to struggle to reach their goals. Concerns were expressed about maintaining the quality of work in the face of increasing time demands for production.
1.1.2	C	<p>“Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sold volumes are documented as follows: FY 04-05 3.6 million board feet (1433 bf/acre) FY 05-06 7.7 million board feet (1938 bf/acre) FY 06-07 10.3 million board feet FY 07-08 12 million board feet target ▪ The above harvests are consistent with the existing and proposed strategic plans; growth is estimated at 24 million board feet; plan is to cut 50% of growth.
1.1.3	C	<p>“A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.” “Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FIA (federal) provides some information valid at the level of the entire 150,000 acre state forest system. ▪ Indiana Division of Forestry nearly completed the design and software for CFI program, incorporating many certification-related issues (monitoring, habitat, landscape issues) one full-time CFI and one part-time staffer for CFI to measure 20% of the ownership each year. ▪ Tract “Management Guides” that allocate land for production or protection and describe past and planned treatments; each year each forest conducts tract-level inventory; for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Greene-Sullivan SF in Fiscal Year 2007-2008 plan to cruise 225 acres and actually cruised 563 already in the first quarter. ○ Pike SF in Fiscal Year 2006-2007 planned to cruise 1,136 acres and actually cruised 1,480 acres. ○ Statewide SF in Fiscal Year 2006-2007 planned to cruise 8,701 acres and actually cruised 9,605

1.1.5	C	<p>“Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of “Performance Goals Summary for FY 2006-2007 showed that data is collected and reported on most key activities and all forest practices including timber sales, inventory, planning, invasive control, planting (125% of goal) and TSI (3008 acres, 104% of goal).
2.1	C	<p><i>“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.”</i></p>
2.1.1	C	<p>“Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tract management plans provide the prescription for planting or natural regeneration.
2.1.2	C	<p>“Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oak regeneration is a major challenge, but IDOF is taking appropriate actions. Regeneration standards are provided in guidance provided to foresters (handbook). 9 OFI There is an opportunity to improve the development of clear requirements to judge adequate regeneration, including species composition and stocking levels for open or clearcut areas.
2.1.3	C	<p>“Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exotics are not planted; confirmed in tract plans and field observations.
2.1.4	C	<p>“Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed such protection by field observations at all sites visited.
2.1.5	N.A.	<p>“Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Applicable. The Indiana Division of Forestry does not plan to change species composition through planting, but might use increased levels of supplemental planting of difficult-to-regenerate species to help maintain composition. Have not been doing much planting, & only to maintain the natural and indigenous forest base.
2.2		<p><i>“Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.”</i></p>
2.2.1		<p>“Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 08 Hardwood management does not normally use herbicides. Typically involves cut & inject. 08 Verified invasive species chemical use appropriate.

2.2.2	C	<p>“Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At OPSF in storage in garage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pathway (vines on TSI) Picloram and 2-4-D ○ Garlon 4 being bought for future use ○ Roundup (glyphosate) ○ Rodeo (water version of roundup) ▪ At GSSF listed as applied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Razor pro- glyphosate ○ Crossbow -24d garlon 3A ○ Garlon 4 ○ Tordon K ○ Aqua Neat –glyphosate for water ○ Invade 80 -surfactant ○ Emulus - emulsifier ○ Axit - Oil ○ Stalker- Arsenal (no longer used, but released by FSC)
2.2.3		<p>“Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 All foresters are licensed applicators. ▪ 08 Site visits did not identify any problems.
2.2.4		<p>“Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 Gypsy moth “Slow to Spread” program is applied to State forests by Entomology and Plant Pathology department.
2.2.5	C	<p>“Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bill Gallogly and Rob at Owen Putnam are both certified; Steve Siscoe at Greene-Sullivan has core training but not licensed, because he doesn’t apply restricted chemicals, instead using commercial applicators who are licensed ▪ Confirmed that periodic safety inspections documented at OPSF; occur at all locations. ▪ Periodic training documented at OPSF – topic of the February, 2007 training was “MSDS Material Safety Data Sheets”
2.2.6	Minor 08 CLOSED	<p>“Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example ... chemicals stored at appropriate locations”</p> <p><u>SFI-2007-03: At the Owen Putnam State Forest Headquarters chemicals were stored inside and outside (on top of) a lockable, dedicated metal but unvented “flammable liquid storage cabinet” within a garage/workshop adjacent to the work area of an employee.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the Owen Putnam State Forest Headquarters chemicals were stored inside and outside (on top of) a lockable, dedicated metal but unvented “flammable liquid storage cabinet” within a garage/workshop adjacent to the work area of an employee. ▪ 08 Confirmed revised Chemical Storage Policy addresses chemical storage and other matters. ▪ 08 Verified acquisition of 19 storage cabinets.
2.3	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i></p>
2.3.1	EXR	<p>“Use of soils maps where available.”</p> <p><u>Exceeds the SFI Requirements: Soils maps and use of information from them exceed requirements.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forest soil descriptions, based on soils maps, are included in all tract management

		guides. Some guides also include the maps themselves.
2.3.2	C	<p>“Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trained foresters plan and supervise all harvests, which are approved by the timber management specialist.
2.3.3	C	<p>“Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.
2.3.4	C	<p>“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).”</p> <p><u>Closed CAR SFI-2006-01: based on documentation and interviews, confirmed the following:</u></p> <p><i>“DoF Action: The site has been water barred, leveled and seeded as per BMP protocol (Completed December 5 2006). The revised timber sale contract specifies a limit of acceptable rutting. Foresters continue to closely monitor sales and will prevent this unacceptable activity to the extent possible. DoF staff has worked extensively to create BMP legislation which would improve harvesting practices statewide.”</i></p> <p>Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited that there was ample down woody debris, minimized skid trails, and little rutting.</p>
2.3.5	EXR	<p>“Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.”</p> <p><u>Exceeds the SFI Requirements: Silvicultural practices throughout the forests are superb.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.
2.3.6	C	<p>“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contracts now include a standard clause for rutting limits.
2.3.7	EXR	<p>“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.”</p> <p><u>Exceeds the SFI Requirements: Roads are exceptionally well designed, constructed, and maintained.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of maps and field inspections revealed an appropriate road density.
2.4		<i>“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.”</i>
2.4.1		<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 Gypsy moth “Slow to Spread” program is applied to State forests by Entomology and Plant Pathology department, also survey for invasive species.
2.4.2	C	<p>“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited that stands are generally thinned in a timely manner, and post-harvest stands consist of mostly very healthy and vigorous trees.
2.4.3		<p>“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 Foresters contact state entomologist when have suspected pest problems. ▪ 08 DoF funds annually \$100,000 and approximately \$100,000 in kind work towards invasive species and forest pest eradication.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 DoF does not use trees derived through biotechnology. • 09 DoF has a tree improvement program at it’s seed orchards and works with the Purdue hardwood tree improvement program.
2.5	NA	<i>“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.”</i>

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	Minor	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <p><u>Minor Non-conformance SFI-2007-2: At Ferdinand State Forest Compartment 4 Tract 7/8 an ephemeral stream was crossed in three places, was disturbed by harvest activities, and was blocked in one place by a berm intended to reestablish the stream channel at the primary crossing. Page 35 of Indiana Logging and Forestry Best Management Practices includes under general guidelines for ephemeral streams “minimize soil disturbance, crossings and channel blockages”.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Foresters are trained, plan harvests to include BMPs, work with loggers to ensure BMPs through mandatory pre-harvest conference, periodic inspections with results shared, post-harvest “punch-list”, and closeout inspections. ▪ BMP compliance rates are quite high (89%). ▪ 08 Pictures verify blockage corrected. ▪ 08 Verified BMPs addressed in a very well attended training session. ▪ 08 Site visits did not identify any BMP issues except for an area where logger had skidded down an ephemeral stream (compt 6 tract 13) but BMP weekly monitoring and final inspection identified problem and recommended appropriate corrective actions.
3.1.2	C	<p>“Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed that contracts specify BMP compliance.
3.1.3		<p>:Plans that address wet weather events...:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed managers have the authority and responsibility to halt logging activities. • Interview foresters to determine whether they use this authority. ▪ Review of interim BMP monitoring reports indicates loggers were moved off when conditions dictated.
3.1.4	EXR	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <p><u>Exceeds the SFI Requirements: The program for monitoring of BMP use and effectiveness is the strongest the team has seen.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BMP Monitoring (via internal audits of BMPs) on all aspects of all completed harvests has been done for several years; results show very high compliance rates. ▪ BMP monitoring is reviewed by a third party.
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	C	<p>“Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Foresters plan and supervise all harvests and land management activities; they are trained in mitigation measures for protection of these features, which are shown on maps and generally avoided when planning treatments if possible. ▪ 08 Verified in field.
3.2.2	C	<p>“Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited and by review of timber harvest maps that aquatic resources are shown on maps (good topographic maps are readily available showing most such features) and that BMP-related protection zones are flagged or designated for protection.

3.2.3	C	<p>“Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.
3.2.4		<p>“Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 08 DoF accesses Heritage Trust database prior to doing any work to check for special species.
3.2.5	N.A.	<p>“Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N.A.: BMPs do exist
4.1	C	<p><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></p>
4.1.1	C	<p>“Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indiana now has a statewide “Comprehensive Wildlife Strategic Plan” that help identify species habitat conservation needs. It is being used to help develop the “DRAFT Wildlife Strategic Plan” Reviewed and discussed with staff “DRAFT Management Guidelines for Wildlife Habitat Features” Reviewed and discussed with staff “DRAFT Wildlife Strategic Plan” Individual properties or groups of properties will have wildlife plans developed over the next two years. These will replace the 5-year fish and wildlife habitat operational guides done in the past.
4.1.2	C	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Database of known T&E species checked during tract planning and sale planning When T&E species are found protection measures are developed and implemented; the Indiana bat strategy; draft bat HCP are examples.
4.1.3	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indiana bats are the most threatened. “As of October 30, 2007, HCVFs are limited to dedicated Nature Preserves (2,018 acres) and Old Forest Areas (5,706 acres) and five areas with special features or values under consideration as HCVFs (591 acres) for a total of 8,315 acres.” Nature preserves program in gradually surveying the state forest system.
4.1.4	MINOR 08 CLOSED	<p>“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).”</p> <p><u>Minor Non-conformance SFI-2007-01 Criteria for stand level wildlife habitat elements (based on available science) have been drafted but not approved or implemented. Training has begun, but field foresters are not yet fully applying the draft standards.</u></p> <p><u>Closed Minor Non-conformance SFI-2006-2 , but then issued a more restricted Minor non-conformance focused on implementation. DNR Response to 2006-2 CAR: “DoF Action: See FSC CAR2006.4. After an extensive search, the Division employed a Wildlife Specialist who reported to work on September 24, 2007. In the five weeks with the Division, he is becoming familiar with the Division and our personnel, forests, issues, etc. He has developed draft wildlife habitat guidelines in the document “DRAFT Management Guidelines for Wildlife Habitat Features.doc”. Additionally, he is developing a wildlife habitat strategic plan draft, “DRAFT Wildlife Strategic Plan.doc”. Property personnel</u></p>

		<p><i>have been exposed to training on wildlife habitat elements during a classroom training session at Clark SF on 10/23/2007 and a field exercise at Martin SF on 10/24/2007.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Owen Putnam SF large cull trees are marked with X, meaning logger’s choice for removal or retention. If the buyer wants these trees they can all be removed, which does not ensure that large snags needed to meet bat management guidelines are created. ▪ The two-day training was focused on Oak regeneration, but Scott Haulton, Wildlife Specialist provided background and used many field sites to do some preliminary training on HCP and guidelines. He also got input on the draft guidelines. ▪ 08 Verified training conducted in March & September at Property Section meetings ▪ 08 Monitoring of snags & cavity trees verified via summary in DoF “ecological assessment appendix” taken on annual tract inventory (9,000 acres/yr). ▪ 08 Wildlife Specialist is conducting field audits on app 30% of harvest areas annually to monitor & evaluate compliance and effectiveness of guidelines (set during pre-harvest planning). ▪ 08 – Site visits identified sufficient retention.
4.1.5	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New wildlife biologist is working on property-specific wildlife plans. His approach will strengthen the existing 2.5 mile radius review done for each tract management guide.
4.1.6	C	<p>“Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indiana Division of Forestry has identified 5,706 acres of Old Forest Areas. These are designated on 7 state forests, where older forest canopy (125 + years) is maintained. These areas are managed with limited harvesting using single-tree selection designed to maintain old-forest attributes, using longer entry intervals (30+ years), higher residual retention, and more retention of snags and coarse woody debris than in the rest of the forest, but will also use larger openings to maintain oak-dominated composition where it exists. These planned treatments are reviewed at the division level to ensure that they are appropriate.
4.1.7	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation in the Invasive Species Task Force ▪ Invasive species control contract reviewed; confirmed that funding is available, used, and increasing, but so is the problem. ▪ Have many contracts for control of invasives; examined records for GSSF from 10/31/07 back to April 2005 for in-house, well-organized spreadsheet with date, personnel, location, species, acres, chemicals, and method (basal foliar) ▪ For outside contracts they keep records of contract, certified applicator: example Paul Clayton, Nelson, Asplundh Tree Expert License# 17951 (license must be in hand before the work can be done, DOA does bidding on contracts and the review is done by an engineering group that manages the process)
4.1.8	C	<p>“Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of data shows that prescribed fire is used.
4.2		<p><i>“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.”</i></p>

4.2.1		<p>“Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 DoF reviews heritage trust data of known occurrences prior to beginning operations. ▪ 08 Timber sale (compt 2 tract 10) on Jackson-Washington State Forest contained a known Indiana Bat roost. Roost area was noted and flagged off .
4.2.2	C	<p>“A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.”</p> <p>Closed SFI-2006-3 by review of Indiana Division of Forestry written rresponse</p> <p><u>The corrective action plan was confirmed during the 2007 Surveillance audit by review of documentation of research meetings, by interviews with central office staff who organized and presented, and by field staff who attended training that connected research to their assigned responsibilities. Staff also demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter of the training and research.</u></p> <p><i>“DoF Action: We will continue to conduct research efforts with the Hardwood Ecosystem Experiment and will implement management activities based on data from that effort. We will continue to hold annual meetings to deliver research findings to our management personnel. Two annual meetings have been held to date, with the next to be scheduled during the late winter or spring, 2008.</i></p> <p><i>The presence of a wildlife specialist on staff will help field personnel incorporate biodiversity issues into forest management decisions. Furthermore, we will require that all professional staff in the Properties Section complete the level of training necessary to meet the Certified Forester standard as defined by the Society of American Foresters. A copy of those eligibility and recertification requirements is available in the file “SAF CF Requirments.doc.”</i></p> <p><i>To address the specific training gaps, the Division has begun and will continue to provide training sessions to meet identified needs. This year has focused on oak regeneration, disturbance regimes necessary to maintain oak-hickory dominated forests, and successional trends in an undisturbed oak-hickory forest. Toward that end, we encouraged our field personnel to attend SILVAH: OAK training in Nashville, IN, 02/21-22/07 (oak regeneration, stand development, disturbance, prescribed fire), Oak Regeneration and Management sponsored by the University of Kentucky Extension, 10/3-4/07 (regeneration dynamics, management tools), and oak management training at Clark/Martin SF 10/23-24/07. The Division has an enhanced budget to cover out-of-state training and has encouraged all staff to take advantage of training opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>To enhance our staff training in the area of managing wildlife species of concern, our staff Wildlife Specialist will provide both classroom and field training. This training will occur concurrently with the implementation of property level wildlife management plans. Two other emphasis areas under consideration include management of sensitive plant communities and a forest stand dynamics course. The Division of Nature Preserves was unable to provide the plant community training but recommended an outside contractor which we have been unable to secure at this time. The forest stand dynamics will also involve a contract trainer based on the work of Oliver and Larson.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The above list of actions was confirmed. IDOF has clearly increased its attention to training and to ensuring that research access is a major part of training.
5.1	C	<p>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</p>
5.1.1	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trained foresters continue to plan and supervise all harvests and incorporate visual considerations into all activities.

5.1.2	C	<p>“Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.
5.2		<p><i>“Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.”</i></p>
5.2.1	C	<p>“Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of over 20 tract management plans as well as observations in the field revealed that most clearcuts are quite small and embedded within a matrix of closed canopy forest. Only occasional cuts exceed 10 acres, so the average clearcut size is very low.
5.3		
6.1.	C	<p><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></p>
6.1.1	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have found a few new tribal sites in the past year; lithic scatter remains but not burial sites; typically discovered by field staff or by more detailed arch review by means of shovel probes on a grid.
6.1.2	C	<p>“Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NHI hit for nearby butterfly at Ferdinand caused Indiana to attempt to buy the land. ▪ Interviews provided good evidence of management of special sites, but none visited.
7.1	C	<p><i>“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.”</i></p>
7.1.1	C	<p>“Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited that sawtimber utilization is good but that top wood is rarely utilized.
9.1		<p><i>“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, & management of forest resources.”</i></p>
9.1.1	Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 DoF financially supports Hardwood Ecosystem Project, Invasive species research through Purdue, Forest Carbon Model research on Morgan- Monroe forest. Annual total approximately \$400,000. In kind support includes providing personnel to help set up plots and data collection.
9.2		<p><i>“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.”</i></p>
9.2.1		<p>”Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 DoF conducts the statewide FIA on a 5 year cycle – regeneration and growth are addressed. • 09 DoF conducts a timber products output survey every 5 years – addresses drain. • 09 DoF conducts BMP inspections on all state forest operations and on 10% of the Classified Forests Program. • 09 Biodiversity conservation is addressed in the Forest Stewardship plan and at the

		2 Forest Education Centers.
10.1		<i>“Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.”</i>
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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 Verified DoF has written statements at various sites, web site and strategic plan about commitment to SFI program.
10.1.2	C	“Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carl Hauser is the management representative with overall responsibility for the program including tracking CARs and responses. Field-related objectives are the responsibility of foresters, while Objectives 9-13 are covered by central office.
10.1.3	C	“Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.” <u>There is an opportunity to improve the system for record-keeping on training.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indiana Division of Forestry’s response to FSC CAR.2006.6 provided many good examples of increased training for ecological forestry and related issues. ▪ 2008 Budget will include \$20,000 for in-state training and \$10,000 for out-of-state training; printed budget showed \$67,450 for in-state travel and \$6,150 for out of state travel; remainder from other sources such as grants. ▪ Will be providing incentives for their foresters (resource specialists) to attain training that is the equivalent of the SAF Certified Forester credential. ▪ Ay Ariens, Forest Archeologist attended training sponsored by InDOT on methods for effective tribal consultation and communication. ▪ Information on special status species: research-oriented internal seminar planned for April 2007 on species of concern ▪ October 10 training for new foresters at Clark SF; agenda included how to conduct a state heritage database search, provided hints for doing internet searches (Google); also new wildlife specialist as well as heritage botanists; did not document who attended ▪ Discussed annual evaluation reviews done by property managers of resource specialists; formal protocol includes a training category, which is discussed annually; (historically training was under-funded) ▪ Reviewed training plan portion of the annual review conducted by one Property Manager for one Resource Specialist; the “Employee Development Plan” portion outlined a goal for attending annual pesticide training to maintain license; attend Covert Wildlife training, wants to attend more SAF meetings and various workshops, scheduling public education events; discussed the person’s changed job responsibilities and how their training needs are affected. ▪ For managers there are some required training courses and many other optional training courses; one manager told me he did the mandated training but not much more; his manager is aware of this; training was getting less attention last year due to the emphasis on timber goals, but more recently is being re-emphasized.
10.1.4	C	“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.” SFI-2006-4: Closed based on the state forester’s decision on the final day of the audit that all timber sales offered by the Indiana Division of Forestry will require one trained member of the logging crew on each active timber sale will have taken at least introductory logger training (i.e. Soren Erickson Level 1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the opening meeting Indiana Division of Forestry indicated that they had not incorporated logging training requirements into the contract template as intended in the above CAP. During the course of the audit staff determined that sufficient

		loggers were already formally trained to incorporate a training requirement into the contract. State Forester John Siefert made this provision official on the last day of the audit, and the CAP is sufficiently implemented to close the CAR.
10.2	C	<i>“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.”</i>
10.2.1	C	<p>“Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers’ training courses...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Indiana SFI Implementation Committee has been reactivated with the support and encouragement of Indiana Division of Forestry. A letter was sent to all Indiana Sawmill Owner and/or Operators describing the SIC, inviting participation including the next executive meeting, and providing handouts including: SFI Tool Kit and 3 SFI tri-fold brochures. The initial focus is to be logger training. ▪ Indiana Division of Forestry helped organize and draft this letter/ mailing
11.1		<i>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.”</i>
11.1.1		<p><i>Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08 Information is available on Internet. • 08 Interviews with field foresters indicate they are aware of how to obtain detailed information.
11.1.2		<p><i>System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall management system including tract level planning, the cultural resource program, and central office staff review of all projects comprise the system. • 08 Standard timber sale contract includes clauses specifying compliance with various laws.
11.1.3		<p><i>Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08 There have not been any regulatory violations assessed against Indiana Division of Forestry management.
11.1.4	NA	<p><i>Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
11.2	C	<i>“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.”</i>
11.2.1	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Posters on bulletin boards at all work sites visited describe many aspects of worker’s rights according to federal and state law.
12.1		<i>“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.”</i>

12.1.1		<p>“Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See 10.2.1 above. The initial focus is on logger training. Review during next audit. ▪ 09 SIC has only 2 members – Jack is one. Meetings done in conjunction with the Indiana Forestry Industry Council. Meet quarterly. DoF and IFIC are basically doing the SIC duties.
12.1.2		<p>“Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 Writing Forest Stewardship Plans. • 09 @ Forest Education Centers.
12.1.3		<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 Indiana Division of Forestry is working to establish forestry research/demonstration areas. • 09 Project Learning Tree is supported by Indiana Division of Forestry • 09 The state produces information regarding management approaches for habitat and for protection of RTE species. • 09 DoF provides financial and staff support to the Indiana Woodland Steward Institute
12.1.4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 DoF runs the Classified Forest Program which provides a tax break for qualified landowners. • 09 DoF works closely with TNC to purchase fee and conservation easements on Forest Legacy tracts: Girl Scout Camp & Camp Happy Hollow.
12.1.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09 DoF knowledgeable OF Brown County Hills Project – habitat corridor; Blue River Project – pristine river; Upper Mississippi Watershed.
12.2		<p><i>“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.”</i></p>
12.2.1		<p>“Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See 10.2.1 above. The initial focus is on logger training. Review during next audit.
12.3	C	<p><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</i></p>
12.3.1	C	<p>“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A notice was sent that included the following statement: <i>“Hoosiers' input will be sought in three public meetings this month on whether DNR should provide more recreational opportunities at state forests, and if so, the methods by which the State should pay for them.”</i> The notice included dates, times, and locations for three public meetings. ▪ Reviewed input received to date in report “Notes from Public Meetings – May 29-31, 2007, Recorded by Carl Hauser – 07/10/2007” ▪ Discussed pending updates/improvements to web site and challenges when updating.
12.3.2	C	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reviewed report “2007 Indiana State Forest Open House Process Prepared by Tom Lyons, July 2007” which included statement: “Between January and May of 2007 the Division of Forestry conducted nine (9) open houses. Each of the state forest management units participated in one of the open houses. For the attendees

		<p>convenience and to lessen the preparation effort for the properties, Jackson-Washington State Forest, Starve Hollow Beach SRA and Selmier State Forest jointly participated in a single open house as did Clark State Forest and Deam Lake SRA and Ferdinand/Pike State Forests. Salamonie State Forest joined with Salamonie Reservoir SRA in a single open house.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A summary of comments received was prepared, overall description: “Attendance at the 2007 open houses varied from 6 to 118. A total of 301 people registered at the open houses and a total of 29 comments were received.” Details on attendance and comments received and attendees by property or session were provided in a table. The process appears to be allowing for a meaningful dialogue and input. ▪ Reviewed poster (also available on the web site): “Indiana Department of Natural Resources -Division of Forestry: Summary of Annual Accomplishments – 2006”
12.4	C	<i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.”</i>
12.4.1	C	<p>“Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and 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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed May 16, 2007 letter to the Native American Indian Affairs Commission inviting comments on the Draft Strategic Plan and notifying them of three public input meetings. ▪ State archeologist improved her skill through training; several new sites are reported each year and protected.
12.5		<i>“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.”</i>
12.5.2	C	<p>“Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed by interviews and review of documents from open houses and strategic plan update that there are robust processes in place and that input is considered in the development of plans and in making decisions.
12.6		<i>“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”</i>
12.6.1*	C	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.” (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed with SFI, Inc. that report was provided. ▪ 08 Copy of cover email indicates report submitted on time. ▪ 09 Verified report submitted on time.
12.6.2	C	<p>“Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed record-keeping by reviewing reports, interviewing foresters, and checking selected data against data presented verbally. Most measures are accurate, but there were some discrepancies. ▪ Verified recordkeeping adequate.
12.6.3		<p>“Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 08 2006 & 2007 reports available.
13.1*	C	<i>“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.”</i>

13.1.1	C	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiana Division of Forestry has systems in place to track goals and results, formally established annually as “Property Performance Goals” for each of the ten administrative units. A tracking mechanism exists, for example, for cultural resources and for timber marking, timber sales, TSI, and forest inventory. • 08 Verified System in place. • 09 Verified System in place.
13.1.2	C	<p>“System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A program specialist is assigned to certification. He is responsible for accumulating data to fill out the SFI Annual Survey. ▪ The assistant state forester compiles the “Property Performance Goals” and accomplishments. ▪ SFI-specific issues, while closely tracking the Indiana Division of Forestry’s goals and objectives, are not explicitly addressed in data collection, review, and reporting. ▪ 08 SFI-specific issues, while closely tracking the Indiana Division of Forestry’s goals and objectives, are still not explicitly addressed in data collection, review, and reporting. ▪ 09 Verified system in place.
13.1.3		<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve ongoing methods for SFI-specific management review.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not formally conducted with agenda or minutes, but clearly was done more informally. During the audit a summary of meetings and management review was provided to the audit team. ▪ A critical factor in the decision for conformance is the active involvement of the State Forester in all aspects of certification, including attendance in all certification activities and site visits during all three audits to date (Readiness Review, Certification Audit, Surveillance Audit). ▪ 08 Improvements to SFI program include: hired Scott Haulton Wildlife Specialist. Have decided to hire at least a part time forest ecologist. Begin CFI process which calls for inventorying 700 plots/year. Development of environmental assessment and DoF BMP forester, Duane McCoy, has trained 97 loggers in 4 training sessions. ▪ 08 Not formally conducted with agenda or minutes. ▪ 09 Verified management review occurred 9/23/09. Very well documented with agenda and minutes.

Field Sites Visited 2007

Monday November 10 – Morgan-Monroe State Forest

Interviews with Jim Allen, property manager, Dave Vadas, Resource Manager, David Ramey, forest supervisor, Amy Zillmer and Laurie Burgess, resource specialists.

Site 1: Sale #200810 - intermediate thin (selective thin, improvement cut, some salvage), file paperwork in order (sale contract has BMP language & requirement to have professional trained logger on-site at all times, prelog checklist, interim and final BMP inspection forms).

Site 2: C1, Tract 10 - fire salvage, file paperwork in order.

Site 3: C13, Tract 9 - marked intermediate thin, no logging activity yet, file paperwork in order.

Site 4: C8, Tract 3 – intermediate thin, paperwork in order.

Tuesday November 11 - Selmier State Forest

Interview with Rob McGriff, property manager & district forester.

Site 1: C1, Tract 6 – intermediate thin and salvage, file paperwork complete.

Site 2: C1, Tracts 2-4 – Active job Bill Bane professional logger trained, file paperwork complete.

Tuesday November 11 – Jackson-Washington State Forest

Interviewed Brad Schneck, property manager, Mike Spalding and Jacob Hougham, resource specialists.

Site 1: C2, Tract 10 - intermediate thin with some salvage, file paperwork complete, very good management of known Indiana bat roost within the sale area.

Site 2: C2, Tract 16 - marked, unsold thin (white pine), file paperwork complete.

Site 3: C5, Tract 2 – intermediate thin with 2 regeneration openings, file paperwork complete.

Site 4: C6, Tract 13 – intermediate thin along major creek, file paperwork complete, logger had skidded up an ephemeral drain. This was noted in the interim and final BMP inspection reports. Logger was instructed to drag debris into drain to mitigate disturbance. This same logger had done an excellent job on 2 other sites.

Dave Wager visited these sites during the afternoon:

Compt 4 Tract 11: Improvement cut with single and group selections on 79 acres (Active Harvest). Interviewed operator Mike Reynolds who had Cutter 3, BMP, CPR/First Aid training in the last 2 years. Operating on state forests costs him approximately 25% more because of additional BMP requirements. Observed marking and skidding. Some cull trees with cavities marked- though sale was marked prior to exposure to new guidelines. Good choice for group selection to-be-established around dense paw paw area. Home site area protected. Skid trails pre-designated by forester.

Compt 3 Tract 10: Improvement cut with single tree selection (82 acres). Harvested 2007; TSI Completed April 2008. Home site area protected. Operator not following skid trail alignment resulted in damage to residual white oak at one location. Silviculture and TSI executed effectively. Two BMP violations had been identified during internal review.

Compt 6 Tract 13: Improvement cut with single and group selections. Harvest Sept 08. BMP infraction (skidding ephemeral stream) identified during DoF internal BMP review. No mitigation (other than distributing tops) necessary. Harvest executed effectively- TSI not yet complete.

Wednesday November 12 - Martin State Forest

Interviewed Jim Lauck and Abe Bear, resource specialist.

Site 1: C3, Tract 7 – intermediate thin, file paperwork complete. Final BMP inspection identified a few tops in creek.

Site 2: C3, Tract 5 – Shelterwood cut (heavy), file paperwork complete.

Site 3: C3, Tract 4 – Shelterwood cut with a large opening (9.8 ac), file paperwork complete.

Site 4: C5, Tract 2 – unsold marked intermediate cut, file paperwork complete.

2009

Interviewees

DoF Staff: Headquarters: John Seifert, Dan Ernst, Carl Hauser, John Friedrich, Scott Haulton and A. J. Ariens.

Harrison-Crawford: Dwane Sieg, Wayne Werne and Christine Martin.

Clark: Walt Zak, Greg Roeder and Brad Steward.

Field Sites Visited

Monday October 26 – Harrison-Crawford State Forest

Site 1: 6450701 – Stand Improvement Cut (SIC) encouraging oak and walnut. Timber Sale Paperwork (TSPW) good. Headquarter staff completed final BMP inspection. All shagbark hickory and 3 largest trees not cut due to proximity to Indiana Bat caves. Contained three small clearcuts.

Site 2: Post Oak/Cedar Nature Preserve – managed by the Division of Nature Preservers within IDNR.

Site 3: 6450906 – Sold but not cut. SIC to encourage oak. Marking and yard location look good. Bat measures implemented. Timber Stand Improvement (TSI) included basal spray of Alianthus.

Site 4: 6450805 – SIC. Completed March 09. TSPW = good. Road well graveled with water bars on skid trails.

Site 5: Tract 3009 – TSI to enhance oak regen. <3” cut & spray, > 3” girdle & spray.

Site 6: Wyndotte Wetland Lake – DNR constructed lake with infestation of Brazilian Elodea. Have sprayed 3 times.

Site 7: 6450807 – Clearcut pine – some fuel chip. On Leavenworth Barrens Nature Preserve. Managed by Div of Nat Preserves. TSPW = good. Good water bars on skid trail. Pine (not natural) cut in effort to make site a barren.

Tuesday October 27 – Harrison-Crawford State Forest

Site 8: 6451001 – 56.5 acre clearcut in 3 pieces on ridge top. Planted Virginia, red and white pine in decline. A piece > 20 acres had an undisturbed island in the middle. Not cut. Hope for oak regen.

Site 9: 6450704 – Salvage sale from straight line wind. Completed summer 2008 – no staff BMP inspection yet. Had trouble with logger rutting skid trail. Did not return deposit and fixed skid trail with water bars.

Tuesday October 27 – Clark State Forest

Site 10: 6301009 & 13 – SIC to encourage oak with clearcut opening. TSPW = good. Logger just finished, skid trails water barred.

Site 11: 6300411 & 12 – SIC not cut. TSPW = good. Marking okay - to encourage oak release. Intermittent stream crossing will be bridged.

Site 12: C11T1 – SIC completed in 2007 to encourage oak. TSPW = good; BMP inspection done by headquarters. Clearcut - DoF does not have criteria for acceptable stocking levels or species composition in clearcut areas.

Site 13: C9T1 & 3 – SIC finished in fall 2008. No BMP inspection by headquarters yet. TSI done on everything but clearcut.

Wednesday October 28 – Clark State Forest

Site 14: 15T5 & 7 – Future timber sale, not marked. Moved road entrance to prevent gravel from washing onto property across main road.

Site 15: Deam Lake – Recent salvage from tornado & hurricane around recreation areas. Construction of horse barns and RV camping areas.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Certified Organization		Indiana Department of Natural Resources	
Registration number		NSF-SFIS-6L841	
Address	Street, No.	402 West Washington St.	
	City	Indianapolis	Zip/Postal Code 46204
	State/Province	Indiana	
Contact person		Carl Hauser	
Telephone		317.232.4114	Fax 317.233.3863
E-mail		chauser@dnr.state.in.us	Http

CERTIFICATE INFORMATION

Certification achieved (SFI, CSA)	SFI & FSC
Certificate number /	NSF-SFIS-6L841
Date Certified / Expiry Date (pls note if a recertification)	
Date first certified	January 3, 2007
Text in Scope Line of Certificate	The Sustainable Forestry Initiative program of the Indiana Division of Forestry including land management operations on approximately 156,000 acres of Indiana State Forest and related sustainable forestry activities.
Certification Body Name	NSF-ISR
Accreditation Body Name	ANAB
Accreditation Number	NSF-ISR 1301672-071107

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

Forest area (to which certification applies)	156,020 ACRES	HECTARES
SFI Certification Breakout by State/Province	All in Indiana	
Land ownership	100% public %__private	
Has this same area been previously certified?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> If Yes, SFI & FSC If Yes, what portion of the acres/hectares (and AAC for certificates in Canada) reported on this form was previously certified? 150,000 acres	
Forest Type (circle acres or hectares)	Type: Hardwood with some pine: 156,020 acres	

CONTACT INFORMATION

Certified Organization		Indiana Department of Natural Resources	
Registration number		NSF-SFIS-6L841	
Address	Street, No.	402 West Washington St.	
	City	Indianapolis	Zip/Postal Code 46204
	State/Province	Indiana	
Contact person		Carl Hauser	
Telephone		317.232.4114	Fax 317.233.3863
E-mail		chauser@dnr.state.in.us	Http

CERTIFICATE INFORMATION

Certification achieved (SFI, CSA)	SFI & FSC
Certificate number /	NSF-SFIS-6L841
Date Certified / Expiry Date (pls note if a recertification)	
Date first certified	January 3, 2007
Text in Scope Line of Certificate	The Sustainable Forestry Initiative program of the Indiana Division of Forestry including land management operations on approximately 154,000 acres of Indiana State Forest and related sustainable forestry activities.
Certification Body Name	NSF-ISR
Accreditation Body Name	ANAB
Accreditation Number	NSF-ISR 1301672-071107

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

Forest area (to which certification applies)	153,820 ACRES	HECTARES
SFI Certification Breakout by State/Province	All in Indiana	
Land ownership	100% public %__private	
Has this same area been previously certified?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> If Yes, SFI & FSC If Yes, what portion of the acres/hectares (and AAC for certificates in Canada) reported on this form was previously certified? 150,000 acres	
Forest Type (circle acres or hectares)	Type: Hardwood with some pine: 156,020 acres	