



2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600
Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
+1.510.452.8000 main
+1.510.452.8001 fax

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

*Indiana Department of Natural Resources,
Division of Forestry, Classified Forest & Wildlands Program
Indiana, USA*

SCS-FM/COC-00123N

402 West Washington Street, Room W296
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46204
Brenda Huter, BHuter@dnr.IN.gov
<http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/4801.htm>

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
15/Mar/2010	14/Mar/2015

DATE OF FIELD AUDIT
10-14/Oct/2013
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
23/Dec/2013

SCS Contact:
Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification
+1.510.452.8000
bgrady@scsglobalservices.com



Foreword

Cycle in annual surveillance audits			
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual audit	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual audit
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:			
Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry (DoF), Classified Forest Program (CFP)			

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual audits to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance audits are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope audit would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC audit protocols. Rather, annual audits are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual audit);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this audit; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the audit.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the general public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site audit. Section B contains more detailed results and information for the use by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Annual Audit Team.....	4
1.3 Standards Employed	4
2 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	7
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	7
4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	7
4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	7
4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	11
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	14
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	15
7. CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION SCOPE	15
8. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	20
SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL).....	22
Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation.....	22
Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted.....	28
Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed.....	29
Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations	29
Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations.....	29
Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs.....	38

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Annual Audit Team

Auditor Name:	Dave Wager	Auditor role:	Lead Auditor
Qualifications: Qualifications: As previous FM Director for SCS, Dave spent ten years managing and/or leading Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) endorsed certification assessments on more than 100 forest management operations covering over 25 million acres of forestland across 16 countries. As a certification practitioner, Dave Wager has led FSC forest management and chain-of-custody assessments on a range of private and public operations across North America, Asia, and Latin America. In other natural resources work, Dave played a key role in the development of Starbucks CAFE Practices- a program to ensure procurement of sustainably grown and processed coffee. Dave has 17 years' experience working in forestry and the environmental field. He has expertise in forest ecology and business (B.S. business, Skidmore College; M.S. Forest Resources, Utah State University). While studying forest ecology at Utah State University, Dave was awarded a NASA Graduate Student Research Fellowship to develop dendrochronological techniques to assess Douglas-fir growth in Utah's Central Wasatch Mountains.			

2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	5
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	1
C. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and post-site follow-up:	.25
D. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	5.25

1.3 Standards Employed

1.3.1. Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards

Box 1.3.1. – Applicable FSC-Accredited Standards		
Title	Version	Date of Finalization
FSC US Forest Management Standard	V1-0	8 – July – 2010
All standards employed are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org), the FSC-US (www.fscus.org) or the SCS Forest Conservation Program homepage (www.scscertified.com/forestry). Standards are also available, upon request, from Scientific Certification Systems (www.scscertified.com).		

2.0 ANNUAL AUDIT DATES AND ACTIVITIES

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

2 Annual Audit Dates and Activities

2.1 Annual Audit Itinerary and Activities

10 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 11 Dubois County Meeting at Holiday Inn Express	Review CARs, update to program, staff changes
Field visits to District 11	<p>Review of CFs in Dubois counties. Viewed recent timber harvests, invasive species control, planting, and TSI work</p> <p>Timber sale review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regeneration openings (conversion of pine to hardwood) - Protected archeological sites - Water bar implementation and other erosion control - Intermittent streams and removal of tops <p>Document review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management plans - Annual Report for each property - Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluation Record - Pre harvest conference form - Archeological check - Timber sale contracts - Logger interview
11 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 16 Office	Review of hard copies of group records.
Field visit in District 16	<p>Viewed recent timber harvests, marked timber sales not yet harvested, invasive species control, parcel without harvest activity, and TSI work</p> <p>Timber sale review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pre-harvest RTE check - Water bar implementation and other erosion control - Stand level habitat (den, cavity, snag trees) considerations - Directional felling and residual stand damage - Skid trail layout <p>Document review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management plans - Annual Reports - Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluation Record - Pre harvest conference form

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Archeological check - Timber sale contracts
12 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 10 Office	Review of hard copies of group records, paper files for RTE information, management plan status, maps, and other documents.
Field visit in District 10	<p>Viewed recent timber harvests, marked timber sales not yet harvested, invasive species control, and TSI work</p> <p>Timber sale review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pre-harvest RTE check - Water bar implementation and other erosion control - Stand level habitat (den, cavity, snag trees) considerations - Boundary marking - Directional felling and residual stand damage - Skid trail layout and landing size - Quality of post-harvest stand - Boundary markings - NTFP monitoring <p>Document review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management plans - Inventory records - Annual Reports - Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluation Record - Pre harvest conference form
13– Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
Indianapolis	Auditor deliberate and review records.
14 – Oct	
FMU/Location/ sites visited*	Activities/ notes
District 7 Field	<p>Viewed recent timber harvests, tree planting, marked timber sales not yet harvested, wildlife food plots, invasive species control, and TSI work</p> <p>Timber sale review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pre-harvest RTE and archeological check - Water bar implementation and other erosion control - Stand level habitat (den, cavity, snag trees) - Directional felling and residual stand damage - Skid trail layout and landing size - Quality of post-harvest stand - Boundary markings - NTFP monitoring - Wildlife tree considerations <p>Document review included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management plans - Annual Reports

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timber Sale Visitation and Evaluation Record - Pre harvest conference form
--	---

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME's conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include document and record review, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observation of implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and stakeholder analysis. When there is more than one team member, team members may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus between team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME's conformance to the FSC standards and policies.

4. Results of the Evaluation

4.1 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2012.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	FSC STD 30-005 Indicator 2.3
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): ICF's Umbrella Group procedures require that district foresters be notified prior to the start of timber harvests, and this is not consistently occurring. Of the harvest sites selected during the 2012 audit, several were completed without notifying the Division of Forestry.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation): ICF must identify the extent of this problem (i.e., what percentage of sales occur without being notified), determine the root cause of the failure to notify, and take actions to ensure pre-harvest notification occurs.	
FME response (including any	To identify the extent of the problem, the Division of Forestry compiled a list of timber sales reported by landowners on the 2012 Classified Forest & Wildlands

<i>evidence submitted)</i>	<p>Annual report. District Foresters then identified which sales they had been informed of and which they had not received notification until receiving the annual report. District foresters were informed about 62% of the timber harvests. Sales that were reported to have used a consultant forester, advanced knowledge of the sale increased to 76%.</p> <p>Action Steps to ensure pre-harvest notification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Continued communication with industry and professional foresters. The State Foresters provides update for both groups at their regular meetings. 2) Continued communication with group members. In the 2013 Classified Forest & Wildlands Newsletter there was a reminder for landowners to contact their District Forester prior to harvesting timber. Similar information will continue to appear in publications to our group members. 3) District Foresters follow up with landowners who did not give prior notice of timber sales. The forester issues an informative CAR – reminding landowners that they are part of the certified group and in the future they need to contact the forester before the timber harvest. The forester then completes the post-harvest inspection of the property. 4) With the 2013 Annual Report, the Division of Forestry will contact all certified landowners who report that they plan to have a timber harvest the following year via e-mail or postcard if no e-mail is available. One district is testing this option this fall using a letter to the landowner.
SCS review	<p>SCS auditor verified that the actions described above occurred. Conformance with the pre-harvest notification requirement is improving. Given the large number of landowners enrolled in the FSC certificate it is unrealistic to expect perfection on the pre-harvest notification requirement.</p> <p>In the absence of 100% notification, DoF undertakes monitoring and corrective actions to ensure harvest activities conform with FSC standards. Follow-up actions include (internal Corrective Actions or forced landowner withdraw) from the certification when DoF learns of harvests that have occurred without notification.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

Finding Number: 2012.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	Indicator 9.1.a.

Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):	
Indicator 9.1.a requires that the forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU. Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f. Most of ICF's HCVF types can be identified through Natural Heritage Database searches that occur pre-harvest. However, some forest types or conditions (e.g., type I and type II old growth) are not tracked in the Natural Heritage Database and the auditor determined that there is insufficient effort to search for HCV forests prior to harvests or during management plan development. Given the lack of tract level inventory and that old growth is not a layer in the Natural Heritage Database, there is a need for more guidance to Umbrella Group participants on identifying and managing these types.	
Corrective Action Request (or Observation):	
ICF must implement an enhanced strategy to identify and ensure maintenance of Type I and Type II Old Growth Forests and other HCVF not tracked in the Natural Heritage Database.	
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	The Division of Forestry has developed a procedure to identify and ensure maintenance of Type I & Type II Old Growth Forest and other HCVF on Indiana Classified Forest Certified Group properties. A training regarding Old Growth Forest, HCVF and RSA was provided to District Foresters at the section meeting September 17-18, 2013. The training included a field trip to a potential Type II Old Growth Forest.
SCS review	SCS auditor verified that the old growth training occurred and that it was very well attended by District Foresters (DF). All DF's were asked to review their enrolled properties for old growth. One DF interviewed during this audit had old growth candidate possibilities that will be reviewed at the next re-inspection. All other DFs were currently unaware of any old growth existing within their district.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2012.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator(s):	Family Forest Indicator 7.1.a
Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations): Written management plans that are in conformance with FSC requirements do not exist for all properties within the certified group. While many Districts have made excellent progress at updating plans per the timeline established when ICF was certified, some Districts have fallen behind schedule. DoF does not have a tally of the total number of properties lacking a current plan, and as such lack a strategy to direct the necessary resources to ensure all plans meet the FSC standards over time. NOTE: Certain elements of FF indicator 7.1.a may be met in the Umbrella Management Plan and other overarching management planning documents.	

Corrective Action Request (or Observation):

DoF must determine the number of properties lacking a current management plan and develop a strategy to ensure FSC compliant plans are in-place.

FME response
(including any evidence submitted)

The Division of Forestry required district foresters to perform a file search to determine how many files were lacking Stewardship Plans that conform to FSC Guidelines. Based on that audit we discovered that 13.3% of the tracts had no plan or a poor plan. To address this issue we have done the following:

- 1) Moved the production of Stewardship Plans and 5 year inspections to a higher level in the Performance Appraisal process. Mid-year reviews indicate that the district foresters will achieve the goals that were established during last Performance Appraisal and Work Profile creation process.
- 2) Hired a second asst. district forester who will focus on 5 year inspections and Stewardship Plan writing. She is an experienced field forester and will require little training to perform her new duties. She will be assigned to districts that have a backlog in inspections and Stewardship Plan. She begins her job September 30, 2013.

A review of the monthly accomplishment report shows an increase in Stewardship Plan production. From January-July, 2012 we produced 1609 Stewardship Plans. From January-July, 2013 we produced 1911 Stewardship Plans. This represents a 16% increase without the addition of the new asst. district forester. We will continue to monitor our progress and maintain the emphasis on plan in the Performance Appraisal process until all tracts have a plan that meets FSC standards.

SCS review

As requested, DoF assessed the current status of plan updates and has implemented a strategy to address the backlog. As described above, CFP took some significant steps to address the backlog of plans needing updates. During 2013 audit, all DF's provided SCS auditor with an update of current planning backlog and their proposed actions to address the backlog. The addition of the Asst District Forester position is key to conducting re-inspections and updating plans. SCS will continue to monitor implementation of the strategy and progress achieved. At the time of the 2013 audit, significant progress had been achieved to warrant closing the CAR.

Status of CAR:

- Closed
 Upgraded to Major
 Other decision (refer to description above)

4.2 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2013.01	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.3.f.
<p>Non Conformity: Indicator 6.3.f requires that the forest manager “maintains, enhances, or restores habitat components and associated stand structures, in abundance and distribution that could be expected from naturally occurring processes. These components include:</p> <p>a) large live trees, live trees with decay or declining health, snags, and well-distributed coarse down and dead woody material. Legacy trees where present are not harvested; and</p> <p>b) vertical and horizontal complexity.</p> <p>c) Trees selected for retention are generally representative of the dominant species found on the site. “</p> <p>For the following reasons DoF is not in conformance with this requirement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> DoF lacks a legacy tree retention policy for the CFP. Numerous properties inspected in 2013 audit had large diameter wildlife trees designated with an “x”. This cull tree designation gives the logger the discretion to harvest the tree if some or all of the tree can be utilized. Many times there is little economic value in these trees and they have significant ecological value as wildlife trees. Wildlife section of most Classified Forest management plans fails to mention den trees or legacy trees. DoF lacks any numeric target or even general guidelines for what is a sufficient number of den/cavity trees per acre to meet wildlife habitat objectives of landowner and FSC 6.3.f requirements. 	
Corrective Action Request	Evidence of corrective action and compliance with applicable requirements must be submitted by the deadline stated above.
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2013.02	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.3.g.1
<p>Background: Indicator 6.3.g.1 requires that “when even-aged silvicultural systems are employed, and during salvage harvests, live trees and other native vegetation are retained within the harvest unit in a proportion and configuration that is consistent with the characteristic natural disturbance regime unless retention at a lower level is necessary for the purposes of restoration or rehabilitation.” Even-aged harvests are very rare on Classified Forests. During 2013 audit, we did not observe any even-aged harvests that lacked retention. However, DoF lacks any explicit policy requiring green tree retention during even-aged harvests.</p>	
Observation	DoF should develop and implement a green tree retention policy to help ensure conformance with FSC requirement 6.3.g.1.
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

Finding Number: 2013.03	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	7.1.a
<p>Background: Indicator 7.1.a requires that the written management plan for the property or properties under certification include “quantitative and qualitative description of the forest resources to be managed, including at minimum stand-level descriptions of the land cover, including species and size/age class and referencing inventory information.”</p> <p>Only some property level plans have a quantitative description and thus there is an opportunity to improve quantitative data specific to each property. Additionally, for one recent harvest that was inspected in 2013 harvest volume by species was not in the property file, rather only the total volume removed was available.</p> <p>This is an observation as opposed to a CAR because at the group level, the Division of Forestry produced</p>	

a "Volume and Growth of Classified Forest and Wildlands Program Lands Memo (October 8, 2008)" that generally addresses sustained harvest rates for all Classified Forest Program properties. Furthermore, DoF recently completed CFI monitoring for the CFP.

Observation	DoF should implement procedures to collect quantitative data during property re-inspection and plan writing. In the absence of gathering quantitative data, DoF should consider providing a range of growth estimates based on State-wide CFI plots and qualitative data that is collected for each property. Additionally, DoF should ensure that harvest volume by species is retained in each property file.
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2013.04

Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	Group Management (FSC-STD-30-005), Requirement 3.2
Background: Per Group Management Requirement 3.2., "the group entity's procedures shall be sufficient to establish an efficient internal control system ensuring that all members are fulfilling applicable requirements." DoF's Umbrella Plan covers issuing corrective actions and mandatory withdrawal for repeat and major non-conformances. However, DoF does not offer any specifics about what types of activities trigger mandatory withdrawal (e.g., repeat occurrences of not notifying DF prior to harvest, substantial deviation from management plan).	
Observation	DoF should provide written guidance and/or training on the types of issues (e.g., repeat occurrences of not notifying DF prior to harvest, substantial deviation from management plan) that trigger mandatory withdrawal from the program.
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2013.05	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> Next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.6.a
Non-conformity: Annual summary of pesticide use for IFG properties includes simazine and dicamba that are on the FSC list of prohibited chemicals. Note: DoF has not yet confirmed that these chemicals were actually used on IFG properties.	
Corrective Action Request	DoF must confirm whether smazine and dicamba were used on IFG member lands. If simazine or dicamba are being used, DoF must take action to ensure that use is ceased or that derogations for continued use are submitted before the due date above.
FME response (including any evidence submitted)	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)

5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

1. To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME's management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.
2. To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from the pre-evaluation (if one was conducted), lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources (e.g., chair of the regional FSC working group). The following types of groups and individuals were determined to be principal stakeholders in this evaluation:

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

DoF employees	Logging contractors
IFG group members	Consulting Foresters

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used. The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team's response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Responses from the Team, Where Applicable

The primary stakeholder consultation was with IFG group members, who all were very appreciative and supportive of DoF staff assistance on forestry issues, the tax incentive of the program, and the Classified Forest Program as a whole. Consultations with logging contractors, consulting foresters, and DoF employees helped confirm conformance with FSC and Group Entity requirements. Stakeholder consultations did not result in any concerns about conformance with FSC.

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual audit team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual audits and the FME's response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

7. Changes in Certification Scope

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Indiana DNR Division of Forestry		
Contact person	Brenda Huter		
Address	402 W. Washington St., Room W296, Indianapolis, IN 46204 USA	Telephone	317-232-0142
		Fax	317-233-3863
		e-mail	bhuter@dnr.in.gov
		Website	www.in.gov/dnr/forestry

FSC Sales Information

FSC salesperson	Same as above.		
Address		Telephone	
		Fax	
		e-mail	
		Website	

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group	

SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate	
# Group Members (if applicable)	7,800 landowners (approximately)	
Number of FMU's in scope of certificate	10,544 parcels (approximately)	
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	Latitude: 39°46'02.12" N (Indianapolis) Longitude: 86°09'55.47" W (Indianapolis)	
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
privately managed	213,816 ha (528,332 ac)	
state managed	0	
community managed	0	
Number of FMUs in scope that are:		
less than 100 ha in area	10,377 parcels	100 - 1000 ha in area 167 parcels
1000 - 10 000 ha in area	0	more than 10 000 ha in area 0
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that:		Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
are less than 100 ha in area	187,221 ha (462,617 ac)	
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	26,795 ha (66,210 ac)	
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	Many group member parcels likely meet the definition of SLIMF FMUs; the audit, however, was conducted to the full standard	
Division of FMUs into manageable units:		

Non-SLIMF Group Members

Name	Contact information	Latitude/ longitude of Non-SLIMF FMUs

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	213,816 ha
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0 ha meeting the FSC definition of plantation, but some areas are planted
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	0 ha (natural regeneration predominates); some Classified Forests and Wildlands properties are old fields that were planted to hardwoods

	and allowed to progress to a natural stand condition.
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	Approximately 213,816 ha (528,332 ac)
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	
Clearcut (clearcut size range)	
Shelterwood	
Other:	
Uneven-aged management	
Individual tree selection	
Group selection	
Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	
The sustainable rate of harvest (usually Annual Allowable Harvest or AAH where available) of commercial timber (m3 of round wood)	Average annual cut of approximately 30 million board feet (Doyle)
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0 ha recorded; some NTFPs are undoubtedly harvested from Classified Forests, but few – if any – lands are managed for NTFPs to the exclusion of timber
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	NTFP volumes are not tracked
Explanation of the assumptions and reference to the data source upon which AAH and NTFP harvest rates estimates are based:	
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: <i>Scientific/ Latin Name</i> (Common/ Trade Name)	
American chestnut (<i>Castanea dentata</i>) White ash (<i>Fraxinus americana</i>) Green ash (<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>) Black ash (<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>) Blue ash (<i>Fraxinus quadrangulata</i>) American basswood (<i>Tilia americana</i>) American beech (<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>) Ohio Buckeye (<i>Aesculus glabra</i>) Butternut (<i>Juglans cinerea</i>) Black cherry (<i>Prunus serotina</i>) Kentucky coffeetree (<i>Gymnocladus dioica</i>) Eastern cottonwood (<i>Populus deltoides</i>) American elm (<i>Ulmus americana</i>) Red/Slippery elm (<i>Ulmus rubra</i>)	

Blackgum (*Nyssa sylvatica*)
 Sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*)
 Hackberry (*Celtis occidentalis*)
 Sugar (Hard) maple (*Acer saccharum*)
 Silver (Soft) maple (*Acer saccharinum*)
 Red (Soft) maple (*Acer rubrum*)
 Shagbark hickory (*Carya ovata*)
 Mockernut hickory (*Carya alba*)
 Bitternut hickory (*Carya cordiformis*)
 Pecan (*Carya illinoensis*)
 Black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*)
 Honey locust (*Gleditsia triacanthos*)
 White oak (*Quercus alba* and others)
 Red oak (*Quercus rubra* and others)
 Osage-Orange (*Maclura pomifera*)
 Sassafras (*Sassafras albidum*)
 American sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*)
 Black walnut (*Juglans nigra*)
 Black willow (*Salix nigra*)
 Yellow-poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*)
 Persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*)
 American Basswood (*Tilia Americana*)
 Eastern White pine (*Pinus strobus*)

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood	All
W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuelwood	All
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species

Conservation Areas

Total area of forest and non-forest land protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives		0 ha recorded; some lands, however, may informally be managed primarily for conservation values, but the majority of Classified Forests are available for harvest; within the overall program, Classified Wildlands are specifically managed for conservation values, but the FSC group certification applies specifically to Classified Forests		
High Conservation Value Forest/ Areas				
High Conservation Values present and respective areas:				Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
	Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).		
Total Area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest/ Area'				9,820 ac

Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.
--

<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.		
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:		
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):		
Description of FMUs excluded from or forested area excised from the scope of certification:		
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country)	Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac)

8. Annual Data Update

Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender): (DNR staff only)		
# of male workers 18	# of female workers 7	
Number of accidents in forest work since last audit	Serious: # 0	Fatal: # 0

Annual Summary of Pesticide and Other Chemical Use

FME does not use pesticides.

Commercial name of pesticide/herbicide	Active ingredient	Quantity applied annually (kg or lbs)	Size of area treated during previous year	Reason for use
2,4-D	2,4-D		1424 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Crossbow	2,4-D; triclopyr		2516 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Gordon's Brush Killer, Tri-Mec	2,4-D, dicamba, R-2(2-Methy-4 Chlorophenoxy) propionic acid			Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Pathway	2,4-D , picloram		312	Timber stand improvement,

				invasive species control, grape vine control
Milestone	aminopyralid		214 acres	Invasive species control
Banvel	Dicamba		47 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control
Stinger	Clopyralid			Invasive species control
Fusilade	fluaazifop-P-butyl		3 acres	Grass control
Roundup, Rodeo, Accord, Touchdown Pro, Refuge, Razor Pro, Enforcer Roots and All, Cornerstone	Glyphosate		7699 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control, tree planting
Stalker, Habitat	Imazapyr		219 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Escort	metsulfuron methyl		26 acres	Invasive species control
Picloram	Picloram		4945 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control
Poast	sethoxydim		74 acres	Invasive species control
Simazine	Simazine		20 acres	Invasive species control; tree planting; timber stand improvement
Oust	sulfometuron methyl		141 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control, tree planting
Garlon	Triclopyr		1865 acres	Timber stand improvement, invasive species control, grape vine control

SECTION B – APPENDICES (CONFIDENTIAL)

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

FME consists of a single FMU

FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

Appendix 1 – List of FMUs Selected For Evaluation

FME consists of a single FMU

FME consists of multiple FMUs or is a Group

Selection of FMUs for evaluation

Introduction

According to the FSC definition (see FSC-STD-01-002 V1-0), a Forest Management Unit (FMU) is “a clearly defined forest area with mapped boundaries, managed by a single managerial body to a set of explicit objectives which are expressed in a self-contained multi-year management plan.” As long as it meets FSC’s definition, any single FMU may range in size from smaller than 20 ha to over 1,000,000 ha.

SCS classifies FMUs included in the scope of the evaluation as sets of 'like' FMUs for the purpose of sampling. ‘Like’ FMUs typically are similar in forest type, size, and applicable FSC national or regional standards. A group or multiple FMU evaluation may consist of one or more sets of 'like' FMUs. At times, SCS may select an FMU for evaluation due to a pertinent stakeholder issue, pending corrective actions or its proximity to another sampled FMU.

These sets are selected to minimize variability within each set in terms of:

- a) Forest types (natural/ semi-natural vs. plantation);
- b) FMU size class – small, medium, and large FMUs (see Annex 1 of FSC-STD-20-007); and
- c) Applicable national or regional Forest Stewardship Standard.

The results of this analysis of a) – c) are detailed below in terms of size of FMUs. SCS determines sampling intensity prior to conducting all evaluations. In special cases, such as the high presence of HCVPs, controversial forest operations, stakeholder issues, RMUs or so-called mega groups, SCS follows section 5.3 and Annex 1 FSC-STD-20-007 and other FSC guidance as appropriate.

Group Management certificates

In the case of forest management groups comprised of SLIMF and non-SLIMF FMUs, SCS samples non-SLIMF and ‘small’ SLIMF FMUs as separate strata. Groups that consist all or in part of ‘small’ SLIMF FMUs may be sampled using the Resource Management Unit (RMU) concept if they meet the definition of RMU (an RMU is a set of FMUs managed by the same managerial body). So-called Mega-groups may be sampled according to Annex 1 of FSC-STD-20-007. In all cases, sampling in group management programs is carried out in accordance to section 5.3 and Annex 1 of FSC-STD-20-007.

Sampling process for large and medium size FMUs

Part 1:

A) Step A determines the number of sets of 'like' FMUs in each evaluation. Classify the FMUs under the

scope of the evaluation into sets of 'like' FMUs:

1. Within each management type and size class, determine if there are any differences in national or regional Forest Stewardship Standards;
2. Categorize the FMUs by management type (either "Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management" or "Plantation Forest Management");
3. Within each management type, categorize the FMUs by the two size classes in Table 1; and
4. Record the number of sets of 'like' FMUs for each size class: 0.

B) Step B is to determine the *number of sets* of 'like' FMUs to visit during the evaluation.

1. All sets of 'like' FMUs must be visited in the main evaluation.
2. 50% of the sets of 'like' FMUs shall be visited in surveillance and re-evaluations for FMUs in size class 1,000-10,000 ha, and all sets of 'like' FMUs must be visited in surveillance and re-evaluations for FMUs > 10,000 ha.

See Worksheet 1 for a full representation of Steps A & B.

Table 1

Size class	Main evaluation	Surveillance	Re-evaluation
>10,000 ha	$X = y$	$X = 0.8 * y$	$X = 0.8 * y$
>1,000 – 10,000 ha	$X = 0.3 * y$	$X = 0.2 * y$	$X = 0.2 * y$

Worksheet 1. Check a box for each set of 'like' FMUs within a group containing medium and large FMUs. Each box checked represents one set of a 'like' FMU. So if there are two boxes checked, there are two sets of 'like' FMUs for given size classes.

Size Class	>1,000 – 10,000 ha	>10,000 ha
Forest Stewardship Standard 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs
	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs
Forest Stewardship Standard 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs
	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs
Sum of sets of 'like' FMUs	0 (ICF has no Non-SLIMF member)	0
Number of sets of 'like' FMUs to visit		
<input type="checkbox"/> Main evaluation	All	All
<input type="checkbox"/> Surveillance	50%	All
<input type="checkbox"/> Re-evaluation	50%	All
Total sets of 'like' FMUs to visit within each size class (rounded to nearest upper whole number)	0	0

Part 2:

1. For each set of 'like' FMUs to be sampled, SCS shall select a minimum number of units for evaluation (x) by applying the applicable formula in Table 1 (y= total number of FMUs within a set of 'like' FMUs). The number of units to be sampled (x) is calculated by entering the total number of units within the set of 'like' FMUs (y) is as follows:

		Applicable equation for evaluation from Table 1	Sample size (rounded to nearest upper whole number)
Set 1 – description of set			
Total number of FMUs	NA		
Set 2 – description of set			
Total number of FMUs	NA		
<i>Add more Sets as necessary for calculations</i>			

2. Each FMU within the group shall have been visited on-site by the certification body at least once in a 5 years certificate cycle. *This information must be tracked by the client or SCS or both.*

Sampling process for small size FMUs

Sampling for FMUs ≤ 1,000 ha must be conducted in a 2-step approach in accordance to Annex 1 of FSC-STD-20-007:

Part 1:

A) Step A determines the number of sets of 'like' FMUs in each evaluation. Classify the FMUs under the scope of the evaluation into sets of 'like' FMUs:

1. Within each management type and size class, determine if there are any differences in national or regional Forest Stewardship Standards;
2. Categorize the FMUs by management type (either “Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management” or “Plantation Forest Management”);
3. Within each management type, categorize the FMUs by the two size classes in Table 2; and
4. Record the number of sets of 'like' FMUs for each size class: _____.

B) Step B defines the minimum number of sets of 'like' FMUs *to be sampled* in each evaluation. This number (x) shall be calculated by entering the total number of sets of 'like' FMUs (y) found in Step A into the applicable formula in Table 2.

See Worksheet 2 for a full representation of Steps A & B.

Table 2

Size class	Main evaluation	Surveillance	Re-evaluation
100 – 1,000 ha	$X = 0.8 * \sqrt{y}$	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y}$	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y}$
<100 ha	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y}$	$X = 0.3 * \sqrt{y}$	$X = 0.3 * \sqrt{y}$

Worksheet 2. Check a box for each set of ‘like’ FMUs within a group containing FMUs $\leq 1,000$ ha. Each box checked represents one set of a ‘like’ FMU. So if there are two boxes checked, there are two sets of ‘like’ FMUs for given size classes.

Size Class	<100 ha	100 – 1,000 ha
Forest Stewardship Standard 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs
	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs
Forest Stewardship Standard 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest FMUs
	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs	<input type="checkbox"/> Plantation FMUs
Sum of sets of ‘like’ FMUs	1	1
Applicable equation for evaluation from Table 2	$X = 0.3 * \sqrt{y}$	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y}$
Results of equation	$X = 0.3 * \sqrt{1} = 0.3$	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{1} = 0.6$
Total sets of ‘like’ FMUs to visit during evaluation (rounded to nearest upper whole number)	0.9 \rightarrow 1	

Part 2

Part 2 defines the minimum number of units to be sampled within each set of ‘like’ FMUs selected to be sampled in Part 1. For this purpose, FMUs managed by the same managerial body (e.g. the same resource manager) may be combined to a single ‘resource management unit’ (RMU). The number of units to be sampled (x) shall be calculated by entering the total number of units (y= number of FMUs directly managed by the forest owner + number of RMUs) within the set of ‘like’ FMUs (y) into the applicable formula in Table 2. So the number of units to be sampled (x) is calculated by entering the total number of units (y= number of RMUs + remaining FMUs) within the set of ‘like’ FMUs (y) is as follows:

	Applicable equation for evaluation from Table 2	Sample size (rounded to nearest upper whole number)
Set 1 – description of set:		
1. ICF is organized into RMUs, thus the exercise done in Worksheet 2 is irrelevant. All FMUs \leq		

1,000 ha are classified as natural/ semi-natural forest management. ICF qualifies for RMU classification since ICF district foresters provide: a) management planning preparation; b) harvesting planning review using ICF templates; c) group level baseline documentation and information; d) robust group member training programs; e) a timber sale clearinghouse for group members to market certified forest products; and f) group member monitoring at intensity greater than that required by FSC-STD-30-005. Due to these multiple factors, ICF reasonably qualifies as the managerial body that manages all group members.

2. ICF organizes RMUs at the district level, which is a group of counties based on legislative representation. Although a regional office may serve multiple districts, sampling for monitoring of group members is based at the district level.

Basis for RMU classification: 1. Describe how the FME’s management meets the requirement that each FMU within an RMU must be managed by the same managerial body. 2. Describe how RMUs are determined. FMUs classified as part of a given RMU may be based on the group manager’s or certification body’s grouping of ‘like’ FMUs according management type, ecozones, districts, political boundaries, regulatory context, and/or other units. For example, an FME may stratify ‘small’ FMUs into districts based on location and then classify FMUs into an RMU based at the county-level.

Number of RMUs	20	$X = 0.6 * \sqrt{y} \rightarrow X = 0.6 * \sqrt{20} = 2.68$	3; actual sample size was 4 districts.
Remaining FMUs	0		
Total (y = RMU + FMU)	20		
		Applicable equation for evaluation from Table 2	Sample size (rounded to nearest upper whole number)
Set 2 – description of set			
Basis for RMU classification: (as above)			
Number of RMUs			
Remaining FMUs			
Total (y = RMU + FMU)			

Sampling within a ‘resource management unit’ shall be conducted in accordance to Clause 5.4.2 in a main- and re-evaluation and in accordance to Clause 6.3 in a surveillance evaluation as detailed in FSC-STD-20-007.

Simplified sampling options for large Group Certificates of ‘small’ FMUs (based Annex 1 of FSC-STD-20-007)

Mega groups of small size FMUs ≤ 1,000 ha

1. For mega groups or sets of small size FMUs (i.e. more than 5,000 members per group or set) the certification body may sub-stratify the group or sets of small size FMUs according to the level of risk in relation to presence of HCVs, land tenure or land use disputes, and long harvesting cycles.

2. In the demonstrated absence of:

- high conservation value attributes, and
- land use or tenure disputes, and

- short (< 30 years) rotation cycles, the certification body may reduce the sampling size as specified in Table 2 for units within a set of 'like' FMUs by a maximum of 50% (but not less than 55 units in total).			
Non-SLIMF FMUs			
<i>Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management</i>			
Name		Rationale for selection (check all that apply)	
NA		<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<i>Plantation Forest Management</i>			
NA		<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
SLIMF FMUs			
<i>Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management</i>			
Name		Rationale for selection (check all that apply)	
NA		<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<i>Plantation Forest Management</i>			
NA		<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
SLIMF RMUs (groups of 'small' FMUs managed by same managerial body only)			
<i>Natural/ Semi-Natural Forest Management</i>			
Name	RMU Name	Rationale for selection (check all that apply)	
1. Tall Timbers 2. Blessinger 3. Smock 4. Harder 5. Vonderheide	District 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: recent timber harvest, TSI
1. Partee 2. Duke Energy 3. Hirsch 4. Huffman 5. Sibrel	District 16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: atypical bottomland forest, recent timber harvest
1. McCormick 2. Ubelhor 3. Kline 4. Bland 5. Waldschmidt 6. Werne	District 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
1. Murphy 2. Stipp	District 7	<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Tree planting

3. Rosehill Farm			
4. Felton			
5. Wright			
Plantation Forest Management			
NA		<input type="checkbox"/> Random sample	<input type="checkbox"/> Near other sampled FMU
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Appendix 2 – List of Stakeholders Consulted

List of FME Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Contact	Consultation method
Phil Wagner	Asst. State Forester	pwagner@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation, meeting
Brenda Huter	Forest Stewardship Coordinator	bhuter@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation, meeting
Carl Hauser	District Forester, D-10		Field consultation
Scott Haulton	Forestry Wildlife Specialist	shaulton@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Gretchen Herbaugh	District Forester, D-16	gherbaugh@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Adam Dumond	District Forester, D-11	adumond@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
Janet Eger	District Forester, D-7	jejer@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
James Dye	Assistant District Forester	jdye1@dnr.in.gov	Field consultation
John Seifert	State Forester	jseifert@dnr.IN.gov	Field consultation, meeting

List of other Stakeholders Consulted

Name/ Title	Organization	Contact	Consultation method
David Sent, Trustee	Tall Timbers Land Trust	NA	Field consultation
Ron Wright	Landowner	NA	Field consultation
Dexter Eastridge	Independent logger	NA	Field consultation
Dan Vonderheide	Landowner	NA	Field consultation
Tom Kinney	Consulting Forester	NA	Field consultation
Keith McCormick	Landowner	NA	Field consultation
Nancy Bland	Landowner	NA	Field consultation
Wayne Werne	Landowner	NA	Field consultation
Alan Smock	Landowner	NA	Field consultation
Justin Herbaugh	Consulting Forester	NA	Field consultation

Appendix 3 – Additional Audit Techniques Employed

None.

Appendix 4 – Pesticide Derogations

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There are no active pesticide derogations for this FME.		
Name of pesticide / herbicide (active ingredient)		Date derogation approved
Condition	Conformance (C / NC)	Evidence of progress

Appendix 5 – Detailed Observations

Evaluation year	FSC P&C Reviewed
2009	All – Recertification Evaluation
2010	Open CAR/OBS: 1.1, 1.6, 2.1, 3.1, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.3, 8.1, 6.9, and 8.3. GAP Assessment to new FSC-US Standard: 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.8, 6.10, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, and 9.1.
2011	FSC-STD-30-005 (V1-0), 1.3, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 7.1, 7.2, and 7.4.
2012	4.2, 5.1-5.4, 6.3, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4
2013	1.5, 7.1, 9.1, 4.2, 6.2, 6.5, 8.4, 8.5

C= Conformance with Criterion or Indicator
NC= Nonconformance with Criterion or Indicator
NA = Not Applicable
NE = Not Evaluated

REQUIREMENT	C/N C	COMMENT/CAR
P1 Forest management shall respect all applicable laws of the country in which they occur, and international treaties and agreements to which the country is a signatory, and comply with all FSC Principles and Criteria.		
C1.5. Forest management areas should be protected from illegal harvesting, settlement and other unauthorized activities.	C	
1.5.a. The forest owner or manager supports or implements measures intended to prevent illegal and unauthorized activities on the Forest Management Unit (FMU) .	C	During 2013 audit observed CFP properties to be well gated and signed. CFP regulations require posting the corners of enrolled properties. Observed good use of logging slash to block off vehicle access points. During 5-year re-inspections, DF’s take note of unauthorized activities and discuss ways to address the problem.

<p>1.5.b. If illegal or unauthorized activities occur, the forest owner or manager implements actions designed to curtail such activities and correct the situation to the extent possible for meeting all land management objectives with consideration of available resources.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Most of the properties are posted, gated, and contain CFP signs. In some instances owners work with Conservation Officers. Some landowners use hidden cameras to monitor ginseng patches.</p>
<p>C4.2. Forest management should meet or exceed all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families.</p>		
<p>4.2.a. The forest owner or manager meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering health and safety of employees and their families (also see Criterion 1.1).</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 4.2.a Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Determined low risk because of State and Federal health and safety requirements.</p>
<p>4.2.b. The forest owner or manager and their employees and contractors demonstrate a safe work environment. Contracts or other written agreements include safety requirements.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DoF document “Required Elements of a Certified Timber Sale Contract” includes language requiring that loggers meet all Federal, State, County, and Municipal laws regarding safety. Verified that such language is being included in contracts.</p>
<p>4.2.c. The forest owner or manager hires well-qualified service providers to safely implement the management plan.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>
<p>FF Indicator 4.2.c Low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Audit confirms low risk of negative social or environmental impact.</p>
<p>P5 Forest management operations shall encourage the efficient use of the forest’s multiple products and services to ensure economic viability and a wide range of environmental and social benefits.</p>		
<p>C5.1. Forest management should strive toward economic viability, while taking into account the full environmental, social, and operational costs of production, and ensuring the investments necessary to maintain the ecological productivity of the forest.</p>		
<p>5.1.a. The forest owner or manager is financially able to implement core management activities, including all those environmental, social and operating costs, required to meet this Standard, and investment and reinvestment in forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The condition of properties inspected during the 2013 audit indicates landowners are making necessary investments to implement requirements of certification. Some observed examples of investment and reinvestment in the forest include post-harvest TSI, road maintenance, tree planting, wildlife food plot planting, removal of invasive plants, and boundary marking. Annual audits conducted between 2009-2012 found similar conclusions regarding making necessary investments in the forest. In some cases, DF’s have faced landowner resistance to post harvest timber stand improvement. However, DF’s continue to request this work to be done. In cases where forest sustainability is at risk, DF’s require it to be done to remain in the FSC certified group. The CFP has received some public criticism that landowners are using the program as a tax shelter without having proper regard for the timber and habitat values that non-industrial lands offer. Conclusions of FSC audits during the first four years of certification suggest that the majority of landowner objectives and follow-through is consistent with the intent of the CFP program, and that abuse of the tax shelter benefit is</p>

		minimal. One caveat regarding this conclusion is that the audit selection process for visiting CFP properties has been biased toward properties with recent timber harvests. The SCS auditor recommends that to accurately test the hypothesis of tax shelter abuse the audit should include more properties that have not had recent timber harvest activity.
5.1.b. Responses to short-term financial factors are limited to levels that are consistent with fulfillment of this Standard.	C	Although short-term financial factors can be a factor in determining the timing and intensity of timber harvests the overall results of timber harvests are fulfilling this standard.
P6 Forest management shall conserve biological diversity and its associated values, water resources, soils, and unique and fragile ecosystems and landscapes, and, by so doing, maintain the ecological functions and the integrity of the forest.		
C 6.2. Safeguards shall exist which protect rare, threatened and endangered species and their habitats (e.g., nesting and feeding areas). Conservation zones and protection areas shall be established, appropriate to the scale and intensity of forest management and the uniqueness of the affected resources. Inappropriate hunting, fishing, trapping, and collecting shall be controlled.	C	
6.2.a. If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.	NA	All group members qualify as SLIMF
FF Indicator 6.2.a If there is a likely presence of RTE species as identified in Indicator 6.1.a then either a field survey to verify the species' presence or absence is conducted prior to site-disturbing management activities, or management occurs with the assumption that potential RTE species are present. Surveys are conducted by biologists with the appropriate expertise in the species of interest and with appropriate qualifications to conduct the surveys. A secondary review of the survey does not need to be included in the process. If a species is determined to be present, its location should be reported to the manager of the appropriate database.	C	Per DoF procedures, Natural Heritage database surveys are completed when preparing management plans and prior to a harvest. If the Natural Heritage database query indicates possible presence of forest dwelling RTE species, management occurs with the assumption that they are present. Auditors observed good conformance with these requirements. Through interviews and file reviews, verified DF's are using appropriate resources to determine habitat needs of RTE species when Natural Heritage hits come up.
6.2.b. When RTE species are present or assumed to be present, modifications in management are made in order to maintain, restore or enhance the extent, quality and viability of the species and their habitats. Conservation zones and/or protected areas are established for RTE species, including those S3 species that are considered rare, where they are necessary to maintain or improve the	C	Most Natural Heritage occurrences are within wetland or river corridors that are not impacted by timber harvests. However, when occurrences do occur within forested areas, appropriate actions are taken.

<p>short and long-term viability of the species. Conservation measures are based on relevant science, guidelines and/or consultation with relevant, independent experts as necessary to achieve the conservation goal of the Indicator.</p>		
<p>6.2.c. For medium and large public forests (e.g. state forests), forest management plans and operations are designed to meet species’ recovery goals, as well as landscape level biodiversity conservation goals.</p>	NA	All group members have private land.
<p>6.2.d. Within the capacity of the forest owner or manager, hunting, fishing, trapping, collecting and other activities are controlled to avoid the risk of impacts to vulnerable species and communities (See Criterion 1.5).</p>	C	Controlled by Conservation Officers though DNR Law Enforcement Division.
<p>C6.5. Written guidelines shall be prepared and implemented to control erosion; minimize forest damage during harvesting, road construction, and all other mechanical disturbances; and to protect water resources.</p>	C	
<p>6.5.a. The forest owner or manager has written guidelines outlining conformance with the Indicators of this Criterion.</p>	C	Indiana Logging and Forestry Best Management Practices – 2005 BMP Field Guide addresses Criterion 6.5. The guidelines are developed and distributed by DoF. Confirmed FME staff, consulting foresters, and loggers have familiarity with BMPs.
<p>6.5.b. Forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place.</p>	C	Overall DoF does a reasonable job at ensuring BMPs are met on IFG harvests. BMPs are included in timber sale contracts, reviewed during pre-harvest meeting, reviewed during harvest inspections and close-out, and monitored randomly through State BMPS audits. As part of the IFG, DF’s give corrective actions to landowners for BMP violations. In some cases, there are repeated BMP violations or refusals to make necessary corrections and landowners must withdrawal from the program. Also see Observation 2013.4 for opportunity to provide clarity to DF’s regarding what types of violations trigger mandatory withdrawal.
<p>6.5.c. Management activities including site preparation, harvest prescriptions, techniques, timing, and equipment are selected and used to protect soil and water resources and to avoid erosion, landslides, and significant soil disturbance. Logging and other activities that significantly increase the risk of landslides are excluded in areas where risk of landslides is high. The following actions are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Slash is concentrated only as much as necessary to achieve the goals of site preparation and the reduction of fuels to moderate or low levels of fire hazard. ● Disturbance of topsoil is limited to the minimum necessary to achieve successful regeneration of species native to the site. ● Rutting and compaction is minimized. ● Soil erosion is not accelerated. ● Burning is only done when consistent with natural 	C	Overall DoF does a reasonable job at ensuring BMPs are met on IFG harvests. See 6.5.b for more details.

<p>disturbance regimes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural ground cover disturbance is minimized to the extent necessary to achieve regeneration objectives. • Whole tree harvesting on any site over multiple rotations is only done when research indicates soil productivity will not be harmed. • Low impact equipment and technologies is used where appropriate. 		
<p>6.5.d. The transportation system, including design and placement of permanent and temporary haul roads, skid trails, recreational trails, water crossings and landings, is designed, constructed, maintained, and/or reconstructed to reduce short and long-term environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil and water disturbance and cumulative adverse effects, while allowing for customary uses and use rights. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all roads and trails (temporary and permanent), including recreational trails, and off-road travel, is controlled, as possible, to minimize ecological impacts; • road density is minimized; • erosion is minimized; • sediment discharge to streams is minimized; • there is free upstream and downstream passage for aquatic organisms; • impacts of transportation systems on wildlife habitat and migration corridors are minimized; • area converted to roads, landings and skid trails is minimized; • habitat fragmentation is minimized; • unneeded roads are closed and rehabilitated. 	C	<p>During 2013 audit observed overall acceptable conformance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - controlling access - minimizing road density and using existing roads - minimizing erosion through water bars and seasonal restrictions - minimizing sediment discharge through crossings and buffers - maintaining free passage for aquatic organisms by clearing debris from intermittent streams - minimizing wildlife impacts - minimizing area of property in roads, landings, and skid trails and using existing skid trails. - minimizing habitat fragmentation
<p>6.5.e.1. In consultation with appropriate expertise, the forest owner or manager implements written Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) buffer management guidelines that are adequate for preventing environmental impact, and include protecting and restoring water quality, hydrologic conditions in rivers and stream corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps and springs, lake and pond shorelines, and other hydrologically sensitive areas. The guidelines include vegetative buffer widths and protection measures that are acceptable within those buffers.</p> <p>In the Appalachia, Ozark-Ouachita, Southeast, Mississippi Alluvial Valley, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, and Pacific Coast regions, there are requirements for minimum SMZ widths and explicit limitations on the activities that can occur within those SMZs. These are outlined as requirements in Appendix E.</p>	C	<p>Implementation of BMPs covers this requirement. SMZs inspected at 2013 audit conformed with 6.5.e.1.</p>
<p>6.5.e.2. Minor variations from the stated minimum SMZ widths and layout for specific stream segments, wetlands and other water bodies are permitted in limited</p>	NA	<p>No variation from minimum SMZ widths.</p>

<p>circumstances, provided the forest owner or manager demonstrates that the alternative configuration maintains the overall extent of the buffers and provides equivalent or greater environmental protection than FSC-US regional requirements for those stream segments, water quality, and aquatic species, based on site-specific conditions and the best available information. The forest owner or manager develops a written set of supporting information including a description of the riparian habitats and species addressed in the alternative configuration. The CB must verify that the variations meet these requirements, based on the input of an independent expert in aquatic ecology or closely related field.</p>		
<p>6.5.f. Stream and wetland crossings are avoided when possible. Unavoidable crossings are located and constructed to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and fragmentation of aquatic habitat. Crossings do not impede the movement of aquatic species. Temporary crossings are restored to original hydrological conditions when operations are finished.</p>	C	Covered through implementation of BMPs. Stream crossings reviewed during 2013 audit conformed with 6.5.f.
<p>6.5.g. Recreation use on the FMU is managed to avoid negative impacts to soils, water, plants, wildlife and wildlife habitats.</p>	C	Most properties are gated and recreation is carefully controlled by landowner. Did not observe any significant impacts from recreation during 2013 audit.
<p>6.5.h. Grazing by domesticated animals is controlled to protect in-stream habitats and water quality, the species composition and viability of the riparian vegetation, and the banks of the stream channel from erosion.</p>	C	Grazing is prohibited on all CFP properties. Observed conformance to this prohibition.
<p>P7 A management plan -- appropriate to the scale and intensity of the operations -- shall be written, implemented, and kept up to date. The long-term objectives of management, and the means of achieving them, shall be clearly stated.</p>		
<p>C7.1. The management plan and supporting documents shall provide: a) Management objectives. b) description of the forest resources to be managed, environmental limitations, land use and ownership status, socio-economic conditions, and a profile of adjacent lands. c) Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, based on the ecology of the forest in question and information gathered through resource inventories. d) Rationale for rate of annual harvest and species selection. e) Provisions for monitoring of forest growth and dynamics. f) Environmental safeguards based on environmental assessments. g) Plans for the identification and protection of rare, threatened and endangered species. h) Maps describing the forest resource base including protected areas, planned management activities and land ownership. i) Description and justification of harvesting techniques and equipment to be used.</p>	C	
<p>7.1.a. The management plan identifies the ownership and legal status of the FMU and its resources, including rights held by the owner and rights held by others.</p>	NA	All group members qualify as SLIMF

<p>FF Indicator 7.1.a A written management plan exists for the property or properties for which certification is being sought. The management plan includes the following components:</p> <p>i. Management objectives (ecological, silvicultural, social, and economic) and duration of the plan. Guidance: Objectives relate to the goals expressed by the landowner within the constraints of site capability and the best available data on ecological, silvicultural, social and economic conditions.</p> <p>ii. Quantitative and qualitative description of the forest resources to be managed, including at minimum stand-level descriptions of the land cover, including species and size/age class and referencing inventory information. Guidance: In addition to stand-level descriptions of the land cover, information in site-level plans may include: landscape within which the forest is located; landscape-level considerations; past land uses of the forest; legal history and current status; socio-economic conditions; cultural, tribal and customary use issues and other relevant details that explain or justify management prescriptions.</p> <p>iii. Description of silvicultural and/or other management system, prescriptions, rationale, and typical harvest systems (if applicable) that will be used.</p> <p>iv. Description of harvest limits (consistent with Criterion 5.6) and species selection. Also, description of the documentation considered from the options listed in Criterion 5.6 if the FMU does not have a calculated annual harvest rate.</p> <p>v. Description of environmental assessment and safeguards based on the assessment, including approaches to: (1) pest and weed management, (2) fire management, and (3) protection of riparian management zones; (4) protection of representative samples of existing ecosystems (see Criterion 6.4) and management of High Conservation Value Forests (see Principle 9). Guidance: Regional environmental assessments and safeguards or strategies to address pest and weed management, fire management, protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and plant community types, protection of riparian management zones, and protecting representative samples of ecosystems and High Conservation Value Forests may be developed by state conservation agencies. Site specific plans for family forests should be consistent with such guidance and may reference those works for</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The following collection of documents comprise the Management Plan for IFG members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Plan - Natural Heritage Database documentation - Archeological check documentation - Timber sale contracts - Annual Report for each property - Classified Forest and Wildlands Database (w/ Mapping System) - IFG Umbrella Plan - Classified Forest Procedure Manual - Indiana Logging and Forestry Best Management Practices – 2005 BMP Field Guide. <p>This collection of documents covers the requirements of 7.1.a.</p>
---	----------	---

<p>clarity.</p> <p>vi. Description of location and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and plant community types.</p> <p>vii. Description of procedures to monitor the forest, including forest growth and dynamics, and other components as outlined in Principle 8.</p> <p>viii. Maps represent property boundaries, use rights, land cover types, significant hydrologic features, roads, adjoining land use, and protected areas in a manner that clearly relates to the forest description and management prescriptions.</p> <p>Guidance: Property level maps for family forests may be simple and efficient to produce, and may cover only the necessary information needed for management to the FSC-US Family Forest Standard. At the group level, if GIS is used coverage should include protected areas, planned management activities, land ownership, property boundaries, roads, timber production areas, forest types by age class, topography, soils, cultural and customary use areas, locations of natural communities, habitats of species referred to in Criterion 6.2, riparian zones and analysis capabilities to help identify High Conservation Value Forests. Group managers may rely on state conservation agencies for complex GIS services.</p>		
<p>7.1.b. The management plan describes the history of land use and past management, current forest types and associated development, size class and/or successional stages, and natural disturbance regimes that affect the FMU (see Indicator 6.1.a).</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All group members qualify as SLIMF</p>
<p>FF Indicator 7.1.b Actions undertaken on the FMU are consistent with the management plan and help to achieve the stated goals and objectives of the plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Properties visited in 2013 were following the management plan. When management activities deviate from the plan, DF's issue recommended and/or mandatory actions to ensure the trajectory of the property is aligned to management objectives.</p>
<p>C8.4. The results of monitoring shall be incorporated into the implementation and revision of the management plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.4.a. The forest owner or manager monitors and documents the degree to which the objectives stated in the management plan are being fulfilled, as well as significant deviations from the plan.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Addressed during and following harvest, during 5-year re-inspection as needed, and at 10 year plan re-write. All DF's are provided with tablet computers and access to centralized planning database to facilitate plan updates. Although, plan updates are behind scheduled in 2012 and 2013 DoF made progress on the backlog. Additionally, Statewide BMP monitoring on CFP parcels helps assess how well BMP's are being implemented generally across the State on IFG members.</p>
<p>8.4.b. Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Occurs through 5-year re-inspections and post-harvest monitoring. When management activities deviate from the</p>

<p>conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.</p>		<p>plan, DF's follow-up with recommended and/or mandatory actions to ensure the trajectory of the property is aligned to management objectives.</p>
<p>C8.5. While respecting the confidentiality of information, forest managers shall make publicly available a summary of the results of monitoring indicators, including those listed in Criterion 8.2.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>8.5.a. While protecting landowner confidentiality, either full monitoring results or an up-to-date summary of the most recent monitoring information is maintained, covering the Indicators listed in Criterion 8.2, and is available to the public, free or at a nominal price, upon request.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>DoF produces annual publicly available summary of activities on IFG members.</p>
<p>P9 Management activities in high conservation value forests shall maintain or enhance the attributes which define such forests. Decisions regarding high conservation value forests shall always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach.</p> <p>High Conservation Value Forests are those that possess one or more of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant: concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control) d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities). 		
<p>C9.1. Assessment to determine the presence of the attributes consistent with High Conservation Value Forests will be completed, appropriate to scale and intensity of forest management.</p>	<p>C</p>	
<p>9.1.a. The forest owner or manager identifies and maps the presence of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) within the FMU and, to the extent that data are available, adjacent to their FMU, in a manner consistent with the assessment process, definitions, data sources, and other guidance described in Appendix F.</p> <p>Given the relative rarity of old growth forests in the contiguous United States, these areas are normally designated as HCVF, and all old growth must be managed in conformance with Indicator 6.3.a.3 and requirements for legacy trees in Indicator 6.3.f.</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry used existing data (e.g., the Division of Nature Preserves database for rare plants, animals, and natural communities) to screen group member properties for known or potential HCVF. HCVF attributes are already normally considered as part of the management plan, but the Division will now specifically refer to such sites as HCVF. The Division also developed internal protocols for training District Foresters and other staff in HCVF concepts and landowner. Information related to HCVF is provided to group members. In 2013, DoF conducted a training to help DF's identify old growth on IFG members. Old growth is the primary HCVF on IFG properties that would not be covered via Nature Preserves survey and protection.</p>
<p>9.1.b. In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with qualified specialists, independent experts, and local community members who may have</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>All members qualify as a SLIMF.</p>

knowledge of areas that meet the definition of HCVs.		
FF Indicator 9.1.b In developing the assessment, the forest owner or manager consults with databases, qualified experts, and/or best available research and literature.	C	IFG consults with Nature Preserves, TNC, and other experts for identifying HCVF.
9.1.c. A summary of the assessment results and management strategies (see Criterion 9.3) is included in the management plan summary that is made available to the public.	C	HCVF assessment is summarized in the IFG Umbrella Plan and in the property management plans when HCVF is relevant.

Appendix 6 – Chain of Custody Indicators for FMEs

Chain of Custody indicators were not evaluated during this annual audit.